



Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

9239/13

Paper 1 Written Examination

May/June 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 30

Published

Students did not sit exam papers in the June 2020 series due to the Covid-19 global pandemic.

This mark scheme is published to support teachers and students and should be read together with the question paper. It shows the requirements of the exam. The answer column of the mark scheme shows the proposed basis on which Examiners would award marks for this exam. Where appropriate, this column also provides the most likely acceptable alternative responses expected from students. Examiners usually review the mark scheme after they have seen student responses and update the mark scheme if appropriate. In the June series, Examiners were unable to consider the acceptability of alternative responses, as there were no student responses to consider.

Mark schemes should usually be read together with the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers. However, because students did not sit exam papers, there is no Principal Examiner Report for Teachers for the June 2020 series.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™ and Cambridge International A & AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **18** 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.

Annotations

Scripts must be annotated to show how and where marks have been awarded. For scripts marked on RM Assessor, the following on-screen annotations are available.

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

Annotation	Meaning
✓	Correct, creditworthy point
X	Incorrect point or no creditable material (L0 – level 0 response)
?	Unclear/confused point
EVAL	Evaluation
J	Judgement
+	Strength
-	Weakness
ND	Needs developing
On page comment	Space for summative comment if needed
NAQ	Not answering the question
REP	Repetition (same point made with different example, but not used to enhance the explanation)
SEEN	Seen
L1	Level 1 response
L2	Level 2 response
L3	Level 3 response
C	Undeveloped comparison of content

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> analyse arguments to understand how they are structured and on what they are based analyse perspectives and understand the different claims, reasons, arguments, views and evidence they contain synthesise relevant and credible research/text in support of judgements about arguments and perspectives critically evaluate the strengths, weaknesses and implications of reasoning in arguments and overall perspectives critically evaluate the nature of different arguments and perspectives use research/text to support judgements about arguments and perspectives
---	--

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

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>The China-Pakistan Economic Corridor (CPEC) may affect local people in different ways.</p> <p>Explain how <u>three</u> different groups of locals may be affected by the CPEC, as mentioned by the author in Document 1.</p> <p>Credit 1 mark for correctly identifying an effect upon a local group of people plus 1 mark if this is correctly explained. e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local businessmen may have increased profits / <i>'We can double our sales and profits'</i> ✓ because fruit such as cherries can be diverted along the CPEC transport network to China where cherries are very popular. ✓ • Local farmers may be physically displaced / <i>'there will be no farmland left for us'</i>. ✓ because rich investors from outside planning development may buy up their farmland which is in short supply (<i>'only 1% of the land can be farmed'</i>). ✓ • Local fisher-folk may be physically displaced / <i>'they have heard that they will be displaced to Sur, 20 Km away'</i> ✓ because Gwadar port where they fish is being transformed into a deep-sea port. ✓ or Local fisher-folk may become unemployed / <i>'local fisherfolk terrified about loss of homes and livelihood'</i> ✓ because workers with more skills are coming to Gwadar and may replace the locals who have fewer skills and no education. ✓ Note: an effect upon the local fisherfolk can only be credited once. <p>Examples of 1 mark answers of an undeveloped statement of an effect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local businessmen may have increased profits. • Local farmers may be physically displaced. • Local fisher-folk may be physically displaced / may become unemployed. 	6

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>3 × 1 + 1</p> <p>Credit 1 mark</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for a correct explanation that quotes wholly from the text e.g. <i>'We can double our sales and profits if we can sell to China where cherries are very popular'</i> <p>An explanation does not require the answer to develop the text from the candidates 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.</p> <p>Credit 0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> for answers that explain effects that have already happened to locals e.g. locals selling their land cheaply in the early 2000s. for answers that explain effects upon others e.g. the Rafi group real estate agent. for general answers that do not relate specifically to the locals e.g. boosting tourism in Gilgit-Baltistan. for answers taken from the candidate's own knowledge. for answers with no creditworthy material. <p>RM Assessor annotation: ✓ for each correct identification and explanation. The annotation should be placed within the body of the text to indicate where the marks were awarded.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence given by the author of Document 1 to support her conclusion.</p> <p>Use the levels-based marking below to credit marks. No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following. Their argument:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gives balanced evidence – both potential advantages of the CPEC – <i>boost tourism, beneficial shift in exports</i> and negatives – <i>displacement, loss of homes and livelihood</i>. • gives wide geographical examples – views from <i>Gilgit – Baltisan business</i> in the east to <i>Gwadar fisherfolk</i> in the west. • gives local personal first-hand evidence – supports conclusion <i>other than the locals</i> with views of local farmer <i>Hunzai</i> and local fisher-folk <i>Karim</i> who can see first-hand negative impacts of the CPEC. • gives sourced statistics – <i>the China Daily newspaper</i>, to give authority to the claim that the CPEC investment will bring <i>up to 16,400 MW</i> to overcome energy shortfalls. • gives commonly accepted statistics – <i>CPEC is a 3,218 kilometre route</i>, to indicate its importance. • gives statistical evidence in context – to give significance to the claim of fisherfolk potential drop in earnings from <i>PKR 50,000 a week, skilled workers same in a month</i>. Also <i>only 1% of the land can be farmed</i> to give context to the claim about the fear of displacement by investors for development. • gives firm evidence of present situation – what is happening now (<i>not speculation</i>) to locals – <i>a businessman, farmer and fisherman</i> to support the conclusion. • gives relevant passionate evidence – presents evidence of <i>fears, terrified about loss</i>, and strong relevant emotional statements of desperation <i>we will not leave, we do not know anything other than fishing</i>. • presents evidence with author's local expertise – <i>Ebrahim</i> is editor of the <i>Third Pole</i> which specialises in issues in the <i>Himalayas</i>, so he is likely to be informed about the local impact to be able to make the judgements about locals in the conclusion. • vested interest to present accurate evidence – as an <i>editor for the Third Pole</i>, both the author and the publication will need to present accurate information to retain public confidence in the publication. 	12

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • uses vague claims and predictions – <i>should provide up to 16 400 MW, we can double our sales if we.., can make up to PKR50 000, which lack precision and allow for doubt.</i> • presents views that may not be typical / transferrable – the negative situation of farmer <i>Hunzai</i> and fisherman <i>Karim</i> may not be typical of others in their area or other areas of Pakistan where locals may benefit from the CPEC. • uses some unsourced evidence – <i>3218 kilometre route, fisherfolk can make up to PKR 50 000, Rafi Group made a ten-fold profit</i> – which weakens the authority of the claims. • presents much opinion – from businessman <i>Salman</i>, farmer <i>Hunzai</i> and fisherman <i>Karim</i> which is not supported by other sourced evidence, weakening the authority of the claims. • Involves possible vested interest to select gripping evidence – as the <i>editor for The Third Pole</i> may have a greater motive to be selective and look for emotional responses that would interest readers. <p>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.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>The authors of Documents 1 and 2 consider the effects of the CPEC.</p> <p>To what extent is the authors' argument in Document 2 more convincing than that of the author in Document 1?</p> <p>No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p>More Convincing argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more dispassionate argument – Riaz, Mi (Doc 2) give more dispassionate academic claims, <i>produce equal opportunities for all regions and there are international concerns</i>; whereas Ebrahim (Doc 1) presents evidence of <i>fears, terrified about loss</i>, and emotional feelings of desperation <i>we will not leave</i>. • more weighty authoritative perspectives used – Riaz, Mi (Doc 2) give more claims from officials and experts with authority <i>Chief Minister of the Punjab, China's Ambassador in Pakistan, President Xi, Chairman of Gwadar port, internationally known Pakistan economist</i> who are likely to have expertise in the field to make informed claims; whereas Ebrahim (Doc 1) presents the opinions of individuals from business, farming and fishing whose views carry less weight. • more weighty concrete public examples used – Riaz, Mi (Doc 2) use the <i>Thar desert project</i> as example of China's economic assistance, <i>Gwadar port project</i> as example of CPEC improvement projects; whereas Ebrahim (Doc 1) uses farmer <i>Hunzai</i> and fisherman <i>Karim</i> as examples of local negative opinion • more expertise to assess the social-economic impact of the CPEC – Riaz is a <i>PhD scholar in Economics</i> and Mi is a <i>professor in social-economic development</i>, so they (in Doc 2) are well placed to make knowledgeable assessments in this field; whereas Ebrahim (Doc 1) is a journalist relying on the expertise of others <i>policymakers, NGOs</i>. • possible less vested interest to be selective – Riaz, Mi (Doc 2) as a <i>PhD Scholar</i> and <i>professor</i> have no known vested interest to be selective ; whereas Ebrahim (Doc 1) as the <i>editor for The Third Pole</i> may have a greater motive to be selective and look for emotional responses to interest readers. <p>Less convincing argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • less local personal first-hand evidence to support opposing conclusion about locals – Riaz, Mi (Doc 2) give only the wider national picture from the aspirations of government officials and conclude weakly from these to <i>benefit to the local people</i>; whereas Ebrahim (Doc 1) supports his conclusion <i>other than the locals</i> better including views of local farmer <i>Hunzai</i> and local fisher-folk <i>Karim</i> who can see first-hand negative impacts of the CPEC. • less balanced evidence – Riaz, Mi (Doc 2) give only the positives effects e.g. <i>restore Pakistan's economic growth</i> with a few problems implementing this; whereas Ebrahim (Doc 1) recognises both the potential advantages of the CPEC – <i>boost tourism, beneficial shift in exports</i> and the negatives – <i>displacement, loss of homes and livelihood</i>. 	12

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • less statistical evidence – Riaz, Mi (Doc 2) give more vague unsupported claims of <i>fastest growing economy, low economic growth and reduce unemployment; whereas</i> Ebrahim (Doc 2) gives specific statistics to give significance/scale to support the claims – <i>displacement only 1% of farmland, earnings comparison PKR50 000 fisherfolk per week, skilled workers per month.</i> • more speculation in argument – Riaz, Mi (Doc 2) give the predictions of government officials – <i>China’s president, premier and ambassador, Pakistan’s Federal Minister, Chief Minister of the Punjab, Chairman of Gwadar port</i> which are more uncertain; whereas Ebrahim (Doc 1) gives detailed evidence of what is presently the case – <i>what is happening to a businessman, farmer and fisherman.</i> • less passionate claims – Mi (Doc 2) give more general claims, <i>produce equal opportunities for all regions and there are international concerns; whereas</i> Ebrahim (Doc 1) presents evidence of <i>fears, terrified about loss</i>, and strong relevant emotional statements of desperation <i>we will not leave, we do not know anything other than fishing</i>, which are more gripping than the evidence of Riaz. • less local expertise of authors – Riaz and Mi from China (Doc 2) are academics, <i>PhD Scholar and professor</i>, looking at wider issues, but conclude about the effect upon locals; whereas Ebrahim (Doc 2) is editor of the <i>Third Pole</i> which specialises in issues in the <i>Himalayas</i>. So he may be more informed about local impact to be able to make judgements about locals. <p>Neither more or less convincing evidence</p> <p>because different</p> <p>different perspectives – Ebrahim (Doc 1) concentrates on evidence of the impact on local farmers e.g. <i>Hunzai</i> and fisherfolk e.g. <i>Karim</i>; whereas Riaz, Mi (Doc 2) focus on national and international benefits e.g. <i>economic assistance and growth</i>. Both could be correct i.e. advantages at the wider level and disadvantages for some locals.</p> <p>because similar</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both claim national advantages. – Both Ebrahim (Doc 1) and Riaz, Mi (Doc 2) agree on the same benefits for Pakistan e.g. an improved transport network, the hope to <i>enhance ‘Pakistan’s economy’ and ‘bridge Pakistan’s power short fall.’</i> • Both use relevant perspectives. – Ebrahim (Doc 1) supports the conclusion about locals with the views of a local farmer <i>Hunzai</i> and fisherfolk <i>Karim</i>; whereas Riaz, Mi (Doc 1) give the wider national picture from the aspirations of government officials from China and Pakistan. • Both have some balance of evidence in their argument. – Ebrahim (Doc 1) recognises both the potential advantages of the <i>CPEC boost tourism, beneficial shift in exports</i> and the negatives <i>widespread displacement, loss of homes and livelihood</i>; whereas Riaz, Mi (Doc 2) recognise both the advantages and respond to possible challenges e.g. <i>international concerns</i> and explain how these challenges will be tackled e.g. Xi’s exhortation to <i>‘work shoulder to shoulder’</i>. <p>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.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Judgement</p> <p>Candidates should critically assess perspectives and the use of examples and evidence in order to reach a judgement.</p> <p>In doing this they might conclude that Ebrahim (Doc 2)'s argument is more convincing because of more balanced statistical evidence which is less speculative with more first-hand sources directly related to the conclusion about locals, written in a more emotionally convincing manner.</p> <p>Alternatively, they might conclude that overall, despite Riaz, Mi (Doc 1)'s more limited evidence for the local point in their conclusion, their argument is stronger because it is written from the viewpoint of academic research and includes the claims of government officials from both Pakistan and China who agree on the benefits.</p> <p>Credit should be given to any alternative judgement on the basis of the assessment and reasoning e.g. that both arguments have equally strong evidence.</p>	

Marking and annotation guidance – Question 2 – 12 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	9–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both strengths and weaknesses of evidence are assessed. • Assessment of evidence is sustained. • Assessment explicitly includes the impact of specific evidence upon the claims made. • Communication is highly effective – explanation and reasoning accurate and clearly expressed.
L2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
X	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no creditable material.

- In Question 2 there are 4 bullet points on the levels grid. They reflect:
 - How much assessment of evidence there is
 - The quality/sophistication/consistency of the assessment of the evidence
 - 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 9 marks out of 12.

- 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 (9) to the mark grid on the right-hand side.
- Other examples:
 - e.g. L3 L3 L3 L3 Overall Level 3 – Mark 12
 This fulfils all L3 criteria so is at the top of L3. This **must** be awarded 12 marks.
 - e.g. L2 L1 L2 L1 Overall Level 2 – Mark 6
 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 5
 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 9

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 9.

- e.g. L1 X L1 L1 Overall Level 1 – Mark 3

Use X where there is no creditworthy material (L0)

Marking and annotation guidance – Question 3 – 12 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	9–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The judgement is sustained and reasoned. • Alternative perspectives have sustained assessment. • Critical evaluation is of key issues raised in the passages and has explicit reference. • Explanation and reasoning is highly effective, accurate and clearly expressed. • Communication is highly effective – clear evidence of a structured cogent argument with conclusions explicitly stated and directly linked to the assessment.
L2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgement is reasoned. • One perspective may be focused upon for assessment. • Evaluation is present but may not relate to key issues. • Explanation and reasoning is generally accurate. • Communication is accurate – some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment.
L1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 particular 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 –i.e 9.
- Other examples:
 - e.g. L2 L2 L2 L2 L2 Overall Level 2 – mark 8
Having 5 L2 marks gives the top of L2 (8 marks) as all level 2 criteria have been met. It **must** be given 8 marks. There should be no subjective judgement.
 - e.g. L2 L2 L1 L1 L2 Overall Level 2 – mark 6/7
Having 5 L2 marks would give the top of L2 (9 marks) but this has two L1 grades (ignoring the communication level) bringing it to a mid L2 – 6 or 7 marks. [The L2 for communication might inform your judgement to give the higher mark]

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