

**Annotation guidance for centre markers and moderators for June 2016**

1. It is essential that the report should be annotated by centres in order
  - a. that the marks awarded by the centre for each AO are accurate
  - b. that the moderator can understand why marks have been awarded. Every page should have some annotation.
2. Comments are to guide the centre markers and the moderators, not for the candidates, so they should be linked very directly to the requirements of the mark scheme
3. The AO marks are for the work as a whole, so 'AO2' 'AO3' etc. should not be used in marginal comment. One paragraph cannot justify for example 'high AO2'
4. The marginal comments should refer to
  - argument
  - the use and evaluation of evidence
  - the quality of reflection
5. Argument

The following annotations will be useful.

<b>IRR</b>	irrelevant material
<b>DES</b>	merely describing factual material
<b>SOME ARG</b>	some relevant argument
<b>GOOD ARG</b>	good argument
<b>EX ARG</b>	excellent argument - particularly effective and well supported
<b>NOT CLEAR</b>	it is not easy to follow the point being made
<b>ASS</b>	Assertion - just stating unsupported view
<b>WELL SUPP</b>	view is well backed up

The final judgement should make it clear whether there are two clear perspectives; whether there is balance between different arguments; whether the conclusion follows logically from the overall argument.

6. Evidence

It is helpful to indicate where there is a source; how evidence is used; where there is evaluation; how strong that evaluation is

<b>S</b>	source – only reference
<b>S USED</b>	where a source is used uncritically to support a point/argument
<b>SOME EVAL</b>	there is some critical comment but not very strong or developed
<b>GOOD EVAL</b>	supported and developed evaluation
<b>EX EVAL</b>	Excellent evaluation - particularly effective and well supported
<b>NOT REF</b>	no reference or footnote

**Cambridge International AS and A Level Global Perspectives and Research (9239)  
Component 4: Cambridge Research Report - Annotations**

(e.g. The view is supported by a study in Alabama of primary schools (S USED)  
The view is supported by a study in Alabama of primary schools. This was sponsored by the State and may not be impartial (SOME EVAL) The sample of schools was limited to only certain districts but it is corroborated by a similar survey in North Carolina (GOOD EVAL)  
Both were conducted at the same time and both reached similar conclusions which helps to support the reliability of the Alabama study which though state sponsored was published in a University study of this teaching method. It also accords with some European studies, but it does assume that the streaming of children is inherently advantageous which some have challenged (EX EVAL)

7. Conclusions

<b>CONC FOLLOWS</b>	conclusion follows directly from the arguments
<b>NOT SHOWN EARLIER</b>	New material introduced without any reference to earlier argument
<b>IRR</b>	conclusion deals with material outside the scope of the question

8. Reflection

<b>SIMPL</b>	Very limited and simplistic personal comment
<b>RES</b>	Refers to research done
<b>SPEC</b>	reflection is specific to this research
<b>GEN</b>	reflection might apply to any research on any topic

The marginal comments must link up with the final judgements made on the different AOs. There must be a short explanation of the overall mark awarded for each AO.

Please remember the audience for and purpose of the comments. ‘Some of the best work I have seen’ will mean little to a moderator. ‘Amazing for a student of this age’ is unhelpful to the moderator. ‘Very strong evaluation and clear and convincing argument’ is better than ‘Totally excellent work’