Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH	**9239/13**
Paper 1 Written Exam	**May/June 2023**
MARK SCHEME	
Maximum Mark: 45	

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 2023 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 **24** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:
Marks must be awarded in line with:
• the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question • the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question • the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.
GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:
Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).
GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:
Marks must be awarded **positively**:
• marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate • marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do • marks are not deducted for errors • marks are not deducted for omissions • answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.
GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:
Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

PUBLISHED

Social Science-Specific Marking Principles
(for point-based marking)

1	**Components using point-based marking:**

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

From this it follows that we:

a   DO credit answers which are worded differently from the mark scheme if they clearly convey the same meaning (unless the mark scheme requires a specific term)

b   DO credit alternative answers/examples which are not written in the mark scheme if they are correct

c   DO credit answers where candidates give more than one correct answer in one prompt/numbered/scaffolded space where extended writing is required rather than list-type answers. For example, questions that require *n* reasons (e.g. State two reasons …).

d   DO NOT credit answers simply for using a 'key term' unless that is all that is required. (Check for evidence it is understood and not used wrongly.)

e   DO NOT credit answers which are obviously self-contradicting or trying to cover all possibilities

f   DO NOT give further credit for what is effectively repetition of a correct point already credited unless the language itself is being tested. This applies equally to 'mirror statements' (i.e. polluted/not polluted).

g   DO NOT require spellings to be correct, unless this is part of the test. However, spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. Corrasion/Corrosion)

2   **Presentation of mark scheme:**

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

3	**Calculation questions:**
	• The mark scheme will show the steps in the most likely correct method(s), the mark for each step, the correct answer(s) and the mark for each answer.
	• If working/explanation is considered essential for full credit, this will be indicated in the question paper and in the mark scheme. In all other instances, the correct answer to a calculation should be given full credit, even if no supporting working is shown.
	• Where the candidate uses a valid method which is not covered by the mark scheme, award equivalent marks for reaching equivalent stages.
	• Where an answer makes use of a candidate's own incorrect figure from previous working, the 'own figure rule' applies: full marks will be given if a correct and complete method is used. Further guidance will be included in the mark scheme where necessary and any exceptions to this general principle will be noted.
4	**Annotation:**
	• For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
	• For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
	• Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

Instructions for examiners

The total mark for this paper is 45. **Question 1** assesses AO1 skills.
Question 2 assesses AO1 skills. **Question 3** assesses AO1 and AO3 skills.

Question 1 is points marked using ✓ or ✗ . Answers to **Question 1** can be brief, using short sentences or bullet points.

Answers to **Question 2** and **Question 3** should be written in continuous prose.

For **Question 2** and **Question 3** annotate clearly in the left-hand margin according to the specific instructions provided.

Refer to the marking grid at the end of each question to award a mark based on the annotations for each aspect (e.g. AO1a). Record the mark for each aspect (e.g. AO1a) in the right-hand marking panel on RM Assessor.

Indicative content or exemplar responses are provided as a guide. Inevitably, the mark scheme cannot cover all responses that candidates may make for all the questions. In some cases, candidates may make responses which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should nevertheless be credited according to their relevance and quality.

The definition of **perspective** used in this syllabus is: a perspective is a coherent world view which is a response to an issue. It is made up of argument, evidence, assumptions and may be influenced by a particular context.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**The author of Document A considers the impact of financial bailouts.** **Identify <u>two</u> costs to Greece of the financial rescue, as given by the author of Document A.**	**2**
	The question assesses AO1. Answers to Question 1 can be brief, using short sentences or bullet points. Show a correct answer with ✓ in the text, up to a maximum of two marks. Any **two** of the following: • **Finance minister (Yanis Varoufakis)** (who was against tough EU bailout conditions) **lost his job**. • (Prime minister Alexis Tsipras accepted a tough bailout) **Greece had to follow EU economic requirements**. • **Prime minister (Alexis Tsipras)** (lost the support of his party and) **resigned**. Do not accept: • Financial markets in … reacted wildly to news about the Greek bailout • There are no more free lunches (refers to Zimbabwe).	

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**The author of Document B describes a new approach to managing aid projects.** **Identify <u>three</u> positive impacts of flipping accountability to the community, as given by the author of Document B.**	**3**
	The question assesses AO1. Answers to **Question 1** can be brief, using short sentences or bullet points. Show a correct answer with ✓ in the text, up to a maximum of three marks. Any **three** of the following: • (Those implementing the project are) **accountable to their own people**. • **Communities top up grants** (with voluntary work/ cash/materials). • **Women** (have improved their) **bargaining power** / (are taking) **new leading roles**. • (Community members are able to negotiate in order) **to secure lower prices (**for Palestinian people). Do not accept: • Activism, voluntarism, real ownership, pride, and dignity (identified as associated experience, not results of flipping accountability). • We form our own grammar rules. • The NGOs want to please the donor.	

Instructions for Question 2

The question assesses AO1. (Research, analysis and evaluation)

Answers should be written in continuous prose. There is no requirement for candidates to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the assessment made.

Annotate clearly in the left-hand margin according to the instructions provided below.

There are three aspects to consider when marking the answer. Annotations for each aspect are listed in **increasing order of significance.** For example, in AO1a **EG** reflects a **higher skill** than **T.** This is reflected in the mark tables.

- **Identify evidence (AO1a).** Candidates should identify a range of types of evidence and give examples. Annotate with **T** if no example given or **EG** if type is given **and** exemplified.

T	**Identify type of evidence. (**Without an example)
EG	**Example of type of evidence.**

- **Analyse strengths and weaknesses of evidence (AO1b).** Candidates should analyse both strengths and weaknesses of a range of evidence used by the author including an explanation. For **limited** explanation use **+** for strength and **–** for weakness. For clear explanation use **EXP**

+	**Strength of evidence** recognised but with limited explanation**.**
-	**Weakness of evidence** recognised but with limited explanation**.**
EXP	**Strength or weakness of evidence** clearly explained.

- **Evaluate evidence (AO1c).** Impact of evidence may be **asserted** and not explained **(I)** Evaluation may be **attempted** but not explained **(EVAL ^)** [**EVAL** and **^** are two separate annotations on RM]. Candidates **explain** the impact of evidence on the author's argument/perspective [**EVAL]** and include a **judgement** of its effectiveness. **(EVAL J)**

I	**Impact of evidence** is asserted and not explained.
EVAL ^	**Shows undeveloped point of evaluation.** Evaluation attempted but not explained.
EVAL	**Evaluation of impact of evidence** on argument/perspective.
EVAL J	**Evaluation of impact of evidence** on argument/perspective and includes judgement**.**

Marking grid for Question 2

Examiners should allocate a mark for each aspect (AO1a, AO1b, AO1c), using the mark descriptors and required annotations.

AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation

AO1a Identify evidence	Mark	Annotations
Identifies a wide range of different types of evidence with examples	5	4 **EG** or more
Identifies a range of different types of evidence with examples	4	3 **EG**
Identifies a limited range of different types of evidence with examples	3	2 **EG**
Identifies a limited range of evidence, using different types **or** examples	2	2**T** or 1**EG**
Identifies one piece of evidence	1	1**T**
Identification of evidence is not present. No creditable material.	0	No **T** or No **EG**

AO1b Analyse strengths and weaknesses of evidence	Mark	Annotations
Analyses strengths and weaknesses of a wide range of evidence with clear explanation	5	2 **+** (or more) and 2 **–** (or more) with 3 or more **EXP**
Analyses strengths and weaknesses of a range of evidence with clear explanation	4	2 **+** (or more) and 1 **–** (or more) (**or opposite**) with 2 **EXP**
Analyses strengths and weaknesses of a range of evidence with limited explanation	3	2 **+** (or more) and 1 **–** (or more) (**or opposite**) with 0 or 1 **EXP**
Analyses strengths or weaknesses of a range of evidence with limited explanation	2	[2**+**] **or** [2**-**] **or** [1**+** and 1**-**]
Explanation of strengths **or** weaknesses of evidence is limited	1	[1**+**] **or** [1**-**]
No analysis is present. No creditable material	0	No **+** or **–** or **EXP**

AO1c Evaluate evidence	Mark	Annotations
Evaluation includes explanation of the impact of evidence on the argument/ perspective and makes a wide range of reasoned judgements	5	**2 EVAL J** or more
Evaluation includes explanation of the impact of evidence on the argument/ perspective and makes reasoned judgements	4	**1 EVAL J**
Evaluation includes an explanation of the impact of evidence on the argument/ perspective	3	**1 EVAL** (or more)
Evaluation is attempted but lacks clarity, and the impact of evidence on the argument/perspective is not explained	2	**1 EVAL ^** (or more)
The impact of evidence on the argument/perspective is asserted and not explained	1	**1 I** (or more)
No evaluation is present. No creditable material	0	No **I, EVAL^, EVAL or EVAL J**

Examiners allocate a mark for each aspect (AO1a, AO1b, AO1c), using the mark descriptors and required annotations.

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author of Document A to support their argument about international aid.** **In your answer include the impact of the evidence on the author's argument.**	**15**
	Indicative content No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content. **Strengths** **[Example only]** • **Ability to see**: The author's evidence that Zimbabwe had record inflation where 35 quadrillion Zimbabwe dollars equalled one USD (**EG**) is credible (**+**) because he is based in Zimbabwe giving him first-hand experience. (**EXP**) This supports his argument, giving the reader confidence that his evidence is credible. (**EVAL**) • All the evidence provided is **relevant** and directly supports the author's conclusion. • The author provides **clear and compelling examples:** of the contrast between the treatment of Greece and Zimbabwe in the introduction and of the political impact of receiving bailouts: Yanis Varoufakis lost his job. • The document is published in The Africa Report – focussing on African politics and economics. **Plausible source** of relevant info. • Good use of **relevant sources**: The author quotes the IMF, Robert Mugabe. • Good use of **relevant, detailed statistics**: The author provides a statistic to show the size of Zimbabwe's debt (USD 10 bn) and clarifies that by giving the exchange rate. The author gives details of the money needed by Zimbabwe and compares that to the much larger amounts actually provided to Greece. • **Dates** are provided (2 May 2010), adding to the **plausibility** of the argument.	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**Weaknesses** • Some **unexplained evidence**: pro-indigenous policies/ sanctions/ bad management/ autocratic government/ details of Greek bailout. • Rukuni's **lack of ability to see** re Greece. • Some **unsourced evidence**: Financial markets reacted wildly. China insists that there are no more free lunches. • Some **vague evidence**: Tendai Biti was voted the best finance minister in Africa.	

Instructions for Question 3

The question assesses AO1 (Research, analysis and evaluation) and AO3 (Communication).

Answers should be written in continuous prose. There is no requirement for candidates to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the assessment made.

A perspective is made up of argument, evidence and assumptions and may be influenced by a particular context.

Annotate clearly in the left-hand margin according to the instructions provided below.

There are five aspects to consider when marking the answer. Annotations for each aspect are listed in **increasing order of significance**. For example, in AO1a **C** reflects a **higher skill** than **K.** This is reflected in the mark tables.

- **Identify and compare key components of arguments (AO1a).** Candidates should identify a range of key components of arguments from both documents. Annotate with **K** if key component is identified for one document and **C** if key component is compared for both documents.

K	**Identification of key component of argument** for one document
C	**Comparison of key components** from both documents.

- **Analyse and compare perspectives (AO1b).** Candidates should analyse by identifying, describing and explaining the perspectives given in both documents. **Identification only** (**P ^**), identification with **limited description** (**P**), **comparing** and **describing** in **both** documents (**PD**) and **comparing** and **explaining** in **both** documents (**PE**).

P ^	**Identification of perspective(s)** with no description.
P	**Identification of perspective(s)** with limited description.
PD	**Analyses by comparing and describing perspectives in both documents.**
PE	**Analyses by comparing and explaining perspectives in both documents.**

- **Evaluate arguments (AO1c).** Candidates should aim to evaluate key components of arguments with clearly illustrated and balanced reference to **both documents**. Evaluation may be **unsupported** (asserted) (**ND**). Evaluation includes illustration with reference to both documents. (**EVAL**)

ND	Unsupported evaluation of argument.
EVAL	**Evaluation of argument** in both documents.

- **Judgement about argument and perspective (AO1d).** Candidates should aim to give a reasoned and supported answer which includes intermediate conclusions and a main conclusion. The judgement may be **unsupported** (**U ^ or U**)**, partly supported** (**J ^**) **or clearly reasoned and supported** (**J**)

U ^	**Unsupported judgement** – stated only
U	**Unsupported judgement –** with reasoning
J ^	**Partly supported judgement –** with reasoning
J	**Supported judgement –** with reasoning

- **Communication (AO3)** A candidate should aim to produce a clearly written well-structured and logical argument that is focused throughout on the question.

  Structure should include introduction, development and conclusion, should flow and answer the question. Each paragraph should follow on logically and contain a separate point. Each new idea should be clearly indicated – preferably in a new paragraph.

  'Logical' means that it is easy to follow the argument as there are no sudden changes of direction leading to confusion in the reader.

NAQ	**Not answering the question**

Marking grid for Question 3 – AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation

AO1a Identify and compare key components of arguments	Mark	Annotations
Compares a wide range of key components of arguments from both documents	5	4 **C** or more
Compares a range of key components of arguments from both documents	4	3 **C**
Compares a limited range of key components of arguments from both documents	3	2 **C** or (1 **C** and 2 **K** or more)
Identifies key components of arguments with no comparison	2	2 **K** or 1 **C** or 1 **C** and 1 **K**
Limited identification of key components of arguments with no comparison	1	1 **K**
No identification of arguments. No creditable material	0	No **K**

AO1b Analyse and compare perspectives	Mark	Annotations
Analyses by comparing and explaining the perspectives given in both documents	5	**1 PE** or more
Analyses by comparing and describing the perspectives given in both documents	4	**1 PD** or more
Identifies and compares both perspectives but with limited description	3	**2 P (one for each doc)**
Identifies one perspective but with limited description	2	**P**
Identifies one perspective with no description	1	**P ^**
No identification of perspectives. No creditable material	0	**No P^, P, PD or PE**

AO1c Evaluate arguments	**Mark**	**Annotations**
Evaluation of key components of arguments is illustrated by clear, balanced reference to both documents	5	**4 or more EVAL** (2 or more for each Doc)
Evaluation of key components of arguments is illustrated by clear reference to both documents but lacks balance	4	**3 or more EVAL** (2 or more for one Doc and one for the other Doc)
Evaluation of key components of arguments with limited reference to both documents	3	**2 EVAL / 1 EVAL and 1 ND (both** Docs)
Evaluation of arguments is unsupported (asserted) but refers to both documents	2	**ND** but refers to Doc A **and** Doc B
Evaluation of arguments is unsupported (asserted) and only refers to one document	1	**ND** and only refers to Doc A **or** Doc B
No evaluation is present. No creditable material	0	No **ND or EVAL**

AO1d Judgement about argument and perspective	**Mark**	**Annotations**
Judgement is clearly reasoned and supported. Includes intermediate conclusions and a main conclusion	5	**J or J ^** intermediate **and J** in the final conclusion
Judgement is clearly reasoned and supported. Includes **either** intermediate conclusion(s) **or** a main conclusion	4	**J** intermediate **or** in the final conclusion
Judgement is reasoned but is only partly supported. Includes **either** intermediate conclusion(s) **or** a main conclusion	3	**J ^** intermediate **or** in the final conclusion
Judgement is reasoned but not supported	2	**U**
Judgement is stated without reasons or support	1	**U ^**
No judgement is made. No creditable material	0	**No U^, U, J^ or J**

AO3 Communication

Communication	Mark	Annotations
Produces a clearly written, well-structured and logical argument that is focused throughout on the question	5	Meets the descriptor – and contains no **NAQ**
Produces a clearly written, well-structured argument that links to the question	4	Meets the descriptor
Produces a clearly written argument with uneven structure that links to the question	3	Meets the descriptor
Produces an argument that lacks clarity and structure and does not always link to the question	2	Meets the descriptor
Communication is cursory or descriptive and lacks structure	1	Meets the descriptor
No creditable material	0	Meets the descriptor – **NAQ** throughout

Examiners should allocate a mark for each aspect (AO1a, AO1b, AO1c, AO1d and AO3), using the mark descriptors and required annotations.

Further guidance for AO3 is given below.
Guidance for awarding marks for AO3 in Question 3.

Note: 'clearly written' refers to the content and the ease of being able to follow the candidates' argument. It should be thought of as: "**clearly expressed**".
The quality of handwriting should not be considered as a factor when awarding marks. This is not what 'clearly written' means in the descriptors.
If a candidate makes little attempt to answer the question and has lots of NAQ (e.g is very descriptive or wrote an essay on their own opinion of the subject matter) the **maximum** score is **2 marks.**
If a candidate wrote very little/ wrote in bullet points/has limited content that addresses the question the **maximum score** is **2 marks.**
If a candidate makes no attempt to develop an argument **at all**, the **maximum** score is 1 mark.
If a candidate wrote in continuous prose, expressed themselves clearly and addressed the question, **start at 3 marks** – then consider if it better fits the descriptions above or below 3 marks. If the answer is **not** clearly expressed or **focused mainly on one document**, it lacks clarity **and** has uneven structure and may only be worth **2 marks.**
If the answer has an introduction, clear paragraphs, considers **both documents in a balanced way,** reaches **a judgement** and generally links to the question it could be worth **4 marks.**
If the answer contains the criteria for 4 marks above, **is logical and has no irrelevant content (No NAQ)** it could be worth **5 marks**.

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**The authors of the two documents present different arguments and perspectives on international aid.** **Evaluate the arguments of the authors of both documents. In your answer, consider their perspectives and include a reasoned judgement about whether one argument is stronger than the other.**	**25**
	No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some parts of the following indicative content.	
	Indicative content – perspectives (AO1b) A perspective is made up of argument, evidence and assumptions and may be influenced by a particular [global] context. The perspective is the overall point the author is making / what the author is writing about / what the overall argument the author is making. **It gives an overview**. The other AO1 aspects consider the key components of argument, evaluation and judgement. These consider the individual components of the candidate's argument. • Doc A is about Zimbabwe having rules imposed (**P^**). Doc B is about local communities having control (**P^**) • Doc A takes the view that the IMF and Western countries will not bail out Zimbabwe unless they agree to their rules (**P**) • Doc B takes the view that aid agencies should give control of money and decisions to local communities. (**P**) **PD** requires analysis by comparing and describing perspectives for both documents. It **requires active comparison**, not just placing two separate points for each document next to each other. • The two perspectives are very different: Rukuni (Doc A) takes the view that Zimbabwe should accept the recommendations / rules set by international funders such as Aid agencies or the IMF, while Jarrar (Doc B) proposes that Aid agencies or those funding humanitarian projects, should hand over the decision making to local communities. (**PD**) • Personal perspectives provided by Jarrar (Doc B) via the personal examples (Jarrar's own responses of fear and pride/reactions of Bedouin woman and community participant) come from her own experiences of living and working in Jerusalem. This is very different from Rukuni's (Doc A) more news-based approach – which gives distance and is not so personal. **(PE)** • However, Rukuni (Doc A) has a more pragmatic perspective that Zimbabwe should accept the realities if it wants a bailout, compared to the more idealistic perspective of Doc B (Jarrar) that local communities should be given the freedom to manage their own projects funded by international aid organisations and donors. Rukuni's perspective is based more in his investigative take on politics and economics. (**PE**)	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Indicative content – Arguments** No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. At each point of comparison, **candidates may argue that either Document is stronger, or they are equally strong**. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content. **[Example only]** **Well-supported conclusion:** Jarrar's argument (Doc B) is that the approach works and should be rolled out elsewhere. The experiences in East Jerusalem, described and explained, support this view, giving the reader confidence that the approach would be effective. (**EVAL**) The conclusion in Doc A, that Zimbabwe should follow Greece's example, is less well supported(**C**), as it is clear from the evidence provided that it did not work out so well for Greece. This is less convincing for the reader. (**EVAL**) The well-supported conclusion in Doc B makes Jarrar's argument stronger than Rukuni's. (**J**) **Provenance**: Jarrar's (Doc B) relevant experience and expertise in Development (detail in preamble) far outstrip Charles Rukuni's (Doc A) experience as a journalist. **Convincing evidence of positive change:** Jarrar (Doc B) makes a well-supported argument that flipping accountability is effective and has many unexpected positive impacts. Contrasts with the lack of positive change as laid out in Rukuni's (Doc A) description of the move to an inclusive government in Zimbabwe. **Clearer explanations:** In Doc B details of how the programme worked to strengthen the argument, whereas the details of 'the bitter medicine' in Doc A are unclear. **More use of statistical evidence** (arrears of USD150m) and exact dates in Doc A (2 May 2010) give a clearer timeline to underpin the argument, whereas the timeline in Doc B is less clear. - More use of formal **named sources** and mention of specific organisations and individuals makes the argument in Doc A more credible than the personal quotes from unnamed sources such as 'one participant' in Doc B. - More formal, detached and **less emotional style**, despite a clear sense of injustice, makes Doc A more credible than the more personal style of Doc B. - Both arguments are well-supported with relevant evidence and explanation. - Both arguments are well-structured and generally logical.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Indicative content – Judgement** The candidate may conclude that Document A is stronger due to its use of specific statistics and dates and that its more formal approach makes it more convincing. (**J**) The candidate may conclude that the provenance of the author of Document B, with her first-hand experience and clear personal involvement in survivor and community-led crisis response, provides a stronger argument. (**J**) The candidate may come to a judgement that the two arguments are different. They have different strengths and weaknesses but overall are generally equally strong arguments. Both arguments are well-supported with relevant evidence and explanation. Both arguments are well-structured and generally logical. (**J**)	

Annotation	Meaning
✔	**Correct, creditworthy point**. Used in **Question 1** only.
✘	**Incorrect point.** Used in **Question 1** or for clear error elsewhere.
T	**Identify type of evidence. (**Without an example) Used in **Q2** (AO1a)
EG	**Example of type of Evidence.** Used in **Q2** (AO1a)
+ or –	**Strength or weakness of evidence** recognised but with limited explanation**.** Used in **Q2** (AO1b)
EXP	**Strength or weakness of evidence** clearly explained. Used in **Q2** (AO1b)
I	**Impact of evidence** is asserted and not explained. Used in **Q2** (AO1c)
^	**Shows undeveloped point**. Added to other annotations (EVAL, P, J and U in **Q2** and **Q3**)
EVAL	**Evaluation of impact of evidence** on argument/perspective and includes a judgement**.** Used in **Q2** (AO1c)
J	**Added to EVAL** to show the inclusion of a judgement. Used in **Q2** (AO1c)
K	**Identification of key component of argument.** Used in **Q3** (AO1a)
C	**Comparison of key components** from both documents. Used in **Q3** (AO1a)
P	**Identification of perspectives** with limited description**.** Used in **Q3** (AO1b)
PD	**Analyses by comparing and describing perspectives in both documents.** Used in **Q3** (AO1b)
PE	**Analyses by comparing and explaining perspectives in both documents.** Used in **Q3** (AO1b)
ND	**Unsupported evaluation of argument.** Used in **Q3** (AO1c)

Annotation	Meaning
EVAL	**Evaluation of argument** in both documents**.** Used in **Q3** (AO1c)
U	**Unsupported judgement.** Used in **Q3** (AO1d)
J	**Supported judgement.** Used in **Q3** (AO1d)
NAQ	**Not answering the question.**
REP	**Repetition.** When repeating a point as a summary or simply stating another example that does not develop the evaluation.
SEEN	To show that answers/pages have been assessed.
💬	**On Page Comment.** Used where necessary to clarify a decision.