



# Cambridge International Project Qualification

---

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL PROJECT QUALIFICATION

9980/01

Paper 1

May/June 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 80

---

**Published**

Students did not sit exam papers in the June 2020 series due to the Covid-19 global pandemic.

This mark scheme is published to support teachers and students and should be read together with the question paper. It shows the requirements of the exam. The answer column of the mark scheme shows the proposed basis on which Examiners would award marks for this exam. Where appropriate, this column also provides the most likely acceptable alternative responses expected from students. Examiners usually review the mark scheme after they have seen student responses and update the mark scheme if appropriate. In the June series, Examiners were unable to consider the acceptability of alternative responses, as there were no student responses to consider.

Mark schemes should usually be read together with the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers. However, because students did not sit exam papers, there is no Principal Examiner Report for Teachers for the June 2020 series.

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

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™ and Cambridge International A & AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **8** printed pages.

**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.

**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.

**Assessment criteria**

Research reports should be assessed using the criteria on the following pages.

Assessment criteria overview: Cambridge International Project Qualification		
<b>AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation</b>		
Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop and justify an appropriate research question</li> <li>• Design and manage own project, using appropriate research methods</li> <li>• Maintain a research log to support the process of research</li> </ul>	24 marks
Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyse findings and/or sources used in order to answer the research question</li> </ul>	20 marks
Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluate the research methods and sources used</li> </ul>	12 marks
AO1 Total		56 marks
<b>AO2 Reflection</b>		
Reflection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reflect on the strengths and limitations of the project</li> <li>• Discuss how and why personal views on the topic have changed or developed as a result of the research conducted</li> </ul>	12 marks
AO2 Total		12 marks
<b>AO3 Communication</b>		
Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicate clearly throughout the report, using appropriate subject-specific terminology, referencing and citation techniques</li> <li>• Structure the report and communicate findings clearly and in an appropriate format</li> </ul>	12 marks
AO3 Total		12 marks
TOTAL		80 marks

Assessment criteria: Cambridge International Project Qualification		
AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation		
AO1: Research		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop and justify an appropriate research question</li> <li>Design and manage own project, using appropriate research methods</li> <li>Maintain a research log to support the process of research</li> </ul>		
Level	Mark Range	Indicative Descriptors
4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The question chosen has been thoughtfully justified.</li> <li>The question has clearly guided the research conducted and content of the report.</li> <li>The research methods and/or sources used are highly appropriate for the project and clearly justified.</li> <li>The project is very well-designed and there is evidence of careful planning throughout.</li> <li>The research log has been consistently maintained and there is evidence that it has been used to support the research process throughout.</li> </ul>
3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The question chosen has been reasonably justified.</li> <li>The question has largely guided the research conducted and content of the report.</li> <li>The research methods and/or sources used are appropriate for the research project and there is a reasonable justification for their selection.</li> <li>The project is well-designed and there is evidence of planning at times.</li> <li>The research log has been maintained throughout the project and there is evidence that it has been used to support the research process at times.</li> </ul>
2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is an attempt to justify the question chosen.</li> <li>The research conducted and content of the report are broadly related to the question.</li> <li>The research methods and/or sources used are either appropriate for the project or there is a reasonable attempt to justify their selection.</li> <li>The project is reasonably well-designed but there is little evidence of planning.</li> <li>The research log has been used to record information relating to some aspects of the research process.</li> </ul>
1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A question has been chosen but there is no serious attempt to justify it.</li> <li>Much of the research conducted or content of the report is only vaguely related to the question.</li> <li>At least one research method and/or a range of sources has been used but these are not well suited to the project and there is little attempt to justify their selection.</li> <li>The research log is superficial and gives little evidence of the research process.</li> </ul>
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mark of zero should be awarded for no creditable content.</li> </ul>

<b>AO1: Analysis</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyse findings and/or sources used in order to answer the research question</li> </ul>		
Level	Mark Range	Indicative Descriptors
4	16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excellent analysis of findings and/or sources used.</li> <li>The analysis is consistently focused on the research question.</li> <li>Conclusions drawn are clearly supported by the evidence presented.</li> <li>There is a clear answer in response to the research question which is reflective of the evidence presented in the report.</li> </ul>
3	11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Good analysis of findings and/or sources used.</li> <li>The analysis is relevant to the research question.</li> <li>Conclusions drawn are supported by the evidence presented.</li> <li>There is an answer in response to the research question relevant to the evidence presented in the report.</li> </ul>
2	6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some analysis of findings and/or sources used.</li> <li>The analysis is partially relevant to the research question.</li> <li>Conclusions drawn are only partially supported by the evidence presented.</li> <li>There is an answer in response to the research question but this is only partially relevant to the evidence presented in the report.</li> </ul>
1	1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some limited analysis of findings and/or sources used.</li> <li>The analysis lacks relevance to the research question.</li> <li>Conclusions drawn are limited or not supported by the evidence presented.</li> <li>There is an answer in response to the research question but this is limited or not relevant to the evidence presented in the report.</li> </ul>
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mark of zero should be awarded for no creditable content.</li> </ul>

<b>AO1: Evaluation</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate the research methods and sources used</li> </ul>		
Level	Mark Range	Indicative Descriptors
4	10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed and insightful discussion of the strengths and limitations of the research method(s) used.</li> <li>Explicit and effective evaluation of a range of sources.</li> </ul>
3	7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed discussion of the strengths and limitations of the research method(s) used.</li> <li>Explicit and effective evaluation of at least one source.</li> </ul>
2	4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some discussion of the strengths and/or limitations of the research method(s) used.</li> <li>Some explicit evaluation of a range of sources.</li> </ul>
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some limited discussion of a strength or limitations of the research method(s) used.</li> <li>Some explicit evaluation of at least one source.</li> </ul>
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A mark of zero should be awarded for no creditable content.</li> </ul>

<b>AO2 Reflection</b>		
<b>AO2: Reflection</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reflect on the strengths and limitations of the project</li> <li>• Discuss how and why personal views on the topic have changed or developed as a result of the research conducted</li> </ul>		
Level	Mark Range	Indicative Descriptors
4	10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed and insightful reflection on the strengths and limitations of the project.</li> <li>• A thoughtful discussion of how and why personal views on the topic have changed or developed, which is clearly and directly related to the research conducted.</li> </ul>
3	7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed reflection on the strengths and limitations of the project.</li> <li>• A clear discussion of how and why personal views on the topic have changed or developed, with direct reference to the research conducted.</li> </ul>
2	4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some reflection on the strengths and/or limitations of the project.</li> <li>• Some discussion of how personal views on the topic have changed or developed, with some reference to the research conducted.</li> </ul>
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some limited reflection on a strength or limitation of the project.</li> <li>• Some discussion of personal views on the topic.</li> </ul>
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A mark of zero should be awarded for no creditable content.</li> </ul>

<b>AO3 Communication</b>		
<b>AO3: Communication</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicate clearly throughout the report, using appropriate subject-specific terminology, referencing and citation techniques</li> <li>• Structure the report and communicate findings clearly and in an appropriate format</li> </ul>		
Level	Mark Range	Indicative Descriptors
4	10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report is well-structured and very clear to follow.</li> <li>• A range of subject-specific terminology is used consistently and accurately throughout the report.</li> <li>• Research findings are communicated clearly and in a highly appropriate format.</li> <li>• Citation and referencing of sources are complete, consistent and in an appropriate format.</li> </ul>
3	7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report is well-structured and clear to follow.</li> <li>• A range of mostly accurate subject-specific terminology is used throughout the report.</li> <li>• Research findings are communicated clearly and in an appropriate format.</li> <li>• Citation and referencing of sources are mostly complete and consistent and in an appropriate format.</li> </ul>
2	4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report is mostly well-structured and fairly clear to follow.</li> <li>• Some accurate subject-specific terminology is used.</li> <li>• Research findings are communicated with some clarity.</li> <li>• Citation and referencing of sources are mostly complete and consistent.</li> </ul>
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The report is not well-structured, making it difficult to follow.</li> <li>• Some subject-specific terminology is used.</li> <li>• Research findings are included.</li> <li>• Citation and referencing of sources is attempted but incomplete.</li> </ul>
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A mark of zero should be awarded for no creditable content.</li> </ul>