



**Cambridge Assessment
International Education**

Example Candidate Responses – Component 1

**Cambridge International AS & A Level
Global Perspectives & Research 9239**

For examination from 2023



© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2023 v1

Cambridge Assessment International Education is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment. Cambridge University Press & Assessment is a department of the University of Cambridge.

Cambridge University Press & Assessment retains the copyright on all its publications. Registered centres are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use. However, we cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within a centre.

Contents

Introduction.....	4
Question 1	6
Example Candidate Response – high	6
Example Candidate Response – middle	7
Example Candidate Response – low.....	8
Question 2	9
Example Candidate Response – high	9
Example Candidate Response – middle	12
Example Candidate Response – low.....	15
Question 3	17
Example Candidate Response – high	17
Example Candidate Response – middle	21
Example Candidate Response – low.....	24

Introduction

The main aim of this booklet is to exemplify standards for those teaching Cambridge International AS & A Level Global Perspectives & Research 9239, and to show how different levels of candidates' performance (high, middle and low) relate to the subject's curriculum and assessment objectives.

In this booklet candidate responses have been chosen from the June 2023 exam series to exemplify a range of answers.

For each question, the response is annotated with a clear explanation of where and why marks were awarded or omitted. This is followed by examiner comments on how the answer could have been improved. In this way, it is possible for you to understand what candidates have done to gain their marks and what they could do to improve their answers. There is also a list of common mistakes candidates made in their answers for each question.

This document provides illustrative examples of candidate work with examiner commentary. These help teachers to assess the standard required to achieve marks beyond the guidance of the mark scheme. Please also refer to the June 2023 Examiner Report for further detail and guidance.

The questions, mark schemes and insert used here are available to download from the [School Support Hub](#). These files are:

9239 June 2023 Question Paper 11

9239 June 2023 Mark Scheme 11

9239 June 2023 Insert 11

Past exam resources and other teaching and learning resources are available on the [School Support Hub](#).

How to use this booklet

This booklet goes through the paper one question at a time, showing you the high-, middle- and low-level response for each question. The candidate answers are set in a table. In the left-hand column are the candidate answers, and in the right-hand column are the Examiner comments.

Example Candidate Response – high		Examiner comments
1	<p>a</p> <p>1 The juvenile justice system has more rehabilitation than the punishment-focused criminal justice system. The juvenile justice system offers more protection. Also, it</p> <p>2 engages them in education, community service</p> <p>3 and work with people of their own age which has the potential to steer the youth toward more successful lives. 4</p>	<p>1 More rehabilitation is a correct answer.</p> <p>2 The juvenile system offering more protection is a different correct answer.</p> <p>3 The list of engagement in education and community service</p> <p>Examiner comments are alongside the answers. These explain where and why marks were awarded. This helps you to interpret the standard of Cambridge exams so you can help your learners to refine their exam technique.</p>

Answers are by real candidates in exam conditions. These show you the types of answers for each level. Discuss and analyse the answers with your learners in the classroom to improve their skills.

How the candidate could improve their answer

- **(a)** The candidate answered this question well and was awarded full marks. Recognising that some answers were duplications and therefore not including them would have saved the candidate time for this 3-mark question.
- **(b)** The candidate duplicated answers that could have been excluded.
- **(b)** The question required identification of negative effects rather than opinion. A good example would have been the stigmatisation of prisoners once they are released.

This section explains how the candidate could improve each response. It helps learners to improve their exam technique.

Common mistakes and guidance for candidates

- Some candidates used two or three examples of the same way or gave negative effects that were not necessary. This time could have been saved for Questions 2 and 3 that were worth significantly more marks.
- Some candidates gave quotes that, although valid in relation to the authors' arguments, were not relevant to the specific question. It is important that candidates clearly understand the requirement of the question before starting to read the documents and identifying relevant points.

This section lists common mistakes as well as helpful guidance from the examiner. This will help your learners to avoid these mistakes. You can use this alongside the relevant Examiner Report to guide your learners.

Question 1

Example Candidate Response – high

Examiner comments

1	a	<p>The juvenile justice system has more rehabilitation than the punishment-focosed criminal justice system. The juvenile justice system offers more protection. Also, it engages them in education, community service and work with people of their own age which has the potential to steer the youth toward more successful lives.</p>
1	b	<p>Two negative effects of prison on prisoners would be the hardening of non-violent offenders and losses of rights to humanity. Due to no seperating of violent and non-violent offenders, this mixing results in the influencing, recruiting and hardening of non-violent offenders. Also, without rehabilitation comes our belief that someone who is imprisoned automatically loses their right to basic humanity.</p>

- 1 More rehabilitation is a correct answer.
- 2 The juvenile system offering more protection is a different correct answer.
- 3 The list of engagement in education and community service is part of rehabilitation, so is not a different way as required by the question.
- 4 Steering youth towards more successful lives is a correct answer.
- 5 Influencing non-violent offenders because of mixing is a correct answer. Three alternatives are given, but only one is required
- 6 Losing their right to basic humanity is given as our belief and therefore not an effect.

Mark for (a) = 3 out of 3

Mark for (b) = 1 out of 2

Total mark awarded = 4 out of 5

How the candidate could improve their answer

- (a) The candidate answered this question well and was awarded full marks. Recognising that some answers were duplications and therefore not including them would have saved the candidate time for this 3-mark question.
- (b) The candidate duplicated answers that could have been excluded.
- (b) The question required identification of negative effects rather than opinion. A good example would have been the stigmatisation of prisoners once they are released.

Example Candidate Response – middle		Examiner comments
1	<p>a</p> <p>• "It has more rehabilitation than the punishment-focused criminal justice system." ①</p> <p>• "A prison record makes it more difficult to find housing and jobs later on."</p> <p>• "Juvenile court caseloads and detention populations actually declined."</p>	<p>① More rehabilitation is a correct answer.</p> <p>Mark for (a) = 1 out of 3</p>
1	<p>b</p> <p>• "overcrowding within prisons...resulting in the increasing recruiting and hardening of non-violent criminals" ②</p> <p>• "they face stigmatization that makes it difficult for them to live and earn." ③</p>	<p>② Influencing non-violent offenders mixing is a correct answer. Three alternatives are given, but only one is required.</p> <p>③ Stigmatisation is a negative effect of prison on prisoners and is a correct answer.</p> <p>Mark for (b) = 2 out of 2</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 3 out of 5</p>

How the candidate could improve the answer

- (a) The candidate needed to read the question more carefully and recognise that it was about how the juvenile justice system is better for young offenders, rather than the difficulties.
- (a) The candidate needed to look carefully at the quotes used and check that they applied to the question.
- (a) The candidate needed to be more selective when identifying different ways.

Example Candidate Response – low		Examiner comments
1	(a) Three ways the juvenile justice system is better is because it offers more protection, hide the records from public view ^{view} , and ^{it allows for} their mistakes ^{to not} affect them in the future. 1	<p>1 The juvenile system offering more protection is a correct answer, but the other parts: hiding the records from public view and allowing mistakes not to affect them in the future are just illustrations of the same point. They are not different ways.</p> <p>Mark for (a) = 1 out of 3</p> <p>2 Both of the candidate's points are mentioned by the author, but not in the context of negative effects of prison on prisoners. Neither is relevant to the question.</p> <p>Mark for (b) = 0 out of 2</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 1 out of 5</p>
1	(b) Two negative effects of prison on prisoners are that it extracts wealth from those least likely to afford afford it and it still upholds its racist and capitalist exploitation. 2	

How the candidate could improve their answer

- **(a)** The candidate needed to read the question carefully and recognise that it asked them to identify three different ways the juvenile justice system is better for young offenders. This means looking at a wider range of ideas put forward by the author to show understanding that there are other alternatives. For example, looking at rehabilitation, lower arrest rates and being steered towards more successful lives, rather than illustrating the same point three times.
- **(b)** Although the examples quoted by the candidate were given by the author, they were not relevant in the context of the question. Consideration of the negative effects of prison on prisoners, rather than quoting broad issues with the justice system were required for this answer.

Common mistakes and guidance for candidates

- Some candidates used two or three examples of the same way, or gave negative effects that were not necessary. This time could have been saved for Questions 2 and 3 that were worth significantly more marks.
- Some candidates gave quotes that, although valid in relation to the authors' arguments, were not relevant to the specific question. It is important that candidates clearly understand the requirement of the question before starting to read the documents and identifying relevant points.
- Answers only needed to be brief and could be in bullet points. Although the answers in the examples were concise, other candidates wrote too much. They often copied out parts of the documents without selecting much of relevance to the question. As Question 1 is only worth 5 marks out of 45, time management is important.
- It is good practice for candidates to read both documents first, then to answer the whole of Question 1, as this provides background understanding of both arguments which are also needed for Questions 2 and 3.

Question 2

Example Candidate Response – high

Examiner comments

2	<p>Document A has a number of strengths, such as the use of statistics. In the document the author quotes research that has figures comparing past and present, and the arrest numbers for different age groups. The use of clear statistics gives the reader a clear view of (developments in) the status and significance of an issue, making the arguments made stronger.</p> <p>Another strength of document A is the use of examples from multiple states. The author uses New York and Massachusetts as examples of states that have raised the age limits for juvenile courtcases. By using more</p>
---	---

- 1 Although the candidate does not quote figures, the example is valid and is recognised as a strength. There is no explanation as to why this is a strength. This part of the candidate's answer demonstrates AO1a and AO1b skills.
- 2 The candidate makes no attempt at evaluation. The impact of the evidence on the argument is described, but not explained. (AO1c)
- 3 This is a different type of evidence (breadth of evidence illustrated referring to various states rather than focusing on just one locality). The candidate gives examples of named states from the document. (AO1a) (AO1b)

Example Candidate Response – high, continued

Examiner comments

2	than one example, the author adds an extra layer of reliability to his work since an occurrence is less likely to be an accidental finding if it happens in more places than one place. This adds statistical significance to the argument.
4	Additionally, the author uses sources with authority and expertise in the subject, such as the US census and the Centers for disease control and prevention. Using such sources adds to the reliability of the given evidence, further strengthening the author's argument.
6	Besides strengths, the text also has weaknesses. One of these weaknesses is that the text does not always clearly cite where the information is from, instead just stating that "research has statist shows". This undermines the argument the author makes since the reader is unable to easily check the claim that is made, which makes the argument more unreliable.
8	Another weakness is the lack of clarity within the claims that are made. It is stated that juveniles going through the youth justice system have lower re-arrest rates than those that go through the adult system. This argument lacks evidence and statistical significance. The reader does not know how big the difference is which worsens the reliability and significance of the claim.

10

- 4 Significantly, the candidate explains why this example of evidence is a strength (unlike in point 1). (AO1b)
- 5 The candidate does not provide an explanation as to why this has an impact on the argument. It is simple assertion.
- 6 The candidate provides a further example linked to a strength, but it is not explained. (Similar to point 1)
- 7 The candidate makes an undeveloped point of evaluation. It is description rather than explanation, but is more than just assertion.
- 8 The candidate introduces the required balance into the answer by including weaknesses. This paragraph covers all AOs. There is an example of unnamed sources as weakness of evidence: 'research shows' and an explanation for why this is a weakness is given: 'the reader is unable to easily check the claim'. The candidate provides some evaluation that the argument might be 'unreliable', but it is not explained (like point 2 and point 7).
- 9 The candidate provides another weakness giving a wider range of types of evidence. These are unsupported statements with no statistics to show the relevance of the evidence. The reason this is a weakness is explained. There is, however, no link to the argument.
- 10 The candidate does not provide a summary to address the impact of the evidence on the argument, nor a judgement as to whether strengths were more significant than weaknesses.

Mark for AO1a = 5 out of 5

Mark for AO1b = 5 out of 5

Mark for AO1c = 2 out of 5

Total mark awarded = 12 out of 15

How the candidate could improve their answer

- **(AO1b)** Whenever the candidate recognised a strength or weakness of the evidence, it needed to be exemplified from the document. The key point for improvement would be for the candidate to have fully explained why the evidence identified is a strength or weakness, rather than just stating or implying that it is.
- **(AO1c)** The candidate needed to give a clear explanation as to how the evidence impacts on the argument. For example, 'the reader is unable to easily check the claim that is made, which makes the argument more unreliable', gives a partial explanation. It would be improved by explaining why this would be more unreliable, e.g. the source might be made up or may not have a credible background / provenance.

Example Candidate Response – middle

Examiner comments

2	<p>One strength of document A is the use of statistics. The author uses quantitative data throughout the argument. For example, the author compares the amount of 18-24 year olds married in 1960 and to 2010, in 1960 there were "45%" married, while in 2010, there only "9% were". The use of quantitative data makes the evidence more plausible, and allows readers to get an objective idea of evidence, rather than subjective. Therefore, the argument is strengthened due to the use of statistical evidence, rather than using vague words to describe the evidence.</p>
3	<p>Another strength of Document A is the solution. The solution is to raise the age to qualify for the youth justice system. This is a strength of</p>

1 The candidate's use of statistics as a type of evidence, exemplified by actual figures, quoted from the document is given as a strength. The reason why this is a strength has only limited explanation.

2 The candidate continues from the analysis of the strength of using statistics as a type of evidence to an explanation of the impact of the evidence on the argument.

3 The solution is part of the argument and not linked to evidence, so the candidate is not answering the question.

Example Candidate Response – middle, continued

Examiner comments

the argument because the solution is plausible, as it has been done before. The author includes evidence of the age being raised in New York and Massachusetts, showing that this change is more than possible, it has already happened in the country somewhere else. Therefore, the author's solution overall strengthens the argument.

On the other hand, Document A is weakened by the global scope of the argument. The argument only discusses the prison systems in the United States and fails to discuss other countries. This makes the argument less generalizable, as it does not relate to more than 1 country. If it had related to other countries, the argument ~~could have~~ would be able to compare to others. However, the scope is narrowed regarding other nations, thus weakening the argument and where the argument is relatable.

Additionally, a weakness of Document A is the use of sources. While the source provided evidence, there was a lack of cited sources. This consequently makes the argument less reliable, as there are no sources to check the credibility. ~~The author could include evidence that has no truth~~ For example, the author

- 4 The candidate mentions the two states, but this is copied from the document without any analysis and it therefore does not link clearly with the evidence. There are better links to global scope (point 5) which are more creditable.
- 5 This is a narrow use of evidence from one named location in the world. The candidate attempts an explanation, but it is only limited in its outcomes.
- 6 The candidate's explanation is focused on argument rather than evidence, so there is some evaluation of the impact on the argument, but not a developed explanation of why this evidence is a weakness.
- 7 A weakness is recognised, that there is a lack of cited sources, but this is not clearly exemplified nor is it implied that it might be an unsupported view of the author.

Example Candidate Response – middle, continued

Examiner comments

		included the statistic that 14,400 18 and 19 year olds had been arrested in California, but included failed to include where the information is from. The evidence lacks credibility, thus weakening the argument.	8
--	--	--	---

8 'The evidence lacks credibility' is a logical conclusion from the final paragraph, but the impact is not explained.

Mark for AO1a = 3 out of 5

Mark for AO1b = 3 out of 5

Mark for AO1c = 3 out of 5

Total mark awarded = 9 out of 15

How the candidate could improve their answer

- **(AO1a)** The candidate only used a limited range of types of evidence, but covered strengths and weaknesses. To improve, a wider range, such as considering the expertise of the author to select suitable evidence (strength) or that the author may no longer have access to accurate evidence (weakness) needed to be considered.
- **(AO1b)** Although both strengths and weaknesses were analysed there was only a limited explanation given. The candidate needed to give more detail as to why the evidence is a strength or weakness rather than just stating that it is without support. This would have given a more thorough answer.
- **(AO1c)** The candidate gave some evaluation of the impact of the evidence on the argument, but to improve they needed to make a judgement about how well the evidence supported the author's argument. For example, did the strengths of the evidence overall outweigh the weaknesses so that the credibility of the argument was well supported?

Example Candidate Response – low **Examiner comments**

2.		<p>The first two paragraphs of document A provide background information and the author's argument. However, from the third paragraph and further, there are great points backed with evidence and even counter-arguments. 1</p> <p>As the author states in paragraph three, "the youth justice system, though imperfect, is more appropriate," they go on to almost immediately provide a well placed piece of evidence stating that the youth justice system has more rehabilitation than the punishment-focused criminal justice system. The author then further backs this up by quoting 2 a research that was conducted. The author states that the Centers for Disease Control conducted research and the Prevention Fund, through research, that juveniles who are under the age of eighteen that go through the youth justice system have a much lower chance of re-arrest, this then feeds into 3 paragraph four, stating that with a criminal record, finding a job or proper housing can be much more of a challenge.</p>
----	--	--

- 1 The candidate's opening paragraph refers to background information and argument, evidence and counterarguments. The candidate uses terms, but does not illustrate them or explain what type of evidence. The candidate's opening paragraph is purely descriptive. This is not needed as time could be better spent on other parts of the answer.
- 2 The candidate's reference to rehabilitation is a statement and is not linked to a defined type of evidence.
- 3 The candidate links a strength to a type of evidence. Reference to research is key especially when exemplified. (AO1a) (AO1b)

Example Candidate Response – low, continued

Examiner comments

		The author then writes that the juvenile system is capable of
		holding those two hazards so that juveniles have a fair and
		equal chance with this almost counter-argument style piece of
	4	evidence. Paragraph five goes to explain that during the 1960s
		generally adopted the fact that most people, ages eighteen or more,
		were married and in an adult role, such as spouse, parent, or
		worker. The author then provides numerical evidence, which proves to be
		majority in their favor, stating that about forty-five percent
		of youth ages 18-21 were married in 1960. More recently, however, that
		percentage has dropped to nine percent. 5
		Overall, the amount of well structured and well timed execution
		of evidence has proven to be in the authors favor to convey
		their argument well. 6

4 The candidate provides further description from the document which is not analysed.

5 The candidate provides a second example of a type of evidence that is recognised as a strength. There are no weaknesses given, so the answer lacks balance and only has a limited range.

6 The candidate's final statement does not relate to the document and could apply to any situation, so there is no evaluation of impact.

Mark for AO1a = 3 out of 5

Mark for AO1b = 2 out of 5

Mark for AO1c = 0 out of 5

Total mark awarded = 5 out of 15

How the candidate could improve their answer

- **(AO1a) (AO1b)** This question required candidates to 'Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence...' 'Assess' includes identifying the types of evidence and analysing their strengths and weaknesses. Focussing on these points rather than simply describing what the author wrote in the document would have improved the candidate's answer.
- **(AO1b)** This question also required a balance between assessment of strengths and weaknesses so mentioning only strengths was a disadvantage for the candidate.
- **(AO1c)** Evaluating the evidence by looking at its impact on the author's argument was worth 5 out of the 15 marks, but the candidate did not attempt this. Ensuring all parts were completed would have improved the candidate's answer and potentially given a higher mark.

Common mistakes and guidance for candidates

- **(AO1a)** Candidates were expected to give examples from the document to illustrate the types of evidence, rather than providing a general answer that could apply to any document.
- **(AO1b)** Candidates concentrated more on strengths of the evidence, rather than the weaknesses (or the opposite), and only stated them with limited explanation. Candidates should look to give clear explanations about why the evidence was a strength or a weakness, rather than just stating that it was.
- **(AO1c)** Candidates were expected to evaluate the impact of the evidence on the argument. This ranges from making a simple assertion, through some evaluation of the impact, to evaluation that includes a judgement. A common error was for candidates to not link the impact of the evidence to the argument, instead relying on a basic assertion that was a low-level skill. To improve, candidates should look to evaluate the impact on the argument and come to a judgement. For example, evaluating how well the evidence shows, or does not show, the credibility of the argument.

Question 3

Example Candidate Response – high

Examiner comments

3	<p>Authors of Document A and B present different arguments to the justice system. While Document A focuses mainly on the youth offenders and their placement in adult prisons, how their placement in adult prisons should be stopped, Document B focuses on the unfairness the justice system is in general and how it should be more effective in helping rehabilitating offenders. With all of this said, they both have their strengths and weaknesses in their arguments.</p> <p>The author of Document A uses statistics from official sources as evidence to support its claim on the treatment of juvenile offenders. This can be seen on the fifth and sixth paragraphs when they use the US census as their source. This strengthens their data argument as it makes the author's claim less opinionated and backed up with reliable evidence. Additionally, the author's use of an official source being the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention also makes its their argument better supported. When compared to the author</p>
---	--

1 The candidate's opening paragraph analyses and compares the different perspectives of the authors. (AO1b) This is a good way to show understanding of the arguments.

2 The candidate identifies the first key component of the argument – use of supported statistics – for Document A. So far, there is no comparison with Document B. (AO1a) There is some evaluation as to what the supporting information is, namely the US Census, but no further explanation as to why this is reliable evidence. (AO1c)

Example Candidate Response – high, continued

Examiner comments

3	Of document B's use of evidence, it has stronger evidence. This is because Document B ba includes no statistics in its evidence making its claim sound opinionated with little support to its claim that pe offenders should be provided with opportunities and to make the justice system more fair. By sounding opinionated the argument of document B is weakened because it can sound bias.	3 The candidate makes a comparison with Document B of the same type of evidence. The candidate states that no statistics are given in Document B and then demonstrates some evaluation by describing that the claim sounds opinionated rather than supported by evidence.
4	Also, the evidence of Document B includes vague sources or no source at all. This is seen when it states, "Decades of research" and "Given the main numbers". With vague sources, the credibility of the evidence can not be checked, therefore making the author's argument weak.	4 The candidate makes an implied judgement that Document B is weakened by the potential bias, but although reasoned it is unsupported by evidence. (AO1d)
5	Although, despite Document B's weak evidence to support the perspective of the author, the author takes more variables into consideration and off when speaking on the issue of offender's treatment, than author of Document A. The author of Document B takes into consideration, race, monetary status, and overcrowding of prisons. This broad use of variables makes its argument strong because it makes it more applicable and demonstrates to the reader the multiple	5 The candidate uses several examples from Document A to reflect how this is a key part of the argument. It is not compared at this point with Document B.
6	complex variables taken into consideration. In comparison, Document A only focuses on the age of the offender as a variable to their	6 The candidate's evaluation is developed and supported with a clear understanding of how these examples strengthen the argument.
7	argument. This makes their argument weak as it seems less applicable to a more narrow amount of people. This also seen by Document	7 The comparison is now made, but the evaluation of the argument for Document A is unsupported and undeveloped. The candidate provides a partly supported judgement to show that this part of the author's argument in Document A is weaker as it is more narrowly focused.

Example Candidate Response – high, continued

Examiner comments

	<p>A's focus on California alone while Document B focuses on a more general group of people. However, both Document A and B use a counterargument to support their claim. In Document A this is seen in paragraph 6 at the beginning and Document B this is seen when it states "There are always those who argue". The use of a counterargument by both Documents makes both of their arguments stronger because it means they took into consideration opposing points of view and still could support their argument.</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>In conclusion, when taking both Document A and Document B into consideration, Document A includes a more stronger argument than Document B because of its stronger evidence, use of expert sources and its more factual and logical tone as compared to Document B's emotional and persuasive tone. Document B's more emotional tone makes it seem more bias. This is also supported by the fact that the author of Document A is more of a credible source than the author of Document B. While Document A is written by Vincent Schiraldi a former commissioner of the New York City Department of Probation and Co-director of the Columbia University Justice Lab, Document B was is written by Akola Thompson a journalist in Guyana. Therefore the author of Document A has more expertise and experience on</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>10</p>

8 A counterargument is a key component of an argument and is described with quotations for both documents. There is a partly supported judgement that both Documents A and B are strong because of this.

9 Although the candidate's paragraph begins with 'In conclusion', there are more comparisons of key components of the argument that have not previously been used. The first is about the difference in tone, Document A as persuasive and Document B as emotional. These are relevant points of comparison for AO1a.

10 Another key component of an argument is the provenance of the authors and the documents. The candidate makes a comparison and evaluation of the significance has added to the credibility of the arguments.

Example Candidate Response – high, continued

Examiner comments

<p>11</p> <p>12</p>	<p>the subject of the justice system than that of Document B. Also Document A is author is has a more reliable reason for writing the article as it is published in a known credible news reporting source that the "LA Times" therefore it was written to be factual and accurate. While, Document B was written by a young columnist meaning they lack experience and published in a minority report therefore suggesting it was written to persuade readers more through pathos than through hard evidence. With all of this said, despite Document A and Document B each having their weaknesses and strengths, Document A is stronger argument is stronger than that of Document B.</p>	<p>11 The candidate's whole final paragraph is building towards a reasoned judgement, but it is only partly supported as it just uses new supporting material rather than using all that is available.</p> <p>12 Communication (AO3) is assessed for the whole answer. The candidate produces a clearly written (expressed), well-structured argument that links to the question.</p> <p>Mark for AO1a = 5 out of 5</p> <p>Mark for AO1b = 4 out of 5</p> <p>Mark for AO1c = 4 out of 5</p> <p>Mark for AO1d = 3 out of 5</p> <p>Mark for AO3 = 4 out of 5</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 20 out of 25</p>
---------------------	--	--

How the candidate could improve their answer

- **(AO1b)** The candidate needed to explain the perspectives of both documents, rather than just describe them.
- **(AO1c)** Some of the evaluation was undeveloped or unsupported. To improve, the candidate needed to fully illustrate from the document and fully evaluate the relevance of the key component on the overall argument.
- **(AO1d)** The candidate's judgement was all partly supported with the final paragraph introducing new ideas rather than concluding. Where the key components of the argument for both documents are compared it is good practice to use an intermediate judgement clearly supported by the material provided by the candidate. In addition, a final paragraph should use key points as support to make an overall judgement as to whether Document A is stronger than Document B, Document B is stronger than Document A, or they are equally strong.
- **(AO3)** Although the candidate's answer was clearly written (expressed) and well-structured it would have been improved with a more logical argument and one that focused on the question throughout.

Example Candidate Response – middle

Examiner comments

3 Document A and B present different arguments and perspectives on the justice system and both includes various strengths and weaknesses to their argument.

Document A had various strengths and weaknesses when it comes to developing its argument and establish perspectives. Document A effectively establishes various perspectives as one source mention was from the Chief Probation Officers of California which is also a credible source as they have the ~~bee~~ background and experience of prisons and establishes good qualitative data. Not only does Document A have strong qualitative data, but it also has strong quantitative data as Schiraldi talks about in the 1960, 45% of ~~gee~~ youths were married to support his claim as to why young offenders should go through the juvenile system rather than the adult system. Furthermore, Document A was written in 2020 which is pretty recent, bring relevance to the author's argument. However, Document A primarily talks about prisons in California rather than prison reform in a global context, limiting the perspectives of the argument. Furthermore Document A provides a ~~strong~~ strong solution, however doesn't provide a way to implement his solution which may weaken his argument. Additionally, Document A may have potential bias as

- 1 The candidate considers Document A and Document B separately. The named source gives a key component of the argument for Document A.
- 2 The candidate shows evaluation of this credible source by recognising their experience of prisons. This is unsupported evaluation as the reasons they are a credible source and why this should be considered a strength to the argument are not clearly given.
- 3 The candidate gives three further key components of evidence – the [recent] publication date, the [limited] geographical scope and the solution put forward. There is no comparison with Document B at this stage. There is unsupported evaluation of the impact of a narrow geographical focus.

Example Candidate Response – middle, continued

Examiner comments

the author ~~was~~ was a former commissioner of the New York City Department of Probation which yes it brings background, knowledge, and credibility, but could also bring some bias as well. On top of that Document A failed to mention a counter claim to strengthen its argument. Thus, Document A poses many strengths and weaknesses, when establishing the argument and perspectives.

Document B has various strengths and weaknesses when it comes to supporting its overall argument. Document B was written by a journalist living in Guyana and is a freelance writer so she may ~~be~~ have a vested interest to promote her work as she doesn't work with a big company.

Furthermore, the Document ~~the~~ B was written in 2020 as well as Document A, which also shows the relevance of the issue as it is pretty recent, ~~therefore~~ which strengthens the claims and evidence made ~~to~~ as the information is up to date. ~~however~~ however, Document B has no kind of stats or quantitative data whatsoever and ultimately weakens the overall argument of ~~the~~ Document B that those in prison just need to be provided with opportunities and reform. ~~the~~ On top of that Document B states that prisons are primarily composed of those who are poor and black and doesn't use

Document B has various strengths and weaknesses when it comes to supporting its overall argument. Document B was written by a journalist living in Guyana and is a freelance writer so she may ~~be~~ have a vested interest to promote her work as she doesn't work with a big company. Furthermore, the Document ~~the~~ B was written in 2020 as well as Document A, which also shows the relevance of the issue as it is pretty recent, ~~therefore~~ which strengthens the claims and evidence made ~~to~~ as the information is up to date. ~~however~~ however, Document B has no kind of stats or quantitative data whatsoever and ultimately weakens the overall argument of ~~the~~ Document B that those in prison just need to be provided with opportunities and reform. ~~the~~ On top of that Document B states that prisons are primarily composed of those who are poor and black and doesn't use

4 The candidate now considers Document B, starting with a comparison of the background of the authors which was covered in the previous paragraph of the answer about Document A.

5 The candidate makes a comparison of the publication dates with both being similar and recent. There is an unsupported and undeveloped evaluation of the significance of this point.

6 The candidate considers the perspective of the author of Document B and gives limited description. There is no equivalent analysis of the perspectives of Document A.

Example Candidate Response – middle, continued	Examiner comments
<p>any kind of evidence to support that claim. Thus, Document B has many strengths and weaknesses to to. However, Document does include a counterclaim as she acknowledges other viewpoints and perspectives as she talks about how some may like prison better and the stigma about being imprisoned you lose human rights, which ultimately strengthens the overall argument made in Document B.</p>	<p>7 The candidate makes further points of comparison in this paragraph and an intermediate judgement. However, although this has reasoning in the paragraph, it is unsupported as there is no reference to the approach of the author of Document A.</p>
<p>In conclusion, Document A has a stronger argument since it includes a variety of statistics, it's strong solution, and use of credible sources to develop its argument that young offenders don't belong in adult prisons, despite not mention the problem in a global aspect and having potential bias. What ultimately makes Document A stronger than Document B is the fact that Document A uses more substantial evidence to support its argument and perspectives.</p>	<p>8 The candidate's conclusion covers some of the points made in the whole answers and makes a judgement that Document A has a stronger argument than Document B. The judgement, though, is only partly supported.</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>9 Communication (AO3) is assessed for the whole answer. The candidate produces a clearly written (expressed) argument that links to the question. However, by writing about the two documents separately, this leads to an uneven structure as the intermediate judgements are limited and there is repetition and assumptions when comparing the documents.</p> <p>Mark for AO1a = 5 out of 5 Mark for AO1b = 2 out of 5 Mark for AO1c = 2 out of 5 Mark for AO1d = 3 out of 5 Mark for AO3 = 3 out of 5</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 15 out of 25</p>

How the candidate could improve their answer

- **(AO1a)** Although the candidate compares a wide range of key components of arguments for both documents, they were separated by writing about Document A and then about Document B. Comparing the key components directly would make for a more concise answer and have benefits for both AO1c and AO1d.
- **(AO1b)** The candidate should look to describe and explain the perspectives of both documents rather than just one. It is good practice to compare the perspectives of both documents at the start of the answer describing and explaining their significance.
- **(AO1c)** The candidate's evaluation was undeveloped or unsupported. To improve, the candidate should have given full illustrations from the document and fully evaluated the relevance of the key component on the overall argument.
- **(AO1d)** The judgement was limited with only one intermediate judgement that was unsupported and the final paragraph having a partly supported judgement. As the candidate distinctly separated the answers into Document A and Document B there was very limited opportunity to make relevant intermediate judgements. Making a direct comparison throughout the answer would have improved the opportunity for good judgements. In addition, a final paragraph should use key points as support to make an overall judgement as to whether Document A was stronger than Document B, Document B was stronger than Document A, or they were equally strong.

Example Candidate Response – low

Examiner comments

3	<p>In documents A and B, arguments are and perspectives are expressed regarding the justice system. While both documents offer a good argument, document B's is stronger and more balanced than document A's.</p> <p>Document B's conclusion, 'People in prison do not lack humanity or the capacity to grow and develop... effective justice and prison systems must be put in place', is well-supported by Author, A'kolo Thompson, a free-lance writer and journalist living in Guyana published in 'the Minority report', and 'Starbrook News in Guyana'. To begin, Thompson includes both the benefits and drawbacks that prison can effect prisoners. Benefits include, the gaining of essential knowledge and skills, this can do a lot to improve their lives after release. Additionally, prisoners who are exposed to and participate in, prison rehabilitative programmes are less likely to reoffend. Drawbacks include, violent and non-violent offenders existing in the same space, this often results in</p>
---	---

1 The candidate's opening paragraph gives an overall judgement, but it is unsupported and simply stated at this stage.

2 While addressing the author's conclusion in Document B, the candidate identifies a perspective of the author of Document B but with limited description. There is no comparison with the perspective of the author of Document A.

3 The background of the author is a key component of argument – it is given here for Document B without any comparison with Document A.

Example Candidate Response – low, continued

Examiner comments

	hardening of non-violent criminals, additionally, when prisoners are released, they face stigmatization that makes it difficult to
4	for them to live and earn. The benefits and the drawbacks imbedded in the document allows for it to become balanced and well-thought out.
	Document A, on the other hand doesn't contain a balanced argument for the candidate's statement that young offenders
5	do not belong in adult prisons. The document only contains the benefits of a juvenile prison for young offenders, including, lower re-arrest rates for youths that go through juvenile prison than through the adult system, engaging them in education, community service, and work with people their own age
	has the potential to steer youth towards more successful lives and those who go through the juvenile system can have their records hidden hidden
6	from public view. Document A only focuses on the benefits of their argument making it unreliable as the document lacks balance.

4 The candidate is descriptive with the information taken from the document without any link to the key components of argument, perspective, or evaluation. It does not add to the candidate's argument.

5 Document A is referred to separately with a comparison of the balance of the argument being given at the start of this paragraph and the end of the previous paragraph. There is some unsupported evaluation.

6 This section is descriptive, adding nothing to the candidate's argument.

Example Candidate Response – low, continued	Examiner comments			
<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td>To conclude, Document B contains a stronger, more clear clear argument when compared to the argument of Document A.</td> </tr> </table>			To conclude, Document B contains a stronger, more clear clear argument when compared to the argument of Document A.	<p>7 As Document A and B are considered separately there are no intermediate judgements. The candidate's final paragraph simply repeats the assertion of the first paragraph. It is unsupported and stated only.</p>
		To conclude, Document B contains a stronger, more clear clear argument when compared to the argument of Document A.		
<p>8</p>	<p>8 Communication (AO3) is assessed for the whole answer. The candidate produces an argument, but it lacks clarity and structure and does not always link to the question.</p> <p>Mark for AO1a = 2 out of 5 Mark for AO1b = 2 out of 5 Mark for AO1c = 2 out of 5 Mark for AO1d = 1 out of 5 Mark for AO3 = 2 out of 5</p> <p>Total mark awarded = 9 out of 25</p>			

How the candidate could improve their answer

- **(AO1a)** The candidate relied on describing information from the documents, rather than considering the key components of the arguments and evaluating them. Considering key components of the argument such as evidence, background / provenance of authors, structure and tone would have improved the answer.
- **(AO1b)** The candidate needed to describe and explain the perspectives of both documents rather than just one. It is good practice to compare the perspectives of both documents at the start of the answer describing and explaining their significance.
- **(AO1c)** The evaluation was limited and undeveloped which reflected the lack of identification in AO1a. To improve, the candidate needed to give full illustrations from the document and have fully evaluated the relevance of the key component on the overall argument.
- **(AO1d)** The judgement in the first and last paragraphs was simply stated. As the candidate distinctly separated the answers into Document A and Document B there was very limited opportunity to make relevant intermediate judgements. Making direct comparisons of a range of key components of argument would have helped with providing supported intermediate judgements.
- **(AO3)** As much of the answer was simply descriptive information from the documents, much was not linked to the question. Having a more focused approach would impact on all the AOs and lead to improvement.

Common mistakes and guidance for candidates

- **(AO1b)** This question specifically asked candidates to consider the authors' perspectives as part of evaluating the argument. Many candidates either did not evaluate perspectives at all or did so in a limited way. A perspective is made up of an argument, evidence and assumptions and may be influenced by a particular [global] context. The perspective is the overall point the author is making / what the author is writing about / what the overall argument the author is making. It gives an overview. The most effective approach is for candidates to consider the perspectives of the documents at the start of the answer, as it prepares for the following detailed consideration of the arguments. This helps the structure of the answer as it leads into consideration of the detail of the argument covered by AO1a and AO1c.

- **(AO1d)** This question asked candidates to evaluate the arguments of both authors and consider their perspectives. Candidates were also required to provide a judgement about whether one argument was stronger than the other. This outcome could be that Document A was stronger than Document B, Document B was stronger than Document A, or they were both equally strong. Some candidates wrote about Document A, and then Document B which made judgement difficult and relied on a final concluding paragraph to make their point. Several candidates appeared to run short of time which meant that the judgement was limited. This could have been improved by comparing each key component of the argument for each document throughout, evaluating it and coming to an intermediate conclusion. This would be a more concise and structured approach to the answer.
- **(AO3)** Communication skills were only assessed in this question. The main issue was a lack of structure in the answer making points that overall did not provide a clear, coherent approach. Making a plan before writing the answer would help candidates structure their answer. The answer could have included an introduction to consider the perspectives, then several paragraphs looking at key components of the arguments and comparing them, before giving an intermediate conclusion for each. To finish, a full conclusion to consider all the supporting detail then making a judgement as to whether one argument was stronger than the other. There would be no need to repeat all of the supporting reasoning and evidence, but a well written summary and judgement would complete the answer clearly.

Cambridge Assessment International Education
The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA, United Kingdom
t: +44 1223 553554
e: info@cambridgeinternational.org www.cambridgeinternational.org

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2023 v1