



Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

9239/11

Paper 1 Written Examination

May/June 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 May/June 2022 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **20** 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.

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.

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.
	Not answering the question. For example, when introducing own knowledge.
	Repetition. When repeating a point as a summary or simply stating another example that does not develop the evaluation.

Annotation	Meaning
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	<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>Explain <u>three</u> different benefits of adventure tourism on Everest, as given by the author in Document 1.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>Use ✓ for each correct explanation. The ✓ should be placed within the body of the text where the marks are awarded.</p> </div> <p>Credit 1 mark for a simple explanation and a second mark for a correct, developed explanation for each of three benefits. Each benefit has a maximum of 2 marks. The same developed explanation can only be credited once. Examples marked (#) could be used to explain accessibility and safety but credit once only. The answer must be linked to adventure tourism, not just generally be about climbing Everest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adventure tourism makes Everest (more) accessible / provides a thrilling experience which benefits tourists (✓) (Simple explanation) Examples of developed explanations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Inexperienced climbers benefit from being able to buy a packaged service that includes guides (Sherpas). (✓) (#) – The author implies that tourists have porters to carry equipment/extra oxygen that previous climbers did not have. (✓) (#) – Adventure tourism has allowed the ultimate thrill of climbing Everest without years of training. (✓) – Large numbers, 500 last year and possibly 700 this year, reach the summit showing that it is now more accessible. (✓) • A safer experience / risks are reduced / Everest is a much safer place than it used to be (✓) (Simple explanation) Adventure tourism on Everest provides safer conditions than previously because: (examples of developed explanations), <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – inexperienced adventure tourists can be clipped to ropes which form a handrail almost all the way to the top. (✓) (#) – it can be implied that having equipment carried by guides and having extra oxygen makes it safer (✓) (#) – statistics show that a smaller percentage of people are dying relative to the numbers now climbing Everest. (✓) • Provides more income for Nepal / Sherpas / Tourism companies. / Everest is a profitable market (✓) (Simple) Examples of Developed explanations are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A climbing permit costs about USD 10 000 for each climber making large amounts of money for Kathmandu/Nepal (✓) – Sherpas can make much more than most people in Nepal (by guiding inexperienced climbers) (✓) – Adventure tourist companies can make about USD 50 000 to provide a packaged service (✓) 	6

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>Credit 0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• for inaccurate claims e.g. It reduces the height of Everest• for answers with no creditworthy material. <p>A simple explanation can be copied directly from the document. However, for developed explanation the text must be used rather than just being quoted. This might involve correct paraphrase, correct precis or correct synthesis of parts of the text.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence that the author gives in Document 1 about adventure tourism.</p> <p>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:</p> <p>Strengths: The author:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gives relevant evidence to directly support the conclusion – <i>conclusion – that adventure tourism has devalued climbing the world’s highest mountain– supported by evidence</i> that there is less risk and uncertainty with <i>handrails and fixed ropes</i>; less of a challenge with <i>supplementary oxygen</i> and <i>no personal responsibility</i> as climbers are in a human chain to the top. • gives some counter-evidence / balanced evidence – gives the positives of restrictions for safety <i>To be fair the best guides think ...Everest is statistically a much safer place</i>; as well as the negatives from Jenkin’s evidence e.g. <i>people had to take no personal responsibility for the climbing experience</i>. • uses detailed evidence – to indicate the significance of the problem e.g. <i>projected rise from 500 to 700 of summiteers in a year</i>; <i>around a 100 people tried to reach the summit in the space of a few hours</i> to indicate the congestion and delays; <i>Supplementary oxygen in effect lowers the altitude from 8850 metres to 6500 metres</i> to indicate the extent to which inexperienced climber can be aided to reach the top. • uses context to give clear significance to the evidence – <i>when saying Everest is statistically a much safer place than it used to be</i> the author qualifies this within the context <i>in terms of deaths per number of people on the mountain i.e.</i> as a proportion of climbers deaths have decreased (regardless of deaths increasing.) • uses a specific relevant example of first-hand personal testimony – to illustrate how the experience of climbing Everest has been devalued – i.e. <i>Mark Jenkins</i> who claimed that <i>he was forced to take his place in the human chain, clipped to a handrail behind masses of less competent climbers</i> and how frustrating it was to climb Everest where <i>people had to take no personal responsibility for the climbing experience</i>. • gives a range of views on different aspects of what is devalued – to indicate the breadth of critical opinion e.g. significance of the problem climber <i>Messner</i> about <i>adventure tourism</i>; mountaineer <i>Mark Jenkins</i> about his personal experience of congestion on Everest; explorer <i>H W Tilman’s</i> view on use of oxygen. • uses evidence from sources with authority and relevant experience – <i>famous climber Reinhold Messner</i>; <i>experienced mountaineer Mark Jenkins</i> writing for <i>National geographic</i>; <i>H W Tilman</i> leader of the <i>1938 Everest expedition</i> – who would all have the relevant mountaineering knowledge to be able to make expert judgements about the situation on Everest. 	10

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • uses his own experience on Everest as evidence – as having climbed Everest in 1988 with <i>no supplementary oxygen</i> – he has the relevant background to be able to compare past and present demands in the climb. • provides global examples – China and Nepal – and global sources from UK (Venables/Tilman) and Germany/Italy (Messner) <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>The author:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • uses unsourced statistics – <i>Last year more than 500 people reached the summit, and this year more than 700 are expected to do so</i>, which limits the significance of the claim and without authority, whether they numbers can be trusted. • uses vague statistics – <i>last year....more than 500, this year....more than 700; around a 100 people; climbing permits averaging about USD 10 000 each</i>, which without exact figures weakens the significance of the increase, the crowds at the summit and the income gained. • uses unsupported claim as evidence – <i>Everest is statistically a much safer place than it used to be</i> without specifying the actual numbers to support this, or the source. This weakens both the significance and authority of the evidence. • presents an example of an experience that may not be typical – If the examples of Mark Jenkins' experience on Everest is not typical of what happens on other days or seasons, it would limit the support for the conclusion claiming <i>that adventure tourism has clearly devalued climbing Everest</i>. • uses evidence from 9 years ago – written in <i>2013</i>, if the situation on Everest, which has been highlighted has been tackled may e.g. such that fewer climbers are allowed at the summit at any one time, then that would weaken the significance evidence given to highlight problems and the need for change. • uses a limited range of sources (only European and mountaineers) – which may not be representative of global opinion – <i>German-Italian climber Reinhold Messner (adventure tourism); UK mountaineer Mark Jenkins (personal responsibility) and UK climber Tilman (supplementary oxygen)</i>. Adventure tourists, Sherpas, governments and companies and not used as sources. • has possibly less neutrality/selective evidence – as a climber that experienced the challenge of pioneering on Everest <i>a new route, with just four climbers, no high-altitude porters, and no supplementary oxygen</i> he may be biased against new ideas of what constitutes adventure and only presents evidence to support the negative side of the modern experience of adventure tourism. <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>The authors of Documents 1 and 2 propose different solutions to the problems on Everest.</p> <p>How far is the authors' argument in Document 2 more convincing than that of the author in Document 1?</p> <p>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:</p> <p>More convincing (because provides):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a more confident positive conclusion – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) are positive giving hope of improvement <i>There are solutions, they just need to be implemented and monitored</i> which may be more appealing; whereas Venables (Doc 1) doubts the solutions he puts forward <i>However, none of this is likely to happen and concludes negatively sad to me... real adventurers...</i> • stronger statistical evidence – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) give precise figures of present working measures – <i>8 kilos of waste brought down and Nepalese deposits of \$4000 and Tibetan fines of \$100 per kilo, also SPCC figures of 40 tonnes brought down</i>; whereas Venables (Doc 1) uses vague statistics of the problem <i>more than 500, more than 700; around a 100 people; climbing permits averaging about USD 10 000 each</i>, and proposes <i>reinstating</i> restrictions without statistics or explaining why they were abandoned, which weakens support / less convincing. • more emotional language to convince of problem – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) use <i>ugly waste, disgusting, an eyesore</i>, to convince of need for action; whereas Venables (Doc 1) gives a reasoned account <i>there is a logical explanation</i> which may not be as compelling. • a strong visual image – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) use the image of <i>the equivalent of three double-decker buses</i> to convince readers of the size of the problem of waste; whereas Venables (Doc 1) simply gives a reasoned account <i>there is a logical explanation</i>, which may not be as compelling. • more up to date solutions – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) are looking for solutions suitable for problems in 2018; whereas Venables (Doc 1), writing in 2013, is trying to solve a situation in 2013 without knowledge of the later situation, so may be outdated. • greater use of local sources of expertise of continuing situation – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) speak directly to <i>Pemba Dorje Sherpa ...told AFP</i> and use <i>Ang Tsering Sherpa</i> and the <i>SPCC</i> all of whom have continuing experience of the problem because of their jobs on the mountain; whereas Venables (Doc 1) uses historic views – <i>Tilman</i> going back to 1938 and the 2013 snap shot of <i>Jenkins</i> for <i>National Geographic magazine</i>. • more varied positive solutions – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) suggest <i>monitoring deposits and fines, more Sherpas and a dedicated rubbish collection team</i> which together tackle the problems from different angles; whereas Venables (Doc 1) suggests more punitive changes in rules <i>restricting numbers and banning the use of supplementary oxygen</i> which are likely to be less popular, so less convincing as solutions. 	14

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more plausible/realistic solutions – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) suggest additions to already partially working solutions <i>monitoring deposits and fines which are already in place</i>; adding to the number of Sherpas and having a <i>dedicated</i> rubbish collection team building on existing clean-ups; whereas Venables (Doc 1) suggests restrictions and banning which he recognises are unlikely to happen because <i>Everest is a profitable seller’s market so who wants to give that up?</i> • more neutrality – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) are reporting the situation as given by Sherpas and a mountaineer; whereas Venables (Doc 1) has more of his own opinion, possibly biased by his own experience of pioneering a new route on Everest with <i>just four climbers, no high-altitude porters, and no supplementary oxygen.</i> <p>Less convincing (because):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • less balanced argument – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) present the solutions in a solely positive light <i>more Sherpas would also help solve the problem, A dedicated rubbish collection team would be another solution</i>; whereas Venables (Doc 1) points out the negatives of <i>restricting numbers</i> – the loss to the local economy – <i>Everest is a profitable seller’s market, so who wants to give that up? As well as the benefits Reinstate those rules and Everest would be peaceful again.</i> • more emotive argument – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) rely on passionate language to persuade <i>ugly waste, disgusting, an eyesore</i>; whereas Venables (Doc 1) gives a reasoned account <i>there is a logical explanation</i> which may be more convincing. • less fundamental solutions – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) focus on minimising the level of waste with <i>monitoring deposits and fines</i>; whereas Venables (Doc 1) addresses the crux of the problem, by <i>reducing the numbers</i> which would reduce congestion and also the amount of waste. • more biased towards Himalayan economy – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) present the views of the Sherpas who have a possible vested interest to support the numbers and make them work and as authors they suggest <i>more Sherpas</i> possibly because they contribute to the local economy; whereas Venables (Doc 1) appears to be focused on an environmental solution despite the economic loss. • less authorial expertise to assess the problem and solutions – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) are a journalist and communication officer, so are likely to have less expertise in assessing the wider context of the problems; whereas Venables (Doc 1) draws on the historical context of the first expeditions <i>Tilman 1938</i> and the personal experience his own in <i>1988</i> to be able to suggest more far reaching solutions of <i>reducing numbers</i> and <i>banning supplementary oxygen.</i> <p>Neither more or less convincing because different:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focus on different aspects of the problem – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) focus on the problem of waste to suggest <i>deposits and fines</i>; whereas Venables (Doc 1) focuses on the problem of congestion to suggest <i>reducing numbers</i>. Both types of solution could be effective at the same time. 	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Neither more or less convincing because similar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both have a structured argument – that supports the solution and their conclusion- Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) present the problem of numbers and waste, then suggest three solutions leading to a conclusion <i>There are solutions, they just need to be implemented and monitored</i>; Venables (Doc 1) presents the problem of congestion, suggests two solutions and points out <i>However Everest is a profitable seller’s market, so who wants to give that up?</i> Concluding – <i>I suspect that the real adventurers will seek their challenges, and experience of wild places elsewhere.</i> • Both provide some evidence/statistics – to support the need for their type of solution- Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) give statistics about waste <i>last year climbers in Nepal successfully brought down nearly 25 tonnes of rubbish and 15 tonnes of excrement</i>; Venables (Doc 1) presents statistics about congestion <i>Last year more than 500 people reached the summit, and this year more than 700 are expected.</i> • Both use sources with first-hand experience – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) use <i>Sherpas Dorje and Tsering</i> together with climber <i>Benegas</i> with <i>over 20 years</i> of climbing Everest; Venables (Doc 1) uses his own experience of the <i>1988 expedition</i> and the experience of <i>Tilman</i> who climbed Everest in <i>1938</i>. • Both include some bias – Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) use the evidence of Sherpas who may have a vested interest to provide solutions that protect the numbers on Everest and so their jobs on the mountain; Venables (Doc 1) may be biased towards <i>reducing numbers</i> and <i>banning supplementary oxygen</i> because of his own experience <i>with just four climbers, no high-altitude porters, and no supplementary oxygen.</i> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that overall Mathema and Symington (Doc 2) despite their lack of specific expertise present a more convincing argument because they use experienced local sources to support positive and more realistic solutions which build upon actions which already work in part. • <i>or that</i> Venables (Doc 1) with his own greater relevant expertise in summiting Everest presents a more convincing argument because it is more balanced, and deals with solving the fundamental problem of crowding, which if solved would also solve the problem of waste. <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"> • Both strengths and weaknesses 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	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers focus more on either the strengths or weakness, 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	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers show little or no assessment of evidence. • Assessment, if any, is simplistic. • Evidence may be identified, and weakness may be named. • Communication is limited – response may be cursory or descriptive.
	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 there is
 - The quality/sophistication/consistency of the assessment
 - 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 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
- (f) J for where judgement is recognised.

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	10–14	<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 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	5–9	<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 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	<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.

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.

PUBLISHED

- **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.**