



**Cambridge Assessment International Education**  
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND INDEPENDENT RESEARCH**

**9777/02**

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<sup>®</sup>, 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"> <li>• The essay is logically structured and explores the issues <b>effectively, fully and concisely</b> without being too brief. A range of <b>relevant</b> sources is used, cited and <b>fully</b> referenced.</li> <li>• There are at <b>least two relevant</b> and <b>contrasting</b> global perspectives stated <b>and</b> explained, using globally contrasting sources.</li> <li>• There is effective selection and critical use of relevant evidence so that the relationship between sources, perspectives and the wider context is <b>clear</b>.</li> <li>• The argument is <b>fully</b> developed with the premises challenged appropriately. The perspectives and sources are <b>critically evaluated</b>.</li> <li>• The essay considers the implications and consequences of <b>each</b> perspective and, through reflection, reaches a <b>convincing, balanced and supported</b> conclusion.</li> <li>• The limitations of the evidence are <b>fully</b> recognised and the need for further research is suggested and its likely impact is <b>assessed</b>.</li> </ul>

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

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