

Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH**9239/12**

Paper 1 Written Exam

May/June 2026**MARK SCHEME**Maximum Mark: 45

Published

This mark scheme contains the instructions and marking guidance that our examiners used to mark candidate responses for this component.

Before they start marking, examiners complete a standardisation process. They review a range of candidate responses and discuss the mark scheme in detail to agree which answers can and cannot be accepted. Examiners award marks where it is clear that candidate responses have met the requirements of the mark scheme. These requirements may vary between different components or different versions of the same component, depending on the exact requirements of the question and the candidate responses seen during the standardisation process.

Sometimes, our mark schemes may allow marks to be awarded to responses which contain elements that are factually incorrect or for content not covered by the syllabus. We do this in response to the demands of a specific question to support candidates and make sure that our assessments are fair. However, these allowances should not be used as a guide for teaching and learning.

We cannot discuss the mark scheme with schools, and we recommend that schools read the mark scheme together with the assessment material and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

This document consists of **24** printed pages.

General marking principles

All examiners must apply these marking principles when marking candidate responses.

1	Examiners must award marks for each response in line with: - the specific content defined in the mark scheme - the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the level descriptions - the standard of response required as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.
2	Examiners must award whole marks (not half marks, or other fractions).
3	Examiners must award marks positively . This means that: - marks are not deducted for errors or omissions - marks are awarded for correct/valid answers as defined in the mark scheme and also for other valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme referring to your team leader as appropriate - the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar are judged only when the mark scheme indicates that these features are specifically assessed in the question. However, the meaning of all responses must be unambiguous.
4	Examiners must consistently apply the requirements of the mark scheme and any rules for what to do when candidates have not followed instructions correctly.
5	Examiners must use the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme, unless limited by the quality of the candidate responses seen.
6	Examiners must award marks according to the mark scheme and must not award marks with grade thresholds or grade descriptions in mind.

**Social Sciences-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 credit answers which are obviously self-contradicting or trying to cover all possibilities
- f** 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).
- g** 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.
- Content in the answer column in brackets is for examiner information/context to clarify the marking but is not required to earn the mark (except Accounting syllabuses where they indicate negative numbers).

3 Calculation questions:

- The mark scheme will show the steps in the most likely correct method(s), the mark for each step, the correct answer(s) and the mark for each answer
- If working/explanation is considered essential for full credit, this will be indicated in the question paper and in the mark scheme. In all other instances, the correct answer to a calculation should be given full credit, even if no supporting working is shown.
- Where the candidate uses a valid method which is not covered by the mark scheme, award equivalent marks for reaching equivalent stages.
- Where an answer makes use of a candidate's own incorrect figure from previous working, the 'own figure rule' applies: full marks will be given if a correct and complete method is used. Further guidance will be included in the mark scheme where necessary and any exceptions to this general principle will be noted.

4 Annotation:

- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
- 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.

Annotations guidance for centres

Examiners use a system of annotations as a shorthand for communicating their marking decisions to one another. Examiners are trained during the standardisation process on how and when to use annotations. The purpose of annotations is to inform the standardisation and monitoring processes and guide the supervising examiners when they are checking the work of examiners within their team. The meaning of annotations and how they are used is specific to each component and is understood by all examiners who mark the component.

We publish annotations in our mark schemes to help centres understand the annotations they may see on copies of scripts. Note that there may not be a direct correlation between the number of annotations on a script and the mark awarded. Similarly, the use of an annotation may not be an indication of the quality of the response.

The annotations listed below were available to examiners marking this component in this series.

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Correct, creditworthy point. Used in Question 1 only.
	Incorrect point. Used in Question 1 only
	Identify type of evidence. (Without an example) Used in Q2 (AO1a)
	Example of type of Evidence. Used in Q2 (AO1a)
	Strength or weakness of evidence recognised but with limited explanation. Used in Q2 (AO1b)
	Strength or weakness of evidence clearly explained. Used in Q2 (AO1b)
	Impact of evidence is asserted and not explained. Used in Q2 (AO1c)
	Shows undeveloped point. Added to other annotations (EVAL, P, J and U in Q2 and Q3)

Annotation	Meaning
J	Added to I to show the inclusion of a judgement. Used in Q2 (AO1c)
K	Identification of key component of argument. Used in Q3 (AO1a)
E	Comparison of key components from both documents. Used in Q3 (AO1a)
P	Identification of perspectives with limited description. Used in Q3 (AO1b)
PD	Analyses by comparing and describing perspectives in both documents. Used in Q3 (AO1b)
PE	Analyses by comparing and explaining perspectives in both documents. Used in Q3 (AO1b)
ND	Unsupported evaluation of argument. Used in Q3 (AO1c)
EVAL	Evaluation of argument in both documents. Used in Q3 (AO1c)
U	Unsupported judgement. Used in Q3 (AO1d)
J	Supported judgement. Used in Q3 (AO1d). Can also be used in Q2
S	Structured argument Used in Q3 (AO3)
NAQ	Not answering the question.
REP	Repetition. When repeating a point as a summary or simply stating another example that does not develop the evaluation.
SEEN	To show that answers/pages have been assessed.
On page comment	On Page Comment. Used where necessary to clarify a decision.

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 using ✓ or ✗. 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 annotate clearly in the left-hand margin according to the specific instructions provided.

Refer to the marking grid at the end of each question to award a mark based on the annotations for each aspect (e.g. AO1a). Record the mark for each aspect (e.g. AO1a) in the right-hand marking panel on RM Assessor.

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

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	The author of Document A discusses the causes of food shortages. Identify <u>two</u> countries where conflict has triggered food shortages, as given by the authors of Document A. 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. • Ukraine • Ethiopia • Afghanistan Do not accept: • Libya (caused by floods) • South and Central America (not countries and caused by extreme weather)	2

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	The author of Document B argues that we can take action to fight global hunger. Identify <u>three</u> actions we should take, as given by the author of Document B. 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. • Send an email (to Australia)/send an email (calling on Australia) • Leave a message for Norway's/the country's leaders • Sign a petition (to world leaders)/signing our petition to world leaders • calling on world leaders to do something Do not accept: • Take action (the question) • Support smallholder farmers (world leaders, not us)	3

Question	Answer	Marks
Instructions for Question 2		
The question assesses AO1. (Research, analysis and evaluation)		
Answers should be written in continuous prose. 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.		
Annotate clearly in the left-hand margin according to the instructions provided below.		
There are three aspects to consider when marking the answer:		
Identify evidence (AO1a). Candidates should identify a range of types of evidence and give examples. Annotate with T if no example given or EG if type is given and exemplified.		
T	Identify type of evidence. (Without an example)	
EG	Example of type of evidence.	
Analyse strengths and weaknesses of evidence (AO1b). Candidates should analyse both strengths and weaknesses of a range of evidence used by the author including an explanation. For limited explanation use + for strength and – for weakness. For clear explanation use EXP		
+	Strength of evidence recognised but with limited explanation.	
-	Weakness of evidence recognised but with limited explanation.	
EXP	Strength or weakness of evidence clearly explained.	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
Evaluate evidence (AO1c). Impact of evidence may be asserted and not explained (A) Evaluation may be attempted but not explained (I ^) [I and ^ are two separate annotations on RM]. Candidates explain the impact of evidence on the author's argument/perspective [I] and include a judgement of its effectiveness. (I J)		
A	Impact of evidence is asserted and not explained.	
I ^	Shows undeveloped point of evaluation. Evaluation attempted but not explained.	
I	Evaluation of impact of evidence on argument/perspective.	
I J	Evaluation of impact of evidence on argument/perspective and includes judgement.	

Marking grid for Question 2

Examiners should allocate a mark for each aspect (AO1a, AO1b, AO1c), using the mark descriptors and required annotations.

AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation

AO1a Identify evidence	Marks	Annotations
Identifies a wide range of different types of evidence with examples	5	4 EG or more
Identifies a range of different types of evidence with examples	4	3 EG
Identifies a limited range of different types of evidence with examples	3	2 EG
Identifies a limited range of evidence, using different types or examples	2	2 T or 1 EG
Identifies one type of evidence	1	1 T
Identification of evidence is not present. No creditable material.	0	No T or No EG

AO1b Analyse strengths and weaknesses of evidence	Marks	Annotations
Analyses strengths and weaknesses of a wide range of evidence with clear explanation	5	2 + (or more) and 2 – (or more) with 2 or more EXP
Analyses strengths and weaknesses of a range of evidence with clear explanation	4	2 + and 1 – (or opposite) with 1 EXP
Analyses strengths and weaknesses of a range of evidence with limited explanation	3	2 + and 1 – (or opposite) with 0 EXP
Analyses strengths or weaknesses of a range of evidence with limited explanation	2	[2 +] or [2 –] or [1 + and 1 –]
Explanation of strengths or weaknesses of evidence is limited	1	[1 +] or [1 –]
No analysis is present. No creditable material	0	No + or – or EXP

PUBLISHED

AO1c Evaluate evidence	Marks	Annotations
Evaluation includes a range of explanations of the impact of evidence on the argument/ perspective and makes reasoned judgements	5	2 I (or more) and 1 J
Evaluation includes a range of explanations of the impact of evidence on the argument/ perspective	4	2 I (or more)
Evaluation includes an explanation of the impact of evidence on the argument/ perspective	3	1 I
Evaluation is attempted but lacks clarity, and the impact of evidence on the argument/perspective is not explained	2	1 I ^ (or more)
The impact of evidence on the argument/perspective is asserted and not explained	1	1 A (or more)
No evaluation is present. No creditable material	0	No A, I ^, I or 1 J

Examiners allocate a mark for each aspect (AO1a, AO1b, AO1c), using the mark descriptors and required annotations.

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author of Document A to support their argument that there is plenty we can do to keep more people from falling into hunger. In your answer, include the impact of the evidence on the author's argument. Indicative content No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content. Strengths • <i>[annotated example]</i> The provenance (T) of the UNWFP (EG) gives credibility (+) to their claim that there no real global food shortage and that there is plenty we can do about the issue. Their expertise and access to information, as a global organisation, the US division of United Nations World Food Program, which works in over 100 countries and territories, makes the author's evidence credible as it is based on their research and is based on their experience which should be sound. (EXP) This strengthens their argument.(A) • Numerical evidence: 1.3 billion tons could feed 1.26 billion people; 139 million civilians; 400 million people; • Global real-world examples: Conflict: Ukraine, Ethiopia, Afghanistan. Climate change: South and Central America Libya. Solutions: South Sudan show that this is a global issue • Relevant examples: Conflict, economic shocks, climate change and soaring prices; scientists, farmers, and transport experts; destroying agricultural land, roads, and infrastructure • Named organisations: U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO); World Food Program USA; United Nations World Food Program • Expert sources: U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO); World Food Program USA; United Nations World Food Program • Sourced evidence: World Food Program USA report; According to the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization Weaknesses • Little detailed evidence about how wasted food could feed undernourished people/ how communities restore degraded land. • Limited range of sources, all UN related could show selectivity • Some figures unclear and not contextualised 27% increase, 15 000 football fields. Do not tell us about the amount of food produced.	15

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2	• Unsourced evidence: much of it is unsourced (numbers and information from Ukraine, 80% of the world's hungriest people, etc) • Vague numerical evidence: More than 80% • Bias/Vested interest: the report cited is by the World Food Program and the Doc is by the World Food Program, so they are not using impartial evidence/reports	

Question	Answer	Marks
Instructions for Question 3		
The question assesses AO1 (Research, analysis and evaluation) and AO3 (Communication).		
Answers should be written in continuous prose. 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.		
A perspective is made up of argument, evidence and assumptions and may be influenced by a particular context.		
Annotate clearly in the left-hand margin according to the instructions provided below.		
There are five aspects to consider when marking the answer:		
Identify and compare key components of arguments (AO1a). Candidates should identify a range of key components of arguments from both documents. Annotate with K if key component is identified for one document and C if key component is compared for both documents.		
K	Identification of key component of argument for one document	
C	Comparison of key components from both documents.	
Analyse and compare perspectives (AO1b). Candidates should analyse by identifying, describing and explaining the perspectives given in both documents. Identification only (P ^), identification with limited description (P), comparing and describing in both documents (PD) and comparing and explaining in both documents (PE).		
P ^	Identification of perspectives with no description.	
P	Identification of perspectives with limited description.	
PD	Analyses by comparing and describing perspectives in both documents.	
PE	Analyses by comparing and explaining perspectives in both documents.	

Question	Answer	Marks
Evaluate arguments (AO1c). Candidates should aim to evaluate key components of arguments with clearly illustrated and balanced reference to both documents. Evaluation may be unsupported (asserted) (ND). Evaluation includes illustration with reference to both documents. (EVAL)		
ND	Unsupported evaluation of argument.	
EVAL	Evaluation of argument in both documents.	
Judgement about argument and perspective (AO1d). Candidates should aim to give a reasoned and supported answer which includes intermediate conclusions and a main conclusion. The judgement may be unsupported (U ^ or U), partly supported (J ^) or clearly reasoned and supported (J)		
U ^	Unsupported judgement – stated only	
U	Unsupported judgement – with reasoning	
J ^	Partly supported judgement – with reasoning	
J	Supported judgement – with reasoning	
Communication (AO3) A candidate should aim to produce a clearly expressed, well-structured and logical argument that is focused throughout on the question. Structure should include introduction, clear paragraphs and conclusion, should flow and answer the question. Each paragraph should follow on logically and contain a separate point. Each new idea should be clearly indicated – preferably in a new paragraph. 'Logical' means that it is easy to follow the argument as there are no sudden changes of direction leading to confusion in the reader. No annotation is required except NAQ to show not linking to the question. The mark should be selected by using the guidance that follows the mark tables. Choose the most appropriate descriptor in the marking grid.		
NAQ	Not answering the question	

Marking grid for Question 3 – AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation

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

AO1b Analyse and compare perspectives	Mark	Annotations
Analyses by comparing and explaining the perspectives given in both documents	5	1 PE or more
Analyses by comparing and describing the perspectives given in both documents	4	1 PD or more
Identifies and compares both perspectives but with limited description	3	2 P (one for each Doc)
Identifies one perspective but with limited description	2	P
Identifies one perspective with no description	1	P ^
No identification of perspectives. No creditable material	0	No P^, P, PD or PE

PUBLISHED

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

*Note: a candidate who does not mention both documents is not awarded more than 1 mark

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

AO3 Communication

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

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

Further guidance for AO3 is given below.

Guidance for awarding marks for AO3 in Question 3.

- If a candidate makes no attempt to develop an argument at all, the maximum score is **1 mark**.
- If a candidate made little attempt to answer the question and had lots of NAQ (e.g. was very descriptive or wrote an essay on their own opinion of the subject matter) the maximum score is **2 marks**.
- If a candidate wrote very little/ wrote in bullet points/has limited content that addresses the question the maximum score is **2 marks**
- If the answer was not clearly expressed or focussed mainly on one document, it lacks clarity and has uneven structure and may only be worth **2 marks**.
- If a candidate wrote in continuous prose, expressed themselves clearly and addressed the question, start at **3 marks** – then consider if it better fits the descriptions above or below **3 marks**.
- If the answer has an introduction, clear paragraphs, considers both documents in a balanced way, reaches a judgement and generally links to the question it could be worth **4 marks**.
- If the answer contains the criteria for **4 marks** above, is logical and has no irrelevant content (No NAQ) it could be worth **5 marks**.
- 'Clearly written' refers to the content and the ease of being able to follow the candidates' argument. It should be thought of as: 'clearly expressed'.
- The quality of handwriting should not be considered as a factor when awarding marks. This is not what 'clearly written' means in the descriptors.

Question	Answer	Marks
3	The authors of both documents present different arguments and perspectives on global hunger. Evaluate the arguments of the authors of both documents. In your answer, consider their perspectives and include a reasoned judgement about whether one argument is stronger than the other. No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some parts of the following indicative content. Indicative content – Perspectives • [Example only] The authors Doc A are talking about global hunger. (P[^]) • [Example only] The author Doc B is talking about global hunger. (P[^]) • [Example only] The Perspective of Document A is that we/the global community can do lots of things to stop people suffering from hunger/there isn't an overall shortage of food, there is just one in certain places. (P) • The Perspective of Document B is that world leaders need to do something now to solve world hunger/a call to action that we should all encourage world leaders to do something. (P) • [Example only] The authors of both documents believe that the issue of hunger can be solved and that there is, in reality, no global food shortage. Khanyi Mlabi (Doc B) provides a clear perspective that world leaders could solve the issue of global hunger and that we should pressure them to do so. She describes the many actions ordinary people can take to pressure world leaders to do more. The World Food Program USA (Doc A) has a similar perspective that there is plenty that can be done to stop more people falling into hunger. But they talk more about the many non-natural causes of world hunger and the things that could happen in the global community to stop hunger at its source. (PD) • [Example only] The authors of both documents believe that the issue of hunger can be solved and that there is, in reality, no global food shortage. Khanyi Mlabi (Doc B) provides a clear perspective that world leaders could solve the issue of global hunger and that we should pressure them to do so. Her perspective comes from her work with Global Citizen, who aim to end extreme poverty worldwide. As a result of her work, she believes that activism can make a difference. The World Food Program USA (Doc A) has a similar perspective that there is plenty that can be done to stop more people falling into hunger. Their perspective has developed from many years of experience in the area of global hunger. However, this is more related to direct actions taken by the UN World Food Program than individual activism. Doc A outlines many of the actions already taken by the organisation to help communities. (PE)	25

Question	Answer	Marks
3	Indicative content – Arguments No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. At each point of comparison, candidates may argue that either Document is stronger, or they are equally strong. Candidates may include some of the following indicative content. [Example only] Clear supporting Evidence: Doc A is stronger than Doc B because it provides more supporting evidence for its argument. The WFPUSA (Doc A) provides convincing statistics and examples to support their argument that there is no global food shortage (1.3 billion tons of wasted food is enough to feed 1.26 billion people) and that there are specific reasons for food shortages, including conflict (examples from Ukraine, Ethiopia, Afghanistan) and climate change (South and Central America, Libya). These statistics and examples contextualise their argument and help the reader to understand the issue of global hunger. (EVAL) In Doc B, Khanyi Mlabi provides only one statistic about poverty, (less than 10%) (C) a general statement that we are going backwards and no examples of places where smallholder farmers have been helped or need more help.(ND). This lack of supporting information and detail makes Doc B seem weaker than the well supported argument in Doc A (U). Logical structure: The argument in Doc A is stronger because it is well-structured. It introduces the issue of global food shortages, explains some of the causes, providing detailed examples, then goes on to give clear examples of the possible solutions. It provides examples of work already done to help prevent disaster-induced food shortages. This leads logically to the conclusion that there is plenty to be done about the issue. Doc B is less well-structured. It does start with a quote from David Beasley saying we should all be afraid, with some discussion about poverty, but no real explanation of the issue of hunger and how it is caused. Then it goes straight into a range of things we could do, mainly contacting a range of people about it and asking them to do something. The actual solutions are not so clear. Appeal to emotion: Doc B is stronger because the author, Khanyi Mlabi, puts the reader in the picture. She convinces us that all we need to do is contact world leaders and persuade them to take action and the issue of hunger will be solved by them. She asks the rhetorical question ‘How can we help’ and then lists things we can do, as ordinary people. She uses emotive language ‘global food systems are broken’ and concludes by appealing to our sense of humanity. Doc A is more matter of fact and more concerned with telling us what the UN World Food Program is doing. It has less of an impact on us as readers because it does not give us a role. Simple message: Doc B is stronger because the author concentrates on one main solution. The solution is to support smallholder farmers. Khanyi Mlabi tells us that helping smallholder farmers can solve the hunger crisis and build sustainable food systems. All it needs is the engagement of world leaders. This is easier for us to grasp than the more complex message of Doc A which can sometimes be confusing. It tells us that there is no shortage of food but then it gives us 4 causes of the hunger crisis. It gives us explanations and examples of two of those causes and gives us one vague solution for one of those. Then it tells us that the UNWFP helps prevent disaster-induced shortages. Doc A is more difficult to follow so this makes Doc B stronger.	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3	• Gaps in the argument: Both documents have gaps in the argument. Doc B does not explain for example why there is a global hunger problem or how contacting Australia will help. Doc A does not explain how economic shocks or soaring food prices are caused or what their impacts might be. Doc A does not explain what can be done about the lack of skilled people, financial capital or environmental resources. Doc A gives us a lot of information about the impact of conflict but does not suggest any solutions. • Similar conclusions: Both documents conclude that there is much we can do to solve the problem of global hunger. Food shortages and hunger are not inevitable. Indicative content – Judgement [Example only] A candidate may conclude that Doc A is stronger because it provides more supporting information and evidence and gives the reader a fuller picture of the issue of hunger and food shortages while Doc B lacks supporting information and evidence and concentrates only on some general actions we could take. A candidate may conclude that Doc B is stronger because it appeals to emotion and is easier to follow, while Doc A is more formal, less direct and more confusing. A candidate may conclude that neither Doc A or Doc B is stronger, they have different strengths and weaknesses but they both have gaps in their logic, and they come to similar conclusions.	