Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH **9239/13**

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 **25** 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 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.

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.

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.

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 discusses how artificial intelligence technology has reduced congestion in cities across the world.** **Identify two cities that have had a reduction in travel times, as given by the author of Document A.** 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. • Hangzhou • Pittsburgh Do not accept: • Yanbu • Malaysia • Delhi	2

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**The authors of Document B discuss the growing problem of traffic congestion in African cities.** **Identify <u>three</u> negative consequences of traffic congestion in cities, as given by the authors of Document B.** 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. • lower air quality/increased automobile emissions/greenhouse gases • increased fuel consumption • supply chain problems/wasting time/long waits in delivery of raw materials or products / delays in deliveries / businesses suffer because time is wasted • Increased journey times for commuters or people Do not accept: problems associated with developing infrastructure	3

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 **(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	**Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author of Document A to support their argument that artificial intelligence technology can solve traffic congestion problems.** **In your answer, include the impact of the evidence on the author's argument.** **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** • *[annotated example]* **Global evidence (T)** increases the validity of the argument as it demonstrates the solution can work in any city around the world **(+)**. By offering a range of successful examples from diverse cities the author is able to generalise his solution (**EXP**). The author references cities in China, Saudi Arabia and the US to support his argument (**EG**). The use of these examples supported by data help convince the reader of the author's reasoning because the technology is already in place throughout the world (**I**). • **provenance** – author is a co-founder of a science website that works with experts in the field. • **supporting evidence** – the wide range of examples (Yanbu, Pittsburgh Hangzhou) all support one another and add validity to the author's argument. • **expert evidence** – the argument is supported by others with appropriate credibility; e.g. Carnegie Mellon University professor of robotics, Stephen Smith, founded Surtrac. Expert evidence is also provided by Alibaba and Huawei. • **precise quantitative evidence** – This reduced travel times by 26% and wait times at intersections by 41%. • **detailed qualitative evidence** – e.g. 'AI technologies to make sense of large amounts of data collected by sensors and cameras that record road activity. The systems can then provide insights that local operators can use to make real-time decisions to optimise traffic'.	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**Weaknesses** • **provenance** – limited detail about the author's actual expertise in AI so by implication this is a potential weakness • **vague claims** – e.g. 'Year-by-year, traffic has only gotten worse in most cities across the world.' • **vested interest** e.g. Wang Jian, chairman of Chinese tech giant Alibaba's technology committee • **unsourced evidence** – 'Delhi, drivers spend up to 58% more time stuck in traffic' • **vague sources of evidence** – nothing is known about Techwire Asia • **vague statistical evidence –** It uses the data to coordinate more than 1000 road signals around a city.	

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**

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**.

See also additional guidance for Q3 on Page 22

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**The authors of both documents present different arguments and perspectives about ways to reduce traffic congestion in cities.** **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.** 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** *[annotated example]* The author uses a range of current success stories from around the world to support his perspective that AI is the best solution to the problem. Doc A's perspective is strongly influenced by the theme of technology. He believes the best response to the issue of global city congestion is to employ AI technology. Doc B's perspective is different. This perspective is contextualised by specific reference to developing countries and this shapes a more traditional physical infrastructural response (**PD**). The author spends more time discussing the problems caused by traffic congestion with a specific focus on Africa. These problems are informed by two themes: environment and economics (**PE**). **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. *[annotated example]* **Global scope**: Doc A's examples is drawn from all over the world, referencing the problems of congestion in Delhi and the successful solutions implemented in Pittsburgh, Yanbu and Hangzhou. This gives Doc A's perspective global scope and convinces the audience that the solution is both rational and effective (**EVAL**). Whereas Doc B focusses on Africa only, making it more geographically specific (**C**). By being specific Doc B is able to be more detailed about the problems and solutions required for the developing world. This is neither more or less strong than a less specific and more generalisable solution offered by Doc A (**J**).	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Solution** – Doc A's solution is more appealing and, on the surface, appears to be more simply applied than that offered by Doc B which requires huge infrastructural development. Doc A's solution is already existing in certain places whereas Doc B cannot point to any successful implementation. **Structure of Argument –** After briefly outlining the problem, Doc A offers numerous examples each with detail before arriving to a short but logical conclusion. Doc A is very solutions-focused and spends very little time discussing the problems caused by traffic congestion beyond saying drivers get stuck in traffic. The author is quite repetitive and moves from city to city without using discourse markers. Doc B spends much of the argument outlining the negative impacts of traffic congestion with reference to different themes (Health, Environment, Economics) which adds more reasoning to the perspective, explaining why changes need to happen. Both conclusions are brief, but Doc A's is better supported. **Provenance –** Doc A's author is a co-founder of a science website that works with experts in the field, though there is limited detail about the author's actual expertise in AI. Doc B's provenance is stronger. The SEI is a world-renowned non-profit organisation and the lead author, Romanus Opiyo, has high level and relevant expertise – he holds a PhD in Urban and Regional Planning. **Ability to see –** Doc B is written by the programme leader for SEI Africa and it is plausible to assume that he is based in the continent about which he writes. In contrast, Doc A's publisher is based in Romania and evidence is drawn from areas that are beyond the author's specific location. **Evidence –** Both documents use a range of evidence types with both strengths and weaknesses. Doc A has much statistical evidence, some of which is precise and sourced. All of Doc A's evidence is relevant. Doc B has less statistical evidence and the reference to emissions in the US is not clearly relevant. Both have some expert/credible evidence; Doc A professor of robotics, Stephen Smith and Doc B Massachusetts Institute of Technology. **Language style –** Both employ technical language which gives the reader a sense of them being more objective and well-informed. Doc A e.g., City Brain crunches data in real-time from video cameras at intersections* and GPS data from local cars and buses. It uses the data to coordinate more than 1,000 road signals around a city. Doc B e.g., During rush hour traffic, emissions of hydrocarbon, carbon monoxide and oxides of nitrogen are very high. They are normally double the rate of emissions in free-flow traffic. **Counter argument/Balance –** Doc A offers a fleeting reference to other possible solutions, 'Expanding roadways, improving public transport, and encouraging alternative forms of mobility are very important and have their part to play in improving traffic flow' but readily dismisses them. Doc B remains focused on the need for mass transport solutions and acknowledges the difficulties associated with implementing this solution. Doc A envisages no problems with its solution and so it could be argued Doc B is more realistic.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Indicative content – Judgement** *[annotated example]* A candidate may conclude that Doc A is stronger because it has more supporting evidence and a greater range of examples that explicitly provide evidence for the solution, whereas Doc B doesn't reference specific examples where the solution has worked so the reader is likely to be more persuaded by Doc A **(J).** A candidate may conclude that Doc B is stronger because it offers a more balanced approach, recognising both problems and solutions unlike Doc A that offers no potential difficulties with implementing their solution. This may persuade readers because they will appreciate the objective reality that underpins Doc B. A candidate may conclude that neither Doc A or Doc B is stronger because they have different foci. Doc B's argument is highly specific to the continent of Africa which provides a unique context whereas Doc A's solution is supported with reference to a global range of cities all of which are technologically advanced.	

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).
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.
?	**Unclear point**