

Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH**9239/12**

Paper 1 Written Exam

May/June 2024

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 2024 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 **22** 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 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 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.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>The author of Document A discusses the introduction of Bitcoin to El Salvador.</p> <p>Identify three disadvantages of Bitcoin for Salvadorans, as given by the author of Document A. 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too complex for everyday use • Requires internet access • Will not work for pupusa vendors, bus drivers or shopkeepers • Sending remittances via Bitcoin may cost more than money transfers / Bitcoin isn't free / the cost of acquiring bitcoins. <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has attracted angry protests • It doesn't turn out to have such a bright future • Mining bitcoin is expensive. 	3
1(b)	<p>The author of Document B mentions cryptocurrency mining.</p> <p>Identify two countries where cryptocurrency mining takes place, as given by the author of Document B.</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/two] marks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cambodia • China <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southeast Asia • Singapore 	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 (**A**). Evaluation may be **attempted** but not explained (**I ^**) [**I** and **^** are two separate annotations on RM]. Candidates **explain** the impact of evidence on the author’s argument/perspective [**I**] and include a **judgement** of its effectiveness (**I J**).

A	Impact of evidence is asserted and not explained.
I ^	Shows undeveloped point of evaluation. Evaluation attempted but not explained.
I	Evaluation of impact of evidence on argument/perspective.
I 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 type 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 2 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 1 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 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 range of reasoned judgements	5	2 I (or more) and I J
Evaluation includes explanation of the impact of evidence on the argument/perspective and makes a reasoned judgement	4	2 I (or more)
Evaluation includes an explanation of the impact of evidence on the argument/perspective	3	1 I
Evaluation is attempted but lacks clarity, and the impact of evidence on the argument/perspective is not explained	2	1 I ^ (or more)
The impact of evidence on the argument/perspective is asserted and not explained	1	1 A (or more)
No evaluation is present. No creditable material.	0	No A, I ^, I or I J

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

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author of Document A to support their argument about cryptocurrency.</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"> • <i>[annotated example]</i> The author presents a clear example (+) of the possible impact of bitcoin in El Salvador, El Zonte ‘Bitcoin Beach’ (EG). The author provides a narrative description that helps the reader to understand that Bitcoin could be accepted and used in El Salvador and to explain what may have influenced Nayib Bukele’s thinking. (I) • All evidence is relevant. The author’s conclusion that bitcoin might be a savvy strategy is supported. • Provenance – the author has a background in computer science, experience in creating software and as a journalist in tech policy. • Statistical information – figures from Mellers and World Bank help to support the counter argument and the author’s rebuttal on the topic of remittances. • Named sources, people and places (Chivo, Nayib Bukele, Mellers, World Bank, El Zonte) give the reader a plausible context for the author’s argument. • The author provides background information to give the reader an understanding of the way the new policy was introduced and its possible impacts. <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some unsourced information: sending Bitcoin via ATM can cost more than a money transfer / thousands of people have significant bitcoin wealth. • Speculative predictions about the possible success of the policy (could provide revenue and investment, might spend, might relocate might be a savvy...). [NB: could also be used to support a strength point about author deliberately distancing self from debate to give a neutral view.] • Some vague information – lack of detail / unsupported claims: one Salvadoran, too complex for everyday use, A few years ago, unnamed ‘local businesses’ (with no specifics about their acceptance of bitcoin). 	15

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	3 C or more
Compares a range of key components of arguments from both documents	4	2 C
Compares a limited range of key components of arguments from both documents	3	1 C
Identifies key components of arguments with no comparison	2	2 K or more
Limited identification of key components of arguments with no comparison	1	1 K
No identification of arguments. No creditable material.	0	No K, C

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	2 ND refers to Doc A and Doc B
Evaluation of arguments is unsupported (asserted) and only refers to one document	1	1 ND
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.

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>The authors of the two documents present different arguments and perspectives on cryptocurrency.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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>Indicative content – Perspectives</p> <p><i>[annotated example]</i> Timothy Lee (Doc A) gives a clear, balanced perspective on Nayib Bukele’s decision to adopt bitcoin as an official currency. His perspective is focused on El Salvador, and he considers pros and cons of the adoption. His interest in the details of events and impacts comes from his background in computer science and his experience of creating software and leading a tech policy team at the Washington Post.</p> <p>Though he focuses narrowly on El Salvador, he does not seem to have any local connections or inside knowledge. On the other hand, Doc B has a wider perspective, because it has been written by the ASEAN Post team, published in Malaysia, with a main focus on geopolitics and renewable energy, financial technology and the environment of Southeast Asia (PE). In addition, the document brings in information, research and opinions on the environmental impacts of bitcoin from a range of sources around the world, providing a global perspective.</p> <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>	25




PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><i>[annotated example]</i> Use of Counter argument Doc A includes a counter argument: that cryptocurrency may not be so positive for ordinary Salvadorans. This is supported by some explanation of the difficulties and an opinion from a Salvadoran. This gives the argument strength as it provides balance and gives the reader confidence that the author is presenting an unbiased, coherent argument and has considered different views (EVAL). However, Doc B does not include a counter argument, no positives of cryptocurrency are presented (C), just a view that cryptocurrency is here to stay, so we need a solution for the environmental damage it does. This makes Doc A's more balanced neutral argument seem stronger (J).</p> <p>Global scope Doc A is solely focused on El Salvador and the specifics of the introduction of bitcoin to the country. This narrows the scope of the argument to the details of what might happen in El Salvador. Whereas Doc B has a much wider focus, firstly on Southeast Asia but bringing in views and evidence from around the world, giving the argument a more global scope.</p> <p>Unsupported claims Doc A makes a series of unsupported claims and suggestions with no hard evidence to support them. It implies that Nayib Bukele is only interested in attracting business and foreign investment and casts doubt on his statement about financial inclusion. However, there is no real evidence provided to convince the reader that this is so. Doc B supports all claims with explanation, quotes from reliable sources or statistics, giving the reader more confidence that the argument is well-founded.</p> <p>Relevant examples. Doc A provides the reader with local flavour and a detailed description of events, names and places (Bukele, Chivo, pupusa vendors, Bitcoin 2020 conference in Miami, El Zonte) that provide a clear context for the argument. Whereas Doc B provides much more general statistical evidence with few real-world examples, apart from quite vague examples such as 'Cambodia is a hub', 'China relies heavily'.</p> <p>Focus: Both authors are considering impacts of cryptocurrency however their focus is different. Document A is mainly concerned with the possible positive impacts of cryptocurrency use in El Salvador in economic terms, attracting tourism and business. On the other hand, Document B is mainly focused on the environmental impacts of cryptocurrency.</p> <p>Structure: Though the documents are different, in terms of focus, both provide logical arguments and accessible explanations for their ideas. Both are clearly introduced and structured so that it is easy to understand and follow their arguments and both support their conclusions with a logical argument. Both have somewhat undeveloped conclusions, so they have equal strength in terms of structure.</p>	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Indicative content – Judgement</p> <p><i>[annotated example]</i> A candidate may conclude that Doc B has a stronger argument as it has clearly sourced evidence for its claims and takes a more global view, providing suggestions for ways of moving forward and reducing the environmental damage cryptocurrency causes (J).</p> <p>A candidate may conclude that Doc A has a stronger argument, as it provides more detailed local background and information and examples that make it easier to understand the context and the pros and cons of El Salvador’s adoption of bitcoin as one of its currencies.</p> <p>A candidate may conclude that both documents have their strengths, Doc A its more detailed local flavour and balanced argument, Doc B its broader global perspective and range of sourced evidence, they are considering different aspects of cryptocurrency, and both focus on only one aspect, so they are equal in strength and weakness.</p>	

Annotation	Meaning
	Correct, creditworthy point. Used in Question 1 only.
	Incorrect point. Used in Question 1 only.
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).
A	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).
I	Evaluation of impact of evidence on argument/perspective. Used in Q2 (AO1c).
J	Added to I 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.
?	Unclear point