Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH **9239/11**

Paper 1 Written Examination **May/June 2021**

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 May/June 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **21** 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.

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	Calculation questions:
	• The mark scheme will show the steps in the most likely correct method(s), the mark for each step, the correct answer(s) and the mark for each answer
	• If working/explanation is considered essential for full credit, this will be indicated in the question paper and in the mark scheme. In all other instances, the correct answer to a calculation should be given full credit, even if no supporting working is shown.
	• Where the candidate uses a valid method which is not covered by the mark scheme, award equivalent marks for reaching equivalent stages.
	• Where an answer makes use of a candidate's own incorrect figure from previous working, the 'own figure rule' applies: full marks will be given if a correct and complete method is used. Further guidance will be included in the mark scheme where necessary and any exceptions to this general principle will be noted.

4	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.

1 **Questions 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 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).
    (f) 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.

3 **Annotation:**
  - For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers.
  - 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.

Annotation	Meaning
✓	**Correct, creditworthy point**. Used in Question 1 only.

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

AO1 **Research, analysis and evaluation**	- analyse arguments to understand how they are structured and on what they are based - analyse perspectives and understand the different claims, reasons, arguments, views and evidence they contain - synthesize relevant and credible research/text in support of judgements about arguments and perspectives - critically evaluate the strengths, weaknesses and implications of reasoning in arguments and overall perspectives - critically evaluate the nature of different arguments and perspectives - use research/text to support judgements about arguments and perspectives

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

Question	Answer	Marks
1	**Child labour unions in Latin American countries are trying to achieve improvements for their members.** **Explain three different improvements as given by the author of Document 1.** 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. **Credit 1 mark** for a simple explanation **plus 1 mark** for a correctly developed explanation for each of **three** different improvements. e.g. • **Unions protect child workers' rights / (set up projects to) improve working conditions (Para 6)** ✓ (simple) Defend the right to work rather than children having to work illegally **/** Demand that governments provide legal protection ✓ **(Para 3)** [Development] [*As synthesised from different parts of the document, direct quoting, if correctly linked, as well as correct paraphrasing is acceptable*] • **Unions can provide better-paying jobs for children (Para 6)** ✓ (simple) because they can make agreements with buyers to pay fair prices (e.g. Venezuela) **/** because they can get their members to act together in strikes to increase pay.✓ (e.g. Newspaper boys in Bolivia.) **(Para 6)** [Development] [*As these are do not require synthesis the development part needs to be paraphrased **not just quoted***] **/** People pay us less because we are young and so we are discriminated against. **(Para 3)** • **Unions require members to stay in school (Para 6)** ✓ (simple) so children can work a few hours a day but still go to school **(Para 4)** / if working full-time (like Victor Chipani) they can still go to night school (to improve their status/futures – e.g. applying to medical school.) **(Para 2)** ✓ [Development] [Synthesised so direct quoting, if correctly linked, is acceptable] A simple explanation may be copied directly from the text. A development point requires **using the text** rather than just quoting it. This might involve correct paraphrase, correct precis or correct synthesis of parts of the text as described above.	6

Question	Answer	Marks
1	**Credit 1 mark** • for a development point used **instead** of a simple point ✓ • for a simple explanation that quotes from the text without paraphrasing or synthesis e.g. *In Ecuador, the union has organised cooperatives that provide better-paying jobs for children.* ✓ **Credit 0 marks** • for answers that are not linked to the role of the child labour unions. e.g. Child Labor Eradication or ILO • for answers that *do not relate explicitly to actual improvements* e.g. NGOs funding and adult social workers advising unions. • for a *general explanation* that refers to less vulnerable rather than identifying definite improvements e.g. Child labourers are now less vulnerable because they are part of the union. • for answers with no creditworthy material.	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence that the author gives in Document 1 to support the claims made about child labor.** **Use the levels-based marking grid below to credit marks.** No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following: **Strengths** **The author:** • **has relevant experience in the geographical area** – as a journalist in *El Alto* she has first-hand experience to assess the problem of child labour and to be able to <u>select relevant evidence</u> e.g. *Chipani's* story. • **has expertise in the area –** having *won several awards for her investigations in social justice,* she is likely to be aware of the key issues and <u>sources of evidence in this area</u> such as *ILO* rules, and Bolivia's *office of CLE.* • **has possible neutrality** – as an *independent journalist* she is not tied to the viewpoints of a publication, so can <u>independently select evidence</u> without having to tailor this to a publisher, so the <u>evidence might more accurately reflect the situation.</u> • **gives relevant evidence to directly support the conclusion** …The evidence shows that unions <u>can</u> *protect child workers* with *improved working conditions, better-paying jobs* (Ecuador) and *fair prices* for produce (Venezuela) allowing children to *help out families.* • **gives some counterevidence / balanced evidence** – from the *federal Office of Child Labour Eradication – not lower the working age*; as well as the positives claimed by unions- of retained education and *better-paying jobs* allowing children to *help out families.* • **gives wider geographical evidence (than just Bolivia) –** to indicate the significance of the problem of child labourers, *14 million in Latin America* and solutions *Ecuador and Venezuela* not just in Bolivia, but over the whole of Latin America. • **uses sourced statistical evidence –** to indicate to the reader the extent and importance of the problem – *according to the Switzerland-based International Labour Organization (ILO), there are currently more than 215 million child workers, 14 million of them in Latin America.* • **uses sources with authority** – *ILO, Head of federal Office of Child Labour Eradication (OCLE), and the president and a leader of UNATSBO* on policy and effects of rules and unions which gives the claims more weight than just the author's personal reflection/opinion. • **uses first-hand personal testimony** – of child worker *Chipani, UNATSBO child officials* and *Bolivia's OCLE,* whose evidence gives direct insight to the problems and solutions.	12

Question	Answer	Marks
2	• **uses specific relevant examples as evidence** – of solutions in *Bolivia – strikes*, *Ecuador – cooperatives* and *Venezuela – buyers' agreements,* to illustrate the significance of the extent of what child labour unions can achieve. • **uses specific description as evidence rather than emotional language** – to convince readers of the extent of the problem – the evidence of Chipani's situation is narrated to evoke sympathy but without emotional language. **Weaknesses** **The author:** • **presents limited evidence to support one part of the conclusion** – we <u>should</u> protect children in work. The evidence supports that child labor unions <u>can</u> protect, but the argument that we should do so is inferred from the evidence that it is possible to do this. • **uses some unsupported statistics** – *more than 150 nations…, more than 100 000 children…., as many as a million child workers…,* without authority, which reduces whether the evidence can be trusted. • **uses some vague statistics** – *more than 215 million, more than 100 000 children, more than 150 nations*, which limits the significance of the statistical evidence. • **uses an exaggerated claim** – *United, we as child workers can achieve anything* – which reduces confidence in the plausibility of the evidence. • **uses evidence from 10 years ago** – written in 2011, so the situation in Latin America which is an economically developing area may have changed in that time, such that fewer children may need to work to help their families This questions the relevance of the evidence to today's situation. • **presents examples that may not be typical** – If the two examples of the unions' successes in Ecuador and Venezuela are not typical of what happens more widely, it would limit the support of this evidence for the conclusion claiming *that we can protect children in work.* • **uses sources with possible vested interest** – to select the positives and negatives – Chipani, Gutiérrez and Mamani, as union leaders/members, might have a vested interest to present the positives achieved as evidence to persuade the public to support their cause, without referring to evidence where they may have been less successful. • **has possibly less neutrality** – as an *independent journalist* has possibly fewer restraints upon her selection of evidence and issues, so this might be biased to support her beliefs about child labour. 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.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**The authors of Documents 1 and 2 suggest different solutions to the problem of children in work.** **How far is the author's argument in Document 2 more convincing than that of the author in Document 1?** **Use the levels-based marking grid below to credit marks.** No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following: **More convincing** **because provides:** **more practical stronger/clearer solution –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) gives the reader a specific solution …argues for *10 years of compulsory, high quality education (*to prevent school drop outs to work*)*; whereas Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) simply states *we can and should protect children in work* without giving a clear action. **more forceful structure, call to action throughout** – Bhagatin (Doc 2) *This must change, The Act must be scrapped, responsibility must be taken away from, now time to recognise, we must now take charge;* whereas Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) simply presents the evidence leading to action at the very end *we can and should.* **more passionate language-** Bhagatin (Doc 2) uses forceful language to convince the reader*:, statistics unquestionably show, the need for that is self-evident, the poorest Indian has the clear-sightedness*; whereas Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) simply presents evidence towards the conclusion, *so being realistic*. **greater statistical basis –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) argues from firm statistical evidence throughout, some sourced, *Pratham* and *MHRD;* whereas Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) relies on the personal views of *Chipani, Gutiérrez, Mamani and Duran.* **wider geographical evidence –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) gives a fuller context with statistics from the *US* and *China* to indicate the significance of education for India; whereas Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) confines her argument to *Latin America* with one reference to *global* figures, *more than 215 million child workers worldwide.* **more authorial expertise to assess the problem of child labour –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) *was formerly in charge of child labour elimination in the government of India* so can draw on personal experience of the problem, so her solution is likely to carry more authority/weight than Friedman-Rudovsky's (Doc1) argument, whose experience as a journalist is in social justice, so likely to be less specialised.	12

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Less convincing because:** • **weaker supporting evidence for the conclusion –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) gives no firm evidence to support her key claim *there is no country…high quality mass education…elimination of child labour*; whereas Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) gives examples from *Ecuador* and *Venezuela* of how *we can… protect children in work*. • **less balanced argument –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) dismisses the ability of law to help combat the problems of child labour as *least effective pieces of legislation, concentrating on her own views*; whereas Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) gives the claims of *the ILO* and the *head of the OCLE* as counterargument to balance those of the *union UNATSBO* that has opposing views. • **narrower perspective/solution –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) advocates education as the sole answer *10 years of compulsory, high quality education*, not recognising financial needs; whereas Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) presents both the need for education and work, *unions…require their members to stay in school* and a *realistic* solution. • **fewer sources with first-hand experience –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) who has some personal experience in *child labour elimination* presents only her own opinion *we must now*; whereas Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) uses the first-hand experience of *Chipani*, the *president and a leader of UNATSBO* and the *head of OCLE* who inform the reader more widely. • **smaller range of independent authorities –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) relies mainly on statistics from *MHRD*; whereas Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) uses sourced evidence from the *ILO, UNATSBO* and *OCLE*, which gives more authority to the evidence. • **fewer examples to support the claims –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) gives no examples to illustrate her claim that education leads to *the elimination of child labour*; whereas Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) gives examples of unions' achievements in *Venezuela* and *Ecuador* to directly support her conclusion that *we can protect children in work*. • **more negative emotional language –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) uses more emotionally charged language *backward looking, laughably low, rotten classrooms*, which gives a less neutral argument than Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) who simply presents the claims and information for the reader to decide. • **possible greater motive/bias –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) was *formerly in charge of child labour elimination in the government of India* so may still have a vested interest to select information in favour of that cause; whereas Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) as an *independent journalist* may be more open to discussing both sides and leaving the reader to form a judgement.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Neither more nor less convincing** **because different:** • **provide different perspectives geographically** – Bhagatin (Doc 2) the situation in *India*; Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) the situation in *Latin America* …these could require different solutions, so both conclusions could be appropriate to their areas. • **look at different solutions to the problem** – Bhagatin (Doc 2) at the solution to improve education provision to *eliminate child labour*; whereas Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) looks at the solution to *protect children in work*. **because similar:** • **Both have clear conclusions and a supporting structured argument –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) gives opinion and evidence to support *10 years of compulsory, high quality education*; and Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) gives first-hand testimony and evidence to support *we can and should protect children in work.* • **Both point out the negative side of child labour laws –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) that *they are not able to be enforced*; and Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) that it means *Hundreds of millions of children worldwide are working without legal protection. This makes them the world's most vulnerable labor force*. • **Both present some balance of argument –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) presents government initiatives in education *REA* and *programme for universal elementary education* as well as the need for *10 years of compulsory high quality education*; and Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) presents both the views of the *union UNATSBO* and the *government OCLE.* • **Both provide some sourced evidence/statistics –** Bhagatin (Doc 2) relies mainly on statistics from *MHRD*; and Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) uses sourced evidence from the *ILO, UNATSBO and OCLE*, both therefore providing an element of authority. 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.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Judgement** Candidates should critically assess perspectives and the use of examples and evidence in order to reach a judgement. In doing this they might conclude: • that Dr Bhagatin (Doc 2) is more convincing because more authorial expertise, a greater use of statistics and a clear practical solution. • or that overall, despite Friedman-Rudovsky (Doc1) lack of specific expertise, her argument is stronger because it is more balanced, includes first hand personal testimony and a solution that is 'realistic' recognising both the need to work and the need to regulate this. Credit should be given to any alternative judgement on the basis of the assessment and reasoning e.g. that both arguments are equally strong.	

Marking and annotation guidance – Question 2 – 12 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.]**
    (d) J when a judgement is reached (Max 11 marks if judgement not included)

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

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	9–12	• **Both** strengths and weaknesses of evidence are assessed. • Assessment of evidence is **sustained, and a judgement is reached.** • Assessment explicitly includes the **impact** of specific evidence upon the claims made. • Communication is **highly effective** – explanation and reasoning **accurate** and **clearly** expressed.
L2	5–8	• Answers focus more on **either** the strengths **or** weakness of the evidence, although **both** are present/identified. • Assessment identifies strength **or** weakness of evidence with little explanation. • Assessment of evidence is relevant but **generalised, not always linked** to specific claims. • Communication is **accurate** – explanation and reasoning are **limited**, but **clearly** expressed.
L1	1–4	• Answers show **little** or **no** assessment of evidence. • Assessment of evidence, if any, is **simplistic**. • Evidence may be **identified,** and weakness may be **named**. • Communication is **limited** – response may be **cursory** or **descriptive**.
X	0	• no creditable material.

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

- 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 9 marks out of 12.

- 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 (9) to the mark grid on the right-hand side.

- Other examples:

  - e.g.   L3   L3   L3   L3   Overall Level 3 – Mark 12

  This fulfils all L3 criteria so is at the top of L3.

  - e.g.   L2   L1   L2   L1   Overall Level 2 – Mark 6

  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 5
  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 9
  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 9.
  - e.g.   L1   X   L1   L1   Overall Level 1 – Mark 3
  Use X where there is no creditworthy material (L0)

Marking and annotation guidance – Question 3 – 12 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
    (f) J for where judgement is recognised.

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	9–12	• The judgement is **sustained** and **reasoned**. • Alternative perspectives have **sustained** assessment. • Critical evaluation is of **key** issues raised in the passages and has **explicit** reference. • Explanation and reasoning are **highly effective**, accurate and clearly expressed. • Communication is **highly effective** – clear evidence of a structured cogent argument with conclusions explicitly stated and directly linked to the assessment.
L2	5–8	• Judgement is **reasoned**. • **One perspective** may be focused upon for assessment. • Evaluation is present but may **not relate to key** issues. • Explanation and reasoning are **generally accurate**. • Communication is **accurate** – some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment.
L1	1–4	• Judgement, if present, is **unsupported** or **superficial**. • Alternative perspectives have little or no assessment • Evaluation, if any, is **simplistic/undeveloped**. Answers may **describe** a few points comparing the two documents. • Relevant evidence or reasons may be **identified**. • Communication is **limited**. Response may be cursory.
X	0	• no creditable material.

- 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 particular 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 –i.e. 9.
- Other examples:
    - e.g.   L2   L2   L2   L2   L2   Overall Level 2 – mark 8
      Having 5 L2 marks gives the top of L2 (8 marks) as all level 2 criteria have been met.

    - e.g.   L2   L2   L1   L1   L2   Overall Level 2 – mark 6/7
      Having 5 L2 marks would give the top of L2 (9 marks) but this has two L1 grades (ignoring the communication level) bringing it to a mid L2 – 6 or 7 marks. [The L2 for communication might inform your judgement to give the higher mark]

- 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 all levels there is a range of 4 marks so make your judgement mainly on the first 4 criteria, saving the communication mark as final guidance.**