

Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH**9239/13**

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 **23** 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.

Science–Specific Marking Principles

1	Examiners should consider the context and scientific use of any keywords when awarding marks. Although keywords may be present, marks should not be awarded if the keywords are used incorrectly.
2	The examiner should not choose between contradictory statements given in the same question part, and credit should not be awarded for any correct statement that is contradicted within the same question part. Wrong science that is irrelevant to the question should be ignored.
3	Although spellings do not have to be correct, spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. ethane / ethene, glucagon / glycogen, refraction / reflection).
4	The error carried forward (ecf) principle should be applied, where appropriate. If an incorrect answer is subsequently used in a scientifically correct way, the candidate should be awarded these subsequent marking points. Further guidance will be included in the mark scheme where necessary and any exceptions to this general principle will be noted.
5	<u>'List rule' guidance</u> For questions that require <i>n</i> responses (e.g. State two reasons ...): • The response should be read as continuous prose, even when numbered answer spaces are provided. • Any response marked <i>ignore</i> in the mark scheme should not count towards <i>n</i>. • Incorrect responses should not be awarded credit but will still count towards <i>n</i>. • Read the entire response to check for any responses that contradict those that would otherwise be credited. Credit should not be awarded for any responses that are contradicted within the rest of the response. Where two responses contradict one another, this should be treated as a single incorrect response. • Non-contradictory responses after the first <i>n</i> responses may be ignored even if they include incorrect science.

6 Calculation specific guidance

Correct answers to calculations should be given full credit even if there is no working or incorrect working, **unless** the question states 'show your working'.

For questions in which the number of significant figures required is not stated, credit should be awarded for correct answers when rounded by the examiner to the number of significant figures given in the mark scheme. This may not apply to measured values.

For answers given in standard form (e.g. $a \times 10^n$) in which the convention of restricting the value of the coefficient (a) to a value between 1 and 10 is not followed, credit may still be awarded if the answer can be converted to the answer given in the mark scheme.

Unless a separate mark is given for a unit, a missing or incorrect unit will normally mean that the final calculation mark is not awarded. Exceptions to this general principle will be noted in the mark scheme.

7 Guidance for chemical equations

Multiples / fractions of coefficients used in chemical equations are acceptable unless stated otherwise in the mark scheme.

State symbols given in an equation should be ignored unless asked for in the question or stated otherwise in the mark scheme.

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.

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 importance of formal remittances for the Bangladeshi economy. Identify three reasons that the value of formal remittances to Bangladesh is not increasing, as given by the author 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 three marks. - Workers / migrants are low-skilled - Over-supply of workers - Fake job letters / empty promises of employment - Hundi / informal (remittance) methods / channels Do not accept: - Stricter regulations that force recruiting agencies to send a certain proportion of skilled workers abroad. - The government gains foreign currency from formal remittance methods	3

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	The authors of Document B discuss the importance of professionalizing public health services to address the problem of brain drain. Identify two countries where steps are being taken to professionalize public health services, as given by the authors 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 two marks. • Rwanda • Liberia Do not accept: • Africa • Sweden • U.S. / Canada / Europe	2

Question	Answer	Marks
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.	
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	Mark	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	Mark	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	Mark	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 I 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 I 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 the government must increase the level of remittances received from emigrating workers. 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 author's use of comparative statistics (T) USD 203.33 per month, significantly lower than the USD 564.10 sent by a Filipino worker (EG) is a strength (+) because the comparison between Bangladeshi and Filipino remittances contextualises the data in a meaningful way and clearly demonstrates just how low Bangladeshi remittances are compared to other countries, strengthening the problem for Bangladesh. (EXP) The statistics support the author's argument that high skilled workers would increase the value of remittances. (I^) • First-hand evidence: from a principal of a technical training centre said...; • Relevant / expert sources: According to data from the Bureau of Manpower, Employment and Training (BMET); according to data from the International Organisation for Migration; Dr Selim Raihan • Patterns and trends: the proportion of low-skilled migrants increased from 75.24% in 2021 to 78.64% in 2022. • Author's expertise: Siddiqui... specialization in the fields of migration, national and overseas employment, aviation, tourism and hospitality (so evidence provided should be accurate) • Date of publication: same as date of data in Doc so evidence is current • Publication: Bangladeshi daily newspaper– local to the issue so should provide accurate evidence / information • Current evidence: dates 2020–21, 2023, all near date of document so current to issue • Specific numerical data: USD 24.77 billion, increased from 75.24% in 2021 to 78.64% in 2022. • Relevant examples: countries such as Oman;	15

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Weaknesses • Unsourced statistics: <i>In 2022, a record year, Bangladeshi workers secured 11.35 lakh (1.135 million) overseas jobs; USD 24.77 billion remittance peak; '75.24% to 78.64%' increase in low-skilled migrants; average of USD 203.33 per month</i> • Unnamed experts: <i>According to migration experts; labour experts said</i> • Anonymous sources: <i>principal of a technical training centre, who asked to remain anonymous said</i> • Approximate figures: <i>remaining around USD 22 billion</i> • Claims unsupported by data: <i>'Recruiting agencies favour sending unskilled workers over skilled workers'; 'Many workers are given fake job letters'</i> No comparative regional analysis: <i>less than workers from 'other countries,' and other countries are not specified</i>	

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	

PUBLISHED**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

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 the two documents present different arguments and perspectives on work and migration. 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] Doc A is talking about migrating workers leaving Bangladesh. (P[^]) Doc B is talking about the brain drain in Africa. (P[^]) [Example only] Doc A's perspective is that the Bangladeshi government needs to increase the value of remittances. (P) Doc B's perspective is that Africa needs to invest in health workers/stop health workers from moving abroad to work. (P) [Example only] Doc A's perspective is that the Bangladeshi government needs to increase the value of remittances. The remittances that Bangladeshis working abroad send home are vital for the economy and Bangladesh should employ strategies to increase those remittances. The author acknowledges the positives of exporting workers. In complete contrast Doc B's perspective is that Africa needs to invest in health workers/stop health workers from moving abroad to work. Doc B argues that workers migrating from Africa has negative consequences. Doc B says that by improving the employment conditions for health workers, they will be less likely to want to move abroad, and this will allow African countries to grow their health workforce. (PD) [Example only] Doc A's perspective is that the Bangladeshi government needs to increase the value of remittances. This is because exporting workers is vital for economic security. Doc A understands the serious economic difficulties that Bangladesh faces and that remittances are an important source of money for the economy. Doc A's perspective is informed by statistics that show the value of remittances are not increasing and so Doc A's argues for three solutions that will help increase the level of remittances Bangladeshi workers send home. In contrast, Doc B's perspective is that Africa needs to invest in health workers/stop health workers from moving abroad to work. This is because the authors recognise the number of health workers per population in Africa is reducing standards of care and creating negative employment conditions for workers. Doc B's view is informed by data and experiences from different African countries and tries to speak for the whole continent about the importance of growing the number of people working in health care in Africa. (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. • [annotated example] Doc A is stronger than Doc B given that the solutions offered by Doc A are more tangible and directly related to the issue of increasing the level of remittances. Doc A successfully sets out the issue and then offers three precise ways in which the government can improve the value of remittances by tackling current problems. Each of these problems are explained clearly with reference to examples, statistics and sources making for a strong and easily understood argument (EVAL). Doc B's solutions are less clearly related to the issue of tackling the brain drain (C). The link between professionalising both public health supply chain management and community health workers as a solution to the brain drain is not as clear which makes it more difficult for the reader to follow. As such the argument presented by Doc A is stronger than Doc B's. (J^) • Relevant statistical evidence: Doc A is stronger, as all statistics offered are explicitly relevant to the issue of remittances '11.35 lakh (1.135 million) overseas jobs', 'remits an average of USD 203.33' whereas Doc B has some less relevant statistics 'An additional 11,625 participants joined the conference sessions online'. • Wider Global relevance – Doc B has a wider global perspective as it addresses an issue facing the whole continent 'it's projected that Africa will have a shortage of 6.1 million health workers' and uses examples from a African countries, an international conference as well as making comparisons with Western countries whereas Doc A is focused very much on the issues facing Bangladesh with brief references to other countries. • Emotional connection– Doc B is stronger, as it paints a picture of the experience of patients and healthcare workers 'Patients may even get turned away from health centers' and extra stress on overstretched doctors and nurses already struggling' whereas Doc A refers to Bangladeshi workers as a commodity 'workers being exported' with no description of their lived experience or the personal impact of working abroad. • Structure – Doc A and Doc B are equally strong; Doc A sets out the issue in the introduction and then provides three solutions. Similarly Doc B sets out the issue in the introduction and then provides two solutions. Both documents conclude by saying their respective solutions need to be implemented.	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3	International sources – Doc B and Doc A both make reference to international sources, Doc A International Organisation for Migration Doc B International Conference on Public Health in Africa and World Health Organization. Indicative content – Judgement [Example only] A candidate may conclude that Doc B is stronger because it has wider global perspective as it refers to the problems faced by a whole continent in contrast to the narrow view offered by Doc A's focus on just one country, Bangladesh. The wider global focus of Doc B makes the issue of healthcare worker shortage seem more important. A candidate may conclude that Doc A is stronger because there is a wider range of evidence types provided and all are explicitly relevant to the issue in contrast to Doc B which has a narrower range of evidence some of which lacks relevance to the issue. Doc A's use of quotations by people with first hand experience coupled with well contextualised statistics provide a clear view of the problem for the reader. Neither Doc A nor Doc B is stronger as they both have similarly structured arguments which set out the issue in an introduction followed by a range of solutions and a short conclusion. The structure of the documents makes them similar in style and allows the reader to follow the logical progression of both arguments.	