

---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH**

**9239/12**

Paper 1 Written Exam

**March 2018**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 30

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

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

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the March 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

**PUBLISHED****Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance										
<p><b>Note</b> 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:</p> <p>a. Mark grids describe the top of each level.</p> <p>b. <b>To determine the level</b> – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer.</p> <p>c. <b>To determine the mark within the level</b>, consider the following:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="174 587 2056 906"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="174 587 853 639">Descriptor</th> <th data-bbox="853 587 2056 639">Award mark</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="174 639 853 687">Consistently meets the criteria for this level</td> <td data-bbox="853 639 2056 687">At top of level</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="174 687 853 775">Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency</td> <td data-bbox="853 687 2056 775">Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="174 775 853 858">Just enough achievement on balance for this level</td> <td data-bbox="853 775 2056 858">Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="174 858 853 906">On the borderline of this level and the one below</td> <td data-bbox="853 858 2056 906">At bottom of level</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				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
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												
<p><b>Assessment Objectives for Global Perspectives</b></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="181 1007 2063 1318"> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="181 1007 562 1318"> <p>AO1 <b>Research, analysis and evaluation</b></p> </td> <td data-bbox="562 1007 2063 1318"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• analyse arguments to understand how they are structured and on what they are based</li> <li>• analyse perspectives and understand the different claims, reasons, arguments, views and evidence they contain</li> <li>• synthesise relevant and credible research/text in support of judgements about arguments and perspectives</li> <li>• critically evaluate the strengths, weaknesses and implications of reasoning in arguments and overall perspectives</li> <li>• critically evaluate the nature of different arguments and perspectives</li> <li>• use research/text to support judgements about arguments and perspectives</li> </ul> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<p>AO1 <b>Research, analysis and evaluation</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• analyse arguments to understand how they are structured and on what they are based</li> <li>• analyse perspectives and understand the different claims, reasons, arguments, views and evidence they contain</li> <li>• synthesise relevant and credible research/text in support of judgements about arguments and perspectives</li> <li>• critically evaluate the strengths, weaknesses and implications of reasoning in arguments and overall perspectives</li> <li>• critically evaluate the nature of different arguments and perspectives</li> <li>• use research/text to support judgements about arguments and perspectives</li> </ul>								
<p>AO1 <b>Research, analysis and evaluation</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• analyse arguments to understand how they are structured and on what they are based</li> <li>• analyse perspectives and understand the different claims, reasons, arguments, views and evidence they contain</li> <li>• synthesise relevant and credible research/text in support of judgements about arguments and perspectives</li> <li>• critically evaluate the strengths, weaknesses and implications of reasoning in arguments and overall perspectives</li> <li>• critically evaluate the nature of different arguments and perspectives</li> <li>• use research/text to support judgements about arguments and perspectives</li> </ul>												

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	<p><b>The author of Document 1 argues that people in poorer countries are now more aware of income gaps.</b></p> <p><b>Identify <u>two</u> different reasons that he gives for this argument.</b></p> <p><b>Credit 1 mark</b> each for correct versions of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• globalisation of communication/ or an example of this: TV/internet/social media</li> <li>• greater (political) openness of countries (like the former Soviet bloc, China and Burma)</li> </ul> <p><b>Credit 0 marks</b> for the changes within the context of globalisation e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• rich countries have experienced higher economic growth rates than poor countries</li> <li>• people in poorer countries are much more aware of these income gaps</li> <li>• the cost of transportation has decreased</li> </ul>	<b>2 × 1</b>	<p><b>Do not credit answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• taken from the candidate's own knowledge.</li> <li>• with no creditworthy material.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)	<p><b>Explain <u>two</u> opposing ways of dealing with the problem of migration, given by the author of Document 1.</b></p> <p><b>Credit 2 marks</b> each for up to two correct developed explanations of opposing ways. Accept correct versions of the following examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rich countries keep the immigrants out. ✓ They do this by building barriers to stop people crossing borders. ✓</li> <li>• Rich countries could manage immigration. ✓ They could do this by allowing much greater freedom of movement for foreigners from poor countries and allowing them to apply for and get jobs in rich countries on a temporary basis. ✓</li> </ul> <p><b>Credit 1 mark</b> each for up to two correct simple explanations of opposing ways e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rich countries keep the immigrants out. ✓</li> <li>• Rich countries could manage immigration. ✓</li> </ul> <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They build fences. ✓</li> <li>• They allow freedom of movement for foreigners from poor countries to apply for and get jobs in rich countries. ✓</li> </ul>	<b>2 × 2</b>	<p>Maximum of two marks for an explanation of one way to deal with the problem.</p> <p><b>Credit 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• for answers taken from the candidate's own knowledge.</li> <li>• for no creditworthy material.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p><b>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence given in Document 1 to support the author’s argument.</b></p> <p><b>Use the levels based marking opposite to credit marks.</b> No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p><b>Strengths</b> The following strengthen the support for the author’s argument:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>author’s expertise</b> – As a leading world scholar in global income inequality, he has the expertise to recognise and select relevant sources of statistics to support his claims about increased income gaps and awareness of these.</li> <li>• <b>use of expert sources of evidence</b> – The expertise of the Immigrant Survey, UBS report and researchers Professor Clark and Senik increase the authority for the statistics which support the author’s claims about the increased economic gaps and increased awareness of these.</li> <li>• <b>use of a range of historical evidence</b> – Using a variety of sources (as above) strengthens his claims about changes since the 1980’s which have increased migration. Also the example of Lampedusa adds an historical perspective.</li> <li>• <b>use of accurate comparisons in evidence</b> – the comparison of a bus driver’s wage in Amsterdam and Mumbai is adjusted to reflect the different costs of living, so the comparison is plausible.</li> <li>• <b>some balance of evidence</b> – The author recognises the economic worries of Europe and balances managed migration against the evidence of the negative impact of barriers to migration.</li> <li>• <b>use of a range of relevant examples</b> from different parts of the globe– The examples of the fences in Mexico, Saudi Arabia and Spain illustrate the global extent of the ways rich countries try to keep migrants out and supports his claim about uncomfortable questions.</li> <li>• <b>neutrality of the author</b> – Because he is a leading world scholar in global income inequality, he is likely to want to present accurately the unsourced evidence about the barriers and their effect.</li> </ul>	10	<p>Use the levels based marking grid below and the indicative content in the left-hand column to credit marks.</p> <p><b>For each bullet give a level (that can include split levels e.g. L2/L1) to inform the overall level and mark within the available range. These should be placed at the end of the answer with the overall level in the right-hand margin. (Use X for Level 0)</b></p> <p><b>Note: Level 3 involves the impact of the evidence upon the claim – a key characteristic</b></p> <p><b>Level 3</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>8–10 marks</b></span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Both</b> strengths and weaknesses of evidence are assessed.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence is <b>sustained</b>.</li> <li>• Assessment explicitly includes the <b>impact</b> of specific evidence upon the claims made.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>highly effective</b> – explanation and reasoning <b>accurate</b> and <b>clearly</b> expressed.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p><b>Weaknesses</b> The following weaken the support for the author’s argument:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>lacks balance of evidence</b> – No evidence is given to support an alternative way to interpret the cause of migration e.g. refugees fleeing from war or famine. He gives only the evidence to support the ‘best way to look at migration’ i.e. an economic interpretation.</li> <li>• <b>some statistics lack reference to the context of the cost of living</b> – The comparisons between South Korea and India, Denmark and Mali do not make it clear whether the figures given take this into consideration.</li> <li>• <b>economic differences may not be typical</b> – If the author has selected examples of extreme economic gaps, these figures would not be representative of global economic differences and would exaggerate the economic reasons for migration.</li> <li>• <b>several assumptions</b> – The author assumes that the evidence of increased globalisation of communication supports the idea that people have access to the media, read the reports about income disparity and, because they are aware, act on this awareness.</li> <li>• <b>lack of support of evidence</b> – The claims of decreased transportation costs, examples of fenced countries, Lampedusa tragedy figures and the ‘better alternative’ of temporary programs for workers are all unsupported, which reduces their authority.</li> <li>• <b>unsupported solution</b> – He does not give evidence to support his solution of managed immigration and freedom of movement.</li> <li>• <b>selective evidence</b> – As an academic working on global income inequality he has a natural bias to interpret the cause of migration from that perspective and to present evidence from that field to support the perspective.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Level 2</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>4–7 marks</b></span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers focus more on <b>either</b> the strengths <b>or</b> weaknesses of the evidence, although <b>both</b> are present/identified. <b>Note: maximum 6 marks if both not present.</b></li> <li>• Assessment identifies strength <b>or</b> weaknesses of evidence with little explanation.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence is relevant but <b>generalised, not always linked</b> to specific evidence or specific claims.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>accurate</b> – explanation and reasoning is <b>limited</b>, but <b>clearly</b> expressed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>1–3 marks</b></span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers show <b>little or no</b> assessment.</li> <li>• Assessment, if any, is <b>simplistic</b>.</li> <li>• Evidence may be <b>identified</b> and weaknesses may be <b>named</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>limited</b> – response may be <b> cursory</b> or <b>descriptive</b>.</li> </ul> <p><b>Credit 0 marks</b> where there is no creditable material. (Use X in the level summary)</p> <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	Guidance
3	<p><b>Both authors give a solution to the problem of migration. To what extent is the author’s argument in Document 2 more convincing than that of the author in Document 1?</b></p> <p>No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p><b>More Convincing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>a wider perspective</b> – Park (Doc 2) recognises another cause of migration, political disorder as well as environmental causes, whereas Milanovic (Doc 1) limits the discussion of causes to purely economic motives.</li> <li>• <b>a larger range of sourced evidence</b> – Park (Doc 2) uses evidence from a range of transnational organisations as well as personal reports which gives more authority to the argument, whereas Milanovic (Doc 1) uses only three sources.</li> <li>• <b>more first-hand perspective</b> – Park (Doc 2) uses the personal insights of Syrian farmer which brings the reality of those affected, whereas Milanovic (Doc 1) gives a more detached theoretical argument.</li> <li>• <b>uses more emotional language</b> – Park (Doc 2) uses ‘devastating drought’, ‘ragged material’, ‘chronic hunger’, ‘forced to flee’ to convince the reader, whereas Milanovic (Doc 1) uses a more academic approach.</li> </ul> <p><b>More convincing conclusion / solution</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>more effective</b> – Park (Doc 2) tackles the root-cause, the environment, rather than the symptoms of migration i.e. queued immigrants Milanovic (Doc 1).</li> <li>• <b>better for the environment</b> – Park (Doc 2) proposes sustainable development, whereas Milanovic (Doc 1) does not address this.</li> <li>• <b>better for stability</b> – Park (Doc 2)’s solution enables people to stay in their own country, whereas Milanovic (Doc 1) tries to give a short-term solution of temporary workers’ programs.</li> <li>• <b>more humane</b> – Park (Doc 2) deals with individuals, communities and culture, rather than putting immigration limits on people’s needs Milanovic (Doc 1).</li> </ul>	14	<p>Use the levels based marking grid below and the indicative content in the left-hand column to credit marks.</p> <p><b>For each bullet give a level (that can include split levels e.g. L2/L1) to inform the overall level and mark within the available range. These should be placed at the end of the answer with the overall level in the right-hand margin. (Use X for Level 0)</b></p> <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> <p><b>Level 3</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>10–14 marks</b></span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The judgement is <b>sustained</b> and <b>reasoned</b> throughout.</li> <li>• Alternative perspectives have sustained assessment.</li> <li>• Critical evaluation is of <b>key</b> issues raised in the passages and has <b>explicit</b> reference.</li> <li>• Explanation and reasoning is <b>highly effective</b>, accurate and clearly expressed.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>highly effective</b> – clear evidence of a structured cogent argument with conclusions explicitly stated and directly linked to the assessment.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>more easily accepted</b> – Park (Doc 2) uses the general rule of recognising a problem early, which is difficult to disagree with, whereas Milanovic (Doc 1) puts forward an untested solution which would be easier to dismiss.</li> </ul> <p><b>Less convincing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>less relevant expertise</b> – Park (Doc 2)'s expertise seems to be in Asia, whereas he is discussing Africa as well as Syria, so he may not have as much relevant expertise as Milanovic (Doc 1), who is a world scholar on global income inequality and discusses this area.</li> <li>• <b>a narrower historical perspective</b> – Park (Doc 2) looks at environmental displacement since 1989, whereas Milanovic (Doc 1) looks at economic gaps since 1960.</li> </ul> <p><b>Neither more or less convincing</b></p> <p><b>Same</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• both give structured arguments with conclusions supported by reasons</li> <li>• both support with relevant evidence and relevant arguments</li> <li>• both are experts in their fields</li> </ul> <p><b>Different (do not conflict)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Park (Doc 2) gives a different perspective on the causes for migration, environmental factors, as opposed to Milanovic (Doc 1)'s economic factors. Both are equally valid.</li> <li>• Park (Doc 2) gives a different solution to tackle the root-cause enabling sustainable development, whereas Milanovic (Doc 1) tackles the problem of migration from global rights and freedom of movement. Each perspective is valid.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Level 2</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>5–9 marks</b></span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judgement is <b>reasoned</b>.</li> <li>• <b>One perspective may be focused upon for assessment.</b></li> <li>• Evaluation is present but may not relate to key issues.</li> <li>• Explanation and reasoning is <b>generally accurate</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>accurate</b> – some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>1–4 marks</b></span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judgement, if present, is <b>unsupported</b> or <b>superficial</b>.</li> <li>• Alternative perspectives have little or no assessment.</li> <li>• Evaluation, if any, is <b>simplistic/undeveloped</b></li> <li>• Relevant evidence or reasons may be <b>identified</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>limited</b>. Response may be cursory.</li> </ul> <p><b>Credit 0 marks</b> where no creditable material. (Use X in the level summary)</p>

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
3	<p><b>Judgement</b></p> <p>Candidates should critically assess perspectives and the use of examples and evidence in order to reach a judgement. In doing this they might conclude that Professor Park's argument (Doc 2) is stronger because of greater balance, a wider range of expert sources, a personal perspective and a more effective solution. Alternatively, they might conclude that overall, despite Dr Milanovic's narrower focus, his argument (Doc 1) is more convincing because of his more relevant expertise and more immediate solution.</p> <p>Credit should be given to any alternative judgement on the basis of the assessment and reasoning including if the answer supports a judgement that the arguments are equally convincing for different reasons.</p>		

**PUBLISHED****Question 2**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
L3	8–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Both</b> strengths and weaknesses of evidence are assessed.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence is <b>sustained</b>.</li> <li>• Assessment explicitly includes the <b>impact</b> of specific evidence upon the claims made.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>highly effective</b> – explanation and reasoning <b>accurate</b> and <b>clearly</b> expressed.</li> </ul>
L2	4–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers focus more on <b>either</b> the strengths <b>or</b> weakness of the evidence, although <b>both</b> are present/identified.</li> <li>• Assessment identifies strength <b>or</b> weakness of evidence with little explanation.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence is relevant but <b>generalised, not always linked</b> to specific claims.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>accurate</b> – explanation and reasoning is <b>limited</b>, but <b>clearly</b> expressed.</li> </ul>
L1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers show <b>little</b> or <b>no</b> assessment of evidence.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence, if any, is <b>simplistic</b>.</li> <li>• Evidence may be <b>identified</b> and weakness may be <b>named</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>limited</b> – response may be <b> cursory</b> or <b>descriptive</b>.</li> </ul>
L0 (X)	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no creditable material.</li> </ul>
<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 3**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
L3	10–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The judgement is <b>sustained</b> and <b>reasoned</b>.</li> <li>• Alternative perspectives have <b>sustained</b> assessment.</li> <li>• Critical evaluation is of <b>key</b> issues raised in the passages and has <b>explicit</b> reference.</li> <li>• Explanation and reasoning is <b>highly effective</b>, accurate and clearly expressed.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>highly effective</b> – clear evidence of a structured cogent argument with conclusions explicitly stated and directly linked to the assessment.</li> </ul>
L2	5–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judgement is <b>reasoned</b>.</li> <li>• <b>One perspective</b> may be focused upon for assessment.</li> <li>• Evaluation is present but may <b>not relate to key</b> issues.</li> <li>• Explanation and reasoning is <b>generally accurate</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>accurate</b> – some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment.</li> </ul>
L1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judgement, if present, is <b>unsupported</b> or <b>superficial</b>.</li> <li>• Alternative perspectives have little or no assessment</li> <li>• Evaluation, if any, is <b>simplistic/undeveloped</b>. Answers may <b>describe</b> a few points comparing the two documents.</li> <li>• Relevant evidence or reasons may be <b>identified</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>limited</b>. Response may be cursory.</li> </ul>
L0 (X)	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no creditable material.</li> </ul>
<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>		