



# Cambridge O Level

---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES**

**2069/01**

Paper 1 Written Exam

**For examination from 2025**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 70

---

**Specimen**

---

This document has **18** 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 descriptions 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 descriptions for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptions 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 descriptions.

**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 descriptions in mind.

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

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

From this it follows that we:

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

**2 Presentation of mark scheme:**

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

**3 Annotation:**

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

**Assessment objectives****AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation**

- design, carry out and evaluate research into current global issues, their causes and consequences and possible course(s) of action
- use evidence to support claims, arguments and perspectives
- identify and analyse issues, arguments and perspectives
- analyse and evaluate the evidence and reasoning used to support claims, arguments and perspectives
- analyse and evaluate sources and/or processes to support research, arguments and perspectives
- develop a line of reasoning to support an argument, a perspective or course(s) of action.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>According to Source 1, how many people regularly suffered from hunger and poor nutrition in 2021?</b></p> <p>From Source 1, candidates are expected to identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 800 million</li> </ul> <p>Award 1 mark for the correct answer.</p>	<b>1</b>
1(b)(i)	<p><b>Identify <u>one</u> example of a generalisation from Source 2.</b></p> <p>From Source 2, candidates are expected to identify <b>one</b> of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hunger always destroys health/education/employment.</li> <li>• We must have compassion and care for everyone.</li> <li>• When people come together/demand change, extraordinary things happen.</li> </ul> <p>Award 1 mark for a correct answer.</p>	<b>1</b>
1(b)(ii)	<p><b>Explain why the example you identified is a generalisation.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>A generalisation is a statement suggesting that something is true all of the time when it is only true some of the time; or a statement applying the characteristics of a small sample to a whole population.</p> <p>Award 2 marks for a response which clearly explains why the identified example is a generalisation.</p> <p>Award 1 mark if the response shows understanding of a generalisation but the relationship to the example is not clear.</p> <p>Award 0 if there is no creditable response.</p>	<b>2</b>

Question	Answer	Marks																		
1(c)	<p data-bbox="308 230 1238 264"><b>From Source 2, describe the food charity’s perspective on hunger.</b></p> <p data-bbox="308 304 411 331"><b>Table A</b></p> <p data-bbox="308 371 1058 405">Use this table to give marks for each candidate response.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 443 1326 1133"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="308 443 1326 495"><b>Analysis of issues and perspectives (AO1)</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 495 411 546"><b>Level</b></th> <th data-bbox="411 495 1206 546"><b>Description</b></th> <th data-bbox="1206 495 1326 546"><b>Marks</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 546 411 734"><b>3</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 546 1206 734"> <p data-bbox="427 557 823 591"><b>Clear analysis of the source</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 591 1118 723" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes a wide range of elements of the perspective.</li> <li>• Frequent use of relevant material and examples taken from the source.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1206 546 1326 734"><b>5–6</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 734 411 891"><b>2</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 734 1206 891"> <p data-bbox="427 745 831 779"><b>Some analysis of the source</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 779 1155 880" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes a range of elements of the perspective.</li> <li>• Some use of relevant material and examples taken from the source.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1206 734 1326 891"><b>3–4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 891 411 1079"><b>1</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 891 1206 1079"> <p data-bbox="427 902 855 936"><b>Limited analysis of the source</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 936 1171 1068" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes a limited range of elements of the perspective.</li> <li>• Little or no use of material and examples taken from the source.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1206 891 1326 1079"><b>1–2</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1079 411 1133"><b>0</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 1079 1206 1133"><b>No creditable response</b></td> <td data-bbox="1206 1079 1326 1133"><b>0</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="308 1167 560 1193"><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p data-bbox="308 1234 1190 1267">Candidates may describe the following elements of the perspective:</p> <ul data-bbox="308 1267 1321 1572" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issue – hunger is a worldwide problem.</li> <li>• Causes – pandemics and rising food prices.</li> <li>• Consequences – hunger affects people’s health, education and employment.</li> <li>• Values – we should have compassion and care for other people and help those in need; everyone has a right to food.</li> <li>• Action – support the charity and the United Nations World Food Programme; work collaboratively for change; protest about the issue.</li> <li>• Other relevant response.</li> </ul>	<b>Analysis of issues and perspectives (AO1)</b>			<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>3</b>	<p data-bbox="427 557 823 591"><b>Clear analysis of the source</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 591 1118 723" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes a wide range of elements of the perspective.</li> <li>• Frequent use of relevant material and examples taken from the source.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	<b>2</b>	<p data-bbox="427 745 831 779"><b>Some analysis of the source</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 779 1155 880" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes a range of elements of the perspective.</li> <li>• Some use of relevant material and examples taken from the source.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>	<b>1</b>	<p data-bbox="427 902 855 936"><b>Limited analysis of the source</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 936 1171 1068" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes a limited range of elements of the perspective.</li> <li>• Little or no use of material and examples taken from the source.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Analysis of issues and perspectives (AO1)</b>																				
<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>																		
<b>3</b>	<p data-bbox="427 557 823 591"><b>Clear analysis of the source</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 591 1118 723" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes a wide range of elements of the perspective.</li> <li>• Frequent use of relevant material and examples taken from the source.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>																		
<b>2</b>	<p data-bbox="427 745 831 779"><b>Some analysis of the source</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 779 1155 880" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes a range of elements of the perspective.</li> <li>• Some use of relevant material and examples taken from the source.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>																		
<b>1</b>	<p data-bbox="427 902 855 936"><b>Limited analysis of the source</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 936 1171 1068" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes a limited range of elements of the perspective.</li> <li>• Little or no use of material and examples taken from the source.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>																		
<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>																		

Question	Answer	Marks																					
1(d)	<p><b>Sources 1 and 2 suggest causes of hunger.</b></p> <p><b>Which cause of hunger do you think is the most significant? Explain why.</b></p> <p><b>Table B</b></p> <p>Use this table to give marks for each candidate response.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 548 1326 1357"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="416 548 1206 595"><b>Analysis of issues and perspectives (AO1)</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 595 416 647"><b>Level</b></th> <th data-bbox="416 595 1206 647"><b>Description</b></th> <th data-bbox="1206 595 1326 647"><b>Marks</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 647 416 804"><b>4</b></td> <td data-bbox="416 647 1206 804"> <b>Clear justification of an opinion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opinion is clearly explained and supported.</li> <li>• The explanation is credible and clearly related to the identified issue.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1206 647 1326 804"><b>7–8</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 804 416 960"><b>3</b></td> <td data-bbox="416 804 1206 960"> <b>Some justification of an opinion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opinion is explained with some support.</li> <li>• The explanation is mainly credible and related to the identified issue.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1206 804 1326 960"><b>5–6</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 960 416 1151"><b>2</b></td> <td data-bbox="416 960 1206 1151"> <b>Partial justification of an opinion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opinion is partly explained and has minimal support.</li> <li>• The explanation is partly related to the identified issue.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1206 960 1326 1151"><b>3–4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1151 416 1308"><b>1</b></td> <td data-bbox="416 1151 1206 1308"> <b>A limited opinion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opinion is asserted with limited explanation.</li> <li>• Any explanation may be general, tangential to the issue and lacking credibility.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1206 1151 1326 1308"><b>1–2</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1308 416 1357"><b>0</b></td> <td data-bbox="416 1308 1206 1357"><b>No creditable response</b></td> <td data-bbox="1206 1308 1326 1357"><b>0</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Candidates may identify <b>one</b> of the following causes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poverty and unemployment.</li> <li>• Food shortages.</li> <li>• Extreme weather and climate change.</li> <li>• Food waste.</li> <li>• War and conflict.</li> <li>• Unfair international trade.</li> <li>• Pandemics.</li> <li>• Rising food prices.</li> </ul>	<b>Analysis of issues and perspectives (AO1)</b>			<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Clear justification of an opinion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opinion is clearly explained and supported.</li> <li>• The explanation is credible and clearly related to the identified issue.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Some justification of an opinion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opinion is explained with some support.</li> <li>• The explanation is mainly credible and related to the identified issue.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Partial justification of an opinion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opinion is partly explained and has minimal support.</li> <li>• The explanation is partly related to the identified issue.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>A limited opinion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opinion is asserted with limited explanation.</li> <li>• Any explanation may be general, tangential to the issue and lacking credibility.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Analysis of issues and perspectives (AO1)</b>																							
<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>																					
<b>4</b>	<b>Clear justification of an opinion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opinion is clearly explained and supported.</li> <li>• The explanation is credible and clearly related to the identified issue.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>																					
<b>3</b>	<b>Some justification of an opinion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opinion is explained with some support.</li> <li>• The explanation is mainly credible and related to the identified issue.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>																					
<b>2</b>	<b>Partial justification of an opinion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opinion is partly explained and has minimal support.</li> <li>• The explanation is partly related to the identified issue.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>																					
<b>1</b>	<b>A limited opinion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The opinion is asserted with limited explanation.</li> <li>• Any explanation may be general, tangential to the issue and lacking credibility.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>																					
<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>																					

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	Candidates may give the following reasons to justify their opinion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Has greatest impact on the extent of hunger.</li><li>• Affects the most people locally, nationally or internationally.</li><li>• Ethically or morally most important.</li><li>• Has multiple negative consequences.</li><li>• Creates a vicious circle.</li><li>• Affects other aspects of life for different groups in society.</li><li>• Reflects expert opinion.</li><li>• Is the most difficult to solve.</li><li>• Other relevant response.</li></ul>	



Question	Answer	Marks																					
2(a)	<p><b>Explain the strengths and weaknesses of the research outlined in Source 3.</b></p> <p><b>Table C</b></p> <p>Use this table to give marks for each candidate response.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 477 1321 1462"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="308 477 1321 528"><b>Evaluate research into current global issues (AO1)</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 528 411 580"><b>Level</b></th> <th data-bbox="411 528 1203 580"><b>Description</b></th> <th data-bbox="1203 528 1321 580"><b>Marks</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 580 411 770"><b>4</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 580 1203 770"> <p><b>Consistently evaluative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points, including both strengths and weaknesses.</li> <li>• Explanations are credible, supported, and clearly related to the purpose of the research.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 580 1321 770"><b>7–8</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 770 411 960"><b>3</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 770 1203 960"> <p><b>Mainly evaluative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoned explanation of a range of evaluative points.</li> <li>• Explanations are mostly supported, credible and related to the purpose of the research.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 770 1321 960"><b>5–6</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 960 411 1184"><b>2</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 960 1203 1184"> <p><b>Partly evaluative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive with little explanation.</li> <li>• Explanations are partially supported and may lack some credibility or partly related to the purpose of the research.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 960 1321 1184"><b>3–4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1184 411 1408"><b>1</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 1184 1203 1408"> <p><b>Limited evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited range of evaluative points without explanation; the research or topic in the source is only described.</li> <li>• Evaluative points are asserted and/or not credible and/or not related to the purpose of the research.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1184 1321 1408"><b>1–2</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1408 411 1462"><b>0</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 1408 1203 1462"><b>No creditable response</b></td> <td data-bbox="1203 1408 1321 1462"><b>0</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Candidates may identify the following strengths and weaknesses of the research.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear purpose of research.</li> <li>• Research was ethical – permission was given by the manager.</li> <li>• Primary research.</li> <li>• Notes were taken to record the interview accurately.</li> <li>• Case study may provide detailed information.</li> <li>• Research based on authentic, personal testimony and experience.</li> <li>• The source of evidence / respondent is clearly related to the research purpose/question.</li> <li>• Uses a quotation from the interview as evidence.</li> <li>• Other relevant response.</li> </ul>	<b>Evaluate research into current global issues (AO1)</b>			<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>4</b>	<p><b>Consistently evaluative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points, including both strengths and weaknesses.</li> <li>• Explanations are credible, supported, and clearly related to the purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>	<b>3</b>	<p><b>Mainly evaluative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoned explanation of a range of evaluative points.</li> <li>• Explanations are mostly supported, credible and related to the purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	<b>2</b>	<p><b>Partly evaluative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive with little explanation.</li> <li>• Explanations are partially supported and may lack some credibility or partly related to the purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>	<b>1</b>	<p><b>Limited evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited range of evaluative points without explanation; the research or topic in the source is only described.</li> <li>• Evaluative points are asserted and/or not credible and/or not related to the purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Evaluate research into current global issues (AO1)</b>																							
<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>																					
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Consistently evaluative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points, including both strengths and weaknesses.</li> <li>• Explanations are credible, supported, and clearly related to the purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>																					
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Mainly evaluative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoned explanation of a range of evaluative points.</li> <li>• Explanations are mostly supported, credible and related to the purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>																					
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Partly evaluative</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive with little explanation.</li> <li>• Explanations are partially supported and may lack some credibility or partly related to the purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>																					
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Limited evaluation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited range of evaluative points without explanation; the research or topic in the source is only described.</li> <li>• Evaluative points are asserted and/or not credible and/or not related to the purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>																					
<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>																					

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No clearly stated research question.</li><li>• Only one research method – interviews.</li><li>• Data may not be complete as it was difficult to hear the interviewee.</li><li>• No opportunity to verify or check data (triangulation).</li><li>• Small sample size – may not be typical.</li><li>• Interviewee may be biased or have a vested interest that makes data unbalanced/untypical/exaggerated.</li><li>• Presence of other people may influence the responses of the interviewee – lack of confidentiality.</li><li>• Quotation may be selective and not typical.</li><li>• Other relevant response.</li></ul>	

Question	Answer	Marks																					
2(b)	<p><b>‘Most people enjoy growing their own food.’</b></p> <p><b>Explain how this claim could be tested. You should consider the research methods and evidence that could be used.</b></p> <p><b>Table D</b></p> <p>Use this table to give marks for each candidate response.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 548 1326 1496"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="308 548 1326 600"><b>Design research into current global issues (AO1)</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 600 411 651"><b>Level</b></th> <th data-bbox="411 600 1204 651"><b>Description</b></th> <th data-bbox="1204 600 1326 651"><b>Marks</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 651 411 842"><b>4</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 651 1204 842"> <b>An appropriate and fully justified research design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoned explanation of a wide range of methods and evidence.</li> <li>• Explanations are credible and clearly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1204 651 1326 842"><b>7–8</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 842 411 1032"><b>3</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 842 1204 1032"> <b>An appropriate and justified research design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoned explanation of a range of methods and evidence.</li> <li>• Explanations are credible and mostly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1204 842 1326 1032"><b>5–6</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1032 411 1249"><b>2</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 1032 1204 1249"> <b>A partly justified research design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of methods and/or evidence that are mostly descriptive with little explanation.</li> <li>• Explanations may lack some credibility and/or are partly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1204 1032 1326 1249"><b>3–4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1249 411 1440"><b>1</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 1249 1204 1440"> <b>Limited research design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited range of methods and/or evidence without explanation; the research or topic is only described.</li> <li>• Methods and evidence are not credible and/or not related to testing the claim/purpose of the research.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1204 1249 1326 1440"><b>1–2</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1440 411 1496"><b>0</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 1440 1204 1496"><b>No creditable response</b></td> <td data-bbox="1204 1440 1326 1496"><b>0</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Candidates may discuss the following ways to test the claim stated in Source 3.</p> <p>Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews of relevant experts or people who grow their own food.</li> <li>• Observation.</li> <li>• Review of secondary sources / literature / research / documents.</li> <li>• Internet and media search.</li> <li>• Questionnaires.</li> <li>• Surveys.</li> <li>• Case studies of people who grow their own food.</li> <li>• Other relevant response.</li> </ul>	<b>Design research into current global issues (AO1)</b>			<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>An appropriate and fully justified research design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoned explanation of a wide range of methods and evidence.</li> <li>• Explanations are credible and clearly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>An appropriate and justified research design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoned explanation of a range of methods and evidence.</li> <li>• Explanations are credible and mostly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>A partly justified research design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of methods and/or evidence that are mostly descriptive with little explanation.</li> <li>• Explanations may lack some credibility and/or are partly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Limited research design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited range of methods and/or evidence without explanation; the research or topic is only described.</li> <li>• Methods and evidence are not credible and/or not related to testing the claim/purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Design research into current global issues (AO1)</b>																							
<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>																					
<b>4</b>	<b>An appropriate and fully justified research design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoned explanation of a wide range of methods and evidence.</li> <li>• Explanations are credible and clearly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>																					
<b>3</b>	<b>An appropriate and justified research design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoned explanation of a range of methods and evidence.</li> <li>• Explanations are credible and mostly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>																					
<b>2</b>	<b>A partly justified research design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A range of methods and/or evidence that are mostly descriptive with little explanation.</li> <li>• Explanations may lack some credibility and/or are partly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>																					
<b>1</b>	<b>Limited research design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited range of methods and/or evidence without explanation; the research or topic is only described.</li> <li>• Methods and evidence are not credible and/or not related to testing the claim/purpose of the research.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>																					
<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>																					

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	Evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statistics/information on attitudes of people to the source of their food.</li> <li>• Individual testimony or personal experience.</li> <li>• Material from organisations that produce food e.g. farmers, gardeners.</li> <li>• Material from pressure groups / charities / governments / international organisations concerned about food supply.</li> <li>• Primary and secondary research data and information.</li> <li>• Quantitative and qualitative research data and information.</li> <li>• Research reports.</li> <li>• Other relevant response.</li> </ul>	

Question	Answer	Marks																					
3	<p><b>Which argument is more convincing, Grace's or Seth's?</b></p> <p><b>Your answer should:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>consider both arguments</b></li> <li>• <b>evaluate their reasoning, evidence and use of language</b></li> <li>• <b>support your judgement with their words and ideas.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Tables E and F</b></p> <p>Use these tables to give marks for each candidate response.</p> <p><b>Table E</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Analysis (AO1)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Description</th> <th>Marks</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>4</b></td> <td> <b>Consistently analytic throughout and fully supported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses a wide range of aspects of both arguments.</li> <li>• Frequent use of relevant material taken from the source.</li> <li>• Clear and explicit comparison of the two arguments.</li> </ul> </td> <td><b>7–8</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>3</b></td> <td> <b>Mainly analytic and supported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses a range of aspects of both arguments.</li> <li>• Some use of relevant material taken from the source.</li> <li>• Clear comparison of the two arguments.</li> </ul> </td> <td><b>5–6</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2</b></td> <td> <b>Partly analytic and descriptive with some support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses a limited range of aspects of both arguments.</li> <li>• Occasional use of material taken from the source.</li> <li>• Implied comparison by simple juxtaposition of the two arguments.</li> </ul> </td> <td><b>3–4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>1</b></td> <td> <b>Descriptive and unsupported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses a limited range of aspects of one argument.</li> <li>• Little or no use of material taken from the source.</li> </ul> </td> <td><b>1–2</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>0</b></td> <td><b>No creditable response</b></td> <td><b>0</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Analysis (AO1)			Level	Description	Marks	<b>4</b>	<b>Consistently analytic throughout and fully supported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses a wide range of aspects of both arguments.</li> <li>• Frequent use of relevant material taken from the source.</li> <li>• Clear and explicit comparison of the two arguments.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Mainly analytic and supported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses a range of aspects of both arguments.</li> <li>• Some use of relevant material taken from the source.</li> <li>• Clear comparison of the two arguments.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Partly analytic and descriptive with some support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses a limited range of aspects of both arguments.</li> <li>• Occasional use of material taken from the source.</li> <li>• Implied comparison by simple juxtaposition of the two arguments.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Descriptive and unsupported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses a limited range of aspects of one argument.</li> <li>• Little or no use of material taken from the source.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>
Analysis (AO1)																							
Level	Description	Marks																					
<b>4</b>	<b>Consistently analytic throughout and fully supported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses a wide range of aspects of both arguments.</li> <li>• Frequent use of relevant material taken from the source.</li> <li>• Clear and explicit comparison of the two arguments.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>																					
<b>3</b>	<b>Mainly analytic and supported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses a range of aspects of both arguments.</li> <li>• Some use of relevant material taken from the source.</li> <li>• Clear comparison of the two arguments.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>																					
<b>2</b>	<b>Partly analytic and descriptive with some support</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses a limited range of aspects of both arguments.</li> <li>• Occasional use of material taken from the source.</li> <li>• Implied comparison by simple juxtaposition of the two arguments.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>																					
<b>1</b>	<b>Descriptive and unsupported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyses a limited range of aspects of one argument.</li> <li>• Little or no use of material taken from the source.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>																					
<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>																					

Question	Answer	Marks																					
3	<p data-bbox="308 230 411 264"><b>Table F</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 304 1326 1527"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="308 304 1326 353"><b>Evaluation (AO1)</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 353 411 405"><b>Level</b></th> <th data-bbox="411 353 1203 405"><b>Description</b></th> <th data-bbox="1203 353 1326 405"><b>Marks</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 405 411 701"><b>4</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 405 1203 701"> <p data-bbox="427 416 1054 488"><b>Consistently evaluative throughout and fully explained</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 488 1193 689" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed and reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points throughout the response.</li> <li>• Both reasoning and evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated explicitly.</li> <li>• Clear, supported judgement consistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 405 1326 701"><b>7–8</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 701 411 958"><b>3</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 701 1203 958"> <p data-bbox="427 712 879 745"><b>Mainly evaluative and explained</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 745 1193 947" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoned explanation of a range of evaluative points within most of the response.</li> <li>• Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated.</li> <li>• Judgement generally consistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 701 1326 958"><b>5–6</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 958 411 1216"><b>2</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 958 1203 1216"> <p data-bbox="427 969 975 1003"><b>Partly evaluative with little explanation</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 1003 1161 1205" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive and/or asserted with little explanation.</li> <li>• Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are mostly described.</li> <li>• Judgement lacks some clarity and may be partly inconsistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 958 1326 1216"><b>3–4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1216 411 1473"><b>1</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 1216 1203 1473"> <p data-bbox="427 1227 874 1261"><b>Descriptive without explanation</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 1261 1102 1462" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or two evaluative points that are asserted, tangential or not relevant.</li> <li>• The topic or the arguments in the source are described.</li> <li>• Judgement is unclear and inconsistent with the candidate's argument or may not be included.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1216 1326 1473"><b>1–2</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1473 411 1527"><b>0</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 1473 1203 1527"><b>No creditable response</b></td> <td data-bbox="1203 1473 1326 1527"><b>0</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Evaluation (AO1)</b>			<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>4</b>	<p data-bbox="427 416 1054 488"><b>Consistently evaluative throughout and fully explained</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 488 1193 689" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed and reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points throughout the response.</li> <li>• Both reasoning and evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated explicitly.</li> <li>• Clear, supported judgement consistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>	<b>3</b>	<p data-bbox="427 712 879 745"><b>Mainly evaluative and explained</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 745 1193 947" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoned explanation of a range of evaluative points within most of the response.</li> <li>• Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated.</li> <li>• Judgement generally consistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	<b>2</b>	<p data-bbox="427 969 975 1003"><b>Partly evaluative with little explanation</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 1003 1161 1205" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive and/or asserted with little explanation.</li> <li>• Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are mostly described.</li> <li>• Judgement lacks some clarity and may be partly inconsistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>	<b>1</b>	<p data-bbox="427 1227 874 1261"><b>Descriptive without explanation</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 1261 1102 1462" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or two evaluative points that are asserted, tangential or not relevant.</li> <li>• The topic or the arguments in the source are described.</li> <li>• Judgement is unclear and inconsistent with the candidate's argument or may not be included.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>	
<b>Evaluation (AO1)</b>																							
<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>																					
<b>4</b>	<p data-bbox="427 416 1054 488"><b>Consistently evaluative throughout and fully explained</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 488 1193 689" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed and reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points throughout the response.</li> <li>• Both reasoning and evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated explicitly.</li> <li>• Clear, supported judgement consistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>																					
<b>3</b>	<p data-bbox="427 712 879 745"><b>Mainly evaluative and explained</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 745 1193 947" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoned explanation of a range of evaluative points within most of the response.</li> <li>• Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated.</li> <li>• Judgement generally consistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>																					
<b>2</b>	<p data-bbox="427 969 975 1003"><b>Partly evaluative with little explanation</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 1003 1161 1205" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive and/or asserted with little explanation.</li> <li>• Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are mostly described.</li> <li>• Judgement lacks some clarity and may be partly inconsistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>																					
<b>1</b>	<p data-bbox="427 1227 874 1261"><b>Descriptive without explanation</b></p> <ul data-bbox="427 1261 1102 1462" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One or two evaluative points that are asserted, tangential or not relevant.</li> <li>• The topic or the arguments in the source are described.</li> <li>• Judgement is unclear and inconsistent with the candidate's argument or may not be included.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>																					
<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>																					

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Candidates are expected to evaluate both arguments presented in Source 4. They should make a supported judgement with some explanation about which person has the most convincing argument. Candidates may support their judgement by considering some of the following aspects of the arguments:</p> <p>Strength of reasoning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• logic</li> <li>• structure</li> <li>• balance</li> <li>• claims</li> </ul> <p>Use of language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• tone – emotive, exaggerated, precise, measured</li> <li>• clarity</li> </ul> <p>Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• range of information and depth</li> <li>• relevance</li> <li>• sufficiency – sample size</li> <li>• source – media; internet</li> <li>• date – how recent</li> <li>• different types of information – fact, opinion, value, anecdote</li> <li>• testimony – from experience and expert</li> </ul> <p>Sources of bias or vested interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• local interest</li> <li>• economic</li> <li>• personal values</li> <li>• experience</li> </ul> <p>Possible consequences of the ideas or actions presented</p> <p>Acceptability of their values to others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant responses should be credited.</p> <p>Examples of evaluative points candidates are likely to discuss are outlined as follows.</p>	

Question	Answer			Marks
3	<b>Argument</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>	
	<b>Grace</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses personal and family experience as her father is a farmer.</li> <li>• Many relevant examples used in support of the argument.</li> <li>• Values are clear – supports human rights.</li> <li>• Clear, measured language.</li> <li>• Understands economic aspects of food production.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much assertion.</li> <li>• Little research evidence given in support.</li> <li>• Expertise is unknown.</li> <li>• Ability to know is questionable.</li> <li>• Argument based on scientific and technological trends that may not continue.</li> <li>• Potential for bias and vested interest.</li> </ul>	
	<b>Seth</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses evidence to support argument – case studies.</li> <li>• Refers to reputable organisations in support of argument – United Nations.</li> <li>• Uses relevant examples.</li> <li>• Credible arguments related to environmental issues.</li> <li>• Values clear.</li> <li>• Passionate and enthusiastic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unbalanced argument – only discusses personal/ local perspectives.</li> <li>• Some generalisation.</li> <li>• Tone harsh at times.</li> <li>• Evidence not fully referenced.</li> <li>• Proposed action may not be realistic/affordable for everyone.</li> </ul>	
AO1 Analysis				8
AO1 Evaluation				8

Question	Answer	Marks															
4	<p><b>A government wants to reduce hunger for people living in poverty.</b></p> <p><b>The following actions are being considered:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Provide free food in areas of poverty.</b></li> <li>• <b>Invest in new farming technologies.</b></li> <li>• <b>Train people to grow and sell food in local areas.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Which <u>one</u> of these actions would you recommend to the government, and why?</b></p> <p><b>In your answer, you should:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>state your recommendation</b></li> <li>• <b>give reasons and evidence to support your choice</b></li> <li>• <b>use the material in the sources and/or any of your own ideas</b></li> <li>• <b>consider different arguments and perspectives.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Tables G, H and I</b></p> <p>Use these tables to give marks for each candidate response.</p> <p><b>Table G</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="304 1066 1326 1877"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="304 1066 1326 1155"><b>Use evidence and reasons to support arguments (AO1)</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="304 1155 411 1200"><b>Level</b></th> <th data-bbox="411 1155 1203 1200"><b>Description</b></th> <th data-bbox="1203 1155 1326 1200"><b>Marks</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1200 411 1429"><b>4</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 1200 1203 1429"> <p><b>Effective use of evidence and reasons to support arguments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a wide range of evidence and reasons to fully support the candidate's argument.</li> <li>• Evidence and reasons are clearly relevant to the issue in the question.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1200 1326 1429"><b>7–8</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1429 411 1653"><b>3</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 1429 1203 1653"> <p><b>Mainly uses evidence and reasons to support arguments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a range of evidence and reasons to support the candidate's argument.</li> <li>• Evidence and reasons are relevant to the issue in the question.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1429 1326 1653"><b>5–6</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="304 1653 411 1877"><b>2</b></td> <td data-bbox="411 1653 1203 1877"> <p><b>Some use of evidence and reasons to support arguments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a limited range of evidence and reasons to partly support the candidate's argument.</li> <li>• Evidence and reasons are not always relevant to the issue in the question.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 1653 1326 1877"><b>3–4</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Use evidence and reasons to support arguments (AO1)</b>			<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>4</b>	<p><b>Effective use of evidence and reasons to support arguments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a wide range of evidence and reasons to fully support the candidate's argument.</li> <li>• Evidence and reasons are clearly relevant to the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>	<b>3</b>	<p><b>Mainly uses evidence and reasons to support arguments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a range of evidence and reasons to support the candidate's argument.</li> <li>• Evidence and reasons are relevant to the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	<b>2</b>	<p><b>Some use of evidence and reasons to support arguments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a limited range of evidence and reasons to partly support the candidate's argument.</li> <li>• Evidence and reasons are not always relevant to the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Use evidence and reasons to support arguments (AO1)</b>																	
<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>															
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Effective use of evidence and reasons to support arguments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a wide range of evidence and reasons to fully support the candidate's argument.</li> <li>• Evidence and reasons are clearly relevant to the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>															
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Mainly uses evidence and reasons to support arguments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a range of evidence and reasons to support the candidate's argument.</li> <li>• Evidence and reasons are relevant to the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>															
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Some use of evidence and reasons to support arguments</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses a limited range of evidence and reasons to partly support the candidate's argument.</li> <li>• Evidence and reasons are not always relevant to the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>															



Question	Answer		Marks
4	<b>Use evidence and reasons to support arguments (AO1)</b>		
	<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>
	<b>1</b>	<b>Limited use of evidence and reasons to support arguments</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses one or two pieces of evidence and/or reasons and these give very little support to the candidate's argument.</li> <li>• Evidence and reasons are tangential or not relevant to the issue in the question.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>
	<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Table H</b>			
		<b>Develop a line of reasoning (AO1)</b>	
<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>	
<b>4</b>	<b>Convincing and clear reasoning</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear, convincing and sustained lines of reasoning related to the issue in the question and the candidate's argument.</li> <li>• Well-structured and explicit consideration of different perspectives or actions.</li> </ul>	<b>7–8</b>	
<b>3</b>	<b>Clear reasoning</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear lines of reasoning mainly related to the issue in the question and the candidate's argument.</li> <li>• Structured consideration of different perspectives or actions.</li> </ul>	<b>5–6</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Some reasoning</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lines of reasoning are difficult to follow at times and not always related to the issue in the question and the candidate's argument.</li> <li>• Some consideration of different perspectives or actions with uneven or little structure.</li> </ul>	<b>3–4</b>	
<b>1</b>	<b>Limited reasoning</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lines of reasoning lack clarity and are often unrelated to the issue in the question or the candidate's argument.</li> <li>• Little or no consideration of different perspectives or actions.</li> </ul>	<b>1–2</b>	
<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>	

Question	Answer	Marks																											
4	<p><b>Table I</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 309 1326 981"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="416 309 1214 360"><b>Judgements about perspectives and action (AO1)</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 360 416 412"><b>Level</b></th> <th data-bbox="416 360 1203 412"><b>Description</b></th> <th data-bbox="1203 360 1326 412"><b>Marks</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 412 416 562"><b>4</b></td> <td data-bbox="416 412 1203 562"> <b>Judgements are fully supported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judgements are clearly related to the issue, clearly explained and consistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 412 1326 562"><b>4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 562 416 685"><b>3</b></td> <td data-bbox="416 562 1203 685"> <b>Judgements are supported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judgements are related to the issue, explained and consistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 562 1326 685"><b>3</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 685 416 835"><b>2</b></td> <td data-bbox="416 685 1203 835"> <b>Judgements are partly supported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judgements are partly related to the issue, partly explained and not consistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 685 1326 835"><b>2</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 835 416 925"><b>1</b></td> <td data-bbox="416 835 1203 925"> <b>Asserted judgements</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judgements are asserted and not explained.</li> </ul> </td> <td data-bbox="1203 835 1326 925"><b>1</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 925 416 981"><b>0</b></td> <td data-bbox="416 925 1203 981"><b>No creditable response</b></td> <td data-bbox="1203 925 1326 981"><b>0</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="308 1010 560 1043"><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p data-bbox="308 1081 1326 1249">Candidates are expected to recommend a course of action using reasons and evidence to justify their choice. Candidates may use and develop the material found in Sources 1 to 4 but should go beyond simply repeating or recycling without interpretation. Other material may be introduced but is not necessary to gain full marks.</p> <p data-bbox="308 1288 935 1321">Candidates may consider some of the following:</p> <ul data-bbox="308 1321 1294 1738" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to scale of impact on hunger.</li> <li>Reference to different consequences and implications for individuals / different groups / government.</li> <li>How long it might take to make a difference.</li> <li>Barriers to change e.g. power of interest groups like farmers and multi-nationals.</li> <li>The influence of individuals and groups on decision making.</li> <li>The role of vested interests and power differences.</li> <li>Potential conflicts of interest.</li> <li>Difficulties in planning and coordinating improvements.</li> <li>Cost and access to resources to implement change.</li> <li>Other relevant response.</li> </ul> <table border="1" data-bbox="292 1749 1342 1890"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="292 1749 1342 1794">AO1 Use evidence and reasons to support arguments</td> <td data-bbox="1342 1749 1460 1794">8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="292 1794 1342 1839">AO1 Develop a line of reasoning</td> <td data-bbox="1342 1794 1460 1839">8</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="292 1839 1342 1890">AO1 Judgements about perspectives and action</td> <td data-bbox="1342 1839 1460 1890">4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Judgements about perspectives and action (AO1)</b>			<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>Judgements are fully supported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judgements are clearly related to the issue, clearly explained and consistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Judgements are supported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judgements are related to the issue, explained and consistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Judgements are partly supported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judgements are partly related to the issue, partly explained and not consistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Asserted judgements</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judgements are asserted and not explained.</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>	AO1 Use evidence and reasons to support arguments	8	AO1 Develop a line of reasoning	8	AO1 Judgements about perspectives and action	4	
<b>Judgements about perspectives and action (AO1)</b>																													
<b>Level</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Marks</b>																											
<b>4</b>	<b>Judgements are fully supported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judgements are clearly related to the issue, clearly explained and consistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>																											
<b>3</b>	<b>Judgements are supported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judgements are related to the issue, explained and consistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>																											
<b>2</b>	<b>Judgements are partly supported</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judgements are partly related to the issue, partly explained and not consistent with the candidate's argument.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>																											
<b>1</b>	<b>Asserted judgements</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judgements are asserted and not explained.</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>																											
<b>0</b>	<b>No creditable response</b>	<b>0</b>																											
AO1 Use evidence and reasons to support arguments	8																												
AO1 Develop a line of reasoning	8																												
AO1 Judgements about perspectives and action	4																												