

Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH**9239/11**

Paper 1 Written Exam

October/November 2025**MARK SCHEME**Maximum Mark: 45

Published

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

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

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

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2025 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

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

PUBLISHED**Generic Marking Principles**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

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

PUBLISHED**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

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

PUBLISHED**Social Science-Specific Marking Principles
(for point-based marking)****1 Components using point-based marking:**

- Point marking is often used to reward knowledge, understanding and application of skills. We give credit where the candidate's answer shows relevant knowledge, understanding and application of skills in answering the question. We do not give credit where the answer shows confusion.

From this it follows that we:

- a** DO credit answers which are worded differently from the mark scheme if they clearly convey the same meaning (unless the mark scheme requires a specific term)
- b** DO credit alternative answers/examples which are not written in the mark scheme if they are correct
- c** DO credit answers where candidates give more than one correct answer in one prompt/numbered/scaffolded space where extended writing is required rather than list-type answers. For example, questions that require *n* reasons (e.g. State two reasons ...).
- d** DO NOT credit answers simply for using a 'key term' unless that is all that is required. (Check for evidence it is understood and not used wrongly.)
- e** DO NOT credit answers which are obviously self-contradicting or trying to cover all possibilities
- f** DO NOT give further credit for what is effectively repetition of a correct point already credited unless the language itself is being tested. This applies equally to 'mirror statements' (i.e. polluted/not polluted).
- g** DO NOT require spellings to be correct, unless this is part of the test. However spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. Corrasion/Corrosion)

2 Presentation of mark scheme:

- Slashes (/) or the word 'or' separate alternative ways of making the same point.
- Semi colons (;) bullet points (•) or figures in brackets (1) separate different points.
- Content in the answer column in brackets is for examiner information/context to clarify the marking but is not required to earn the mark (except Accounting syllabuses where they indicate negative numbers).

3 Calculation questions:

- The mark scheme will show the steps in the most likely correct method(s), the mark for each step, the correct answer(s) and the mark for each answer
- If working/explanation is considered essential for full credit, this will be indicated in the question paper and in the mark scheme. In all other instances, the correct answer to a calculation should be given full credit, even if no supporting working is shown.
- Where the candidate uses a valid method which is not covered by the mark scheme, award equivalent marks for reaching equivalent stages.
- Where an answer makes use of a candidate's own incorrect figure from previous working, the 'own figure rule' applies: full marks will be given if a correct and complete method is used. Further guidance will be included in the mark scheme where necessary and any exceptions to this general principle will be noted.

4 Annotation:

- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
- For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
- Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

Annotations guidance for centres

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

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

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

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	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)

PUBLISHED

Annotation	Meaning
EVAL	Evaluation of impact of evidence on argument/perspective and includes 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 one impact of COVID-19 is that many children ‘saw their education paused.’ Identify three negative consequences for girls of education being paused, 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 three marks. • married too early • (girls) having children too early • miss out on lifesaving vaccines / protection against cervical cancer • reduces their earning potential • (increasing rates of) domestic violence (due to isolation in home due to not going back to school) Do not accept: • disease/hunger (this is not linked to education being paused by the author, just referred to in terms of the impact of the pandemic) • When girls drop out of school (this is a scenario not a consequence of a pause in education) • women who are educated are more likely to educate their children, creating a positive cycle (this is not the negative consequence) • every extra year of schooling has the potential to increase girls’ future wages by 12%, compared with 10% for boys (this is not the negative consequence, it is an illustration of the consequence)	3

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	The author of Document B argues that the ‘root cause’ of illegal migration is global wage inequality. Identify two corporations that make extremely large profits in poorer countries, 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. Show a correct answer with ✓ in the text, up to a maximum of two marks. • Samsung • Apple Do not accept: • Amnesty International • British Broadcasting Corporation • iPhone factory	2

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

- **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 may **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.

AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation

AO1(a) Identify evidence	Marks	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 type of evidence	1	1 T
Identification of evidence is not present. No creditable material.	0	No T or No EG

AO1(b) Analyse strengths and weaknesses of evidence	Marks	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 + (or more) and 1 – (or more) (or opposite) with 1 EXP
Analyses strengths and weaknesses of a range of evidence with limited explanation	3	2 + (or more) and 1 – (or more) (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

AO1(c) Evaluate evidence	Marks	Annotations
Evaluation includes explanation of the impact of evidence on the argument / perspective and makes a range of reasoned judgements	5	2 I (or more) and I J
Evaluation includes explanation of the impact of evidence on the argument / perspective and make a reasoned judgement	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

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author of Document A to support their argument that the COVID-19 pandemic has worsened global inequality. 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. • [annotated example]. <i>Use of quantitative data (T), such as 'fatality rate of 20-year-olds in low-income countries was nearly three times that in high-income ones. And 60-year-olds had almost double the risk of dying' (EG) is strong (+) because it accurately supports the idea of the impact of COVID-19 was severe. This data proves that this is a really bad situation because the data shows such an obvious increased likelihood of death in these places as the numbers are so much higher. With death rates so high, especially in comparison to other, wealthier countries, these numbers are strong supporting evidence (EXP). This would help to convince the reader that global inequality had become worse due to the pandemic, and is clearly evidenced (I^).</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. Strengths • Place of publication, from a relevant international organisation. Gavi is works on saving lives and people's health. • Background of author/expertise, previously staff writer at WHO and genetics graduate • Use of relevant evidence, e.g. '75 million people...677 million', 'increase girls' future wages by 12%, compared with 10% for boys', 'fatality rate of 20-year-olds in low-income countries was nearly three times that in high-income ones'. Studies taken from 2021 are relevant from the time of COVID. • Specific data/statistics/numbers, reference to fatality rate of different age groups rather than just people. • Credible sources, e.g. World Bank, UN Women. • Sources based on research: a survey by UN Women. • Relevant examples, e.g. girls' health: married too early, have children too early, miss out on vaccines HPV; girls' earning potential: increase girls' future wages, women who are educated educate their children. • Some recent evidence – a survey published last month based on the fact that the document is published in 2022 means it is recent. • Some evidence from a range of countries: data from 25 low income countries.	15

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Weaknesses • There is some unsourced evidence, e.g. ‘A study published last month’, ‘potential to increase girls’ future wages by 12%, compared with 10% for boys’. • Unsupported statements, e.g. evidence has shown ‘increasing rates of domestic violence’, but no evidence is provided, also in first two paragraphs. • Use of predictions, e.g. ‘would bring the total number... by the end of the year’, ‘food crisis triggered...could mean that the situation gets worse before it gets better’ • Use of estimates, e.g. ‘the World Bank estimates’ • References to vague numbers: e.g. ‘pushed millions into extreme poverty’, ‘nearly three times’, ‘almost double’ • Lack of specific numerical data, e.g. ‘it seemed that lower income countries were far less affected’, ‘some seemed almost untouched’ • Limited sample size for some of the evidence, e.g. ‘25 lower income countries...high-income ones’ • Lack of information on sample size for some data – survey by UN women does not provide a data or the number of participants or where they were located. • Generalisation – does not specify what is considered a low income country. • Relevance of evidence is not clear – some of the evidence is not related <u>directly</u> to covid e.g. girls dropping out of school. • Unbalanced evidence – some evidence on women and girls, but not as much related to boys. • Undated statistics: e.g. ‘12% compared with 10% for boys’. • Author lack of direct expertise: degree in genetics is not directly related to vaccines/pandemics	

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. Annotations for each aspect are listed in **increasing order of significance**. For example, in AO1a **C** reflects a **higher skill** than **K**. This is reflected in the mark tables.

- **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.

PUBLISHED

- **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 or undeveloped evaluation of a key component of argument.
EVAL	Evaluation of key components of argument.

- **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

AO1a Identify and compare key components of arguments	Marks	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	Marks	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 or more 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

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

PUBLISHED**AO3 Communication**

Communication	Mark	Guidance
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.

Guidance for awarding marks for AO3 in Question 3.

Note: 'clearly written' refers to the content and the ease of being able to follow the candidates' argument. It should be thought of as: '**clearly expressed**'.

The quality of handwriting should not be considered as a factor when awarding marks. This is not what clearly written means in the descriptors.

If a candidate made little attempt to answer the question and had lots of NAQ (e.g. was very descriptive or wrote an essay on their own opinion of the subject matter) the **maximum** score is **2 marks**.

If a candidate wrote very little/wrote in bullet points/has limited content that addresses the question the **maximum score** is **2 marks**.

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

If a candidate wrote in continuous prose, expressed themselves clearly and addressed the question, **start at 3 marks** – then consider if it better fits the descriptions above or below **3 marks**. If the answer was **not** clearly expressed or **focused mainly on one document**, it lacks clarity **and** has uneven structure and may only be worth **2 marks**.

If the answer has an introduction, clear paragraphs, considers **both documents in a balanced way**, reaches **a judgement** and generally links to the question it could be worth **4 marks**.

If the answer contains the criteria for **4 marks** above, **is logical and has no irrelevant content (No NAQ)** it could be worth **5 marks**.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3	The authors of the two documents present different arguments and perspectives on global inequality. Evaluate the arguments of the authors of both documents. In your answer, consider their perspectives and include a reasoned judgement about whether one argument is stronger than the other. 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 • <i>[Annotated example]</i> Doc A is talking about COVID-19. (P^A) Doc B is talking about migrants. (P^A) • <i>[Annotated example]</i> Doc A's view is that COVID-19 made inequality worse (especially for women). (P) Doc B's view global inequality is the main cause of (undocumented) migration. (P). • <i>[Annotated example]</i> Doc A's perspective is that COVID-19 caused more global inequality than existed before it and describes the inequalities. On the other hand, Doc B's perspective is that the increase in undocumented migrants making dangerous journeys is a consequence of global inequality and Doc B describes those low wages and problems. So Doc A focuses on a cause of inequality, and Doc B focuses on the consequences. (PD) • <i>[Annotated example]</i> Doc A's perspective is that COVID-19 caused more global inequality than existed before it. This is because the author is focusing on the impacts of COVID on areas such as poverty, health, and girls' education, all of which are indicators of inequality and have got worse since the pandemic. Doc A focuses on a cause of inequality, and Doc B focuses on the consequences. Doc B's perspective is that the increase in undocumented migrants making dangerous journeys is a consequence of global inequality. This is because he is keen to explain that these migrants should not be blamed for the situations they find themselves in; global inequality is the cause, and this is not their fault. (PE)	25

PUBLISHED

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. • <i>[Annotated example]</i> Expertise of the author – The author of Document A, Priya Joi is an expert in healthcare having worked as a staff writer and editor at the World Health Organisation. This is one of the most globally respected institutions therefore they would only employ an expert to write about these issues (ND). In Document B, the author, Seb Rumsby, is an academic who has been researching Vietnamese migrant workers (C). The author will be an expert because the article topic is the focus of his research project where he has conducted interviews with people affected. Given he is an expert dedicated to working on this issue while belonging to a university, this suggests his work will be reliable, increasing the strength of the argument (EVAL).	

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. • Background of the author – Doc A is an expert who has worked for the WHO, Doc B is an academic who has conducted a relevant research project. • Place of publication – Doc A is published by an organisation that focuses on health and vaccines which has more connection to health inequality, Doc B is published by a not-for-profit media outlet. • Date of publication – Both Docs are published in 2022, so both quite recent. • Recent or outdated evidence – A is mostly recent evidence. Doc B has some older evidence (2011, 2017), so may be slightly outdated. • Reference to expert sources – Doc A uses official sources such as the World Bank and UN Women for most of its evidence whereas Doc B provides three expert sources, BBC, Amnesty International and Vietnam News to cite three pieces of evidence but the rest is unsourced or anecdotal, so Doc B is weaker. • Some unsourced evidence: In Doc A there is reference to ‘a study published last month’. In Doc B the report in 2017 and study from 2011 do not have a clear source. • Use of data – Both Docs used a range of quantitative data to illustrate ideas. • Some vague claims – In Doc A ‘In 2020 low income countries were far less affected. In Doc B ‘less agreement about those fleeing poverty to seek a better future’. • Use of primary research – Doc B is stronger as the author has personally spoken to many of the individuals involved in undocumented migration whereas Doc A relies mainly on secondary research about the impact of COVID for information. • Biased/emotional evidence. In Doc B reference to one interview with a participant who was clearly been affected by the issue may lead to biased views. In Doc A uses more objective information from surveys. • Global focus – Doc A focuses on low-income/high-income countries in the context of a global pandemic. Doc B evidence focuses largely on the experiences of Vietnamese workers. • Use of counterarguments and counter-claims – Doc B includes a counterargument that there is some truth in placing blame with smugglers, whereas Doc A only provides one, unsupported and unexplained counterclaim. ‘In 2020, it seemed that lower income countries were far less affected by COVID-19.’ • Call to action – Doc A there is no clear action that should be taken. In Doc B it makes reference to moving beyond blaming smuggling gangs and irresponsible migrants to addressing the root cause of inequality, although no specific actions are suggested. • Relevant examples – Both documents use relevant examples to support their reasoning. Doc A: married too early, have children too early, lifesaving vaccines. Doc B: Samsung factory, Apple factory, long, exhausting shifts, assembling electronics, earn 10 times more working in a UK nail shop.	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3	• Structure of argument – Both have an organised structure. Doc A introduces its argument with the idea that COVID has made global inequality much worse, and all paragraphs that follow support that argument, with reasoning supported by a wide range of global examples and evidence that all lead to a reasoned conclusion; and Doc B's structure is different but also strong. It focuses on one country, Vietnam, and on personal interviews and stories to provide first-hand support for the conclusion that global inequality is causing the illegal migration crisis. It also includes a counter-argument to support its conclusion. • Style of writing – both use emotive language. In Doc A 'a staggering two-thirds', 'women feel unsafe to speak up'. In Doc B 'So in an unequal world', 'tragic consequences'. Indicative content – Judgement No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach as candidates may argue that A or B is stronger or that they are equally strong. <i>[Annotated example]</i> Doc B is stronger than Doc A because its use of personal, first-hand interviews gives strong support to the conclusion that global inequality is the cause of undocumented migration. The author has spoken to so many of these migrants who are willing to make these perilous journeys and they say that the reason they do it is so they can earn enough money, which they can't in Vietnam. Their lived experience is trustworthy and adds reliability to the conclusion as compared to Doc A which just has second-hand data based on international surveys which cover a range of countries, but lack the detail about what this means for people's lives. (J) A candidate may conclude that Doc A is stronger than Doc B because of its organised structure, with a clear conclusion supported by reasoning, examples and evidence in each paragraph, compared to all the anecdotes in Doc B. In addition, the use of expert and trusted sources for most evidence, especially the World Bank, further strengthens the conclusion that COVID made global inequality even worse. A candidate may conclude that both documents have their strengths and weaknesses. Doc A has expert sources and organised structure but it lacks balance with a counterargument. Doc B has great primary data but it lacks consistent, trusted sources for the evidence.	