



GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

1340/02

Paper 2 Essay

October/November 2017

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 October/November 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

This syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document consists of **4** printed pages.

Approximate weighting of the AOs:

AO1: 10% (3) AO2: 40% (12) AO3: 33% (10) AO4: 17% (5)

- The assessment objectives (AOs) are to some extent inter-dependent and the essays should be marked holistically using the level-based mark scheme below
- Examiners should look at each section of the level descriptors. If all are solidly attained for a level, the top mark for the level is to be awarded. Descriptors describe the top mark of each Level.
- There will frequently be some aspects of the answer which fall within a level and some within the level below. Examiners should award a lower mark in the higher band according to this balance. All marking will be positive. Examiners will use the full range of marks and look for the ‘best fit’, not a ‘perfect fit’.
- There is no requirement for candidates to use technical Critical Thinking terms to access any level and candidates will **not** be rewarded for their use unless they are directly linked to the demands of the question.
- Essays should be between 1750 and 2000 words, excluding the list of reference. Examiners will not credit material after the 2000 word limit.

Level	Marks	Indicative content
4	24–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The essay is logically structured and explores the issues effectively, fully and concisely without being too brief. A range of relevant sources is used, cited and fully referenced. • There are at least two relevant and contrasting global perspectives stated and explained, using globally contrasting sources. • There is effective selection and critical use of relevant evidence so that the relationship between sources, perspectives and the wider context is clear. • The argument is fully developed with the premises challenged appropriately. The perspectives and sources are critically evaluated. • The essay considers the implications and consequences of each perspective and, through reflection, reaches a convincing, balanced and supported conclusion. • The limitations of the evidence are fully recognised and the need for further research is suggested and its likely impact is assessed.

Level	Marks	Indicative content
3	16–23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The essay is well structured and explores the issues effectively though the clarity of expression may be uneven. A range of relevant sources is used, cited and referenced. • There are at least two relevant global perspectives, but they may not be contrasting or fully explained. • There is some attempt to select and make some critical use of relevant evidence although the relationship between sources, perspectives and the wider context are not always clear. • The perspectives and sources are evaluated in the global context, but the treatment lacks width or depth. An argument is developed with some of the premises challenged. • The essay considers some the implications and consequences of each perspective and through reflection, reaches a conclusion which is mostly convincing, balanced and supported. • Some of the limitations of the evidence are recognised and the need for further research is suggested but its likely impact may lack assessment.
2	8–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some of the issues are explored in the essay and there is some structure, but it may lack clarity of expression at times. The range of relevant sources used is limited and some are cited and accurately referenced. • Two perspectives are stated, though not necessarily global or contrasting, and not explained. • There is some attempt to select and make some critical use of relevant evidence although the candidate struggles to explain and control the relationship between sources, perspectives and the wider context. Evaluation is limited at best and the treatment lacks width and depth. • Any argument lacks sufficient development. • The essay considers some the implications and consequences of some perspectives and through some reflection, reaches a conclusion which may be unconvincing due to a lack of balance or support. • Some of the limitations of the evidence are recognised, but the need for further research may be understated, If present.

Level	Marks	Indicative content
1	1–7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues are mainly given a descriptive treatment and the essay may be lacking in structure. The sources used provide a very narrow perspective and the referencing is incomplete or inaccurate. • Any perspectives described lack a genuine global focus or do not offer complementary viewpoints. • The relationship between sources, perspectives and the wider context are unclear or absent. There is little critical use of relevant evidence to communicate the argument. • The argument lacks validity, given the evidence or is not developed sufficiently. There is limited scope to evaluate the perspectives and sources due to a lack of evidence. The essay does not consider the implications and consequences of each perspective. • The essay lacks evidence of reflection and any conclusion may be unconvincing, uneven and lack supporting evidence. • The limitations of the evidence are not recognised and the need for further research is not suggested.
0	0	No creditworthy material has been submitted.