



# Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH**

**9239/13**

Paper 1 Written Exam

**October/November 2022**

**MARK SCHEME**

Maximum Mark: 30

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2022 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **18** printed pages.

**PUBLISHED****Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**PUBLISHED****GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**PUBLISHED****Social Science-Specific Marking Principles  
(for point-based marking)****1 Components using point-based marking:**

- Point marking is often used to reward knowledge, understanding and application of skills. We give credit where the candidate's answer shows relevant knowledge, understanding and application of skills in answering the question. We do not give credit where the answer shows confusion.

From this it follows that we:

- a** DO credit answers which are worded differently from the mark scheme if they clearly convey the same meaning (unless the mark scheme requires a specific term)
- b** DO credit alternative answers/examples which are not written in the mark scheme if they are correct
- c** DO credit answers where candidates give more than one correct answer in one prompt/numbered/scaffolded space where extended writing is required rather than list-type answers. For example, questions that require *n* reasons (e.g. State two reasons ...).
- d** DO NOT credit answers simply for using a 'key term' unless that is all that is required (check for evidence it is understood and not used wrongly)
- e** DO NOT credit answers which are obviously self-contradicting or trying to cover all possibilities
- f** DO NOT give further credit for what is effectively repetition of a correct point already credited unless the language itself is being tested. This applies equally to 'mirror statements' (i.e. polluted/not polluted)
- g** DO NOT require spellings to be correct, unless this is part of the test. However spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. Corrasion/Corrosion).

**2 Presentation of mark scheme:**

- Slashes (/) or the word 'or' separate alternative ways of making the same point.
- Semi colons (;) bullet points (•) or figures in brackets (1) separate different points.
- Content in the answer column in brackets is for examiner information/context to clarify the marking but is not required to earn the mark (except Accounting syllabuses where they indicate negative numbers).

**3 Annotation:**

- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
- For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
- Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

**Annotations**

As noted, scripts must be annotated to show how and where marks have been awarded. Scripts are marked on RM Assessor and these on-screen annotations are available. They should be used as required by the mark scheme and guidance.

<b>Annotation</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
	<b>Correct, creditworthy point.</b> Used in Question 1 only.
	<b>Incorrect point.</b> Used in Question 1 or for clear error elsewhere. Also used to show no creditable material – the equivalent of L0.
	<b>Unclear/confused point</b>
<b>ND</b>	<b>Needs developing.</b> When used alone <b>simply</b> identifies a point made without development. Used in both Question 2 and 3.
<b>ND+ or ND-</b>	<b>Partially developed strength (ND+) or weakness (ND-).</b> Used for <b>general</b> , supported points in Question 2. [ND and + or – added separately]
<b>+ or –</b>	<b>Fully developed strength or weakness.</b> Used for <b>fully</b> supported points in Question 2.
<b>ND EVAL</b>	<b>Partially Developed Evaluation.</b> Used in Question 3 to show where <b>general</b> points are made.
<b>EVAL</b>	<b>Fully Developed Evaluation.</b> Explanation and illustration, <b>fully</b> supporting points in Question 3.
<b>C</b>	<b>Comparison of content.</b> Used in Question 3 when <b>no evaluation</b> ; <b>simply</b> comparison of documents
<b>J</b>	<b>Judgement.</b> Used alone as <b>J</b> to show <b>full</b> judgement, or as <b>ND J</b> , to show <b>partial</b> judgement. Especially used in Question 3.
	<b>Not answering the question.</b> For example, when introducing own knowledge.
	<b>Repetition.</b> When repeating a point as a summary or simply stating another example that does not develop the evaluation.
<b>L1 L2 L3</b>	<b>Level 1, 2 or 3 response.</b> Used in Question 2 and Question 3 to allocate a level for <b>each criterion</b> in the levels tables. They can be used together, like <b>L3/L2 to show a split grade</b> . Used alone to give overall level for the question. (See guidance on last 4 pages)

**PUBLISHED**

Annotation	Meaning
	<b>On Page Comment.</b> Used where necessary to clarify a decision.

Please follow the guidance within the mark scheme on how to annotate each question.

**Note**

The mark scheme cannot cover all points that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases candidates may think of very strong answers which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should be credited according to their quality. If examiners are in any doubt about an answer they should contact their Team Leader or Principal Examiner. For answers marked by levels of response:

- a Mark grids describe the top of each level.
- b **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer.
- c **To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	Award mark
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level

**Assessment Objectives for Global Perspectives**

<b>AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• analyse arguments to understand how they are structured and on what they are based</li><li>• analyse perspectives and understand the different claims, reasons, arguments, views and evidence they contain</li><li>• synthesize relevant and credible research/text in support of judgements about arguments and perspectives</li><li>• critically evaluate the strengths, weaknesses and implications of reasoning in arguments and overall perspectives</li><li>• critically evaluate the nature of different arguments and perspectives</li><li>• use research/text to support judgements about arguments and perspectives.</li></ul>
--	--

**Coverage of Assessment Objectives:****1.a Q1 (a), Q1 (b), Q2, Q3****1.b Q2, Q3****1.c Q2, Q3****1.d Q2, Q3****1.e Q2, Q3****1.f Q2, Q3**

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>Identify <u>two</u> reasons why Filipino migrants are ‘always hiding’, as given by the author of Document 1.</b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>RM Assessor annotation: ✓ for each correct identification. The annotation should be placed within the body of the text to indicate where the marks were awarded.</p> </div> <p><b>Credit one mark</b> for each correctly identified reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘Some migrants came in legally, others didn’t’/Illegal immigrants (hiding because they are illegal immigrants). ✓</li> <li>• Visa restrictions (hiding because they have overstayed their allowed stay time). ✓</li> </ul> <p><b>Do not credit:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tago-ng-tago</li> <li>• Margaret Thatcher was elected</li> <li>• Weak community/lack of support from Filipino Government</li> <li>• Human trafficking concerns.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>Explain how different political leaders have used migration in election campaigns, as given by the author of Document 1.</b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>RM Assessor annotation: ✓ for each correct explanation. The annotation should be placed within the body of the text to indicate where the marks were awarded.</p> </div> <p><b>Credit up to 2 marks each, for up to 2 explanations:</b></p> <p><b>NB Accept any logical explanation given by the candidate. An explanation does not require the answer to develop the text from the candidate’s own understanding. However, it does require using the text rather than just quoting it. This might involve correct paraphrase, correct precis, or correct synthesis of parts of the text.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thatcher: was elected on a popular platform of stopping migration. ✓ She found the Filipino community an easy target as they had no support from the Filipino government. ✓</li> <li>• Trump: migration was a popular issue among the US electorate – they felt they would be burdened by new entrants. ✓ His promise to build a wall to stop migrants was just one of the popular policies he introduced. ✓</li> </ul> <p><b>Allow ‘stopping migration’ once only.</b></p> <p><b>Do not credit:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Donald Trump ignores history</li> <li>• To sustain economic growth/ end recession</li> <li>• DHS (as it is not a political leader).</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence presented by the author in Document 1 to support their argument.</b></p> <p><b>Use the levels-based marking grid below to credit marks.</b> No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p><b>Strengths:</b> The author uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The author’s own <b>first-hand experience</b> provides evidence that supports her argument: her experiences in UK and memories of the Filipino campaign convince us that she knows about the subject.</li> <li>• Facts, opinions and figures <b>from official sources</b> (DHS DFA) are reliable and can be trusted as they are government organisations responsible for collecting data and policy implementation (DHS pointed out that continued inclusion creates the potential for abuse...).</li> <li>• <b>Information from a range of eras</b>, showing how the issues have developed and how some attitudes have remained the same: 1979 Margaret Thatcher and 2016 Donald Trump.</li> <li>• <b>Evidence from DHS</b> supports the view that Filipinos tend to overstay their visas.</li> <li>• <b>Global evidence</b> is reflected in reference to US and UK as well as The Philippines.</li> </ul> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b> The author uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Vague figures:</b> DHS estimated that nearly 40% of visa holders from The Philippines overstayed...</li> <li>• <b>Unsourced figures:</b> The quote in the first paragraph, ‘Migration to the Americas...’ is uncited and unsourced so unclear as to where historical figures originate.</li> <li>• Evidence is mainly about the issues around immigration and the negative impacts of immigration, so it does <b>not always support the conclusion</b> that it is mutually beneficial and necessary. There is only limited reference to benefits, namely the role of Filipino immigrants as nurses in the UK.</li> <li>• Much of the evidence appears to be <b>anecdotal/unsourced</b> and is therefore not convincing.</li> </ul> <p>There is no requirement to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the assessments made.</p>	10

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>To what extent is the argument presented by the author in Document 2 more convincing than that presented by the author in Document 1? You should consider the strengths and weaknesses of each document.</b></p> <p><b>Use the levels-based marking grid below to credit marks.</b>            No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach.            Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p><b>More convincing:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Author’s provenance (reputation/ability to know):</b>                (Doc 2) Jimenez is a lawyer and exec Director... and has past experience as Labor attaché, this convinces us that he is likely to know more and have more access to reliable information than Pedrosa (Doc 1), who is a journalist and seems to depend more on her own views.</li> <li>• <b>Description of own experience in the field:</b>                Doc 2 Jimenez is more convincing in his description of specific roles he has and the reason he has been asked to be involved in formulating the OFW bill. It would be easy enough to check the reality of his claims. Doc 1 Pedrosa claims to have been involved in a campaign and to have worked closely with the Filipino community, but what she did is unclear, and it seems unlikely that we could check on her claims.</li> <li>• <b>Clearer introduction:</b>                Both introduce the historical background, however Jimenez (Doc 2) outlines the specifics of the recent history of migration from Philippines, where Filipinos have gone and what work they have done. Pedrosa (Doc 1) is much vaguer and more rhetorical, just saying people have migrated for thousands of years.</li> <li>• <b>Structure of argument:</b>                Jimenez presents a well-structured argument that is easy to follow and supports the points made with relevant information. His conclusion that migration is a mixed blessing is therefore more convincing than Pedrosa’s more opinionated and less structured argument that migration is unstoppable with a less well supported conclusion that migration is a good thing.</li> <li>• <b>Use of relevant statistics:</b>                12 million Filipinos and USD 32 billion sent to families.</li> </ul>	14

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>Less convincing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Concentration on own status and role:</b> Though both documents include some detail of the authors' experience in the field, Pedrosa, Doc 1, spends much less space on that and gives little detail, whereas Jimenez Doc 2 writes 2 paragraphs really describing why he should do the job he has been asked to do. This makes his argument seem less convincing as he comes across as boastful, so less believable.</li> <li>• <b>Less Balanced view:</b> Pedrosa (Doc1) provides different perspectives, though she is not detailed about all of them; she includes receiving communities, Thatcher, Trump, DHS views and explains the tago-ng-tago attitude of Filipinos and other migrants and their reasons for migrating. Jimenez only really presents his own perspective – and though this is well supported, it is less balanced and so less convincing as an argument (biased).</li> <li>• <b>Conflict of views:</b> In Doc 2, Jimenez seems to imply that migration is generally a very bad thing for Filipino migrants and their families. He is keen to take a role in formulating the bill and yet does not explain to us why migration should continue. This makes his argument less clear and so less convincing as in Doc 1, Pedrosa has a clear opinion that migration is of benefit to migrants. Though she does concede some of the difficulties and barriers, she maintains a positive view.</li> <li>• <b>Sources supporting the argument:</b> Pedrosa (Doc 1) quotes sources for her information (DHS, DOS, DFA) whereas Jimenez (Doc 2) depends mainly on his own opinion and knowledge, making his argument seem opinionated and so less convincing.</li> </ul> <p><b>Neither more nor less convincing:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both have experience of working with the Filipino diaspora.</li> <li>• Both are really based on their own opinion and are a little rhetorical in style.</li> <li>• Both are somewhat boastful and this undermines both to a certain extent.</li> </ul>	

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
3	<p><b>Judgement</b></p> <p>Candidates should critically assess perspectives and the use of evidence and examples to reach a judgement.</p> <p>They may conclude that both are equally convincing and that they have a similar balance of strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>They may conclude that Carmen N Pedrosa is more convincing as she presents a wider range of perspectives and this makes her argument more rounded and stronger.</p> <p>They may conclude that Jimenez' argument is more convincing as it is written by someone with a wide range of international experience dealing with migration issues and who likely has good access to information and official and legal files, making us feel he really knows what he is writing about.</p> <p>There is no requirement to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the assessments made.</p>	

**PUBLISHED****Marking and annotation guidance – Question 2 – 10 marks**

Annotate in the left-hand margin as below:

- a) ND (needs developing) when a point has been mentioned but not developed (simplistic),
- b) ND+ or ND- when a strength or weakness has been partially developed (generalised), and
- c) + or – for a fully developed and explained point of strength or weakness of the evidence used by the author (detailed). **[Point made, point explained, point illustrated with clear example(s) from the document to show impact of the evidence.]**

Use the levels table and the guidance to determine an appropriate level and mark:

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	8-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Both</b> strengths and weaknesses are assessed.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence is <b>sustained, and a judgement is reached</b>.</li> <li>• Assessment explicitly includes the <b>impact</b> of specific evidence upon the claims made.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>highly effective</b> - explanation and reasoning <b>accurate</b> and <b>clearly</b> expressed.</li> </ul>
L2	4-7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers focus more on <b>either</b> the strengths <b>or</b> weakness, although <b>both</b> are present/identified.</li> <li>• Assessment identifies strength <b>or</b> weakness of evidence with little explanation.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence is relevant but <b>generalised, not always linked</b> to specific claims.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>accurate</b> - explanation and reasoning is <b>limited</b>, but <b>clearly</b> expressed.</li> </ul>
L1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers show <b>little</b> or <b>no</b> assessment of evidence.</li> <li>• Assessment, if any, is <b>simplistic</b>.</li> <li>• Evidence may be <b>identified</b>, and weakness may be <b>named</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>limited</b> - response may be <b>cursory</b> or <b>descriptive</b>.</li> </ul>
	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no creditable material.</li> </ul>

- In Question 2, there are 4 bullet points on the levels grid. They reflect:
  - How much assessment there is
  - The quality/sophistication/consistency of the assessment
  - How the evidence is linked to the author's claims
  - Effectiveness of communication.

**PUBLISHED**

- In simple terms the levels are:
  - Level 3 – detailed and sustained
  - Level 2 – generalised and lacking some assessment/explanation
  - Level 1 – simplistic or descriptive
  - Level 0 – have no creditable material (Mark X)
- **You are required to make a judgement of the level that is the best fit for each bullet point. This can include split levels. These will then inform the overall level and mark within it as illustrated below. The notes for awarding marks on page 3 of the mark scheme are for general guidance that reflect the more detailed approach below.**

- These should be listed at the bottom of the answer in the correct order.

– e.g. L3    L2    L2    L2

This would be a L3 answer as it fulfils all the L2 criteria and has one in L3. It is, however, only just in L3 so would be at the bottom of the level and be awarded 8 marks out of 10.

- In the right-hand margin (away from the other 4 level marks) please insert the overall level, in this case L3, then add the mark (8) to the mark grid on the right-hand side.

- Other examples:

- e.g. L3    L3    L3    L3    Overall Level 3 – Mark 10

This fulfils all L3 criteria so is at the top of L3. This **must** be awarded 10 marks.

- e.g. L2    L1    L2    L1    Overall Level 2 – Mark 5

This is a low middle L2 as the L2 criteria have only been partially met.

- e.g. L2    L1    L1    L1    Overall Level 2 – Mark 4

This is a low L2 so the mark is at the bottom of the range.

- e.g. L2    L3/L2    L3/L2    L2    Overall Level 3 – Mark 8

Split grades are allowed where the best fit is a combination of the criteria for two different levels. Treat the L3/L2 as low L3 so overall this would just reach L3 at 8.

- e.g.            L1    X    L1    L1    Overall Level 1 – Mark 2

Use X where there is no creditworthy material (L0)

**PUBLISHED**

- **In Level 2, there is a range of 4 marks so use all 4 criteria to make your judgement.**
- **In Level 3 and Level 1 there is a range of 3 marks so make your judgement mainly on the first 3 criteria, saving the communication mark as final guidance.**

**PUBLISHED****Marking and annotation guidance – Question 3 – 14 marks****Annotate in the left-hand margin as below:**

- a) ND (needs developing) when a point has been mentioned but not developed,
- b) ND EVAL when a point of evaluation has been partially developed (e.g. may make a valid point but without appropriately referencing the documents),
- c) EVAL for a fully developed point that looks at documents and perspectives and uses illustration (perhaps with a quote) from the authors (**Evaluation point made, point explained, point illustrated with clear example(s) from the document as explicit reference**),
- d) C for a direct descriptive comparison of the documents that contains no evaluation (e.g. X said ‘this’ and Y said ‘that’),
- e) ? for an unclear or confused answer, and
- f) J for where judgement is recognised.

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	10–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The judgement is <b>sustained</b> and <b>reasoned</b>.</li> <li>• Alternative perspectives have <b>sustained</b> assessment.</li> <li>• Critical evaluation is of <b>key</b> issues raised in the passages and has <b>explicit</b> reference.</li> <li>• Explanation and reasoning are <b>highly effective</b>, accurate and clearly expressed.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>highly effective</b> - clear evidence of a structured cogent argument with conclusions explicitly stated and directly linked to the assessment.</li> </ul>
L2	5–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judgement is <b>reasoned</b>.</li> <li>• <b>One perspective</b> may be focused upon for assessment.</li> <li>• Evaluation is present but may <b>not relate to key</b> issues.</li> <li>• Explanation and reasoning are <b>generally accurate</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>accurate</b> - some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment.</li> </ul>
L1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judgement, if present, is <b>unsupported</b> or <b>superficial</b>.</li> <li>• Alternative perspectives have little or no assessment.</li> <li>• Evaluation, if any, is <b>simplistic/undeveloped</b>. Answers may <b>describe</b> a few points comparing the two documents.</li> <li>• Relevant evidence or reasons may be <b>identified</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>limited</b>. Response may be cursory.</li> </ul>
X	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no creditable material.</li> </ul>

**PUBLISHED**

- In Question 3, there are 5 bullet points on the levels grid. They reflect:
  - The level of judgement (i.e. how convincing is one document over the other, if at all)
  - Level of perspective (i.e. different viewpoints based on argument, evidence and assumptions within a context)
  - Evaluation
  - Explanation and reasoning
  - Communication.
  
- In simple terms the levels are:
  - Level 3 – Sustained, explicit, highly effective
  - Level 2 – Generalised, generally accurate, less focussed on perspectives and evaluation than L3
  - Level 1 – Superficial, simplistic/undeveloped, descriptive
  - Level 0 – No creditable material. Use X as the annotation for this.
  
- Judgement can be covered throughout the answer with direct evaluation between the documents but can also be achieved by evaluation of the documents separately with a thorough judgement paragraph at the end.
  
- As in Question 2, put the levels for the 5 bullet points at the end of the answer:
  - e.g.        L2    L3    L2    L2    L2  
 This would be a L3 answer as it fulfils all the criteria for L2 and has one L3. This puts it at the bottom of the L3 range of marks – 10.
  
- Other examples:
  - e.g.        L2    L2    L2    L2    L2    Overall Level 2 – mark 9  
 Having 5 L2 marks gives the top of L2 (9 marks) as all level 2 criteria have been met. It **must** be given 9 marks. There should be no subjective judgement.
  - e.g.    L2 L2    L1    L1    L2    Overall Level 2 – mark 7  
 Having 5 L2 marks would give the top of L2 (9 marks) but this has two L1 grades bringing it to a mid L2, i.e. 7.
  
- Split grades are allowed, e.g. L2/L1 or L1/X when the answer does not exactly fit the level descriptors. Treat them as low level, so L2/L1 would be a low level 2 when deciding on the overall level and mark.
  
- **In Level 2 and Level 3, there is a range of 5 marks so use all 5 criteria to make your judgement.**
- **In Level 1 there is a range of 4 marks so make your judgement mainly on the first 4 criteria, saving the communication mark as final guidance.**