

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

**MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2015 series**

**1340 GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES**

**1340/01**

Paper 1 (Written Paper), maximum raw mark 30

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – October/November 2015	1340	01

## 1 Study Document 1.

### (a) Identify two methods in Document 1 that countries are using to stop migration. [2]

Examiners should be aware that this question is worth only two marks and candidates are asked to simply identify methods; it is not expected that they will develop or explain their ideas.

Candidates may identify some of the following:

- Greece is building vast prison-like detention centres for the many migrants who use the country to stop on their way to less economically troubled parts of Europe.
- In the US, a state-of-the-art border fence and high-tech cameras aim to stop the influx of Mexican and other Central American migrants.
- Australia keeps possible illegal migrants arriving by boat in detention centres on Christmas Island, Nauru and other off-shore islands.

### (b) Summarise the author's view on the negative impact of attempts to stop migration. [6]

Examiners should be aware that the question is worth only six marks and therefore candidates are not expected to write at great length. The question also asks the candidates to summarise the author's view so candidates should not be overly rewarded for copying out large sections of the document.

Examiners should award one mark for each valid point made up to a maximum of six marks. A point that is fully developed should be awarded two marks.

Candidates may mention/develop the following:

- Although the number of migrants has remained unchanged their reception in receiving countries has become less tolerant.
- They are very severe with little regard for humanitarian considerations or migrant and refugee rights.
- They exemplify the criminalisation of migration with most governments having closed down legal migration channels in an attempt at reducing immigration numbers and this has led to social and political problems being blamed on migrants.
- People have sought out alternative, more dangerous, desperate and illegal ways to move across borders.

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – October/November 2015</b>	<b>1340</b>	<b>01</b>

## 2 Study Document 1.

**Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the view presented by the author in Document 1.**  
[10]

Responses should focus on both the strengths and weaknesses of the view presented by the author.

- At Level 3 candidates must consider both the strengths and weaknesses.
- At Level 2 there is likely to be imbalance, with most of the answer focusing on the weakness of the view presented by the author, although some may focus largely on the strengths.
- At Level 1 it is likely that candidates will consider only one side of the view presented by the author.

<b>Level 3</b> <b>8–10 marks</b>	Sustained evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of the author’s view, critical assessment with explicit reference to how flaws and strengths impact on the view.  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.
<b>Level 2</b> <b>4–7 marks</b>	Some evaluation of strengths and/or weaknesses of the view, but evaluation may focus on one aspect.  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.
<b>Level 1</b> <b>1–3 marks</b>	Little or no evaluation of strengths and/or weaknesses, although flaws, etc. may be identified.  Level of communication is limited, response may be cursory or descriptive; communication does not deal with complex subject matter.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – October/November 2015</b>	<b>1340</b>	<b>01</b>

No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. There is much material that candidates might consider and examiners should note that not all is required to gain maximum marks; what matters is the quality of argument.

### Strengths

- The author provides a structured approach to the failures of countries to tackle international migration and has a consistent approach to this theme.
- Several detailed examples are given to illustrate the approach many countries take and their consequences. There is a clear global perspective in paragraphs 2 and 3 with examples from Europe, Americas, Australia and India.
- There is use of emotive description to draw the reader to understand the impact on migrants. “Rickety and overloaded vessels filled to the brim with migrants...”
- Author identifies that examples of attempts at stopping migration have a common thread. (Paragraph 4)
- Reference is made to the outcomes of migration research. Although this isn’t referenced, like the examples given, the author is a university lecturer and therefore may bring credibility to her statements.
- There is a clear conclusion and strong statement of opinion regarding faults in the system. There is some reference to a possible broader approach in the penultimate paragraph.

### Weaknesses

- There is little use of statistical evidence (one reference to 3% of world’s population).
- The document consists of much assertion, although supported by detail it is unclear where this has come from or where the research was done.
- The article generally follows one line of reasoning, that migration cannot be stopped regardless of the intervention of countries and that their approach is often too draconian. There is little counter-argument.
- Examples used may have selective bias – the reader has no idea of why these are used when others are not.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – October/November 2015	1340	01

### 3 Study Documents 1 and 2.

**To what extent is Document 2 more convincing than Document 1 in establishing a case for the better management of migration?** [12]

Responses should focus on key reasons and evidence in both documents to compare alternative perspectives and synthesise them to reach a reasoned judgement. To assess whether Document 2 is more convincing than Document 1 in establishing a case, candidates should consider not only the content of the documents, but also critically assess the arguments put forward through a consideration of issues such as the nature of the passages, purpose and language.

- At Level 3 candidates will reach a sustained comparison. In order to do this they will have covered a significant range of issues, and evaluated them clearly. Response offering some high quality evaluative points may be placed lower in this level. To reach the top of this level the full descriptor must be met.
- At Level 2 there will be some evaluation and comparison, but it will be either poorly developed or limited in the areas covered.
- At Level 1 there will be very little comparison of the passages or evaluation and candidates may simply describe or identify areas of similarity and difference.

<p><b>Level 3</b> 9–12 marks</p>	<p>Answers at this level will demonstrate a sustained judgement about which view is more convincing. 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> 5–8 marks</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> 1–4 marks</p>	<p>Answers at this level will compare 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>

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – October/November 2015	1340	01

### Indicative content

- Document 2 suggests some “ways forward” in terms of global or co-operative ventures, to resolve issues and share management of migration flows. Although fewer specific examples the solutions are more global.
- Document 1 tends to have a political perspective, concentrating on policing, whereas Document 2 has both a political and economic viewpoint, looking more at management and overall impact of the migratory process.
- Both authors write from an academic standpoint but it could be argued that the author of Document 1 has more credibility as a lecturer at The University of Kent whereas the author of Doc 2 is an academic researcher at the Centre of International Affairs, Barcelona.
- Document 1 follows an argument that is focussed with little counter-argument. It looks to blame over-zealous and restrictive practices at a country scale. It does not offer solutions to the impact of migration.
- Document 2 has a more balanced approach and aims to look for alternative solutions to the problem of migration most notably by linking with economic development policies.
- Document 2 starts with a bold, unsupported statement.
- Whereas Document 1 refers to criticism of the action of countries Doc 2 looks to co-operation and understanding, reflecting on the impact, not only of destination countries, but also origin and transition countries. For example referring to the impact of shared knowledge on origin and destination countries.
- Neither document uses much in the way of statistics. Document 2 is more specific referring to a population the size of Brazil and referring to them as the world’s fifth nationality. She also cites the origin of the data as the U.N. The impact of the language is more significant in Doc 2.
- Both documents leave the reader to interpret the information provided.
- Both documents provide assertions with no citations giving the origins of the data. However, as a result of this both have strong views. Doc 1 could be considered as stronger given the amount of detailed examples that are provided.