



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
General Certificate of Education  
Advanced Subsidiary Level

---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES**

**8987/01**

Paper 1 Written

**For Examination from 2012**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**1 hour 30 minutes**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 30**

---

This document consists of **5** printed pages and **1** blank page.



The assessment objectives (AOs) are to some extent inter-dependent and the extended writing questions should be marked holistically using the level-based mark schemes below. The approximate distribution of AOs in this component is:

AO1: 18%  
 AO2: 12%  
 AO3: 0%  
 AO4: 0%

**1 (a) Identify two reasons which Benn gives to support his claim. [2]**

Candidates are asked to **identify two** reasons. They do **not** need to give any explanation. Award one mark for each correctly identified reason up to a maximum of two.

Creditworthy answers:

- positive results of aid in people's lives/children attending school
- the deaths of women and children (appeals to emotion)
- unrealised potential (deaths of mothers in childbirth and children die from illness)
- need to fulfil promises made (e.g. at Gleneagles/moral obligation)
- to ensure global safety and security

**(b) Evaluate the evidence which Benn uses to support his claim. [6]**

Benn uses a wide variety of evidence to support his claim and it is not expected that candidates will consider all the evidence.

**Evidence**

The example of the visit to Wajid in Somalia where refugees live in poor huts, are fed by international aid, but children are enjoying school for the first time. It might be argued that the poverty of the tents shows the inadequacy of aid and this might be compared with the school tents. It might also be argued that the children's enjoyment of school does not mean that what they learn has a long term benefit.

There might be consideration of the statistical evidence used by Benn. He states that 6000 children die each day from a lack of clean water to drink. He argues that every year malaria kills one million people, tuberculosis kills two million and AIDS three million. He notes that in the past forty years life expectancy in the developing world has increased by a quarter. He also argues that in the past thirty years illiteracy has fallen by half and that 400 million human beings have been lifted out of absolute poverty.

**Evaluation**

In evaluating this evidence candidates might consider whether the statistics are reliable or representative and whether they support the claim that it is important for the international community to tackle global poverty. At the higher levels candidates do need to link their evaluation to the actual question set.

Candidates may comment on the actual figures used, they are persuasive and although they are rounded it might be noted that this is a speech, rather than a report. However, the use of rounded numbers does indicate that they are unlikely to be entirely accurate.

Award a maximum of three marks for identifying the evidence and a maximum of three marks for the evaluation of the evidence.

## (c) Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of Benn's reasoning.

In your answer you should:

- identify any flaws
- assess the use of analogy
- assess the use of counter-argument, if any.

[9]

**Commentary**

There is much material available for candidates to consider and it is not expected that they will consider all the material. What matters is the quality of evaluation and analysis.

**Flaws**

Some candidates may argue that the whole passage is largely opinion and rhetoric, with an account of a visit to a refugee camp, rather than a reasoned argument. This approach is valid, but will need to be supported by reference to the document.

Candidates may identify the numerous appeals made by Benn. Benn appeals to emotion and this can be linked to the reference to the deaths of women and children – 'women who die alone and afraid on the floor of a darkened hut with no midwife or doctor to help'. There are appeals to history or tradition with the comments 'including Britain as we always do' and references to nineteenth century social reformers. Some might argue that there is an appeal to popularity with 'the tide of human will.' However, some may argue that the appeals are flaws and either approach is acceptable.

Candidates may also question the accuracy of the comment about Britain's support 'as we always do.'

**Analogy**

Campaigns like Make Poverty History are compared to the work of social reformers such as John Snow who identified the cause of the spread of cholera and those who argued for universal education in this country. Candidates can argue that analogy is either useful or not useful in supporting Benn's claim. Some might point to the differences between Make Poverty History and nineteenth century social reformers; the former are giving aid to other nations, whereas the latter were concerned with their own country and whether this difference weakens the analogy. Some may question whether people in poorer countries need persuading that children need to attend school as the document says they are keen to attend and what is needed are more schools. It is also possible to argue that it is not schools but food and health care that are really needed.

**Counter-argument**

Some may suggest that Benn's comment 'to say I am sorry about the condition of humankind, but we can't do anything and I am going to go home etc. is a use of counter-argument.

Level	Marks	Indicative content
3	7–9	There is a <b>detailed</b> evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of reasoning and the critical assessment makes <b>explicit</b> reference to flaws, analogy and counter-argument. The candidate reaches a <b>balanced</b> judgment which is <b>supported</b> by cited evidence from the sources.
2	4–6	There is <b>some</b> evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of reasoning, but the evaluation may focus more on one aspect and the assessment of flaws, analogy and counter-argument <b>may not link clearly</b> to the claim. The evaluation may be <b>slightly uneven</b> and the judgment <b>limited</b> .
1	1–3	There is a <b>limited</b> evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses and flaws, analogy and counter-argument <b>may not be clearly identified</b> . The evaluation is <b>generalised</b> and judgments are based largely on <b>assertion</b> .
0	0	No creditworthy response.

**2 (a) Identify the main conclusion of the argument in Document 2. [1]**

The main thrust of Document 2 is that MDGs and aid are useful but responsibility lies with developing nations as well as with wealthier nations.

**(b) Compare the alternative perspectives presented in Documents 1 and 2.**

**In your answer you should:**

- **refer to the key reasons and evidence supporting the two different viewpoints**
- **state and explain your own reasoned judgement as to where the responsibility for tackling global poverty should lie. [12]**

**Commentary**

Responses should focus on key reasons and evidence in both documents in order to compare alternative perspectives. Candidates should not just compare the content of the two documents, but they should evaluate the evidence in order to reach a balanced conclusion. Responses repeating answers to question 1(a) should not be credited.

In considering the content of the documents candidates might suggest that Document 1 argues that it is important to assist poorer nations because we have a moral obligation and it will help to secure both safety and security. This might be contrasted with Document 2 which notes some recent history of attempts to deal with global deprivation, and is critical of them. Document 2 argues that setting MDG targets is not sufficient as these may not be appropriate, attainable or measurable. However, they might be used to 'demand' money from rich governments, but foreign cash does not always produce results. The proposal that money should be tied to progress is supported by the example of a payment of \$100 for each child completing primary school or passing a literacy test.

There might be some consideration of the origin of the sources and how this impacts on the content and arguments. At the time of the speech Benn was a politician and Minister for Overseas Development, whereas the Economist is produced for international business interests. This may lead to an evaluation of the language used: Benn's is more emotive and contains examples of rhetoric and opinion, which could be quoted to support the argument. This might be contrasted with the Economist which appears to be more reasoned and explained, with the use of relevant evidence. However, it also uses loaded language – 'the great unwashed', 'nationwide nannying'.

At the highest level candidates might note that Document 2 contains a variety of perspectives and assess them.

Candidates should critically assess the use of the evidence and make a balanced judgement based on this. In considering the evidence in the Economist they might note the comparison between Brazil and Sri Lanka and suggest that this ignores other significant factors. They might note that breaking sanitation habits requires money for education programmes. The example of the Doctor who does not turn up for work is not supported and this limits its credibility. There might be a comparison of the statistics used in the two Documents.

At the higher levels candidates should reach a balanced judgement which is consistent with their evaluation and analysis throughout the answer. They might argue that the moral basis of Benn's argument is correct, but that the aid from wealthier countries is insufficient, and poor countries need to take responsibility. However, other judgements may be reached and provided they are supported by reasoning are acceptable.

Level	Marks	Indicative content
3	9–12	The candidate <b>clearly</b> identifies and explains the structure of the arguments in both source documents. The response <b>clearly</b> focuses on the evaluation of the evidence used to support perspectives throughout and the candidate reaches a <b>balanced</b> judgment which is <b>consistent</b> with the evidence.
2	5–8	The response is <b>uneven</b> in its identification and explanations of the arguments by focusing on only one source document. The candidate <b>may</b> identify the structures of the arguments in both source documents <b>without fully developing</b> or explaining them. There is <b>some</b> evaluation of the evidence used to support the perspectives, but the candidate reaches an <b>unbalanced</b> judgment which <b>may not be consistent</b> with the evidence.
1	1–4	There is <b>limited</b> identification and explanation of the structure of the arguments in either source document. The evaluation is <b>limited</b> , focusing mainly on a comparison of the content, and where a judgment is reached it is largely <b>unsupported</b> or superficial.
0	0	No creditworthy response.

