Cambridge International AS Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH **9239/12**

Paper 1 Written Exam **October/November 2020**

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 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **19** printed pages.

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.

---

1   Questions 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 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).
  f   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.

3   **Annotation:**
- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers.
- 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
As noted, scripts must be annotated to show how and where marks have been awarded. Scripts are marked on RM Assessor and these on-screen annotations are available. They should be used as required by the mark scheme and guidance.

Annotation	Meaning
✔	**Correct, creditworthy point**. Used in Question 1 only.
✘	**Incorrect point.** Used in Question 1 or for clear error elsewhere. Also used to show no creditable material – the equivalent of L0.
?	**Unclear/confused point**
ND	**Needs developing.** When used alone **simply** identifies a point made without development. Used in both Question 2 and 3.
ND+ or ND-	**Partially developed strength (ND+) or weakness (ND-).** Used for **general,** supported points in Question 2. [ND and + or – added separately]
+ or -	**Fully developed strength or weakness.** Used for **fully** supported points in Question 2.
ND EVAL	**Partially Developed Evaluation.** Used in Question 3 to show where **general** points are made.
EVAL	**Fully Developed Evaluation.** Explanation and illustration, **fully** supporting points in Question 3.
C	**Comparison of content.** Used in Question 3 when **no evaluation**; **simply** comparison of documents
J	**Judgement.** Used alone as **J** to show **full** judgement, or as **ND J**, to show **partial** judgement. Especially used in Question 3.

Annotation	Meaning
NAQ	**Not answering the question.** For example, when introducing own knowledge.
REP	**Repetition.** When repeating a point as a summary or simply stating another example that does not develop the evaluation.
L1 L2 L3	**Level 1, 2 or 3 response.** Used in Question 2 and Question 3 to allocate a level for **each criterion** in the levels tables. They can be used together, like **L3/L2 to show a split grade**. Used alone to give overall level for the question. (See guidance on last 4 pages)
(comment icon)	**On Page Comment.** Used where necessary to clarify a decision.

Please follow the guidance within the mark scheme on how to annotate each question.

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 • synthesize 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
1(a)	**Identify two positive consequences of the low birth-rate in South Korea, as given by the author in Document 1.**	**2**
	RM Assessor annotation: ✓ for each correct identification. The annotation should be placed within the body of the text to indicate where the marks were awarded.	
	Credit 1 mark each for a correct version of up to two of the following where the answer:	
	Either quotes the text:	
	• An economic blessing • Households saved more • Households invested in children's development • College enrolment rate for women hit 81%	
	Or paraphrases:	
	The low birth rate allowed people to spend more money on their children ✓ and more women enrolled in college ✓.	
	Accept answers that combine two identified consequences.	
	Credit 0 marks for:	
	• Negative consequences e.g. fewer people in work means less tax paid • Government policies for boosting birth rate • Answers with no creditworthy material.	

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**Identify and explain <u>two</u> barriers to increased birth-rate in South Korea, as mentioned by the author in Document 1.**	4
	RM Assessor annotation: ✓ for each correct explanation. The annotation should be placed within the body of the text to indicate where the marks were awarded.	
	Credit 1 mark each for a correct version of up to two barriers where the answer:	
	Either quotes the text:	
	• the cost of education (I)	
	• marriage is not economically possible nowadays(I)	
	• high housing costs(I)	
	• high youth unemployment, even among university graduates(I)	
	• Many women do not wish to leave their jobs. (I)	
	Or paraphrases:	
	• It costs too much to send children to school or college. (I)	
	• Accommodation is very expensive. (I)	
	• Many young people are out of work. (I)	
	• Many women want to carry on working(I).	
	Credit 1 mark each for up to 2 correct explanations.	
	• (Because parents have to pay a very high price for their children's school and college education,) they have fewer children so they can afford to raise them properly. (E)	
	• (Because housing is expensive,) young people can't afford to get married and this limits how many people are having children. (E)	
	• (Because women want to continue working,) they don't take time out to have children. (E)	
	Explanation must include reference to impact on birth rate.	

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	**Credit 0 marks** For a statement of an incorrect part of the text • The population is aging fast. • South Korea's economy advanced. • More women started working. • For answers taken from the candidate's own knowledge (not part of the text) • For answers with no creditworthy material. **An explanation does not require the answer to develop the text from the candidate's own understanding. However, it does require using the text rather than just quoting it. This might involve correct paraphrase, correct precis, or correct synthesis of parts of the text.**	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence the author uses to support his argument in Document 1.** **Use the levels-based marking grid below to credit marks.** No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following: **Strengths:** **Author's provenance:** As a Professor of Economics with experience as an Economist and Adviser to the president of South Korea, we can trust that the author has the knowledge to select and use accurate and relevant evidence. It is also likely he has access to relevant information, adding to the credibility of his evidence. **Use of a range of relevant statistics:** Lee Jong-Wha uses clear and relevant statistics to illustrate the challenge South Korea is facing, He uses historical data (1980) to show the change between that time and 2015. He uses relevant statistics to support his claim that education costs are a barrier. He supports his claims about the impact of the economy on marriage with relevant and accurate statistics (e.g. 302 800 in 2015). He relates this to the statistic on births to married couples, supporting his suggestion that fewer marriages lead to a lower birth-rate. He supports his claim about gender inequality with a statistic about parental leave. **Reliable source:** He includes a finding from Federation of Korean Industries. **Supporting information about a different country:** He supports his points about allowing migration of foreign helpers with information about Singapore where this is done.	10

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**Weaknesses:** The following weaknesses of evidence undermine the author's argument and serve to weaken it: The author uses: **Unsourced evidence:** Most of the evidence about the situation in in South Korea and Singapore is unsourced. This weakens the support for his conclusion, as we do not know whether his sources really are reliable. Because so much is unsourced, the author may be being selective in his choices of information and statistics and we cannot be sure of their accuracy. **Vague statistics:** The author presents incomplete figures, *38% of female respondents* – with no size of survey. General vague statements with no supporting statistics: '*absurdly high price'* Evidence about Singapore *often* is vague and no indication that this is transferable. 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
3	The authors of the two documents present viewpoints on issues of birth-rate. To what extent is the author's argument in Document 2 stronger than that of the author in Document 1? **Use the levels-based marking grid below to credit marks.** No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following: **Stronger:** **More balance:** Michael Sliwinski (Doc 2) balances the negatives and positives of both a falling and a rising birth-rate. This makes his positive viewpoint seem more balanced and convincing than that of Lee Jong-Wha (Doc 1) who generally presents a depressing picture of what the impact of a falling birth-rate is. **Simpler argument:** Michael Sliwinski (Doc 2) presents a simpler argument, with each question answered simply and explained, so that it is easier to follow and understand his viewpoint. This makes his viewpoint seem more logical than Lee Jong-Wha (Doc 1)'s more complicated argument. **More global perspective:** Michael Sliwinski (Doc 2) supports his argument throughout, by explaining with evidence and examples from around the world. He shows us that there are various experiences of birth-rate issues and different approaches to dealing with it. This makes his argument more convincing than Doc 1, which is more limited because Lee Jong-Wha only concentrates on South Korea with a short example of Singapore. **More convincing solutions:** Michael Sliwinski (Doc 2) provides a wider range of examples of solutions that are actually being carried out (e.g. by Apple and Microsoft), so that it is clear that if we want to do something about this issue we can. This is more convincing than Lee Jong-Wha (Doc 1)'s general wishlist.	**14**

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Less strong:** **More unexplained information/ examples:** Michael Lewinski's (Doc 2) includes some unanswered questions and makes claims that are not explained: *Why is this happening?* *One common characteristic is the improved status of women.* *Women who continue education have fewer babies.* This weakens Michael Lewinski's argument, as we cannot understand the relevance of some of his claims. In Doc 1 Lee Jong-Wha clearly explains why women who are working are less likely to have children and why the marriage rate is falling and how that impacts the birth-rate. **Conclusion:** Michael Lewinski's (Doc 2) conclusion lacks any solution – *right now, the issues and solutions are unclear,* whereas Lee Jong-Wha (Doc 1) gives solutions aimed at the South Korean Government – *provide accessible chidcare..* **Provenance of authors:** Michael Sliwinski (Doc 2) is a graduate in History and has a Masters in International Policy, this is less impressive than the status, experience and expertise of Lee Jong-Wha and makes us less convinced by his viewpoints. **The same: neither more or less strong** **Specific expertise relevant to birth-rate:** Neither author has a specific stated expertise in demography or birth-rates, so neither has stronger support for his viewpoint on this count. **Statistical support:** Both authors support their viewpoints with relevant statistics, so on this count, neither is more or less convincing. **Unsourced statistics:** Both generally fail to source their statistics.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Judgement** Candidates should critically assess perspectives and the use of examples and evidence in order to reach a judgement. In doing this they might conclude: The candidate may conclude that the argument in Document 1 is more convincing, as it is written by an author with more access to information and statistics and a higher likelihood of having relevant expertise and experience. The author has a clearer view on the topic and comes to a clear, convincing conclusion that there is a problem in South Korea that must be addressed. The candidate may conclude that the argument in Document 2 is more convincing, as it is more balanced in its views, presents the pros and cons of a lower birth-rate and gives information and examples from around the world to support his more convincing conclusion that we really cannot be sure that we need to take action on birth-rate. The candidate may decide that neither document is particularly stronger than the other, that they both have some weaknesses, and they have some similar strengths, so neither is more convincing than the other. 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.	

Marking and annotation guidance – Question 2 – 10 marks

Annotate in the left-hand margin as below:
(a) ND (needs developing) when a point has been mentioned but not developed (simplistic),
(b) ND+ or ND- when a strength or weakness has been partially developed (generalised) and
(c) + or - for a fully developed and explained point of strength or weakness of the evidence used by the author. (detailed) **[Point made, point explained, point illustrated with clear example (s) from the document to show impact of the evidence.]**

Use the levels table and the guidance to determine an appropriate level and mark:

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	8–10	• **Both** strengths and weaknesses of evidence are assessed. • Assessment of evidence is **sustained, and a judgement is reached.** • Assessment explicitly includes the **impact** of specific evidence upon the claims made. • Communication is **highly effective** - explanation and reasoning **accurate** and **clearly** expressed.
L2	4–7	• 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.
L1	1–3	• 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**.
	0	• no creditable material.

- In Question 2 there are 4 bullet points on the levels grid. They reflect:
  - How much assessment there is
  - The quality/sophistication/consistency of the assessment
  - How the evidence is linked to the author's claims
  - Effectiveness of communication

- In simple terms the levels are:
  - Level 3 – detailed and sustained
  - Level 2 – generalised and lacking some assessment/explanation
  - Level 1 – simplistic or descriptive
  - Level 0 – have no creditable material (Mark X)

- **You are required to make a judgement of the level that is the best fit for each bullet point. This can include split levels. These will then inform the overall level and mark within it as illustrated below. The notes for awarding marks on page 3 of the mark scheme are for general guidance that reflect the more detailed approach below.**

- These should be listed at the bottom of the answer in the correct order.
  - e.g.   L3   L2   L2   L2
  This would be a L3 answer as it fulfils all the L2 criteria and has one in L3. It is, however, only just in L3 so would be at the bottom of the level and be awarded 8 marks out of 10.

- In the right-hand margin (away from the other 4 level marks) please insert the overall level, in this case L3, then add the mark (8) to the mark grid on the right-hand side.

- Other examples:
  - e.g.   L3   L3   L3   L3   Overall Level 3 – Mark 10
    This fulfils all L3 criteria so is at the top of L3. This **must** be awarded 10 marks.

  - e.g.   L2   L1   L2   L1   Overall Level 2 – Mark 5
    This is a low middle L2 as the L2 criteria have only been partially met.

  - e.g.   L2   L1   L1   L1   Overall Level 2 – Mark 4
    This is a low L2 so the mark is at the bottom of the range.

  - e.g.   L2   L3/L2   L3/L2   L2   Overall Level 3 – Mark 8
    Split grades are allowed where the best fit is a combination of the criteria for two different levels. Treat the L3/L2 as low L3 so overall this would just reach L3 at 8.

  - e.g.   L1   X   L1   L1   Overall Level 1 – Mark 2
    Use X where there is no creditworthy material (L0)

- **In level 2 there is a range of 4 marks so use all 4 criteria to make your judgement.**

- **In Level 3 and level 1 there is a range of 3 marks so make your judgement mainly on the first 3 criteria, saving the communication mark as final guidance.**

Marking and annotation guidance – Question 3 – 14 marks

Annotate in the left-hand margin as below:
(a) ND (needs developing) when a point has been mentioned but not developed,
(b) ND EVAL when a point of evaluation has been partially developed (e.g. may make a valid point but without appropriately referencing the documents)
(c) EVAL for a fully developed point that looks at documents and perspectives and uses illustration (perhaps with a quote) from the authors **(Evaluation point made, point explained, point illustrated with clear example (s) from the document as explicit reference.)**
(d) C for a direct descriptive comparison of the documents that contains no evaluation. (e.g. X said 'this' and Y said 'that')
(e) ? for an unclear or confused answer
(f) J for where judgement is recognised.

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	10-14	- 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 are **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.
L2	5-9	- Judgement is **reasoned**. **One perspective** may be focused upon for assessment. - Evaluation is present but may **not relate to key** issues. - Explanation and reasoning are **generally accurate**. - Communication is **accurate** - some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment.
L1	1-4	- 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.
X	0	no creditable material.

- In Question 3 there are 5 bullet points on the levels grid. They reflect:
  - The level of judgement (i.e. how convincing is one document over the other, if at all)
  - Level of perspective (i.e. different viewpoints based on argument, evidence and assumptions within a context)
  - Evaluation
  - Explanation and reasoning
  - Communication

- In simple terms the levels are:
  - Level 3 – Sustained, explicit, highly effective
  - Level 2 – Generalised, generally accurate, less focussed on perspectives and evaluation than L3
  - Level 1 – Superficial, simplistic/undeveloped, descriptive
  - Level 0 – No creditable material. Use X as the annotation for this.

- Judgement can be covered throughout the answer with direct evaluation between the documents but can also be achieved by evaluation of the documents separately with a thorough judgement paragraph at the end.

- As in Question 2, put the levels for the 5 bullet points at the end of the answer:
  - e.g.   L2   L3   L2   L2   L2
    This would be a L3 answer as it fulfils all the criteria for L2 and has one L3. This puts it at the bottom of the L3 range of marks – 10.

- Other examples:
  - e.g.   L2   L2   L2   L2   L2   Overall Level 2 – mark 9
    Having 5 L2 marks gives the top of L2 (9 marks) as all level 2 criteria have been met. It **must** be given 9 marks. There should be no subjective judgement.

  - e.g.   L2   L2   L1   L1   L2   Overall Level 2 – mark 7
    Having 5 L2 marks would give the top of L2 (9 marks) but this has two L1 grades bringing it to a mid L2 i.e. 7

- Split grades are allowed e.g. L2/L1 or L1/X when the answer does not exactly fit the level descriptors. Treat them as low level, so L2/L1 would be a low level 2 when deciding on the overall level and mark.

- **In level 2 and level 3 there is a range of 5 marks so use all 5 criteria to make your judgement.**

- **In level 1 there is a range of 4 marks so make your judgement mainly on the first 4 criteria, saving the communication mark as final guidance.**