



---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES**

**1340/01**

Paper 1 Written Paper

**May/June 2019**

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 May/June 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U 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.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p><b>Identify and explain <u>two</u> reasons given in Document 1 for why technology will increase standards of living.</b></p> <p>Candidates might consider some of the following:</p> <p>Identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Automation reduces production costs and lowers prices to consumers.</li> <li>• Technology increases people’s productivity.</li> <li>• Technology can increase people’s income.</li> <li>• Technology reduces the need for routine work and increases non-routine work.</li> </ul> <p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because consumers pay less money for necessities, they have more money to spend elsewhere on other things that improve their lives.</li> <li>• This means people may have a higher income and so more money to spend on different things to improve their lives.</li> <li>• Because using machines means they can produce more in a shorter space of time and earn more money.</li> <li>• People may be happier at work if they have a more interesting, less routine job to do.</li> </ul>	4	<p>Candidates are required to identify and explain <b><u>TWO</u></b> reasons why technology will increase standards of living.</p> <p>Award ONE mark for any relevant reason identified.</p> <p>Do not reward reasons that are not drawn from the Document.</p> <p>However, explanations may be extrapolated or may be the candidate’s own explanation.</p> <p>Note:</p> <p>Candidates may identify possible improvements in standard of living and explain how they come about as a result of technology.</p> <p>Candidates may identify impacts of technology and explain how they increase standards of living</p> <p>Candidates may identify technological changes and state how their impact leads to an explained improvement in standard of living.</p> <p>Candidates may explain why technology will increase standards of living.</p> <p><b>Standards of living may include: material wealth, increased earnings, financial security, comfort, access to necessities.</b></p>

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
1			<b>Also accept explanation or identification of quality of life such as: rewarding or pleasant work, happiness, free time, health, work / life balance. (as the text does not specify or define Living Standards).</b>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p><b>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the author’s argument in Document 1 about the positive impact of technological development on standards of living.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative Content</b></p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support of history</li> <li>• The support of prominent economists</li> <li>• Data to support argument</li> <li>• Analysts’ arguments (rejected) are based purely on predictions</li> <li>• Economists reject the argument technology will cause damage</li> <li>• Support from the study of the University of Chicago, with 75% of those they questioned agreeing</li> <li>• Logical argument</li> <li>• Does answer the challenges.</li> <li>• The evidence from American history</li> <li>• A lack of empirical evidence to show that the claim is wrong</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence to support the appeal to history</li> <li>• The prominent economists are not named</li> <li>• The data to support the argument is not given, neither is the source that provides the data</li> <li>• There are analysts who disagree</li> <li>• The economists are not named, ‘almost all’ is vague</li> <li>• No precise evidence from American history is cited</li> </ul>	12	<p>There is much material that candidates may consider and examiners should note that not all is required to gain maximum marks, what matters is the quality of evaluation. No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Some candidates may argue that the argument is very strong, citing some of strengths, whilst others may be less convinced highlighting more of the weaknesses exemplified. 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 demands of the question.</p> <p>Responses should focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments put forward in Document 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At Level 3 candidates must consider both the strengths and weaknesses.</li> <li>• At Level 2 there is likely to be imbalance, with most of the answer focusing on the weakness of the arguments, although some answers may focus largely on the strengths. Candidates who focus on only the strengths or weaknesses can still achieve any mark within this level depending upon the quality of the evaluation.</li> <li>• At Level 1 it is likely that candidates will consider only either the strengths or weaknesses. At this level candidates’ answers are likely to be descriptive in approach, particularly at the lower end, if there is evaluation it may be very generalised.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p><b>To what extent is Document 2 more convincing than Document 1 in its view about raising standards of living?</b></p> <p>Candidates should critically assess the use of examples and evidence in order to reach a judgement. In doing this they might conclude that Document 2 is a more or less convincing argument than that put forward in Document 1 with a range of well-chosen examples to help support this line of argument. No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach.</p> <p>Candidates might consider some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document 1 lacks specific evidence whereas Document 2 contains a range of examples to support its claims.</li> <li>• Both Documents appeal to authority / history, but Document 2 provides precise examples whereas Document 1 relies on assertion.</li> <li>• Document 2 has a particular political purpose, to argue the importance of the WTO and free trade, whereas Document 1 does not appear to have a political purpose</li> <li>• Both Documents are produced by respected bodies or academics.</li> <li>• Document 2 has statistical evidence, whose origin is often stated, to support its claims. The statistical evidence provided is precise – 51% etc.</li> <li>• Document 1 does address the counter argument, which Document 2 does not</li> <li>• Document 2 has specific examples from across the world to support its claims.</li> <li>• Document 2 appeals to emotion, arguing that trade barriers impact on the neediest more than the wealthy.</li> </ul>	14	<p>Responses should focus on key arguments and evidence in both documents in order to compare alternative perspectives and synthesise them in order to reach a reasoned judgement. In order to assess whether Document 2 is more convincing than the argument in Document 1 candidates should consider not only the content of the Documents, but critically assess the arguments put forward through a consideration of issues such as the nature of the passages, purpose and language.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At Level 3 candidates will reach a sustained judgement about the view in the question and the extent to which this is true. In order to do this they will have covered a significant range of issues, and evaluated them clearly.</li> <li>• At Level 2 there will be some evaluation and comparison, but it will be either poorly developed or limited in the areas covered.</li> <li>• At Level 1 there will be very little evaluation, comparison will be of the content and candidates may simply describe the documents or identify areas of similarity and difference, with little link to the question.</li> </ul>

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Guidance</b>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Document 1 argues that low skilled workers will not lose out by technology and that new work will be available, might be seen as an appeal to emotion.</li><li>• Both Documents do have arguments that rest on predictions.</li><li>• Both Documents make very big claims for their particular argument or factor.</li></ul>		



**Appendix 1: Level descriptors for Q2**

<b>Level 3</b> <b>9–12 marks</b>	<p>Sustained evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of arguments and evidence, critical assessment with explicit reference to how flaws and counter argument support the argument.</p> <p>Highly effective, accurate and clearly expressed explanation and reasoning; clear evidence of structured argument / discussion, with conclusions reached / explicitly stated in a cogent and convincing manner.</p>
<b>Level 2</b> <b>5–8 marks</b>	<p>Some evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of arguments and evidence, but evaluation may focus on one aspect; assessment of flaws etc. may not link clearly to the argument.</p> <p>Effective and generally accurate explanation and reasoning; some evidence of structured argument / discussion; conclusions may not be explicitly stated or link directly to the analysis.</p>
<b>Level 1</b> <b>1–4 marks</b>	<p>Little or no evaluation of strengths and weaknesses, although flaws etc. may be identified.</p> <p>Level of communication is limited, response may be cursory or descriptive; communication does not deal with complex subject matter</p>

**Appendix 2: Level descriptors for Q3**

<p><b>Level 3</b> <b>11–14 marks</b></p>	<p>Answers at this level will demonstrate a sustained judgement about the view. There will be sustained evaluation of alternative perspectives; critical assessment with explicit reference to key issues raised in the passages leading to a reasoned and sustained judgement.</p> <p>Highly effective, accurate and clearly expressed explanation and reasoning; clear evidence of structured argument / discussion, with conclusions reached / explicitly stated in a cogent and convincing manner.</p>
<p><b>Level 2</b> <b>6–10 marks</b></p>	<p>Answers at this level will be more than just a comparison of the two documents; there will be some evaluation, but this will not be sustained and may focus on one perspective; assessment may not link key reasons and evidence clearly to the perspective or to the reasoned judgement.</p> <p>Effective and generally accurate explanation and reasoning; some evidence of structured argument / discussion; conclusions may not be explicitly stated or link directly to analysis.</p>
<p><b>Level 1</b> <b>1–5 marks</b></p>	<p>Answers at this level will describe a few points and there will be little or no evaluation of perspectives, although some relevant evidence or reasons may be identified. If there is any judgement it will be unsupported or superficial.</p> <p>Level of communication is limited; response may be cursory or descriptive; communication does not deal with complex subject matter.</p>