CAMBRIDGE
International Education

Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH   **9239/12**

Paper 1 Written Exam   **February/March 2025**

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 February/March 2025 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **25** printed pages.

            [Turn over

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.

Annotations guidance for centres

Examiners use a system of annotations as a shorthand for communicating their marking decisions to one another. Examiners are trained during the standardisation process on how and when to use annotations. The purpose of annotations is to inform the standardisation and monitoring processes and guide the supervising examiners when they are checking the work of examiners within their team. The meaning of annotations and how they are used is specific to each component and is understood by all examiners who mark the component.

We publish annotations in our mark schemes to help centres understand the annotations they may see on copies of scripts. Note that there may not be a direct correlation between the number of annotations on a script and the mark awarded. Similarly, the use of an annotation may not be an indication of the quality of the response.

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 ✓ o ✗ . 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 trophy hunting in South Africa.** **Identify <u>two</u> surveys used to measure public opinion 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. • (Survey by) World Animal Protection/WAP • (Survey by) Humane Society International/Africa/HSI/Africa Do not accept: • Professional Hunters Register • South African government	2
1(b)	**The authors of Document B discuss trophy hunting in Pakistan.** **Identify three organisations that have considered Syed Yahya Shah's proposal, 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. • International Union for Conservation of Nature • Gilgit-Baltistan Forest and Wildlife Department • World Wide Fund (for Nature)/WWF Do not accept: • Bar Valley Community	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:

- **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 may **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 **+** and 1 **–** (**or opposite**) with 1 (or more) **EXP**
Analyses strengths and weaknesses of a range of evidence with limited explanation	3	2 **+** and 1 **–** (**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 make 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 about banning trophy hunting in South Africa.** **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 indicative content below. • *[annotated example]* **Statistics/Percentages (T)** are precise and carry more meaning than rounded data **(+).** The author gives results from a survey by World Animal Protection the percentages, such as 84% (**EG**), show just how strong the opposition to trophy hunting is.(**EXP**). The use of these percentages directly supports the author's conclusion that public attitudes are changing and so helps convince the reader that trophy hunting in SA should be banned. (**I**). **Strengths** • **Precise data** *(e.g. precise figures like 10 900)* • **Global data – international survey** *(e.g. WAP and HSI appear to be international organisations)* • **Named first hand sources** *(e.g. Dr Matthew Church and Edith Kabesiime are both quoted)* • **Credible sources** – *Prof Hunting Reg, Edith Kabesiime both close to the topic and therefore credible.* • **Authoritative survey data** *(e.g. WAP survey data seems detailed and well-researched)* • **Range or variety of sources** *(e.g. survey data as well as interviews and quotes)* • **Recent data** *(e.g. up to 2020)* • **Knowledgeable author – expertise** *(e.g. Don Pinnock studies criminology and is a research fellow)* • **Local author – from SA** *(Pinnock is from SA)* • **More than one survey/ Evidence corroborates each other** *(e.g. both surveys say the same thing)* • **Wide range of respondents to surveys** *(e.g. different classes etc.)* • **Large sample size** *(e.g. 3599 people surveyed by HIS)* • **Mixture of both local and global survey data** *(e.g. international and in SA)* • **Long – term survey data** *(2016–2020)*	15

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**Weaknesses** • **Lack of balanced evidence** *(most evidence supports the same view, e.g. the survey data)* • **Lack of comparison with previous years** *(e.g. data from 2016–2020 is not compared with other years)* • **Unsupported claims** *(e.g. loud and expensive campaigns – no real evidence of this)* • **Undated statistics** *(neither survey is dated)* • **Author's Lack of experience of wildlife** *(He is a criminologist)* • **Relying on subjective opinions of survey respondents, or survey respondents not chosen randomly** *(we do not know how objective the surveys were)* • **Some imprecise figures** *(at least 84%)* • **Biased experts** *(Edith Kabesiime may not be a neutral observer as she is a campaigner)* • **Unsourced data** *(174 000 animals – we do not know where this data is from)*	

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:

- **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 evaluation of argument.**
EVAL	**Evaluation of argument** in both documents**.**

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

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

- **Communication (AO3)** A candidate should aim to produce a clearly 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** (at least one for each Doc)
Evaluation of key components of arguments with limited reference to both documents	3	**1 or 2 EVAL** and refers to both Docs
Evaluation of arguments is unsupported (asserted) but refers to both documents	2	**2 ND** refers to both Docs
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 makes little attempt to answer the question and there are several instances 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 writes 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 writes in continuous prose, expressed themselves clearly and addressed the question, **start at 3 marks** – then consider if it better fits the descriptions above or below 3 marks. If the answer is **not** clearly expressed or **focused mainly on one document**, it lacks clarity **and** has uneven structure and may only be worth **2 marks.**

If the answer has an introduction, clear paragraphs, considers **both documents in a balanced way,** reaches **a judgement** and generally links to the question it could be worth **4 marks.**

If the answer contains the criteria for 4 marks above, **is logical and has no irrelevant content (No NAQ)** it could be worth **5 marks**.

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**The authors of both documents present different arguments and perspectives on the advantages and disadvantages of trophy hunting.** **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 more convincing 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** There does <u>not</u> need to be adjacent comparison to award **PD** and **PE.** If answers meet the descriptor in the table in relation to **both documents** the rewardable content can appear in different parts of the answer. • *[Example only]* • Doc A is about perceptions of trophy hunting (**P^**). Doc B is about the benefits of trophy hunting in Pakistan (**P^**). • Doc A talks about public attitudes toward trophy hunting in South Africa (**P**). Doc B talks about how trophy hunting can benefit local communities (**P**). • Doc A's perspective is trophy hunting in South Africa should be banned because it is both bad for wildlife and bad for South Africa's reputation (**PD**). Doc B's perspective is different. This perspective has a positive approach to trophy hunting when undertaken in controlled circumstances arguing it can benefit both wildlife and locals (**PD**). • Doc As author is against trophy hunting in South Africa for two reasons, firstly because public opinion is strongly against the shooting of wild animals for money and he fears South Africa's reputation will be tarnished if trophy hunting continues. He is also concerned because of the vast numbers of animals killed is both cruel and will negatively impact the conservation of animals. The author uses data from two large surveys undertaken to understand public attitudes toward trophy hunting. The author of Doc B takes the opposite view and is in favour of trophy hunting in specific contexts. This is because there is hard evidence of trophy hunting's success for wildlife and local communities when the programmes are implemented following scrutiny and evaluation (**PE**).	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Indicative content – Arguments** No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. At each point of comparison, candidate may argue that either Document is stronger, or they are equally strong. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content. • *[annotated example]:* **Relevant evidence –** although both documents are supported by evidence, Doc B draws upon a real-world example of trophy hunting that has been validated by expert organisations. The case study of the ibex in the Bar Valley is a proven success, by presenting this to the audience the reader is convinced as the evidence is irrefutable. (**EVAL**) In contrast, Doc A relies heavily on the opinions of non-experts gathered from two different surveys (**C**). Although the opinions of South Africans provide important data, it is not rooted in the scientific and detailed approach that underpins the argument about the Bar Valley and consequently Doc A lacks adequate support by comparison. (**J**) • **Balanced argument** – Doc B takes a more balanced approach clearly acknowledging the negative views held by those against trophy hunting whereas Doc A is far more dismissive of the counter argument and uses more loaded language e.g. 'killed a staggering' and 'a disgrace to South Africa'. • **Ability to observe –** both documents make specific reference to areas of the world in which the author or platform is based. The author of Doc A is South African as is the newspaper and the authors of Doc B are from the region and the so is the publication. • **Statistics –** both documents use statistics that are relevant to their argument and support their perspective. • **Language style** – Doc A powerfully announces their opinion from the outset 'Trophy hunting does not contribute to conservation' the author then continues to develop this emotive issue by engaging with persuasive language 'senseless killing' 'unethical and cruel' 'shoot to kill targets'. Doc B is far more considered in its tone and style. • **Expert testimony –** Doc A is able to offer direct quotations from conservationists and their testimony helps the reader interpret the data from the surveys making the information clear, whereas Doc B relies on a historical summary without explicit quotation from those involved. Candidates may also include any of the following points of comparison in their answer: • B is more balanced than A. *(B has more use of counterargument)* • A is more global than B. *(B makes only brief reference to Africa, but A does discuss international opinion)* • B does not have a clear statement of its argument at the opening, but A does. • B has (slightly) less sourced information and use of numerical data than A. (WAP, HSI etc) • A relies more on emotional impact *(use of emotive language)*. • A is more generalisable than B *(because B is more focused on one specific place and one animal)*.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	- Both clearly state arguments in the conclusion. - B uses more formal language (possibly). - Both authors are experienced / knowledgeable. - A has more Quantitative Data than B (but only a little more). - Quantitative Data in A is sourced, in B it is not (surveys are named in A). - Quantitative Data in B has a date, in A it does not (surveys in A are not dated). - Both docs focus mainly on one place, narrow scope (but A may still be more international or generalisable. - Both docs published in local publications (A in SA, B in Pakistan). - B has multiple authors, A does not. - Neither doc has authors with very specific experience in wildlife management or conservation. - Different focus – one on ethics, one on economics. **Indicative content – Judgement** *[annotated example]* A candidate may conclude that Doc B is more convincing because the case study presented provides factual evidence that trophy hunting can support local communities and conservation in certain circumstances when such proposals are based on thorough research and expertise. Doc A's evidence is largely based on public opinion of an emotive issue.(**J**) A candidate may conclude that Doc A is more convincing because the message delivered is clear and consistent throughout. The clarity of the view is enhanced by highly charged language and this is far more persuasive than the more balanced and considered response offered by the authors of Doc B. Neither Doc A or Doc B is more convincing because both pertain to very specific geographic contexts. It may well be the case that trophy hunting is negative for conservation and locals in South Africa. This does not preclude the possibility that trophy hunting in mountains of Pakistan is positive for both locals and wildlife.	

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**