Cambridge International AS Level

Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH **9239/12**

Paper 1 Written Exam **October/November 2018**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 30

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 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

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 descriptors 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.

Note
The mark scheme cannot cover all points that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases candidates may think of very strong answers which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should be credited according to their quality. If examiners are in any doubt about an answer they should contact their Team Leader or Principal Examiner. For answers marked by levels of response:

(a) Mark grids describe the top of each level.

(b) **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer.

(c) **To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	Award mark
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level

Assessment Objectives for Global Perspectives

AO1 **Research, analysis and evaluation**	• analyse arguments to understand how they are structured and on what they are based • analyse perspectives and understand the different claims, reasons, arguments, views and evidence they contain • synthesise relevant and credible research/text in support of judgements about arguments and perspectives • critically evaluate the strengths, weaknesses and implications of reasoning in arguments and overall perspectives • critically evaluate the nature of different arguments and perspectives • use research/text to support judgements about arguments and perspectives

Coverage of Assessment Objectives:
1.a Q1(a), Q1(b), Q2, Q3
1.b Q2, Q3
1.c Q2, Q3
1.d Q2, Q3
1.e Q2, Q3
1.f Q2, Q3

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	**Identify <u>two</u> different partners that the author of doc 1 argues must work together to prevent Afghanistan from failing.** **Credit 1 mark** each for a correct version of **up** to **two** of the following: • Government (accept: Afghanistan / political leaders) **Plus one of:** • the private sector (business) • the non-governmental sector **Credit 0 marks:** • for a statement of an incorrect part of the text e.g. – international companies • for answers taken from the candidate's own knowledge (not part of the text)	**2 × 1**	**Note: For 2 marks:** The answer **must** include **Government (Afghanistan/political leaders) and** one other partner: • private sector and Government; • non-governmental sector and Government; • business and Government or any version of these. ***Not*** • business and the private sector • business and the non-governmental sector • the private and the non-governmental sectors • President Ghani and CEO Abdullah

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)	**Identify and explain <u>two</u> actions the author of Document 1 thinks the Afghan government must take, to make sure that trade, investment and business can be done more easily.** **For up to 2 actions, credit 1 mark** for **each** correct identification and **1 mark** for **each** correct explanation **Identify: (may use information from the main body of the argument or the list in the conclusion)** **From main body of the argument,** any **two of**: • introduce **modern leadership**✓ • allow **problems** to be **solved** at **lowest possible level**✓ • allow **decisions** to be made by **qualified people**, **not just** by the **president and CEO**✓ • **ensure security**✓ • **fight corruption**✓ • **make it easy to do business** ✓ • **support new local businesses**✓ • **attract international companies**✓ • improve **communication channels**✓ **(implied, so accept):** • simplify rules for registering businesses✓ **From list:** any **two** of: Provide security,✓ fight internal corruption,✓ remove barriers to business,✓ support technology and internet availability to the masses✓, listen to the private sector✓	**2 × (1 + 1)**	**Credit up to two marks: (2 × 1)** • for correctly identifying **two** actions the Afghan government must take mentioned in the text. **Credit 0 marks:** • for a statement of an **incorrect** part of the text e.g. 'have to be heroic' 'have to be willing to break the law' • Selling raisins, connecting with Silicon Valley and Chinese investment • for answers taken from the candidate's own knowledge (not part of the text)

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)	**Examples of 2 mark answers: identify and explain:** • The government must provide security✓ so that businesses can work in Afghanistan safely✓. • The government must fight internal corruption✓ because this is a big internal threat to honest business✓. • The government must remove barriers to business✓ such as complicated rules for registering, because these are off-putting for entrepreneurs✓. • The government must support technology✓ and internet availability to the masses because this benefits the country as a whole and allows global trade to be efficient ✓. • The government must listen to the private sector✓ because they know more about what business needs✓ and will help trade.		**Credit up to 2 marks** for logical explanations of **two** actions mentioned in the text **Note:** In some cases the need for the action is not clearly spelt out in the passage, so the candidate may explain logically what this means or what the implications may be. Their explanation should show that they understand the concept, or the argument. **Note:** answers may include material from the text but it must be **used** by the candidate to **explain** the actions the government must take.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	**How convincing is the evidence in Document 1 that the Afghan government needs to take action?** **In your answer you should evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence.** **Indicative content** No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following: **Strengths** **Expert sources for Evidence:** Use of these sources strengthens his evidence: • President and CEO: for the future of Afghan trade • first hand evidence from investors and private sector leaders: on the needs of business. • World Bank and Wall Street Journal: on Afghanistan's ranking as bad place to do business • AISA (complex rules and regs): on barriers to business start up **Relevance of evidence:** all sourced and all support the argument that action needs to be taken by the Government: • possibilities for Afghanistan's economy – first para • need for security • need for easing business • difficulties of starting up compared to UK • costs of internet connection	**10**	Use the levels based marking grid below and the indicative content in the left-hand column to credit marks. **For each bullet give a level (that can include split levels e.g. L2/L1) to inform the overall level and mark within the available range. These should be placed at the end of the answer with the overall level in the right-hand margin. (Use X for Level 0)** **Note: Level 3 involves the impact of the evidence upon the claim – a key characteristic** **Level 3 8–10 marks** • **Both** strengths and weaknesses of evidence are assessed. • Assessment of evidence is **sustained**. • Assessment explicitly includes the **impact** of specific evidence upon the claims made. • Communication is **highly effective** – explanation and reasoning accurate and clearly expressed.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	**Balance of evidence:** • It is not all doom and gloom. The author describes positives of Afghanistan's resources and population and Government's promises. He ends on a can do note, though, generally, the evidence about what needs to be fixed is fairly negative. **Authorial expertise:** • His position as President of BACCI, chairman of MAIH gives support to the unsourced information and evidence presented. **Less convincing / Weaknesses** **Lack of evidence for some sweeping statements/opinion presented as fact:** • Government is never good at business. – no evidence given • The private sector can give Afghanistan a self-sustaining economy by 2025. – no evidence for this • Corruption in government is the biggest internal threat. – no evidence given **Lack of sources** • general information about Afghanistan/evidence of problems of decision-making and Internet are not sourced, weakening the reader's impression of the reliability of the evidence • few solid facts and figures **Lack of Balance** • very little evidence of the positives of doing business in Afghanistan • despite the title, no evidence about the impact of trade • no evidence of any opposing perspective		**Level 2** **4–7 marks** • Answers focus more on **either** the strengths or weakness of the evidence, although **both** are present/identified. • Assessment identifies strength **or** weakness of evidence with little explanation. • Assessment of evidence is relevant but **generalised, not always linked** to specific claims. • Communication is **accurate** – explanation and reasoning is **limited**, but **clearly** expressed. **Level 1** **1–3 marks** • Answers show **little** or **no** assessment of evidence. • Assessment of evidence, if any, is **simplistic**. • Evidence may be **identified** and weakness may be **named**. • Communication is **limited –** response may be **cursory** or **descriptive**. **Credit 0 marks** where there is no creditable material. (Use X in the level summary) There is no requirement to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the assessments made.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	**Both authors give solutions to national problems of business and trade.** **To what extent is the author's argument in Document 2 stronger than that in Document 1?** **Indicative content:** No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include and assess some of the following: **<u>Stronger argument:</u>** **Better structure:** • Zaidi (Doc 2) starts with an explanation of the major issue, lack of competitiveness, and builds on that to support his conclusion. This is a clearer structure than Doc 1, as Hotak does not tell the reader what the issues are in his introduction. We find that out as we go along. **More plausible:** *Whereas Hotak(Doc1) does not provide evidence to support his contention that the private sector can give Afghanistan a self-sustaining economy by 2025*: • Zaidi (Doc 2) explains that Pakistan is already a member of WTO and RTAs but its balance of trade has got worse – supporting his argument that membership is not enough for Pakistan to be a successful trading nation. • The description of complexity of trade agreements supports Zaidi's case that Pakistan needs specialised expertise. • Zaidi explains the human cost of the lack of competitiveness and this tangible explanation supports his argument that Pakistan needs aid to trade successfully.	**(14)**	Use the levels based marking grid below and the indicative content in the left-hand column to credit marks. **For each bullet give a level (that can include split levels e.g. L2/L1) to inform the overall level and mark within the available range. These should be placed at the end of the answer with the overall level in the right-hand margin.** **(Use X for Level 0)** There is no requirement to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the assessments made. **Level 3 10–14 marks** • The judgement is **sustained** and **reasoned**. • Alternative perspectives have **sustained** assessment. • Critical evaluation is of **key** issues raised in the passages and has **explicit** reference. • Explanation and reasoning is **highly effective**, accurate and clearly expressed. • Communication is **highly effective** – clear evidence of a structured cogent argument with conclusions explicitly stated and directly linked to the assessment.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	**Range of perspectives:** • Doc 2 (Zaidi) includes more perspectives, the need for negotiators, problems of infrastructure and lack of specialists, problems of out-dated industry, impact of global trade on domestic industry and employment. Doc 1 (Hotak) concentrates more on what businesses want government to do and does not address any other lack. **Emotive content:** • Human costs of global trade strengthens Doc 2 (Zaidi)'s argument – while Doc 1(Hotak)'s argument is more detached and technical. **<u>Weaker argument:</u>** **Less Expertise** • Doc 2 is written by a freelance journalist which makes the argument less convincing than that written by the chairman of MAIH in Doc 1. • Doc 2 includes only one statement from WTO and no other expert opinions are included. This weakens the argument in comparison to Doc 1: written by an expert and including views of the President and CEO, first hand views from investors and leaders of private sector World Bank, Wall Street Journal and AISA. **Less Evidence:** • The author of Doc 2 provides no evidence in the form of facts and figures and no sources to support the various statements he makes. We have to take everything he says on trust. This weakens his argument in comparison to Doc 1 (Hotak) which has more facts and figures and more sourced evidence. **The same: not stronger or weaker:** • Both authors structure their arguments simply by numbering the various issues "Firstly Secondly Thirdly". • Both authors raise the issue of ICT. • Both authors write one-sided arguments, though Hotak thinks the private sector needs no help to do business whereas Zaidi states that domestic firms need support for training. • Both authors have only one solution – Hotak states that the Afghan Govt. must do it all – Zaidi that Pakistan needs help from outside.		**Level 2** **5–9 marks** • Judgement is **reasoned**. • **One perspective** may be focused upon for assessment. • Evaluation is present but may **not relate to key** issues. • Explanation and reasoning is **generally accurate**. • Communication is **accurate** – some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment. **Level 1** **1–4 marks** • Judgement, if present, is **unsupported** or **superficial**. • Alternative perspectives have **little** or **no** assessment • Evaluation, if any, is **simplistic/undeveloped**. Answers may **describe** a few points comparing the two documents. • Relevant evidence or reasons may be **identified**. • Communication is **limited**. Response may be cursory. **Credit 0 marks** where no creditable material. (Use X in the level summary)

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	**<u>Judgement:</u>** **Candidates may come to any supported judgement. Credit should be given to any judgement on the basis of the assessment and reasoning.** Candidates may conclude that Hotak's argument is more convincing because his status and expertise put him in a much better position to make valid points than Zaidi, who is only a freelance journalist, with no expertise or access to reliable information. They may, however, conclude that Zaidi's lack of vested interest and inclusion of the human angle make his argument more convincing than Hotak's professional angle with its possible biased views.		**Judgement:** Candidates should critically assess perspectives and the use of examples and evidence in order to reach a judgement.