

# Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH**

**9239/13**

Paper 1 Written Exam

**October/November 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 October/November 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.

**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.

**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.










**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.

The annotations listed below were available to examiners marking this component in this series.

**Annotations**

| <b>Annotation</b>   | <b>Meaning</b>   |
|---|--|
|    | <b>Correct, creditworthy point.</b> Used in <b>Question 1</b> only.  |
|    | <b>Incorrect point.</b> Used in <b>Question 1</b> only   |
|    | <b>Identify type of evidence.</b> (Without an example)<br>Used in <b>Question 2</b> (AO1a)                                 |
|   | <b>Example of type of Evidence.</b> Used in <b>Question 2</b> (AO1a)   |
|  | <b>Strength or weakness of evidence</b> recognised but with limited explanation. Used in <b>Question 2</b> (AO1b)          |
|  | <b>Strength or weakness of evidence</b> clearly explained. Used in <b>Question 2</b> (AO1b)                                |
|  | <b>Impact of evidence</b> is asserted and not explained.<br>Used in <b>Question 2</b> (AO1c)                               |
|  | <b>Shows undeveloped point.</b> Added to other annotations (EVAL, P, J and U in <b>Question 2</b> and <b>Question 3</b> )  |
|  | <b>Evaluation of impact of evidence</b> on argument/perspective and includes a judgement. Used in <b>Question 2</b> (AO1c) |

| <b>Annotation</b> | <b>Meaning</b>   |
|-------------------|--|
| <b>K</b>          | <b>Identification of key component of argument.</b><br>Used in <b>Question 3</b> (AO1a)  |
| <b>C</b>          | <b>Comparison of key components</b> from both documents. Used in <b>Question 3</b> (AO1a)                                      |
| <b>P</b>          | <b>Identification of perspectives</b> with limited description.<br>Used in <b>Question 3</b> (AO1b)                            |
| <b>PD</b>         | <b>Analyses by comparing and describing perspectives in both documents.</b> Used in <b>Question 3</b> (AO1b)                   |
| <b>PE</b>         | <b>Analyses by comparing and explaining perspectives in both documents.</b> Used in <b>Question 3</b> (AO1b)                   |
| <b>ND</b>         | <b>Unsupported evaluation of argument.</b> Used in <b>Question 3</b> (AO1c)  |
| <b>EVAL</b>       | <b>Evaluation of argument</b> in both documents.<br>Used in <b>Question 3</b> (AO1c)   |
| <b>U</b>          | <b>Unsupported judgement.</b> Used in <b>Question 3</b> (AO1d)   |
| <b>J</b>          | <b>Supported judgement.</b> Used in <b>Question 3</b> (AO1d). Can also be used in <b>Question 2</b>                            |
| <b>S</b>          | <b>Structured argument</b> Used in <b>Question 3</b> (AO3)   |
| <b>NAQ</b>        | <b>Not answering the question.</b>   |
| <b>REP</b>        | <b>Repetition.</b> When repeating a point as a summary or simply stating another example that does not develop the evaluation. |
| <b>SEEN</b>       | To show that answers/pages have been assessed.   |
| On page comment   | <b>On Page Comment.</b> Used where necessary to clarify a decision.  |

**Instructions for examiners**

The total mark for this paper is 45. **Question 1** assesses AO1 skills.

**Question 2** assesses AO1 skills. **Question 3** assesses AO1 and AO3 skills.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**PUBLISHED**

| Question | Answer  | Marks    |
|----------|---|----------|
| 1(a)     | <p><b>The author of Document A argues that scientists must engage in climate activism.</b></p> <p><b>Identify two scientists who have commented on the role of scientists in climate activism, as given by the author of Document A.</b></p> <p>The question assesses AO1.</p> <p>Answers to <b>Question 1</b> may be brief, using short sentences or bullet points.</p> <p>Show a correct answer with ✓ in the text, up to a maximum of <b>two</b> marks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tierra Curry</li> <li>• Peter Kalmus</li> </ul> <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sherry Rehman (not a scientist)</li> <li>• Kristoffer Tigue (not a scientist)</li> <li>• Any other answer, e.g. Leonardo da Vinci</li> </ul> | <b>2</b> |

**PUBLISHED**

| Question | Answer  | Marks    |
|----------|---|----------|
| 1(b)     | <p><b>The author of Document B presents different views about climate activism.</b></p> <p><b>Identify three newspapers which have published articles criticising climate activism, as given by the author of Document B.</b></p> <p>The question assesses AO1.</p> <p>Answers to <b>Question 1</b> may be brief, using short sentences or bullet points.</p> <p>Show a correct answer with ✓ in the text, up to a maximum of two marks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Courier Mail (newspaper)</li> <li>• The Australian (newspaper)</li> <li>• The Herald Sun (newspaper)</li> </ul> <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (report)</li> <li>• The Guardian (newspaper) (The Document does not mention that this newspaper has published an article critical of climate activism.)</li> </ul> | <b>3</b> |

**PUBLISHED**

| Question   | Answer   | Marks |          |  |           |                                     |          |  |          |  |            |  |
|--|--|-------|----------|--|-----------|-------------------------------------|----------|--|----------|--|------------|--|
| <p><b>Instructions for Question 2</b></p> <p>The question assesses AO1. (Research, analysis and evaluation)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Annotate clearly in the left-hand margin according to the instructions provided below.</p> <p>There are three aspects to consider when marking the answer. Annotations for each aspect are listed in <b>increasing order of significance</b>. For example, in AO1a <b>EG</b> reflects a <b>higher skill</b> than <b>T</b>. This is reflected in the mark tables.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <p><b>Identify evidence (AO1a).</b> Candidates should identify a range of types of evidence and give examples. Annotate with <b>T</b> if no example given or <b>EG</b> if type is given and exemplified.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="237 724 1827 858"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 724 483 791"><b>T</b></td> <td data-bbox="483 724 1827 791"><b>Identify type of evidence.</b> (Without an example)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 791 483 858"><b>EG</b></td> <td data-bbox="483 791 1827 858"><b>Example of type of evidence.</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </li> <li> <p><b>Analyse strengths and weaknesses of evidence (AO1b).</b> Candidates should analyse both strengths and weaknesses of a range of evidence used by the author including an explanation. For <b>limited</b> explanation use <b>+</b> for strength and <b>–</b> for weakness. For clear explanation use <b>EXP</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="237 1031 1827 1225"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 1031 483 1098"><b>+</b></td> <td data-bbox="483 1031 1827 1098"><b>Strength of evidence</b> recognised but with limited explanation.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 1098 483 1165"><b>–</b></td> <td data-bbox="483 1098 1827 1165"><b>Weakness of evidence</b> recognised but with limited explanation.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 1165 483 1225"><b>EXP</b></td> <td data-bbox="483 1165 1827 1225"><b>Strength or weakness of evidence</b> clearly explained.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </li> </ul> |  |       | <b>T</b> | <b>Identify type of evidence.</b> (Without an example) | <b>EG</b> | <b>Example of type of evidence.</b> | <b>+</b> | <b>Strength of evidence</b> recognised but with limited explanation. | <b>–</b> | <b>Weakness of evidence</b> recognised but with limited explanation. | <b>EXP</b> | <b>Strength or weakness of evidence</b> clearly explained. |
| <b>T</b>   | <b>Identify type of evidence.</b> (Without an example)               |       |          |  |           |                                     |          |  |          |  |            |  |
| <b>EG</b>  | <b>Example of type of evidence.</b>                                  |       |          |  |           |                                     |          |  |          |  |            |  |
| <b>+</b>   | <b>Strength of evidence</b> recognised but with limited explanation. |       |          |  |           |                                     |          |  |          |  |            |  |
| <b>–</b>   | <b>Weakness of evidence</b> recognised but with limited explanation. |       |          |  |           |                                     |          |  |          |  |            |  |
| <b>EXP</b>   | <b>Strength or weakness of evidence</b> clearly explained.           |       |          |  |           |                                     |          |  |          |  |            |  |

**PUBLISHED**

| Question   | Answer   | Marks    |  |            |   |          |  |            |   |  |
|--|--|----------|--|------------|---|----------|--|------------|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Evaluate evidence (AO1c).</b> Impact of evidence may be <b>asserted</b> and not explained (<b>A</b>) Evaluation may be <b>attempted</b> but not explained (<b>I ^</b>) [<b>I</b> and <b>^</b> are two separate annotations on RM]. Candidates <b>explain</b> the impact of evidence on the author's argument/perspective [<b>I</b>] and include a <b>judgement</b> of its effectiveness. (<b>I J</b>)</li> </ul> | <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="241 352 490 418"><b>A</b></td> <td data-bbox="490 352 1834 418"><b>Impact of evidence</b> is asserted and not explained.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="241 418 490 488"><b>I ^</b></td> <td data-bbox="490 418 1834 488"><b>Shows undeveloped point of evaluation.</b> Evaluation attempted but not explained.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="241 488 490 553"><b>I</b></td> <td data-bbox="490 488 1834 553"><b>Evaluation of impact of evidence</b> on argument/perspective.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="241 553 490 619"><b>I J</b></td> <td data-bbox="490 553 1834 619"><b>Evaluation of impact of evidence</b> on argument/perspective and includes judgement.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | <b>A</b> | <b>Impact of evidence</b> is asserted and not explained. | <b>I ^</b> | <b>Shows undeveloped point of evaluation.</b> Evaluation attempted but not explained. | <b>I</b> | <b>Evaluation of impact of evidence</b> on argument/perspective. | <b>I J</b> | <b>Evaluation of impact of evidence</b> on argument/perspective and includes judgement. |  |
| <b>A</b>   | <b>Impact of evidence</b> is asserted and not explained.   |          |  |            |   |          |  |            |   |  |
| <b>I ^</b>   | <b>Shows undeveloped point of evaluation.</b> Evaluation attempted but not explained.  |          |  |            |   |          |  |            |   |  |
| <b>I</b>   | <b>Evaluation of impact of evidence</b> on argument/perspective.   |          |  |            |   |          |  |            |   |  |
| <b>I J</b>   | <b>Evaluation of impact of evidence</b> 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**

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

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

**PUBLISHED**

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

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

| Question | Answer   | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 2        | <p><b>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author of Document A to support the argument that climate scientists need to engage in civil disobedience to save the planet from climate change.</b></p> <p><b>In your answer, include the impact of the evidence on the author’s argument.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b><br/>No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content.</p> <p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[Annotated example]</i> <b>One strength of the evidence in the document is the use of relevant numerical data (T)</b>, such as ‘3.2 °C of warming by 2100’ (<b>EG</b>), to support the view that urgent action is needed by scientists. <b>(+)</b> Relevant statistics are a strength because they demonstrate that accurate research has been done to produce the information in the document. Numerical data is concrete and definite, and presents facts rather than mere opinions. Numbers such as 3.2 degrees C will have been calculated carefully and therefore the information is more precise and objective. <b>(EXP)</b> This will have a positive effect on the argument in the document. Precise and accurate data is used to support the view that ‘time is short’ to avert climate disaster because we can see how hot the planet is getting from those numbers and this level of specific detail will mean that readers are more likely to believe the author. When the reader sees that accurate calculations have been done to work out the figure 3.2 degrees, the reader will be shocked and more likely to be convinced that urgent action is necessary (<b>I</b>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Indicative list of possible strengths and weaknesses</b> This list is <b>not</b> exhaustive, and candidates may make other useful and correct comments about the evidence in the document.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Relevant statistics / figures</b>, e.g. ‘costing USD 10 billion’, ‘a third of the country underwater’.</li> <li>• <b>Reputable sources</b>, e.g. <i>The ‘Nature’ article</i></li> <li>• <b>Named Expert sources</b>, e.g. <i>Peter Kalmus, a climate scientist for NASA’s Jet Propulsion Lab; Tierra Curry, a senior scientist at the US Center for Biological Diversity; number of leading scientists, ‘Inside Climate News’; Climate Minister Sherry Rehman.</i></li> <li>• <b>Relevant examples of protest actions</b>, e.g. ‘activists blocked rush hour traffic, deflated car tires... interrupted baseball games and Formula One races...glued themselves to famous works’, ‘Devastating heat waves, wildfires and floods’.</li> <li>• <b>Corroborated claims</b>, e.g. <i>leading climate scientists, Nature, Kalmus, Curry: all present the same information on the climate.</i></li> </ul> | 15    |

**PUBLISHED**

| Question | Answer  | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 2        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Credible author</b>, <i>Kristoffer Tigue is a journalist who writes about environmental justice issues.</i></li> <li>• <b>Ability to see</b>. <i>Author is based in US, which is where some of the climate action is taking place.</i></li> <li>• <b>Global scope</b>, <i>evidence from United States, Europe and Pakistan.</i></li> <li>• <b>Use of direct quotes from experts and activists</b>, <i>‘For the sake of our children, for the sake of the future of humanity, you have a responsibility to do everything you can to get that information out there.’</i></li> <li>• <b>Recent data</b>. <i>Document is dated 2022, and many events in the document are described as being current then, so all the evidence may be up to date.</i></li> <li>• <b>Reliable place of publication, e.g.</b> <i>Inside Climate News is a credible organisation, so evidence is likely to be reliable.</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Use of approximate/rounded/imprecise figures/numerical data</b>, <i>‘around 1,000 scientists’ in ‘more than 25 countries’, ‘Several scientists’, ‘killed thousands of people’.</i></li> <li>• <b>Unsourced evidence</b>, <i>‘extreme weather events are further evidence’,</i></li> <li>• <b>Use of predictions</b>, <i>‘Scientists expect these to worsen dramatically’, ‘if global emissions continue’</i></li> <li>• <b>Vague reference to expertise / unidentified experts</b>, <i>‘more and more scientists’, ‘a group of climate scientists’, ‘growing number of leading scientists’</i></li> <li>• <b>Unsupported claims</b>, e.g. <i>‘Devastating heat waves, wildfires and floods’, ‘monsoon season, made worse by climate change’, ‘Scientists expect these to worsen dramatically if global emissions continue to rise at their current pace’ not backed up with data</i></li> <li>• <b>Lack of balance in evidence</b>. <i>Only scientists who support the argument are mentioned, e.g. Tierra Curry</i></li> <li>• <b>Possible lack of expertise of the author</b>, <i>Kristoffer Tigue is a journalist, not an academic and possibly not an expert.</i></li> <li>• <b>No evidence of impact of protests on climate change</b>. <i>Climate activists blocked rush hour traffic, deflated car tires and interrupted baseball games and Formula One races. But we are not told the impact of this.</i></li> <li>• <b>Lack of precise dates to help us understand when things happened</b>. <i>This summer, climate activists blocked rush hour traffic, deflated car tires and interrupted baseball games and Formula One races.</i></li> </ul> |       |

**PUBLISHED**

| Question  | Answer  | Marks |          |   |          |  |            |  |          |   |           |   |           |   |
|---|---|-------|----------|---|----------|--|------------|--|----------|---|-----------|---|-----------|---|
| <p><b>Instructions for Question 3</b></p> <p>The question assesses AO1 (Research, analysis and evaluation) and AO3 (Communication).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A perspective is made up of argument, evidence and assumptions and may be influenced by a particular context.</p> <p>Annotate clearly in the left-hand margin according to the instructions provided below.</p> <p>There are five aspects to consider when marking the answer. Annotations for each aspect are listed in <b>increasing order of significance</b>. For example, in AO1a <b>C</b> reflects a <b>higher skill</b> than <b>K</b>. This is reflected in the mark tables.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <p><b>Identify and compare key components of arguments (AO1a).</b> Candidates should identify a range of key components of arguments from both documents. Annotate with <b>K</b> if key component is identified for one document and <b>C</b> if key component is compared for both documents.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="235 794 1827 927"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="235 794 481 863"><b>K</b></td> <td data-bbox="481 794 1827 863"><b>Identification of key component of argument</b> for one document</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="235 863 481 927"><b>C</b></td> <td data-bbox="481 863 1827 927"><b>Comparison of key components</b> from both documents.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </li> <li> <p><b>Analyse and compare perspectives (AO1b).</b> Candidates should analyse by identifying, describing and explaining the perspectives given in both documents. <b>Identification only (P ^)</b>, identification with <b>limited description (P)</b>, <b>comparing</b> and <b>describing</b> in <b>both</b> documents (<b>PD</b>) and <b>comparing</b> and <b>explaining</b> in <b>both</b> documents (<b>PE</b>).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="235 1099 1827 1362"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="235 1099 481 1166"><b>P ^</b></td> <td data-bbox="481 1099 1827 1166"><b>Identification of perspectives</b> with no description.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="235 1166 481 1233"><b>P</b></td> <td data-bbox="481 1166 1827 1233"><b>Identification of perspectives</b> with limited description.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="235 1233 481 1300"><b>PD</b></td> <td data-bbox="481 1233 1827 1300"><b>Analyses by comparing and describing perspectives in both documents.</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="235 1300 481 1362"><b>PE</b></td> <td data-bbox="481 1300 1827 1362"><b>Analyses by comparing and explaining perspectives in both documents.</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </li> </ul> |   |       | <b>K</b> | <b>Identification of key component of argument</b> for one document | <b>C</b> | <b>Comparison of key components</b> from both documents. | <b>P ^</b> | <b>Identification of perspectives</b> with no description. | <b>P</b> | <b>Identification of perspectives</b> with limited description. | <b>PD</b> | <b>Analyses by comparing and describing perspectives in both documents.</b> | <b>PE</b> | <b>Analyses by comparing and explaining perspectives in both documents.</b> |
| <b>K</b>  | <b>Identification of key component of argument</b> for one document         |       |          |   |          |  |            |  |          |   |           |   |           |   |
| <b>C</b>  | <b>Comparison of key components</b> from both documents.                    |       |          |   |          |  |            |  |          |   |           |   |           |   |
| <b>P ^</b>  | <b>Identification of perspectives</b> with no description.                  |       |          |   |          |  |            |  |          |   |           |   |           |   |
| <b>P</b>  | <b>Identification of perspectives</b> with limited description.             |       |          |   |          |  |            |  |          |   |           |   |           |   |
| <b>PD</b>   | <b>Analyses by comparing and describing perspectives in both documents.</b> |       |          |   |          |  |            |  |          |   |           |   |           |   |
| <b>PE</b>   | <b>Analyses by comparing and explaining perspectives in both documents.</b> |       |          |   |          |  |            |  |          |   |           |   |           |   |

**PUBLISHED**

| Question   | Answer  | Marks      |  |             |  |            |  |          |   |  |
|--|---|------------|--|-------------|--|------------|--|----------|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Evaluate arguments (AO1c).</b> Candidates should aim to evaluate key components of arguments with clearly illustrated and balanced reference to <b>both documents</b>. Evaluation may be <b>unsupported</b> (asserted) (<b>ND</b>). Evaluation includes illustration with reference to both documents. (<b> EVAL</b>)</li> </ul>   | <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 352 481 419"><b>ND</b></td> <td data-bbox="481 352 1825 419"><b>Unsupported or undeveloped evaluation of a key component of argument.</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 419 481 486"><b>EVAL</b></td> <td data-bbox="481 419 1825 486"><b>Evaluation of key components of argument.</b></td> </tr> </table>   | <b>ND</b>  | <b>Unsupported or undeveloped evaluation of a key component of argument.</b> | <b>EVAL</b> | <b>Evaluation of key components of argument.</b> |            |  |          |   |  |
| <b>ND</b>  | <b>Unsupported or undeveloped evaluation of a key component of argument.</b>  |            |  |             |  |            |  |          |   |  |
| <b>EVAL</b>  | <b>Evaluation of key components of argument.</b>  |            |  |             |  |            |  |          |   |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Judgement about argument and perspective (AO1d).</b> Candidates should aim to give a reasoned and supported answer which includes intermediate conclusions and a main conclusion. The judgement may be <b>unsupported (U ^ or U)</b>, <b>partly supported (J ^)</b> or <b>clearly reasoned and supported (J)</b></li> </ul>  | <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 655 481 722"><b>U ^</b></td> <td data-bbox="481 655 1825 722"><b>Unsupported judgement – stated only</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 722 481 790"><b>U</b></td> <td data-bbox="481 722 1825 790"><b>Unsupported judgement – with reasoning</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 790 481 857"><b>J ^</b></td> <td data-bbox="481 790 1825 857"><b>Partly supported judgement - with reasoning</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 857 481 924"><b>J</b></td> <td data-bbox="481 857 1825 924"><b>Supported judgement - with reasoning</b></td> </tr> </table> | <b>U ^</b> | <b>Unsupported judgement – stated only</b>                                   | <b>U</b>    | <b>Unsupported judgement – with reasoning</b>    | <b>J ^</b> | <b>Partly supported judgement - with reasoning</b> | <b>J</b> | <b>Supported judgement - with reasoning</b> |  |
| <b>U ^</b>   | <b>Unsupported judgement – stated only</b>  |            |  |             |  |            |  |          |   |  |
| <b>U</b>   | <b>Unsupported judgement – with reasoning</b>   |            |  |             |  |            |  |          |   |  |
| <b>J ^</b>   | <b>Partly supported judgement - with reasoning</b>  |            |  |             |  |            |  |          |   |  |
| <b>J</b>   | <b>Supported judgement - with reasoning</b>   |            |  |             |  |            |  |          |   |  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Communication (AO3)</b> A candidate should aim to produce a clearly expressed, well-structured and logical argument that is focused throughout on the question.</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p>‘Logical’ means that it is easy to follow the argument as there are no sudden changes of direction leading to confusion in the reader.</p> <p>No annotation is required except <b>NAQ</b> to show not linking to the question. <b>The mark should be selected by using the guidance that follows the mark tables. Choose the most appropriate descriptor in the marking grid.</b></p> | <table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="237 1331 481 1398"><b>NAQ</b></td> <td data-bbox="481 1331 1825 1398"><b>Not answering the question</b></td> </tr> </table>  | <b>NAQ</b> | <b>Not answering the question</b>  |             |  |            |  |          |   |  |
| <b>NAQ</b>   | <b>Not answering the question</b>   |            |  |             |  |            |  |          |   |  |

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

| <b>AO1a Identify and compare key components of arguments</b>                | <b>Mark</b> | <b>Annotations</b> |
|---|-------------|--------------------|
| Compares a wide range of key components of arguments from both documents    | 5           | 3 <b>C</b> or more |
| Compares a range of key components of arguments from both documents         | 4           | 2 <b>C</b>         |
| Compares a limited range of key components of arguments from both documents | 3           | 1 <b>C</b>         |
| Identifies key components of arguments with no comparison                   | 2           | 2 <b>K</b> or more |
| Limited identification of key components of arguments with no comparison    | 1           | 1 <b>K</b>         |
| No identification of arguments. No creditable material                      | 0           | No <b>K, C</b>     |

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

**PUBLISHED**

| <b>AO1c Evaluate arguments</b>   | <b>Mark</b> | <b>Annotations</b>  |
|--|-------------|---|
| Evaluation of key components of arguments is illustrated by clear, balanced reference to <b>both</b> documents         | 5           | <b>3 or more EVAL</b> (at least one <b>EVAL</b> per doc)* |
| Evaluation of key components of arguments is illustrated by clear reference to <b>both</b> documents but lacks balance | 4           | <b>2 or more EVAL *</b>                                   |
| Evaluation of key components of arguments with limited reference to <b>both</b> documents                              | 3           | <b>1 EVAL and/or 3 or more NDs*</b>                       |
| Evaluation of arguments is unsupported (asserted) but refers to <b>both</b> documents                                  | 2           | <b>2 ND *</b>   |
| Evaluation of arguments is unsupported (asserted) and only refers to one document                                      | 1           | <b>1 ND *</b>   |
| No evaluation is present. No creditable material   | 0           | <b>No ND or EVAL</b>                                      |

**\*Note: a candidate who does not mention both documents cannot get more than 1 mark.**

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

**PUBLISHED****AO3 Communication**

| <b>Communication</b>  | <b>Mark</b> | <b>Annotations</b>                                |
|---|-------------|---|
| Produces a clearly written, well-structured and logical argument that is focused throughout on the question | 5           | Meets the descriptor – and contains no <b>NAQ</b> |
| 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 – <b>NAQ</b> throughout      |

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

**Further guidance for AO3 is given below.**

**Guidance for awarding marks for AO3 in Question 3.**

**Note:** ‘clearly written’ refers to the content and the ease of being able to follow the candidates’ argument. It should be thought of as: ‘**clearly expressed**’.

**The quality of handwriting should not be considered as a factor when awarding marks. This is not what clearly written means in the descriptors.**

If a candidate 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><b>The authors of both documents present different arguments and perspectives on climate activism.</b></p> <p><b>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.</b></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><b>Indicative content – Perspectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[Annotated example]</i> Doc A talks about what climate scientists should do (<b>P<sup>^</sup></b>). Doc B talks about climate stunts and journalists that are getting annoyed. (<b>P<sup>^</sup></b>)</li> <li>• <i>[Annotated example]</i> Doc A's view is that climate scientists need to take action straight away (<b>P</b>). Doc B's view is that all of us need to do our bit to get the climate crisis reversed. (<b>P</b>)</li> <li>• <i>[Annotated example]</i> Doc A is reporting that the scientists' perspective is that they want their colleagues to take action to influence government policy and affect policy change. In contrast, Doc B's perspective is that we all must play a role in tackling the climate crisis and that doing something is better than doing nothing. He says that, instead of complaining, people should take action. (<b>PD</b>)</li> <li>• <i>[Annotated example]</i> Doc A is reporting that the scientists' perspective is that they want their colleagues to take action to influence government policy and affect policy change. This is because they are seen as climate experts who have the knowledge and the status to convince governments to change what they do. In contrast, Doc B's perspective is that we all must play a role in tackling the climate crisis and that doing something is better than doing nothing. This is because the author believes that urgent action is needed and that any action, even those which are 'stunts', can be effective. (<b>PE</b>)</li> </ul> | 25    |

**PUBLISHED**

| Question | Answer   | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 3        | <p><b>Indicative content – Arguments</b></p> <p>No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. At each point of comparison, <b>candidates may argue that either Document is stronger, or they are equally strong</b>. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[Annotated example] Structure of argument</i> – Doc A is stronger than Doc B because of its organised structure, with a clear introduction explaining that climate change is getting worse. It is followed by reasoning in each paragraph, and that reasoning is supported with examples and evidence of climate disasters and reasons climate scientists should get involved. The reasoning leads logically to the conclusion encouraging scientists to get active. This organised structure makes the reader trust the argument (<b>EVAL</b>). In contrast, Doc B is much less organised (<b>C</b>). The author jumps from one idea to another without logical structure, from talking about ‘tomato soup’ stunts to criticising other journalists (‘Dan Petrie was tut-tutting’), before concluding, ‘If you don’t like the gallery protests, organise something better.’ The poorly structured argument makes it less trustworthy because the author is not providing balanced, logical and supported points that lead to that conclusion (<b>EVAL</b>).</li> </ul> <p><b>Indicative list of components of the argument.</b> This list is <b>not</b> exhaustive, and candidates may make other useful and correct comments about components of the argument.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Author’s credibility.</b> <i>Author of Doc B may be considered more credible as he has a background in activism and the document deals with activism. Doc A’s author is a journalist and this may be considered weaker.</i></li> <li>• <b>Different points of view.</b> <i>Doc A has only one point of view, that Climate Scientists need to take action Doc B considers (briefly) 2 different ways of acting in protest against climate change : mass action vs stunts.</i></li> <li>• <b>Variety of actions</b> <i>Doc A gives examples of different types of action. Doc B only gives examples of one type – art protests</i></li> <li>• <b>Descriptions of impacts.</b> <i>Doc A doesn’t really describe what impact climate protests have, but Doc B does describe the impacts (to some extent).</i></li> <li>• <b>Global Scope.</b> <i>Doc A has a greater global scope than Doc B, as it refers to several countries. However, Doc B only has very limited scope, with the document being almost entirely about Australia. does have some global scope. (It mentions London briefly, however.)</i></li> <li>• <b>Different Perspectives.</b> <i>Doc A focuses on an environmental and economic themes, while Doc B has more social themes.</i></li> </ul> |       |

**PUBLISHED**

| Question | Answer   | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 3        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Expert/reputable sources</b> – makes Doc A stronger, e.g. Peter Kalmus, a climate scientist for NASA’s Jet Propulsion Lab; Tierra Curry, a senior scientist at the US Center for Biological Diversity whereas Doc B provides only one expert to support its climate claims/Doc A uses more reputable sources such as The Nature article, Climate Minister Sherry Rehman for its evidence whereas Doc B provides more unsourced or anecdotal information about climate and protests.</li> <li>• <b>Language:</b> Doc B is more persuasive by using more emotional language (e.g. ‘Gosh, wait until he hears about what climate change will do!’) whereas Doc A is slightly more neutral, with fewer emotional pleas.</li> <li>• <b>Use of counterarguments and counter-claims</b> – Doc B provides the arguments of opponents/other journalists whereas Doc A only provides one counter-claim ‘the science community has generally disapproved of scientists participating in activism’ which is not very well explained.</li> <li>• <b>Relevant examples</b> – both documents use relevant examples to support their reasoning that activism is increasing – Doc A: ‘activists blocked rush hour traffic, deflated car tires... interrupted baseball games and Formula One races...glued themselves to famous works’, ‘Devastating heat waves, wildfires and floods’. Doc B: threw tomato soup, glued themselves to artworks, targeted Picasso’s ‘Massacre in Korea’. This strengthens both Docs.</li> <li>• <b>Named sources</b> – Doc B names specifically the journalists he refers to in his argument: Greg Sheridan, Dan Petrie , Andrew Bolt; and Doc A names scientists ‘Kalmus’ and ‘Curry’</li> </ul> <p><b>Indicative content – Judgement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[Annotated example]</i> A candidate may conclude that Doc A is stronger because of its organised structure, with a clear conclusion supported by reasoning, examples and evidence in each paragraph, as opposed to the ‘rant’ in Doc B, which relies much more heavily on appealing to the readers’ emotions, and does not present as much scientific data. In addition, the use of expert and trusted sources for most evidence in Doc A, especially Nature magazine and Climate Minister Sherry Rehman, further strengthens the conclusion that climate scientists have a duty to join climate protests. <b>(J)</b></li> <li>• A candidate may conclude that Doc B is stronger because its use of personal, first-hand information and experience of climate protest gives strong support to the conclusion that we have to think of strategies to combat climate change. The author gives well-versed explanations of the counterarguments and effectively answers those arguments to make his point, unlike the more academic tone of Doc A. His lived experience is knowledgeable and adds reliability to the conclusion.</li> <li>• A candidate may conclude that both documents are equally strong. Doc A has expert sources and organised structure with a clear and well supported conclusion, all of which makes it strong. Doc B has emotive arguing that persuades readers which makes it strong too.</li> </ul> |       |