

Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH**9239/11**

Paper 1 Written Exam

May/June 2026**MARK SCHEME**Maximum Mark: 45

Published

This mark scheme contains the instructions and marking guidance that our examiners used to mark candidate responses for this component.

Before they start marking, examiners complete a standardisation process. They review a range of candidate responses and discuss the mark scheme in detail to agree which answers can and cannot be accepted. Examiners award marks where it is clear that candidate responses have met the requirements of the mark scheme. These requirements may vary between different components or different versions of the same component, depending on the exact requirements of the question and the candidate responses seen during the standardisation process.

Sometimes, our mark schemes may allow marks to be awarded to responses which contain elements that are factually incorrect or for content not covered by the syllabus. We do this in response to the demands of a specific question to support candidates and make sure that our assessments are fair. However, these allowances should not be used as a guide for teaching and learning.

We cannot discuss the mark scheme with schools, and we recommend that schools read the mark scheme together with the assessment material and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

This document consists of **26** printed pages.

General marking principles

All examiners must apply these marking principles when marking candidate responses.

1	Examiners must award marks for each response in line with: - the specific content defined in the mark scheme - the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the level descriptions - the standard of response required as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.
2	Examiners must award whole marks (not half marks, or other fractions).
3	Examiners must award marks positively . This means that: - marks are not deducted for errors or omissions - marks are awarded for correct/valid answers as defined in the mark scheme and also for other valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme referring to your team leader as appropriate - the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar are judged only when the mark scheme indicates that these features are specifically assessed in the question. However, the meaning of all responses must be unambiguous.
4	Examiners must consistently apply the requirements of the mark scheme and any rules for what to do when candidates have not followed instructions correctly.
5	Examiners must use the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme, unless limited by the quality of the candidate responses seen.
6	Examiners must award marks according to the mark scheme and must not award marks with grade thresholds or grade descriptions in mind.

**Social Sciences-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
	Correct, creditworthy point. Used in Question 1 only.
	Incorrect point. Used in Question 1 only
	Identify type of evidence. (Without an example) Used in Q2 (AO1a)
	Example of type of Evidence. Used in Q2 (AO1a)
	Strength or weakness of evidence recognised but with limited explanation. Used in Q2 (AO1b)
	Strength or weakness of evidence clearly explained. Used in Q2 (AO1b)
	Impact of evidence is asserted and not explained. Used in Q2 (AO1c)
	Shows undeveloped point. Added to other annotations (EVAL, P, J and U in Q2 and Q3)

Annotation	Meaning
J	Added to I to show the inclusion of a judgement. Used in Q2 (AO1c)
K	Identification of key component of argument. Used in Q3 (AO1a)
E	Comparison of key components from both documents. Used in Q3 (AO1a)
P	Identification of perspectives with limited description. Used in Q3 (AO1b)
PD	Analyses by comparing and describing perspectives in both documents. Used in Q3 (AO1b)
PE	Analyses by comparing and explaining perspectives in both documents. Used in Q3 (AO1b)
ND	Unsupported evaluation of argument. Used in Q3 (AO1c)
EVAL	Evaluation of argument in both documents. Used in Q3 (AO1c)
U	Unsupported judgement. Used in Q3 (AO1d)
J	Supported judgement. Used in Q3 (AO1d). Can also be used in Q2
S	Structured argument Used in Q3 (AO3)
NAQ	Not answering the question.
REP	Repetition. When repeating a point as a summary or simply stating another example that does not develop the evaluation.
SEEN	To show that answers/pages have been assessed.
On page comment	On Page Comment. 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)	The author of Document A argues that Nusantara needs to be more than just a smart city. Identify <u>two</u> examples of things that could make people want to live in Nusantara, as given by the author of Document A. The question assesses AO1. Answers to Question 1 can be brief, using short sentences or bullet points. Show a correct answer with ✓ in the text, up to a maximum of two marks. • a world class (good / excellent etc.) university (note: 'a university' by itself is not correct, there must be a reference to the quality of the university.) • cutting edge (excellent / modern) research and development (R and D) centre. • green (eco-friendly) industrial hub Do not accept: • Training centre for the Indonesian national football team • Great public transport and infrastructure • Safe and clean • Ancient crossroad of trade and commerce • (all of these are not given as possible reasons why people want move to Nusantara specifically)	2

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	The author of Document B compares city life and rural life. Identify three aspects of city life which may be less healthy than rural life, as given by the author of Document B. The question assesses AO1. Answers to Question 1 can be brief, using short sentences or bullet points. • Air (pollution) / air (quality) • Physical inactivity / lack / absence of physical activity • (an abundance of) (bad / unhealthy) food Show a correct answer with ✓ in the text, up to a maximum of three marks. Do not accept: • malnutrition, • poverty • lack of health facilities	3

Question	Answer	Marks
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.		
T	Identify type of evidence. (Without an example)	
EG	Example of type of evidence.	
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		
+	Strength of evidence recognised but with limited explanation.	
-	Weakness of evidence recognised but with limited explanation.	
EXP	Strength or weakness of evidence clearly explained.	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
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)		
A	Impact of evidence is asserted and not explained.	
I ^	Shows undeveloped point of evaluation. Evaluation attempted but not explained.	
I	Evaluation of impact of evidence on argument/perspective.	
I J	Evaluation of impact of evidence 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.

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

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

PUBLISHED

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

AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Study Document A. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author of Document A to support their argument that people may not be attracted to live in Nusantara when it is complete. In your answer, include the impact of the evidence on the author's argument. Indicative content No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content. • <i>[annotated example]</i> The author's background is a strength (+), as we are told that he 'specializes in trade, finance, and economic development in Southeast Asia (EG)'. Because the document covers development issues in Indonesia, which is a Southeast Asian country, this means that the author is an expert in the area being discussed, and therefore he is likely to be able to comment more effectively, with greater insight into the topic, and that the information he presents is likely to be very accurate. (EXP). This impacts on the perspective of the author in the document and has a positive effect on the reader, because the reader is able to see that the author knows about this topic and therefore the reader is more convinced that the author's perspective is credible. James Guild's expertise and experience, gives the reader confidence that the evidence provided is correct and understood by the author (I) Indicative list of possible strengths and weaknesses This list is not exhaustive, and candidates may make other useful and correct comments about the evidence in the document.	15

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<u>Strengths</u> • Author has relevant qualification. <i>The author holds a PhD in International Political Economy</i> • Author has relevant area of expertise in economic devt in SE Asia. <i>He specializes in trade, finance, and economic development in Southeast Asia.</i> • Author has local knowledge. <i>He studied in the SE Asia area</i> • Place of publication – <i>publication focusses on the Asia Pacific region</i> • Real detailed example of another smart city (<i>Singapore</i>) – <i>this shows that smart cities can actually attract investment</i> • Named failed 'Smart Cities', e.g. <i>Masdar City</i> • Named source for information, e.g. <i>Bloomberg News</i>, • Historical background explaining why Jakarta is popular. <i>Jakarta has been a major political and economic centre for centuries despite its problems</i> • Identified projects that might make Nusantara successful. <i>e.g. world-class university or cutting-edge research and development centres or a green industrial hub.</i> • Inclusion of contrasting examples <i>Singapore is presented as a successful city, while Masdar City and China's green cities are described as less successful.</i> • Personal perspective – the author notes that the President of Indonesia supports this city, and the President's name is given. This adds to the evidence as it shows us one influential individual who supports the development.	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<u>Weaknesses</u> • Unsupported information – for example, it is mentioned that ‘Japan’s SoftBank, are worried about the lack of a clear vision for the new city’ but we are not given any information about why this bank is worried, or what the impacts of this have been. • Lack of statistics: evidence is descriptive with no figures to support it. e.g. ‘very generous financial incentives’ or vague ‘millions of people want to live in’ • Place of publication – the article is not published in a publication specifically focussed on Indonesia • Assumptions or assertions – the use of the word ‘apparently’ suggests that there is no real evidence for this. Phrases such as ‘there are reports’ and ‘apparently’ suggest uncertainty and reduce the authority of the evidence presented. • Unsupported claim – there is no concrete evidence about Singapore being a clean city with good infrastructure and universities. • Vague source, there is no author mentioned and no information about when Bloomberg News reported on this. • Unspecific evidence – ‘Green cities’ in China are not named or identified. • Lack of detail – the colonial history of Jakarta is not explained in detail. • Lack of time-specific detail. The absence of dates, timelines, or stages of development about Nusantara makes it difficult to assess how advanced the project truly is. Generalisation The failures of some planned cities are used to suggest Nusantara may face the same problems. However, the document does not provide detailed evidence showing that Nusantara’s situation is directly comparable to those cities.	

Question	Answer	Marks
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.		
K	Identification of key component of argument for one document	
C	Comparison of key components 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).		
P ^	Identification of perspectives with no description.	
P	Identification of perspectives with limited description.	
PD	Analyses by comparing and describing perspectives in both documents.	
PE	Analyses by comparing and explaining perspectives in both documents.	

Question	Answer	Marks
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)		
ND	Unsupported evaluation of argument.	
EVAL	Evaluation of argument in both documents.	
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)		
U ^	Unsupported judgement – stated only	
U	Unsupported judgement – with reasoning	
J ^	Partly supported judgement – with reasoning	
J	Supported judgement – with reasoning	
Communication (AO3) A candidate should aim to produce a clearly expressed, well-structured and logical argument that is focused throughout on the question. - Structure should include introduction, clear paragraphs 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. ‘Logical’ means that it is easy to follow the argument as there are no sudden changes of direction leading to confusion in the reader. - 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.		
NAQ	Not answering the question	

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

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

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

PUBLISHED

AO1c Evaluate arguments	Mark	Annotations
Evaluation of key components of arguments is illustrated by clear, balanced reference to both documents	5	3 or more EVAL (at least one per doc)*
Evaluation of key components of arguments is illustrated by clear reference to both documents but lacks balance	4	2 or more EVAL *
Evaluation of key components of arguments with limited reference to both documents	3	1 EVAL and/or 3 or more NDs *
Evaluation of arguments is unsupported (asserted) but refers to both documents	2	2 ND *
Evaluation of arguments is unsupported (asserted) and only refers to one document	1	1 ND *
No evaluation is present. No creditable material	0	No ND or EVAL

***Note: a candidate who does not mention both documents is not awarded more than 1 mark**

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

AO3 Communication

Communication	Mark	Annotations
Produces a clearly written, well – structured and logical argument that is focused throughout on the question	5	Meets the descriptor – and contains no NAQ
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 – NAQ throughout

Examiners should allocate a mark for each aspect (AO1a, AO1b, AO1c, AO1d and AO3), using the mark descriptors and required annotations.

Further guidance for AO3 is given below.

Guidance for awarding marks for AO3 in Question 3.

- If a candidate makes no attempt to develop an argument at all, the maximum score is **1 mark**.
- 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 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 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 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**.
- '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.

Question	Answer	Marks
3	The authors of both documents present different arguments and perspectives on urbanisation. 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 [more convincing] than the other. No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some parts of the following indicative content. Indicative content – Perspectives • [Example only] Doc A is talking about a smart city and new capital in development, Nusantara. (P[^]). Doc B is talking about the difference between urban and rural life. (P[^]) • [Example only] Doc A has the view that people will not move to Nusantara just because it will be a smart city and that it needs to develop specific facilities to attract people. (P) Doc B has the view that moving to the city is understandable because cities have so many benefits for people living in them. (P) • Doc A's perspective is that old cities are more attractive in various ways, so people need compelling reasons to move to new cities, modern infrastructure is not sufficient draw. Nusantara is an example of a city which needs to develop facilities to attract people. The author presents reasons why Nusantara may not attract newcomers. This contrasts directly with Doc B's perspective, which is that cities are inevitably more attractive to people than living in rural areas. Doc B says that the growth of cities globally can be explained by the many clear advantages city living has including facilities, infrastructure, new technology and opportunities. (PD) • Doc B's perspective is that the huge growth in cities globally and the movement of people from rural to urban areas is inevitable and is explained by the much higher quality of life offered by cities. This perspective is shaped by the authors' expertise in sustainable urban development and their experience of assisting governments in designing successful sustainable urban development. This is clearly different from Doc A, which does not agree that cities will inevitably attract more people. Doc A's perspective is based on looking in detail at Nusantara, and the author of Doc A claims is that it is not enough for Indonesia's planned new city Nusantara to be advertised as a smart green city of the future. This will not be enough to draw people from the old city with its deep historical roots and the opportunities and experiences it offers. This perspective is shaped by the author's specialisation in Southeast Asian economic development and his knowledge of smart cities around the world, both successful and unsuccessful, and in his research into the problems which Nusantara appears to be having. (PE)	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3	Indicative content – Arguments No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. At each point of comparison, candidates may argue that either Document is stronger, or they are equally strong. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content. • [Example only] Background of the author(s): Doc B is stronger than Doc A in terms of authorship. CITIES FORUM is a global organisation with a multidisciplinary international group of experts experienced in the breadth of topics related to sustainable urban development. This is directly relevant to the issue of urbanisation and their argument about the benefits of city living, and gives the reader confidence that their argument is written from a position of expertise and experience. (EVAL) Doc A appears weaker, being written by a writer on trade, finance and economic development, having much less direct relevance to the issue of urbanisation. (C) • Relevant research: Doc A is stronger than Doc B, in addition to its own experience and expertise, it presents some relevant research from a reputable source, the OECD, about the health issues faced by people living in rural areas. Doc B refers to others' views in general terms 'Singapore is often held up..' and mentions Bloomberg News, but does not refer to any research to support his argument that people will not want to live in Nusantara. • Real life examples: Doc A is stronger than Doc B because the author of Doc A supports their argument with real life examples of successful and unsuccessful smart cities around the world.(Singapore, China's green cities and Abu Dhabi's Masdar City). Doc B gives us generalised comments about the differences between cities and rural areas, but provides no named countries, cities or rural areas to support its argument. • Limited focus: Both arguments are limited and lack balance, though in different ways. Doc B is limited in only presenting advantages of city living without presenting any advantages of rural living. Doc A is limited by a lack of focus on the initial point made that investors are worried about lack of a clear vision. It does not explain further how the vision could be clearer and the main body of the article concentrates on why Nusantara might be unattractive to potential residents, not investors. There is no consideration of why Nusantara might in fact be attractive. Neither document is stronger in terms of focus. • Clear explanations: Both documents provide clear explanations of the central points they make, Doc B explains in simple terms why Nusantara needs to be more than just smart and green, if it is to be a successful capital city. Doc A explains in simple terms why city life is beneficial.	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3	Indicative list of components of the argument. This list is not exhaustive, and candidates may make other useful and correct comments about components of the argument. • Date of publication – Both documents recent, both published in 2023 • Authoritative sources – B cites a well-respected source, e.g. OECD, but Doc A has much unsourced information. Doc A uses Bloomberg News as a source. • Named Author – A has identified individual and named author, but the author of B is an organisation. • Structured argument leading to a conclusion. Both documents have this structure. Both documents are well organised and move logically from point to point. Each builds towards a clear overall conclusion. • Use of counterargument – negative aspects of city life are mentioned in B. But there is little use of counterargument in A, apart from the reference to the positive aspects of Jakarta. • Use of rhetorical effects. Doc A uses rhetorical questions, e.g. in the title, <i>Why Will People Want to Live in Indonesia's New Capital?</i> to get readers to ask themselves the same questions the author is trying to answer. Doc B does not do this, but does use some rhetorical devices to convince the reader, for example in its closing sentences. • Precision of Evidence Document B presents specific data (such as income being 80% higher in cities). Document A often relies on vague wording like 'there are reports' or 'apparently', which weakens the strength of its evidence. • Clarity of Cause and Effect Document B clearly links evidence to conclusions (e.g. higher income → people move to cities). Document A implies links (e.g. smart cities fail → Nusantara may fail) but does not always clearly prove them. • Use of Case Studies Document A uses detailed examples (Singapore, Masdar City, China's green cities). These case studies help readers visualise the argument more clearly. Document B is more abstract and data focused. • Limited Range of Sources Neither document uses a wide variety of clearly named academic or governmental sources. This limits how authoritative both arguments appear.	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3	Indicative content – Judgement [Example only] A candidate may conclude that Doc A is stronger because James Guild provides us with examples of Singapore – a successful smart city and Masdar City and unsuccessful smart city, to support his argument that smart cities need something else to make them attractive. Doc B is weaker because the author provides us with no real-world examples to support their argument, everything is very generalised. (J) A candidate may conclude that Doc B is stronger because the expertise and experience of the CITIES Forum, in sustainable urban development, are much more directly relevant to the issue of urbanisation than the less relevant expertise of James Guild, as a writer on trade finance and economic development. Neither Doc A or Doc B is stronger, they have different strengths and weaknesses, Doc A has more examples, Doc B better provenance, Doc A has no evidence that Nusantara will not include other attractions and Doc B writes in very general terms.	