



Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

9239/11

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 **25** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**Generic Marking Principles**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

PUBLISHED**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).

PUBLISHED**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.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>The author of Document A discusses prison for young offenders.</p> <p>Identify <u>three</u> different ways the juvenile justice system is better for young offenders than the adult justice system, as given by the author of Document A.</p> <p>The question assesses AO1.</p> <p>Answers to Question 1 can be brief, using short sentences or bullet points.</p> <p>Show a correct answer with ✓ in the text, up to a maximum of three marks.</p> <p>Any three of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more rehabilitation / education / community service • lower re-arrest rates / less likely to re-offend • (steers them towards) more successful lives / more productive lives • (offers more) protection / records will be hidden (from public view). <p><i>Do not accept:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juveniles may still be tried as adults. • Youth can stay on their parents' health insurance. 	3

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>The author of Document B contrasts prison with rehabilitation.</p> <p>Identify <u>two</u> different negative effects of prison on prisoners, as given by the author of Document B. The question assesses AO1.</p> <p>Answers to Question 1 can be brief, using short sentences or bullet points.</p> <p>Show a correct answer with ✓ in the text, up to a maximum of two marks.</p> <p>Any two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (violent offenders) influencing / recruiting / hardening non-violent offenders • difficult for them to live and earn / get housing and a job (when they are released) / subject to stigmatization. • (it is so) difficult (for them) to reintegrate into society. <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They lose their right to basic humanity. (our belief not an effect) • Overcrowding in prisons 	2

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.

PUBLISHED

- **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.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author of Document A to support their argument that young offenders do not belong in adult prisons.</p> <p>In your answer include the impact of the evidence on the author’s argument.</p> <p>Indicative content No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content.</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Example only] The author’s provenance as <i>former commissioner...</i> (EG) gives credibility (+) to the factual and historical evidence provided, such as the launch of juvenile courts and laws in California. (EXP) The author’s past experience gives the reader confidence that the factual and historical evidence is correct and understood by the author. (EVAL) • Evidence and examples provided are relevant and explained and support the author’s argument. • The author provides background information on the legal status of youth to support the case that they are generally not considered to be adults. (1st para) • Corroboration of the author’s view from the <i>Chief Probation Officers of California</i>. (explained) • Evidence from Research (CDCP) on re-arrest rates, supports the argument. • Statistical evidence (T) to support the difference in maturity of youth in 1960 with 2010. • (A counter argument is supported with) exact figures of arrests and (rebutted with) reported evidence from New York and Massachusetts. 	15

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little balance of evidence (apart from one sentence on counter argument which weakens the argument), suggests bias. • Much qualitative/anecdotal but unsourced information (depends heavily on provenance of author, who may no longer have access to information) • Some weakly supported statements/sweeping statements (marriage and work help young people grow out of youthful troublemaking – mentions research but provides no actual figures or details of the research.) (Juvenile court caseloads and detention populations declined, no figures provided) • Vague claims (opinion): ‘education, community service... has the potential... more successful lives’ no clear context, no figures provided, no detail given. 	

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 perspectives with no description.
P	Identification of perspectives 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 or undeveloped evaluation of a key component of argument.
EVAL	Evaluation of key components of argument.

- **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 expressed, well-structured and logical argument that is focused throughout on the question.

Structure should include introduction, clear paragraphs 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.

No annotation is required except **NAQ** to show not linking to the question. **The mark should be selected by using the guidance that follows the mark tables. Choose the most appropriate descriptor in the marking grid.**

NAQ	Not answering the question
------------	-----------------------------------

PUBLISHED**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	Guidance
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 on page 21.

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 made little attempt to answer the question and had lots of NAQ (e.g. was 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 was **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**.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p data-bbox="338 213 1939 248">The authors of the two documents present different arguments and perspectives on the justice system.</p> <p data-bbox="338 284 1939 351">Evaluate the arguments of both authors. In your answer, consider their perspectives and include a reasoned judgement about whether one argument is stronger than the other.</p> <p data-bbox="338 386 1939 453">No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some parts of the following indicative content.</p> <p data-bbox="338 488 1939 523">Indicative content – perspectives (AO1b)</p> <p data-bbox="338 558 1939 651">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.</p> <p data-bbox="338 654 1939 715">The other AO1 aspects consider the key components of argument, evaluation and judgement. These consider the individual components of the candidate’s argument.</p> <p data-bbox="338 718 1939 753">Document A writes about the youth justice system (P^). Document B writes about the adult prison system (P^)</p> <p data-bbox="338 756 1939 791">Document A is based on California’s proposed raising of the age limit on the youth justice system from 18 to 20. (P)</p> <p data-bbox="338 794 1939 829">Document B’s perspective is that the way prisoners are treated is due to a lack of sympathy and a right to rehabilitation. (P)</p> <p data-bbox="338 833 1939 893">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.</p> <p data-bbox="338 928 1939 989">Both authors start from a similar viewpoint, that prison is damaging to prisoners. However, Document A has a cooler, more pragmatic and slightly narrower perspective, as his perspective is focussed on the impact of prison on youth in the US.</p> <p data-bbox="338 992 1939 1165">This perspective comes from his background as a commissioner working in NYC Department of Probation. On the other hand, Document B has a somewhat wider perspective on the damage done to prisoners in general with a broader social context including exploitation, class and racism. Her perspective seems to be focussed on Guyana (though this is not stated) as she is writing for a Guyanan audience. Her perspective comes from her interest in socio-political ills, making her more emotionally invested in the issue. (PE)</p>	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Indicative content – Arguments</p> <p>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:</p> <p>[Example only]: (all annotations are given to show progression. In practice K and ND would not be needed here) Structure: Akola Thompson (Doc B) structures her argument well, drawing in the reader by presenting a counter argument from the outset. (K) The argument flows logically to the conclusion (ND) appealing to the reader for a change of attitude. (EVAL) Whereas the counter argument in Doc A is little more than an aside (C), making Doc B stronger structurally. (J^)</p> <p>Style: Vincent Schiraldi Doc A provides a more formal argument, with more statistics, dates and exact information to support it – this contrasts with the sweeping emotionalism of Doc B.</p> <p>Appeal to audience: Doc B Shows empathy with the fears and concerns of those who disagree and appeals to the reader’s sense of justice. Whereas Doc A shows less empathy being more concerned with facts and figures.</p> <p>Provenance: VS (Doc A) has status and expertise in the area of crime and justice. This makes him more credible than the author of Doc B, AT, who is a young journalist.</p> <p>Focus: Both authors have a similar opinion of the negative impacts of prison, though their focus is different: Doc A is focussed on young offenders while Doc B has a more general focus.</p> <p>Logical arguments: Though they support their arguments differently, Doc A with specific sourced evidence and Doc B with more general factual information and discussion; both authors provide logical arguments and accessible explanations for their ideas.</p>	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Indicative content – Judgement</p> <p>Candidate's may introduce their answer with an unsupported judgement as to which, if any argument is stronger. (U[^])</p> <p>Judgement will normally occur at the end of a point, especially as an intermediate judgement at the end of a paragraph.</p> <p>Use U[^] or U, for unsupported judgements and where the candidate refers to one document only.</p> <p>J[^] and J are used when an answer directly refers to both documents and answers the question by including a reasoned judgement about whether one argument is stronger than the other.</p> <p>A candidate may conclude that Doc A has a stronger argument as it has more clear and sourced evidence than Doc B. (J[^]) Doc A uses research from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, whereas Doc B uses no sources and appears to rely on her own knowledge. (J)</p> <p>A candidate may conclude that Doc B has a stronger argument than Doc A due to a clear emotional perspective that draws in and convinces the reader. (J[^])</p> <p>A candidate may conclude that, on balance, neither document is stronger as they both have a similar view of the justice system and prison, though from different perspectives and with different approaches to their arguments. (J)</p>	

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)
	Not answering the question.
	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.