



Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

9239/12

Paper 1 Written Examination

May/June 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 30

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 **18** 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.

Annotations

Scripts must be annotated to show how and where marks have been awarded. For scripts marked on RM Assessor, the following on-screen annotations are available.

Annotation	Meaning
✓	Correct, creditworthy point
X	Incorrect point or no creditable material (L0 – level 0 response)
?	Unclear/confused point
EVAL	Evaluation
J	Judgement
+	Strength
-	Weakness
ND	Needs developing
On page comment	Space for summative comment if needed
NAQ	Not answering the question
REP	Repetition (same point made with different example, but not used to enhance the explanation)
SEEN	Seen
L1	Level 1 response
L2	Level 2 response
L3	Level 3 response
C	Undeveloped comparison of content

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 synthesise 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	<p>Identify and explain <u>three</u> negative effects that large numbers of tourists have on Dubrovnik, as given by the author of Document 1.</p> <p>Credit one mark for each correct identification, up to three marks plus one mark each for a correct explanation of this, up to three marks.</p> <p>Credit marks for correct versions of the following:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="383 488 1890 1118"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="383 488 1137 555">Identify</th> <th data-bbox="1137 488 1890 555">Explain</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="383 555 1137 687">Transport problems e.g. traffic jams in Dubrovnik ✓</td> <td data-bbox="1137 555 1890 687">because of the number of tourists from cruise ships wanting to go to the Old City by coach at the same time. ✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="383 687 1137 786">Transport problems e.g. crowded public transport in Dubrovnik ✓</td> <td data-bbox="1137 687 1890 786">because buses are full of tourists wanting to get about in the Old City. ✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="383 786 1137 885">Damage to heritage e.g. damage to Dubrovnik's main street ✓</td> <td data-bbox="1137 786 1890 885">because of the large numbers of tourists the street has been eroded. ✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="383 885 1137 984">Crowded streets e.g. difficulty walking in the main street ✓</td> <td data-bbox="1137 885 1890 984">because of the number of tour groups stopping to look at places of interest. ✓</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="383 984 1137 1118">Change in culture e.g. Dubrovnik risks becoming a theme park ✓</td> <td data-bbox="1137 984 1890 1118">because of tourists buying souvenirs/ using selfie sticks/ dribbling ice creams alters the feel of the historic world heritage site. ✓</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Cap at 1 mark for a correct answer that quotes wholly from the text e.g. <i>'The main street is packed with tour groups, where it's hard to stand and admire the historic St Blaise's church among all the selfie sticks.'</i> An explanation does not require the answer to develop the text from the candidates own understanding. However, it does require using the text rather than just quoting it. This might involve correct <i>paraphrase</i>, correct <i>precis</i> or correct <i>synthesis</i> of parts of the text.</p>	Identify	Explain	Transport problems e.g. traffic jams in Dubrovnik ✓	because of the number of tourists from cruise ships wanting to go to the Old City by coach at the same time. ✓	Transport problems e.g. crowded public transport in Dubrovnik ✓	because buses are full of tourists wanting to get about in the Old City. ✓	Damage to heritage e.g. damage to Dubrovnik's main street ✓	because of the large numbers of tourists the street has been eroded. ✓	Crowded streets e.g. difficulty walking in the main street ✓	because of the number of tour groups stopping to look at places of interest. ✓	Change in culture e.g. Dubrovnik risks becoming a theme park ✓	because of tourists buying souvenirs/ using selfie sticks/ dribbling ice creams alters the feel of the historic world heritage site. ✓	6
Identify	Explain													
Transport problems e.g. traffic jams in Dubrovnik ✓	because of the number of tourists from cruise ships wanting to go to the Old City by coach at the same time. ✓													
Transport problems e.g. crowded public transport in Dubrovnik ✓	because buses are full of tourists wanting to get about in the Old City. ✓													
Damage to heritage e.g. damage to Dubrovnik's main street ✓	because of the large numbers of tourists the street has been eroded. ✓													
Crowded streets e.g. difficulty walking in the main street ✓	because of the number of tour groups stopping to look at places of interest. ✓													
Change in culture e.g. Dubrovnik risks becoming a theme park ✓	because of tourists buying souvenirs/ using selfie sticks/ dribbling ice creams alters the feel of the historic world heritage site. ✓													

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>3 × (1 + 1)</p> <p>Credit 0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for answers that relate to the dilemma e.g. refer to: tourism providing thousands of jobs or refer to :without tourism Dubrovnik's economy would suffer as these are not a problem caused by large numbers of tourists. They are part of the dilemma of what to doincome v limiting overcrowding. • for answers taken from the candidate's own knowledge e.g. impact of the Game of Thrones. • for answers with no creditworthy material. <p>RM Assessor annotation: ✓ for each correct identification and explanation. The annotation should be placed within the body of the text to indicate where the marks were awarded.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the argument that the author gives in Document 1 about the impact of tourists upon Dubrovnik.</p> <p>Use the levels-based marking below to credit marks. No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clear conclusion and structure – <i>I doubt this will be enough</i> supported by a structure that gives reasons for high numbers, the benefits, the negative impact on locals and tourists and the plans to limit tourists. • uses first-hand sources – the <i>taxi driver's</i> comments about tourists, the <i>guide's</i> use of tourism to work 4 months, and <i>the elderly woman's</i> response to full buses. • uses sources with authority – to give trusted information, <i>UNESCO</i> on safe visitor numbers, <i>Visitor's website</i> on actual numbers, <i>and mayors</i> on plans to limit tourists. • uses own personal experience – ability to see first-hand problems of traffic jams- at the <i>port</i>, congestion points – <i>Pile Gate</i>, difficulties in <i>main street</i> with tour groups, snapshot of <i>authorities</i> not responding to tourist numbers, <i>buses</i> not stopping. • uses relevant emotional expression – to convince readers of the problem..., <i>dribbling</i> ice cream. • uses relevant examples – <i>taxi driver's</i> views on tourist numbers, <i>website count</i> being over the limit, <i>guide</i> funding from tourism months off, <i>elderly woman's</i> experience of public transport. • gives some balance – He gives evidence both for the problems that tourism causes, but also how it <i>provides thousands of jobs</i> and <i>brings euros into the city</i>. • expertise to know what works – he is a <i>travel writer</i> who does on site <i>research</i>, so has direct access to information about problems and strategies to make an informed judgement. • vested interest to present accurate information – As a <i>travel writer</i> for the <i>Traveller</i> website he would have vested interest to present information accurately to maintain both his professionalism and that of the website in the public's eyes to give accurate <i>tips and advice</i> about Dubrovnik. 	12

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gives a conclusion based on opinion – <i>I doubt this will be enough</i> – which as a travel writer, he might not have the expertise to judge municipal strategies proposed by the city's mayor. • lacks balance, uses limited perspectives – The argument doesn't respond to any alternative perspectives about a positive tourist experience in Dubrovnik, he concentrates on the problems. • uses unourced statistics – His statistics about <i>expected visitors – 2 million</i> and <i>expected cruise ships – 538</i> have no source which limits the authority of the projections for the year. • examples may not be typical – If the examples of the <i>taxi driver's</i> views, the <i>guide's</i> work plan, and the <i>elderly woman's</i> experience of full buses are not typical of what happens, his concerns raised are weakened. • his experience as a snapshot in time may not be typical – If his experiences on <i>August 21st</i> are not typical of other times of the year, then this weakens his conclusion – <i>given my experience</i>. • uses an exaggerated unsupported claim – <i>risks becoming a theme park</i>, as there is no evidence of the large-scale activities usually associated with theme park venues. • Vested interest to exaggerate – As a <i>travel writer</i> for the <i>Traveller</i> website he might have vested interest to select and exaggerate particular situations in order to create an engaging storyline e.g. <i>risks a Disneyland on the Adriatic</i>. <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>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Both authors present evidence of the impact of tourism upon European cities.</p> <p>To what extent is the evidence supporting the author’s argument in Document 2 more convincing than the evidence supporting the author’s argument in Document 1?</p> <p>No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p>More Convincing evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • wider geographical evidence – Kottasová (Doc 2) has a wider geographical perspective looking at the evidence for the impact of tourism in <i>Venice, Barcelona, Dubrovnik and Prague</i>. This gives wider corroborating evidence to support the tourist problems than Gebicki (Doc 1) who limits his evidence to Dubrovnik. • wider perspective on solutions – Kottasová (Doc 2) looks at evidence for a range of solutions e.g. limiting <i>hotel rooms, tourist tax, information campaigns, tourist police</i> and limiting <i>cruise ships</i> to improve experience; whereas Gebicki (Doc 1) concentrates on evidence of only one solution Francovic’s. • more sourced authorities for evidence – Kottasová (Doc 2) uses <i>UNESCO, Euromonitor International, Mastercard</i> and the <i>Spanish Prime Minister</i> which bring more authority to her evidence than Gebicki (Doc 1) who uses <i>UNESCO, Prime Ministers</i> and more anecdotal evidence. • more statistical evidence – Kottasová (Doc 2) gives sourced statistics from <i>Euromonitor International, Mastercard and Croatian bureau of statistics</i> making these more credible; whereas Gebicki (Doc 1) has unsourced expected tourist numbers and only the <i>live counter</i> stats. • less bias in evidence – Kottasová (Doc 2) simply gives statistics and reports the proposed solutions; whereas Gebicki (Doc 1) uses emotionally charged language, <i>dribbling ice-cream, Disneyland on the Adriatic</i>, with negative connotations. • greater vested interest to give accurate evidence – Although both journalists, Kottasová (Doc 2) reports for the (<i>world’s largest business website</i>) <i>CNN Money</i> so may have a greater vested interest to be accurate to retain public confidence, than Gebicki (Doc 1) who writes for a <i>travel website</i>. • possibly more experience of European situations – Kottasová (Doc 2) having worked for a Czech weekly newspaper may be in a better position to interpret the evidence more correctly than Gebicki (Doc 1) who is based in <i>Australia</i>. <p>Less convincing evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • less first-hand experience of the evidence – Kottasová (Doc 2) reports the statistics and solutions from authorities; whereas Gebicki (Doc 1) has first-hand experience so can see on the ground how solutions are not working e.g. <i>visitor counter</i>, which is more convincing. 	12

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unsourced evidence for solutions – Kottasová (Doc 2) reports the solutions posed by 4 countries without any sources to confirm this evidence which reduces authority; whereas Gebicki (Doc 1) gives evidence of <i>UNESCO's</i> advice and the proposed solutions of 2 <i>mayors</i>. • less passionate/emotive evidence – Kottasová (Doc 2) simply gives the statistics and reports the proposed solutions; whereas Gebicki (Doc 1) uses emotionally charged claims <i>dribbling</i> ice-creams, and <i>Disneyland on the Adriatic</i> , which persuades the reader and helps them to visualise the problems. • possibly less experience of evidence of tourist issues – Kottasová (Doc 2) has a background in <i>journalism</i> for a <i>business website</i>, so may not have the experience to know how to judge the evidence of the solutions; whereas Gebicki (Doc 1) is at the site with first-hand experience of the solutions failing and is a <i>travel writer</i>, so familiar with the issues. <p>Neither more or less convincing evidence</p> <p>because different</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • different perspectives geographically – Kottasová (Doc 2) looks at the impact of tourism across four European <i>cities</i>; whereas Gebicki (Doc 1) concentrates on the impact in detail on one city, <i>Dubrovnik</i>. <p>because similar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both look at the evidence of growing tourist numbers and the negative effects – Kottasová (Doc 2) for <i>Venice, Barcelona, Dubrovnik</i> and <i>Prague</i>; Gebicki (Doc 1) specifically for <i>Dubrovnik</i>, although he mentions <i>Venice</i> and <i>Barcelona</i>. • Both look at the evidence of proposed solutions – Kottasová (Doc 2) for <i>Venice, Barcelona, Dubrovnik</i> and <i>Prague</i>; Gebicki (Doc 1) specifically for <i>Dubrovnik</i>. • Both present some balance of evidence – Kottasová (Doc 2) looking at being a <i>bad thing</i> as well as solutions; Gebicki (Doc 1) looking at the positives of <i>thousands of jobs</i>, as well as the negatives. • Both provide sourced evidence – relevant examples, statistics and views from authorities e.g. Kottasová (Doc 2) from Spain's PM <i>Rajoy</i>; Gebicki (Doc 1) from Dubrovnik's mayor <i>Frankovic</i>. • Both draw clear conclusions from the evidence – Kottasová (Doc 2) <i>I doubt this will be enough</i>; Gebicki (Doc 1) <i>...will improve the experience of both the tourists and locals alike</i> and so equally strong structures. • Both speculate from the evidence – about the outcome of measures taken Kottasová (Doc 2) <i>I doubt this will be enough</i>; Gebicki (Doc 1) <i>...will improve the experience of both the tourists and locals alike</i>, so potentially equal chances of being incorrect. • Both look at the evidence from the same perspective in time – both Kottasová (Doc 2) and Gebicki (Doc 1) look at the impact of tourism at the same snapshot in time <i>2017</i>. <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>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p data-bbox="322 217 483 248">Judgement</p> <p data-bbox="322 284 1861 316">Candidates should critically assess perspectives and the use of examples and evidence in order to reach a judgement.</p> <ul data-bbox="371 357 1957 628" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="371 357 1957 421">• In doing this they might conclude that Kottasová (Doc 2)'s evidence is more convincing because of wider geographical evidence, more expert sources and more European expertise.<li data-bbox="371 459 1957 523">• Alternatively, they might conclude that overall, despite Gebicki (Doc 1)'s more limited geographical evidence, his evidence is stronger because it is first-hand and written in a more personally convincing style.<li data-bbox="371 561 1957 625">• Credit should be given to any alternative judgement on the basis of the assessment and reasoning e.g. that both arguments have equally strong evidence.	

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.]**

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

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	9–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both strengths and weaknesses of evidence are assessed. • Assessment of evidence is sustained. • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 is limited, but clearly expressed.
L1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. This **must** be awarded 12 marks.
 - 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 is 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgement is reasoned. • One perspective may be focused upon for assessment. • Evaluation is present but may not relate to key issues. • Explanation and reasoning is 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. It **must** be given 8 marks. There should be no subjective judgement.
 - 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.**