

# Cambridge International AS & A Level

---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH****9239/12**

Paper 1 Written Exam

**May/June 2025****MARK SCHEME**Maximum Mark: 45

---

**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 May/June 2025 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **24** printed pages.

**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 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.

**PUBLISHED****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.










**Annotations guidance for centres**















Examiners use a system of annotations as a shorthand for communicating their marking decisions to one another. Examiners are trained during the standardisation process on how and when to use annotations. The purpose of annotations is to inform the standardisation and monitoring processes and guide the supervising examiners when they are checking the work of examiners within their team. The meaning of annotations and how they are used is specific to each component and is understood by all examiners who mark the component.

We publish annotations in our mark schemes to help centres understand the annotations they may see on copies of scripts. Note that there may not be a direct correlation between the number of annotations on a script and the mark awarded. Similarly, the use of an annotation may not be an indication of the quality of the response.

The annotations listed below were available to examiners marking this component in this series.

**Annotations**

Annotation	Meaning
	<b>Correct, creditworthy point.</b> Used in <b>Question 1</b> only.
	<b>Incorrect point.</b> Used in <b>Question 1</b> only
	<b>Identify type of evidence.</b> (Without an example) Used in <b>Q2</b> (AO1a)
	<b>Example of type of Evidence.</b> Used in <b>Q2</b> (AO1a)
	<b>Strength or weakness of evidence</b> recognised but with limited explanation. Used in <b>Q2</b> (AO1b)
	<b>Strength or weakness of evidence</b> clearly explained. Used in <b>Q2</b> (AO1b)
	<b>Impact of evidence</b> is asserted and not explained. Used in <b>Q2</b> (AO1c)
	<b>Shows undeveloped point.</b> Added to other annotations (EVAL, P, J and U in <b>Q2</b> and <b>Q3</b> )
	<b>Evaluation of impact of evidence</b> on argument/perspective and includes a judgement. Used in <b>Q2</b> (AO1c)

Annotation	Meaning
	<b>Identification of key component of argument.</b> Used in <b>Q3</b> (AO1a)
	<b>Comparison of key components</b> from both documents. Used in <b>Q3</b> (AO1a)
	<b>Identification of perspectives</b> with limited description. Used in <b>Q3</b> (AO1b)
	<b>Analyses by comparing and describing perspectives in both documents.</b> Used in <b>Q3</b> (AO1b)
	<b>Analyses by comparing and explaining perspectives in both documents.</b> Used in <b>Q3</b> (AO1b)
	<b>Unsupported evaluation of argument.</b> Used in <b>Q3</b> (AO1c)
	<b>Evaluation of argument</b> in both documents. Used in <b>Q3</b> (AO1c)
	<b>Unsupported judgement.</b> Used in <b>Q3</b> (AO1d)
	<b>Supported judgement.</b> Used in <b>Q3</b> (AO1d). Can also be used in <b>Q2</b>
	<b>Structured argument</b> Used in <b>Q3</b> (AO3)
	<b>Not answering the question.</b>
	<b>Repetition.</b> When repeating a point as a summary or simply stating another example that does not develop the evaluation.
	To show that answers/pages have been assessed.
	<b>On Page Comment.</b> Used where necessary to clarify a decision.

**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. AO1a). Record the mark for each aspect (e.g. AO1a) 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.



**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>The author of Document A discusses family separation at the US border.</p> <p>Identify <b>three</b> different ways the processes for dealing with child migrants should be changed, as given by the author of Document A. The question assesses AO1.</p> <p>Answers to <b>Question 1</b> can be brief, using short sentences or bullet points.</p> <p>Show a correct answer with ✓ in the text, up to a maximum of three marks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ORR officials should be at the border to confirm family relationships <b><u>immediately.</u></b></li> <li>• This (confirming family relationships) should be done in appropriate settings.</li> <li>• Medical and mental health services (that children might need) should also be available <b><u>on site.</u></b> (might say ‘for children’ instead of ‘that children might need’)</li> <li>• (If ORR confirms the family relationship and rules out risks to the child,) children should be released <b><u>with their relatives immediately.</u></b></li> <li>• Families should be allowed to request asylum together.</li> <li>• Policymakers need to create a system that protects children and keeps families together</li> </ul> <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children are taken to US CBP processing centers.</li> <li>• Children are transferred to ORR facilities around the country. (These are ways migrant children are treated at present – the author thinks these should change.)</li> <li>• All people seeking refuge in the US deserve dignity and compassion. (this is not a process, just a principle)</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>The author of Document B discusses child migration.</p> <p>Identify <b>two</b> different ways the GAL program could support child migrants, as given by the author of Document B.</p> <p>The question assesses AO1.</p> <p>Answers to <b>Question 1</b> can be brief, using short sentences or bullet points.</p> <p>Show a correct answer with ✓ in the text, up to a maximum of two marks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• authorize legal representation for child migrants</li> <li>• use available volunteers and attorneys / train volunteers (and appoint them to children's legal cases) / train thousands of attorneys (to represent child migrants in court).</li> </ul> <p>Also accept</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• support the rights of children as children (possible reading)</li> </ul> <p>Do not accept:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (They would) increase child safety</li> <li>• improve the way the immigration system works</li> <li>• improve the outcomes for children</li> </ul> <p>(These describe the general benefits/impacts of using the GAL program, not the ways it could support child migrants)</p>	<b>2</b>

**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:

- **Identify evidence (AO1a).** 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.

<b>T</b>	<b>Identify type of evidence.</b> (Without an example)
<b>EG</b>	<b>Example of type of evidence.</b>

- **Analyse strengths and weaknesses of evidence (AO1b).** 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**

<b>+</b>	<b>Strength of evidence</b> recognised but with limited explanation.
<b>–</b>	<b>Weakness of evidence</b> recognised but with limited explanation.
<b>EXP</b>	<b>Strength or weakness of evidence</b> clearly explained.

- **Evaluate evidence (AO1c).** 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**)

<b>A</b>	<b>Impact of evidence</b> is asserted and not explained.
<b>I ^</b>	<b>Shows undeveloped point of evaluation.</b> Evaluation attempted but not explained.
<b>I</b>	<b>Evaluation of impact of evidence</b> on argument/perspective.
<b>I J</b>	<b>Evaluation of impact of evidence</b> on argument/perspective and includes judgement.

**Marking grid for Question 2****Examiners should allocate a mark for each aspect (AO1a, AO1b, AO1c), using the mark descriptors and required annotations.****AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation**

<b>AO1a Identify evidence</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Annotations</b>
Identifies a wide range of different types of evidence with examples	5	4 <b>EG</b> or more
Identifies a range of different types of evidence with examples	4	3 <b>EG</b>
Identifies a limited range of different types of evidence with examples	3	2 <b>EG</b>
Identifies a limited range of evidence, using different types <b>or</b> examples	2	2 <b>T</b> or 1 <b>EG</b>
Identifies one type of evidence	1	1 <b>T</b>
Identification of evidence is not present. No creditable material.	0	No <b>T</b> or No <b>EG</b>

<b>AO1b Analyse strengths and weaknesses of evidence</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Annotations</b>
Analyses strengths and weaknesses of a wide range of evidence with clear explanation	5	2 <b>+</b> (or more) and 2 <b>–</b> (or more) with 2 or more <b>EXP</b>
Analyses strengths and weaknesses of a range of evidence with clear explanation	4	2 <b>+</b> (or more) and 1 <b>–</b> (or more) ( <b>or opposite</b> ) with 1 <b>EXP</b>
Analyses strengths and weaknesses of a range of evidence with limited explanation	3	2 <b>+</b> (or more) and 1 <b>–</b> (or more) ( <b>or opposite</b> ) with 0 <b>EXP</b>
Analyses strengths or weaknesses of a range of evidence with limited explanation	2	[2 <b>+</b> ] <b>or</b> [2 <b>–</b> ] <b>or</b> [1 <b>+</b> and 1 <b>–</b> ]
Explanation of strengths <b>or</b> weaknesses of evidence is limited	1	[1 <b>+</b> ] <b>or</b> [1 <b>–</b> ]
No analysis is present. No creditable material	0	No <b>+</b> <b>or</b> <b>–</b> <b>or</b> <b>EXP</b>

<b>AO1c Evaluate evidence</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Annotations</b>
Evaluation includes explanation of the impact of evidence on the argument/ perspective and makes a range of reasoned judgements	5	<b>2 I</b> (or more) <b>and I J</b>
Evaluation includes explanation of the impact of evidence on the argument/ perspective and make a reasoned judgement	4	<b>2 I</b> (or more)
Evaluation includes an explanation of the impact of evidence on the argument/ perspective	3	<b>1 I</b>
Evaluation is attempted but lacks clarity, and the impact of evidence on the argument/perspective is not explained	2	<b>1 I ^</b> (or more)
The impact of evidence on the argument/perspective is asserted and not explained	1	<b>1 A</b> (or more)
No evaluation is present. No creditable material	0	No <b>A</b> , <b>I ^</b> , <b>I</b> or <b>I J</b>

**Examiners allocate a mark for each aspect (AO1a, AO1b, AO1c), using the mark descriptors and required annotations.**

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Study Document A. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author of Document A to support their argument that migrant families should be kept together. In your answer, include the impact of the evidence on the author's argument.</p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[annotated example]</i> Human Rights Watch provides <b>anecdotal evidence (T)</b> from a 14-year-old <b>(EG)</b> which <b>corroborates</b> the author's claim that border facilities are no place for a child and that the experience is harmful to children's well-being. <b>(+)</b> This example strongly supports the author's argument that policy makers need to create a system that protects children and keeps families together because it is such a shocking story which will make readers feel moved and they are more likely to agree that a new system needs to be created. <b>(I)</b></li> </ul> <p><b>*Indicative list of possible strengths and weaknesses</b></p> <p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 <b>Precise data</b> (e.g. 12 212 migrating children)</li> <li>2 <b>First hand sources</b> (e.g. 14-year-old boy quoted)</li> <li>3 <b>Credible source</b> (Human Rights Watch).</li> <li>4 <b>Anecdotal evidence/examples</b> (14-year-old boy, explanation of how CBP and ORR operates)</li> <li>5 <b>Range or variety of sources</b> (e.g. statistical data, anecdotal examples)</li> <li>6 <b>Recent data</b> (e.g. 2021)</li> <li>7 <b>Knowledgeable author – expertise</b> (e.g. Erica Bryant, Associate Director of Writing for Vera, organization of hundreds of researchers and advocates who work to make the criminal legal and immigration systems)</li> <li>8 <b>Expertise of publication (linked to evidence in document)</b> (Vera is an organisation of researchers and advocates who work to make the criminal legal and immigration systems so the evidence they provide should be credible)</li> <li>9 <b>Long – term historical data</b> (e.g. Over the past decade, For the past decade)</li> </ol> <p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 <b>Lack of balanced evidence</b> (most evidence supports the same view)</li> <li>2 <b>Lack of comparison with previous years</b> (e.g. 'record' number but no dates or numbers from previous years)</li> <li>3 <b>Imprecise dates</b> (e.g. Over the past decade, For the past decade)</li> <li>4 <b>Some imprecise figures</b> (122 000 seems a rounded number, hundreds of thousands of children, hundreds of miles away)</li> <li>5 <b>Biased experts</b> (author and publication are researchers and advocates against current system so their evidence is likely to be one-sided)</li> </ol>	<b>15</b>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>6 <b>Unsourced data</b> (12 212 migrating children re-entered the US alone, 122 000 children were taken into US custody – we do not know where this data is from)</p> <p>7 <b>Evidence that is dated</b> (During the COVID epidemic - long time ago)</p> <p>8 <b>Unnamed people</b> (14 year old boy, 29 year old sister)</p> <p>9 <b>Unverified reports</b> (where and when did the incident with the cages take place?)</p> <p>10 <b>Vague descriptions</b> (in what way are the CBP facilities horrible and jail like?)</p> <p>11 <b>Unidentified ‘experts’</b> (‘child psychologists’ )</p>	

**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:

- **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.

<b>K</b>	<b>Identification of key component of argument</b> for one document
<b>C</b>	<b>Comparison of key components</b> from both documents.

- **Analyse and compare perspectives (AO1b).** 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**).

<b>P ^</b>	<b>Identification of perspectives</b> with no description.
<b>P</b>	<b>Identification of perspectives</b> with limited description.
<b>PD</b>	<b>Analyses by comparing and describing perspectives in both documents.</b>
<b>PE</b>	<b>Analyses by comparing and explaining perspectives in both documents.</b>



- **Evaluate arguments (AO1c).** 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**)

<b>ND</b>	<b>Unsupported evaluation of argument.</b>
<b>Eval</b>	<b>Evaluation of argument in both documents.</b>

- **Judgement about argument and perspective (AO1d).** 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**)

<b>U ^</b>	<b>Unsupported judgement – stated only</b>
<b>U</b>	<b>Unsupported judgement – with reasoning</b>
<b>J ^</b>	<b>Partly supported judgement - with reasoning</b>
<b>J</b>	<b>Supported judgement – with reasoning</b>

- **Communication (AO3)** A candidate should aim to produce a clearly written well-structured and logical argument that is focused throughout on the question.

Structure should include introduction, development 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.

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.**

<b>NAQ</b>	<b>Not answering the question</b>
------------	-----------------------------------

**PUBLISHED****Marking grid for Question 3 - AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation**

<b>AO1a Identify and compare key components of arguments</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Annotations</b>
Compares a wide range of key components of arguments from both documents	5	3 <b>C</b> or more
Compares a range of key components of arguments from both documents	4	2 <b>C</b>
Compares a limited range of key components of arguments from both documents	3	1 <b>C</b>
Identifies key components of arguments with no comparison	2	2 <b>K</b> or more
Limited identification of key components of arguments with no comparison	1	1 <b>K</b>
No identification of arguments. No creditable material	0	No <b>K, C</b>

<b>AO1b Analyse and compare perspectives</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Annotations</b>
Analyses by comparing and explaining the perspectives given in both documents	5	1 <b>PE</b> or more
Analyses by comparing and describing the perspectives given in both documents	4	1 <b>PD</b> or more
Identifies and compares both perspectives but with limited description	3	2 <b>P</b> (one for <b>each</b> Doc)
Identifies one perspective but with limited description	2	<b>P</b>
Identifies one perspective with no description	1	<b>P</b> ^
No identification of perspectives. No creditable material	0	No <b>P</b> ^, <b>P</b> , <b>PD</b> or <b>PE</b>

<b>AO1c Evaluate arguments</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Annotations</b>
Evaluation of key components of arguments is illustrated by clear, balanced reference to both documents	5	<b>4 or more EVAL</b> (2 or more for each Doc)
Evaluation of key components of arguments is illustrated by clear reference to both documents but lacks balance	4	<b>3 or more EVAL</b> (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	<b>2 EVAL / 1 EVAL and 1 ND (both Docs)</b>
Evaluation of arguments is unsupported (asserted) but refers to both documents	2	<b>2 ND</b> refers to Doc A <b>and</b> Doc B
Evaluation of arguments is unsupported (asserted) and only refers to one document	1	<b>1 ND</b>
No evaluation is present. No creditable material	0	No <b>ND</b> or <b>EVAL</b>

<b>AO1d Judgement about argument and perspective</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Annotations</b>
Judgement is clearly reasoned and supported. Includes intermediate conclusions and a main conclusion	5	<b>J</b> or <b>J ^</b> intermediate <b>and J</b> in the final conclusion
Judgement is clearly reasoned and supported. Includes <b>either</b> intermediate conclusion(s) <b>or</b> a main conclusion	4	<b>J</b> intermediate <b>or</b> in the final conclusion
Judgement is reasoned but is only partly supported. Includes <b>either</b> intermediate conclusion(s) <b>or</b> a main conclusion	3	<b>J ^</b> intermediate <b>or</b> in the final conclusion
Judgement is reasoned but not supported	2	<b>U</b>
Judgement is stated without reasons or support	1	<b>U ^</b>
No judgement is made. No creditable material	0	No <b>U^</b> , <b>U</b> , <b>J^</b> or <b>J</b>

**AO3 Communication**

<b>Communication</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
Produces a clearly written, well-structured and logical argument that is focused throughout on the question	5	Meets the descriptor – and contains no <b>NAQ</b>
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 - <b>NAQ</b> throughout

**Examiners should allocate a mark for each aspect (AO1a, AO1b, AO1c, AO1d 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 candidates’ 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 makes 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 and 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**.

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>The two authors present different arguments and perspectives on the human rights of child migrants.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some parts of the following indicative content.</p> <p><b>Indicative content – Perspectives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>[annotated example]</i> The author of Doc A is talking about US immigration policy. <b>(P<sup>^</sup>)</b></li> <li>• <i>[annotated example]</i> Doc A's perspective is that migrant children arriving in America should not have to suffer, so the immigration system should be improved to protect them<b>(P)</b>. Doc B's perspective is that there needs to be a new approach to improving the legal system for child migrants/The GAL is needed to support child migrants in court, so they are treated fairly and/or justly <b>(P)</b>.</li> <li>• <i>[annotated example]</i> Erica Bryant (Doc A) gives a clear perspective that migrant children arriving in America should not have to suffer, so policymakers need to create a system that protects them and keeps families together. Her focus is on the treatment of minors at the US border and the negative repercussions of family separation. Her interest and concern with this aspect of the human rights of children comes from experience of working with Vera, an organisation focussed on improving immigration system so that they are fair for all. In contrast, Sarah Darnoff's perspective (Doc B) is that there needs to be a new approach to improving the legal system for child migrants. She provides a clear perspective on the workings of child courts and the lack of human rights for migrant children; by outlining the support provided to foster children and comparing this with the lack of support provided to migrant children. This perspective comes from Darnoff's work in child welfare and development and her role as a GAL. <b>(PE)</b></li> </ul>	<b>25</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>Indicative content – Arguments</b></p> <p>No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. At each point of comparison, <b>candidates may argue that either Document is stronger, or they are equally strong</b>. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content.</p> <p><i>[annotated example]:</i> <b>Clear example:</b> In Document A, Erica Bryant provides a clear explanation of what happens to migrant children at the border. Details and the example of the 14-year-old's experience bring the issue to life and help the reader to understand what is going on. Document B is not as clear. Sarah Damoff does not give in any detail an example of what happens to child migrants in court. <b>(C)</b> So, the experience of child migrants is less clear to the reader. <b>(ND)</b> The clarity of detail and examples of the 14 year-old boy provided make Doc A stronger than Doc B. <b>(J^)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Details of proposed solution clearer:</b> In Doc A, Bryant lists clear details of specific changes that should be made to the system, to deal with the issue at the border. All these are directly related to issues explained earlier. (ORR officials at border/appropriate settings/ mental and medial health services/ immediate release). Doc B is vaguer, as we are unclear what exactly happens in court, the suggestions about legal representation, volunteers and attorneys are less easy to understand and evaluate.</li> <li>• <b>More relevant provenance:</b> Doc B is written by Sarah Damoff, who has <b>specific and relevant expertise</b> in the area of Child Protection and experience as a professional in child welfare and development, in particular as a GAL supporting children through the courts. She directly relates her <b>experience of working</b> with foster children to her argument about child migrants. Contrasts with Doc A which is written by an associate director of writing Erica Bryant, who may have access to information but does not appear to have any direct experience of the issues she is writing about.</li> <li>• <b>Sources/specific information:</b> Doc B makes more use of <b>specific</b> information about relevant human rights from <b>formal named sources</b> to support the argument: UNCRC, 1974 Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act. Contrasts with Doc A which refers vaguely to US immigration policy / public health law without giving clear sources or specific information.</li> <li>• <b>Statistical evidence:</b> Both provide recent figures but neither sources these figures, equal strength and weakness of statistical support for their arguments.</li> <li>• <b>Structure:</b> Both arguments consider that children could be better served by an improved system and that improvements are possible. Both are <b>well-supported</b> and generally logical. Neither provides a <b>counter argument</b>.</li> </ul>	

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>Indicative content – Judgement</b></p> <p><i>[annotated example]</i> A candidate may conclude that Doc A is stronger because the details of what happens to children are compelling and give the reader more insight into the issues they face. Whereas Doc B is more general about details of or about how children are actually treated and the personal impact on them. (J)</p> <p>A candidate may conclude that Doc B is stronger because the writer's first-hand experience and expertise in the area of child development means that though some details are not provided, the reader can trust that Damoff fully understands the ins and outs of the courts system and its impact on children and can make a reliable judgement on possible solutions. In contrast, we can assume that Bryant is presenting second hand information and therefore may have a less realistic view of what is possible.</p> <p>Neither Doc A or Doc B is stronger, they are considering different aspects of child migration, both make valid supported points about how child migrants are treated. Both provide evidence to support their claims and both suggest solutions for the issues they raise. Neither provides a counterargument, or any explanation of why children are treated the way they are, so both are equally weak in terms of balance and robustness of argument.</p>	