Cambridge International AS Level

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 2024 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **23** 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.

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).

3	**Calculation questions:**
	• The mark scheme will show the steps in the most likely correct method(s), the mark for each step, the correct answer(s) and the mark for each answer
	• If working/explanation is considered essential for full credit, this will be indicated in the question paper and in the mark scheme. In all other instances, the correct answer to a calculation should be given full credit, even if no supporting working is shown.
	• Where the candidate uses a valid method which is not covered by the mark scheme, award equivalent marks for reaching equivalent stages.
	• Where an answer makes use of a candidate's own incorrect figure from previous working, the 'own figure rule' applies: full marks will be given if a correct and complete method is used. Further guidance will be included in the mark scheme where necessary and any exceptions to this general principle will be noted.
4	**Annotation:**
	• For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
	• For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
	• Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

Instructions for examiners

The total mark for this paper is 45. **Question 1** assesses AO1 skills.
Question 2 assesses AO1 skills. **Question 3** assesses AO1 and AO3 skills.

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

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

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

Refer to the marking grid at the end of each question to award a mark based on the annotations for each aspect (e.g. AO1(a)). Record the mark for each aspect (e.g. AO1(a)) 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 argues that Cambodia faces new challenges after the pandemic.** **Identify three things the government must do to reopen the country to tourism, 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 three marks. • **encourage people back to work in tourism** • **support the development of skills needed for tourism** (for example: cooking, catering, foreign languages) • **economic support** (for local businesses) • **tourism <u>initiatives</u> / tourism <u>rebrand</u> / offer ecofriendly tourism / ecotourism / change tourism / adventure holidays / sustainable activities** Do not accept: • allow planes again • open borders • domestic tourists may be encouraged to spend their money at home • offer exciting destinations to locals • anything that is not about what the government must do, as given by the author.	3

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**The author of Document B argues that Venice must solve its tourism problems.** **Identify two different regulations that might help solve these problems, as given by the author 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 two marks. • **a tourist tax** • **limit tourist numbers** (to about half the current level) Do not accept: • property owners will have to take residential instead of inflated tourist rents • we must walk more and take fewer motorboats • we may have to holiday at less popular places or through reading • making compromises (vague, not specifically referring to regulation). The above are not examples of regulation, just actions that may be taken.	**2**

Instructions for Question 2

The question assesses AO1 (Research, analysis and evaluation).

Answers should be written in continuous prose. There is no requirement for candidates to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the assessment made.

Annotate clearly in the left-hand margin according to the instructions provided below.

There are three aspects to consider when marking the answer. Annotations for each aspect are listed in **increasing order of significance.** For example, in AO1(a) **EG** reflects a **higher skill** than **T.** This is reflected in the mark tables.

- **Identify evidence (AO1(a)).** 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 (AO1(b)).** 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 (AO1(c)).** 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 (AO1(a), AO1(b), AO1(c)), using the mark descriptors and required annotations.

AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation.

AO1(a) Identify evidence	**Marks**	**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**

AO1(b) Analyse strengths and weaknesses of evidence	**Marks**	**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**)

AO1(b) Analyse strengths and weaknesses of evidence	Marks	Annotations
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**

AO1(c) Evaluate evidence	Marks	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 (AO1(a), AO1(b), AO1(c)), 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 the need for new tourism initiatives in Cambodia.** **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]* Use of **specific examples (T)**, such as Ankhor Wat (**EG**), is strong (**+**) because naming specific tourist sites that need to be used less, because they are being 'damaged', provides support to the argument that tourists must be encouraged to visit other places or participate in other activities in Cambodia (**EXP**). This specific example helps the reader to believe that new initiatives are needed (**I**). • Use of **precise statistics**, e.g. 2.6 million visitors each year. • Use of **comparative statistics**, e.g. 122 544 visitors in the first seven months of 2021 compared with 1 306 143 in 2020. • **Author's credibility.** Author is a research fellow at a university. • **Expert sources**, e.g. archaeologists (they have expertise in preservation of ancient sites), Sivlin Chhay (president of the Cambodia Association of Travel Agents), United Nations World Tourism Organisation (experts in tourism). • Use of **relevant examples**, e.g. hiking, mountain biking, kayaking (potential for promoting Cambodian culture); impacts of people handling sandstone carvings (permanent damage); grounded planes and empty, boarded-up stores, unemployed staff (economic crisis); tour guides, hospitality staff, tuk-tuk drivers, and street vendors (dependent on this industry for livelihoods).	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**Weaknesses** • Use of **estimates or vague statistics**, e.g. 'around 19 percent', 'spending around USD 800'. • Use of **predictions**, e.g. 'Domestic tourists may also be encouraged to spend their money at home', 'foreign tourists will appreciate seeing more of the country' (no evidence that either of these things are true). • **Unbalanced evidence**, e.g. no evidential benefit of traditional ('backpackers and temple-visits') tourism provided. • **Absence of context** for quantitative data, e.g. evidential problems of traditional, temple-style tourism are not given context beyond brief reference to 'damage'. • **Lack of sources**, e.g. 'only 112 544 people visited Cambodia', '2.6 million visitors', 'Archaeologists' are not cited. • **Ability to see**, e.g. Markus Bell works in Australia and is not a resident of Cambodia or an expert in tourism as far as we are aware.	

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 AO1(a) **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 (AO1(b)).** 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 (AO1(c)).** 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 (AO1(d)).** 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

AO1(a) Identify and compare key components of arguments	Marks	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**

AO1(b) Analyse and compare perspectives	Marks	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**

AO1(c) Evaluate arguments	Marks	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**

AO1(d) Judgement about argument and perspective	Marks	Annotations
Judgement is clearly reasoned and supported. Includes intermediate conclusions and a main conclusion	**5**	**J** intermediate **and J** in the final conclusion **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 or J**

AO3 Communication

Communication	Marks	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 (AO1(a), AO1(b), AO1(c), AO1(d) 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 candidate's 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 made 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 **focussed mainly on one document**, it lacks clarity **and** has uneven structure, it 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 the two documents present different arguments and perspectives on the need for new tourism initiatives.** **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]* Doc A has a positive perspective about tourism in Cambodia which is that more tourists need to be encouraged to visit, but they need to do a wider variety of tourist activities (PD). This is because the author is focusing on the damage that a concentration of tourists in one place can cause but still sees tourism in Cambodia as a good thing (PE). In contrast, Doc B has a more cautious perspective about tourism in Venice, stressing that the number of visitors needs to be reduced as we 'make compromises' (PD). This is because he is keen to ensure that Venetians are not all pushed out of the city by tourists so he doesn't see tourism as an entirely good thing (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 that they are equally strong**. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content. *[annotated example]* **The sourced evidence** used in Doc A strengthens the argument, such as United Nations World Tourism Organisation and Cambodia Association of Travel Agents providing evidence about tourism's impacts. This is strong, because readers will have more confidence in any numbers presented if they can see which official organisation provided them, therefore they are more likely to believe the argument (EVAL). In Doc B, all pieces of numerical evidence are without official sources (C). When Doc B says '1,000 Venetians per month…move away' and 'with the population at 52 000', readers may feel unsure about the accuracy if they have no source for the statistics (EVAL). This makes the use of sourced evidence in Doc A stronger and therefore potentially more convincing for readers than Doc B (J).	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Relevant examples** – Doc A uses more relevant examples to support their reasoning (hotels, casinos, and restaurants; tour guides, hospitality staff, tuk-tuk drivers, and street vendors; commercial cooking and catering, and foreign language tour-guiding) whereas Doc B uses fewer examples (Amsterdam and Barcelona; New Orleans to Dubrovnik). **Relevant statistical evidence:** Doc A supports its argument with more relevant and specific statistics, e.g. 5.31 billion, 112 544 people, whereas Doc B uses fewer statistics and they tend to be less specific, e.g. '1,000 Venetians', 'population of around 150 000'. **Use of counterarguments and counterclaims:** Doc B provides and responds to counterarguments/counterclaims (e.g. 'Some have accepted the view that Venice is already 'dead' and 'Critics blame the Venetians, saying they have cashed in on tourism') whereas Doc A does not include any counterarguments at all. **Primary evidence:** Doc B is stronger because it has a first-hand quote of a 'Venetian friend' to support its reasoning whereas Doc A has no eye-witness quotes to support its argument. **Historical context**: both documents provide historical context to the tourism problem they wish to solve, e.g. Doc A: 'In less than 25 years… But in April 2020..' and Doc B: 'Visitors have shaped Venice for a thousand years. But for the first time in living memory…'. **Structure of argument:** both documents are well structured. Doc A is organised, set out well (e.g. introduction to establish the problem, historical context to the problem, then solutions with examples and reasons to support, logical conclusion at the end). Doc B is also logical and organised (e.g. introduction with outline of the problem, then solutions supported by reasoning, leading to a logical conclusion), though Doc B's structure further benefits from two counterarguments. **Indicative content – Judgement** *[annotated example]* A candidate may conclude that Document A has a stronger argument, as it has more relevant examples that the reader can visualise and relate to. It also provides cited evidence throughout. The use of official sources strengthens the evidence given and therefore provides a stronger argument that Cambodia must get tourists back to the country, but that they must do so in a new way that gets them to do a new range of activities (**J**).	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	A candidate may conclude that Document B has a stronger argument as its structure is more balanced because it provides a counterargument and a counterclaim. It also provides relevant historical context to the tourism problems. It still provides evidence and examples (even if they are unsourced) to support its reasoning that we must all compromise to save tourist destinations like Venice. A candidate may conclude that both documents have their strengths and weaknesses. Doc A has more relevant examples that the reader can visualise and relate to. It also provides cited evidence throughout, but its historical context is limited to recent years. Doc B is strong as its structure is more balanced because it provides a counterargument and a counterclaim. It also provides relevant historical context to the tourism problems that goes further back than Doc A. So, on balance, both arguments are valid and neither is particularly stronger than the other.	

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** (AO1(a)).
EG	**Example of type of Evidence.** Used in **Q2** (AO1(a)).
+ or -	**Strength or weakness of evidence** recognised but with limited explanation. Used in **Q2** (AO1(b)).
EXP	**Strength or weakness of evidence** clearly explained. Used in **Q2** (AO1(b)).
A	**Impact of evidence** is asserted and not explained. Used in **Q2** (AO1(c)).
^	**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** (AO1(c)).
J	**Added to I** to show the inclusion of a judgement. Used in **Q2** (AO1(c)).
K	**Identification of key component of argument.** Used in **Q3** (AO1(a)).
C	**Comparison of key components** from both documents. Used in **Q3** (AO1(a)).
P	**Identification of perspectives** with limited description. Used in **Q3** (AO1(b)).
PD	**Analyses by comparing and describing perspectives in both documents.** Used in **Q3** (AO1(b)).
PE	**Analyses by comparing and explaining perspectives in both documents.** Used in **Q3** (AO1(b)).
ND	**Unsupported evaluation of argument.** Used in **Q3** (AO1(c)).

Annotation	Meaning
EVAL	**Evaluation of argument** in both documents**.** Used in **Q3** (AO1(c)).
U	**Unsupported judgement.** Used in **Q3** (AO1(d)).
J	**Supported judgement.** Used in **Q3** (AO1(d)).
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.**