Criterion 1: AO1 Listening - Task Fulfilment and Source Validity (20 points)

Mark **Percentage bands** **Points**	1st 100-70% 20–14	2:1 69-60% 13–12	2:2 59-50% 11–10	3rd 49-40% 9–8	Marginal Fail 39-30% 7–6	Clear Fail 29-0% 5–0
Descriptor short	Task Criteria fully addressed overall	Task Criteria very well addressed overall	Task Criteria generally addressed overall	Task Criteria addressed with underdeveloped points	Task Criteria partially addressed	Task Criteria not addressed overall
Descriptor long **Indicators of High Achievement (20–14 / 13–12)** Sources selected are academic, credible, and clearly relevant to the chosen research topic. All task instructions are followed, including number of sources, word count, and referencing conventions. Academic integrity is demonstrated throughout. **Indicators of Middle Achievement (11–10 / 9–8)** Sources are generally academic and relevant, though quality or relevance may vary. Some task requirements may be inconsistently met. Referencing may contain minor errors. **Indicators of Low Achievement (7–6 / 5–0)** Sources are inappropriate, non-academic, or weakly related to the topic. Task instructions have not been followed. Referencing is inaccurate, incomplete, or missing.						

Picture 1 ...

Picture 1 ...

Criterion 1: AO2 Reading - Summary, Evaluation, and Use of Sources (40 points)

Mark **Percentage bands** **Points**	1st 100-70% 40–28	2:1 69-60% 27-24	2:2 59-50% 23-20	3rd 49-40% 19-16	Marginal Fail 39-30% 15-12	Clear Fail 29-0% 11–0
Descriptor short	Task Criteria fully addressed overall	Task Criteria very well addressed overall	Task Criteria generally addressed overall	Task Criteria addressed with underdeveloped points	Task Criteria partially addressed	Task Criteria not addressed overall
Descriptor long **Indicators of High Achievement (40–28 / 27–24)** Annotations demonstrate clear and accurate understanding of academic sources, including aims, methods, findings, and conclusions. Critical evaluation is well developed, identifying strengths and limitations of the research. The relevance of each source to the Extended Research Project is clearly explained. **Indicators of Middle Achievement (23–20 / 19–16)** Annotations demonstrate general understanding of sources, though summaries may lack precision or depth. Critical evaluation is present but uneven, limited, or more descriptive than analytical. Links to the Extended Research Project are evident but may be general or underdeveloped. **Indicators of Low Achievement (15–12 / 11–0)** Understanding of sources is limited, unclear, or inaccurate. Critical evaluation is minimal, absent, or largely descriptive. Links to the Extended Research Project are weak, unclear, or missing.						

Picture 1 ...