Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH **9239/01**

Paper 1 Written Exam **For examination from 2023**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 45

Specimen

This document has **12** pages. Any blank pages are indicated.

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.

**Social Sciences and Humanities Subject-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 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).

f   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.

3   Annotation
- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers.
- 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.

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. 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, award a mark for each aspect of each AO separately using the marking grids. To use the marking grid, start from the top level for each aspect and read down until you meet the level that suits the response.

Indicative content or exemplar responses are provided as a guide. Inevitably, the mark scheme cannot cover all responses that candidates may make for all of 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 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.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**The author of Document A mentions different types of robot.** **Identify <u>two</u> robots that are already being used.** 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. *Any **two** of the following:* • 40 cm-tall humanoid robot • Baby seal robot • Communication robot Do not accept: • Practical robots (examples of nursing care robots such as carry, flush, track, as these are being developed so are not currently in use)	2
1(b)	**The author of Document B refers to a range of ethical issues with using healthcare robots.** **Identify <u>three</u> ethical issues mentioned by the author.** 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. *Any **three** of the following:* • Potential risks • Psychological bonding • Lack of trust • Desire for human interaction • Can cause distress • Detrimental effect on mental well-being Do not accept: • Lack of legal responsibility (these are legal issues not ethical ones) • Problems of safety standards (these are safety issues not ethical ones)	3

Marking grids for Question 2

Examiners should allocate a mark for each aspect of AO1 (AO1a, AO1b, AO1c), using the mark descriptors.

AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation

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

AO1b Analyse strengths and weaknesses of evidence	Mark
Analyses strengths and weaknesses of a wide range of evidence with clear explanation	5
Analyses strengths and weaknesses of a range of evidence with clear explanation	4
Analyses strengths and weaknesses of a range of evidence with limited explanation	3
Analyses strengths **or** weaknesses of a range of evidence with limited explanation	2
Explanation of strengths **or** weaknesses of evidence is limited	1
No analysis is present. No creditable material	0

AO1c Evaluate evidence	Mark
Evaluation includes explanation of the impact of evidence on the argument/perspective and makes a wide range of reasoned judgements	5
Evaluation includes explanation of the impact of evidence on the argument/perspective and makes reasoned judgements	4
Evaluation includes an explanation of the impact of evidence on the argument/perspective	3
Evaluation is attempted but lacks clarity, and the impact of evidence on the argument/ perspective is not explained	2
The impact of evidence on the argument/perspective is asserted and not explained	1
No evaluation is present. No creditable material	0

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author of Document A to support their claims about the development of robotic healthcare equipment.** **In your answer include the impact of the evidence on the author's argument.** The question assesses AO1. Answers to Question 2 should be written in continuous prose. Use the **Marking grids for Question 2** to assess Question 2. 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. No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content. **Indicative content** **Strengths** • [Example only] **Evidence from first-hand sources:** (Head of the Fuyouen senior citizens' home, caregivers and two residents of the home.) All have experience of using communication robots and explain how useful they are as they have the ability to see. This gives the reader confidence that the author's argument is supported by reliable sources who know what they are talking about. • **Use of expert sources:** e.g. deputy director of METI and use of official sources e.g. Japanese government. • **Plausible evidence:** e.g. projected growth of caregivers required. • **Use of statistics:** e.g. '30% of the overall population ...' and '... allocated ¥2.4 billion ...' • **Selection of evidence:** the author has no apparent vested interest as she is reporting the story as a journalist. • **Motive to be accurate:** as a journalist she would aim to preserve her reputation and that of the Japan Times. **Weaknesses** • **Lack of representativeness:** e.g. experience of the one reported care home may not be typical in Japan or in the wider world. • **Lack of balance:** e.g. limited evidence of drawbacks of using robots in care homes. Selected evidence is for the use of robots in care homes. • **Absence of context for quantitative data:** e.g. population statistics (Without knowing the total population of Japan we do not know whether 30% of the overall population is a high or low number.) • **Some vague statistics:** e.g. robots costing between ¥100 000 and ¥200 000 which is a wide range. • **Some estimated statistics:** e.g. The Japanese government estimates that the number of people over 65 will rise by about 7 million ... • **Unreliable sources:** e.g. elderly residents may not have a detailed understanding of the value of the robots.	15

Marking grids for Question 3

Examiners should allocate a mark for each aspect of AO1 (AO1a, AO1b, AO1c, AO1d) and AO3, using the mark descriptors.

AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation

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

AO1b Analyse and compare perspectives	Mark
Analyses by comparing and explaining the perspectives given in both documents	5
Analyses by comparing and describing the perspectives given in both documents	4
Identifies and compares both perspectives but with limited description	3
Identifies one perspective but with limited description	2
Identifies one perspective with no description	1
No identification of perspectives. No creditable material	0

AO1c Evaluate arguments	Mark
Evaluation of key components of arguments is illustrated by clear, balanced reference to both documents	5
Evaluation of key components of arguments is illustrated by clear reference to both documents but lacks balance	4
Evaluation of key components of arguments with limited reference to both documents	3
Evaluation of arguments is unsupported (asserted) but refers to both documents	2
Evaluation of arguments is unsupported (asserted) and only refers to one document	1
No evaluation is present. No creditable material	0

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

AO3 Communication

Communication	Mark
Produces a clearly written, well-structured and logical argument that is focused throughout on the question	5
Produces a clearly written, well-structured argument that links to the question	4
Produces a clearly written argument with uneven structure that links to the question	3
Produces an argument that lacks clarity and structure and does not always link to the question	2
Communication is cursory or descriptive and lacks structure	1
No creditable material	0

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**The two authors present different arguments and perspectives about the development of robotic healthcare equipment.** **Evaluate the arguments of both authors. In your answer, consider their perspectives and include a reasoned judgement about whether one argument is stronger than the other.** The question assesses AO1 and AO3. Answers to Question 3 should be written in continuous prose. Use the **Marking grids for Question 3** to assess Question 3. 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. By perspective we mean a coherent world view in response to an issue. A perspective is different from a theme. No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content. **Indicative content – Perspectives** Doc A has a limited perspective as it only considers the use of robots in healthcare in Japan, in particular in one named care home. Doc B is more international with reference to the US as well as Japan and includes evidence from the International Conference on Robotics and Automation. Doc A only considers the positive outcomes of using robots in healthcare and has a definitive conclusion which lacks balance. Doc B gives the benefits of robots in healthcare but then considers the counterargument relating to legal, safety and ethical concerns leading to a more open conclusion. **Indicative content – Arguments** No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. At each point of comparison, candidate may argue that either Document is stronger, or they are equally strong. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content. [Examples only]: **Provenance:** The author of Doc B (Easton) is a UK university lecturer. Her academic credentials (she has a doctorate) and the reliable place of publication (Society of Computers and Law website) strengthen the argument, because we trust academic expertise. Whereas the author of Doc A (Mai Lida) is a journalist with no specified academic background or specialism in robotics, which makes it weaker. Therefore, Doc B is stronger than Doc A as it has a stronger provenance. **Global scope:** Doc B has a wider scope with reference to US, Japan and an international conference whereas Doc A is narrowly focussed on Japan.	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Sources of evidence:** Both Doc A and Doc B draw evidence from other sources. Doc A uses more first-hand evidence (e.g. care home residents and caregivers) whereas Doc B uses more expert sources like Professor Asaro. **Structure of argument:** Both Doc A and Doc B have clear conclusions and a well-structured argument. **Language style:** Doc A has more emotional appeal, including quotations and the human factor which could be more convincing to some readers. Doc B has a more academic style that appears to be more serious and focussed on detailed concerns that some readers would find stronger than Doc A. **Counter argument:** Doc B has a counterargument whereas Doc A is one sided (looking only at benefits) **Use of statistics:** Doc A uses more statistical evidence, which although rounded and estimated is stronger than the more qualitative statements made by the author of Doc B. **Indicative content – Judgement** A candidate may conclude that Document B is stronger as it has a clear academic structure and a reliable provenance. It has a wider global scope than Document A and addresses a counterargument which Document B doesn't. A candidate may conclude that Document A has a stronger argument as it has more emotional appeal by including first-hand evidence and personal reflections on equipment that has a benefit to residents and carers. It also uses more statistical information that adds more support to the reliability of the argument, making it stronger overall. A candidate may conclude that both documents have their strengths and weaknesses and, on balance, both arguments are valid and so neither is particularly stronger than the other. Both have clear conclusions and a structured argument. Both use official government sources to give strength to their argument.	

BLANK PAGE