Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES (MAURITIUS)   **8030/01**

Paper 1 Written Examination   **October/November 2025**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 30

<div style="border:1px solid black; text-align:center; padding:20px;">

Published

</div>

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2025 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptions for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1: Marks must be awarded in line with: - the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question   - the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question   - the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.
GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2: Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).
GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3: Marks must be awarded **positively**:   - marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate   - marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do   - marks are not deducted for errors   - marks are not deducted for omissions   - answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.
GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4: Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

PUBLISHED
Social Science-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.
➕ or ➖	Strength or weakness of evidence or element of argument identified. Used in **Question 2** and **3**.
=	**Equal/similar.** Use in **Q3** to indicate similarities in strength or weakness of the two arguments, where both are equally strong or weak.
EVAL	**Fully Developed point.** Includes Assessment, Explanation and Illustration, **fully** supported relevant points in **Questions 2** and **3**. In **Q3** includes impact.
ND	**Needs developing.** (missing one of the required elements for full development)
A	**Assertion** (unsupported statement of assessment or candidate's own opinion)
ILL	**Illustration (Not assessment or evaluation)** Where candidate quotes or refers to passage, relevant to their assessment/evaluation/comparison (may include close paraphrase or extrapolation)
J	**Judgement.** Used in both **Q2** and **3** to indicate final and/or interim judgements.
C	**Comparison.** Used in **Question 3** where there is explicit comparison.

Annotation	Meaning
NAQ	**Not answering the question.** For example, when response shows misunderstanding of the question or parts of the response are irrelevant.
L1 **L2** **L3**	**Level 1, 2 or 3 response.** Used at the end of **Q2** and **Q3** to give overall level for the question.
On page comment	**On Page Comment.** If needed to provide summative comments particularly where an answer has just achieved a level (to indicate what is missing/lacking)
SEEN	Use on any blank pages or extra sheets to indicate that these have been looked at. Also where a candidate has written something uncreditable, repeated points, or where no other annotations are appropriate, to indicate that the work has been read.

Note
The mark scheme cannot cover all points that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases candidates may think of very strong answers which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should be credited according to their quality. If examiners are in any doubt about an answer they should contact their Team Leader or Principal Examiner. For answers marked by levels of response:

(a) Mark grids describe the top of each level.

(b) **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer.

(c) **To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	Award mark
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**Identify <u>two</u> historical reasons why women play an equal work role in China, as mentioned by the author in Document 1.** RM Assessor annotation: ✓ for each correct identification. The annotation should be placed within the body of the text to indicate where the marks were awarded. **Credit 1 mark** for each correct identification (**up to two marks**) Credit correct versions of e.g. • **National need during Communism:** Women were expected to work just as hard as men to provide for the many. They needed the entire population to be working. • **Education** If you are a female born after 1980 in a major Chinese city, your chances of attaining higher education are significantly better. **(implies improves status at work)** • **Status** In recent years more women are reaching high status work positions in the tech industry. **Credit 0 marks** for answers with no creditworthy material.	2

Question	Answer	Marks

1(b)	**Explain <u>one</u> reason why the US needs to be more like China by including more women in senior roles, as mentioned by the author in Document 1.**
	
	Credit 2 marks for a developed explanation.
	
	Credit correct versions of:
	
	Because tech companies in China, with women leading, are competing successfully with US companies. So if US wishes to compete, it must include women in those roles **[2]**
	
	Because women in China successfully run Chinese companies. So if the US wishes to keep up, they need to encourage women to run US companies. **[2]**
	
	Because empowered women in senior roles overwhelming support other women in a ripple effect, encouraging women to found new internet companies and become entrepreneurs. So if the US increases the number of women in senior roles, this will bring success to the tech industry. **[2]**
	
	Credit 1 mark
	
	• for a **simple explanation** e.g.
	     Women led tech companies in China are competing successfully with US tech companies. **[1]**
	     Women in China successfully run Chinese companies. **[1]**
	     Empowered women in senior roles overwhelming support other women **[1]**
	
	Credit 0 marks for answers with no creditworthy material.
		2

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence the author uses in Document 1 to support their views.** Use the levels-based marking grid below (page 15) to credit marks. No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following: **Strengths:** The author: • **uses research statistics to support claim –** to support the claim *Studies illustrate this difference in gender culture,* the author presents the *Silicon Valley Bank study of 900 or so…, 54% of U.S. tech companies answered 'one or more' … in China, nearly 80%...* • **uses specific examples** – the examples of the Didi success: *Jean Liu, the president of Didi, China's largest app-based taxi service, was a woman and a mother* and the example of *Chen Xiaohong, who recently raised a $500 million fund, mainly in tech. This is the largest female-run investment fund in the world.* • **named sources** – *The US Silicon Valley Bank, the Chinese government, Bloomberg, Zhao and Fong,* so it is possible to check the credibility of the evidence. • **quotes first-hand experience –** to give direct insight into the effects of children in work. from Chen Xiaohong: *She says that bringing her children helped build a bond with many of the entrepreneurs she backed.* **Weaknesses:** The author: • **Vague sources:** Zhao and Fong – not clear who they are and whether they have expertise or knowledge to support their views. • **Unclear statistics –** 900 or so clients, nearly 80% • **presents examples of success that might not be typical –** if the company success of *Didi* over *Uber* and that of *Chen Xiaohong* as running the largest female-run fund in the world are not representative of the performance of other female led companies in China, it would limit the support of the author's evidence for her claim about *women at senior levels* in China and the *need to learn from the Chinese success of having women at senior levels.* • **Lack of balance in evidence**– although the author uses evidence of and about women in work in China from *Zhao, Fong*, *Chen Xiaohong, and the Chinese government,* there are no clear examples or sources from the US. This weakens support for the argument that the US needs more women in senior roles in the tech industry.	12

Question	Answer	Marks
2	• **Some unsourced evidence** – e.g. *several common views. Over many years women have played an equal work role in China.* Without known provenance the credibility of the evidence is weakened*.* There is no requirement to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the assessments made.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**The authors of Documents 1 and 2 present arguments about gender issues.** **To what extent is the authors' argument in Document 2 more convincing than that of the author in Document 1?** Use the levels-based marking grid (page 15) to credit marks. No set answer is expected, and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following: (please note – these should be explained) **More convincing** **(because provides):** • **Provides possible solutions** – UNDP: China (Doc 2) gives several practical solutions to women's inequality e.g. *gender-specific job advertisements* and *flexible working arrangements*; whereas Lacy (Doc 1) simply suggests *If the US wants to keep up we need to look at China and the role of women* without providing any specific suggestions about how this can be done. • **wider first-hand research** – UNDP: China (Doc 2) uses the research of UNDP representatives and consultants living in China (authors) and the first-hand views of *policy-makers, business leaders, academics and international organisations* to inform their argument; whereas Lacy (Doc 1)'s argument is informed only by her own experience of one summer in China investigating one specific company battle. • **Wider range of sources** – UNDP: China (Doc 2) uses sources from the US…*Silicon Valley Bank, American Public Health Association, Harvard Law School Forum* and *Hewlett Packard* as well as sources from China e.g. *Chinese Academy of Sciences* and *Jean Lili;* whereas Lacy (Doc 1) provides fewer sources mainly from China…*The Chinese government*, *Chen Xiaohong*, *Zhao* and *Fong.* • **a more up to date argument** – UNDP: China (Doc 2) was published in *2021*; whereas Lacy (Doc 1) was published in *2017*, 4 years later. So, the authors of Doc 2 are likely to be aware of recent developments in technology, which is a fast-developing industry, especially post Covid-19. • **more authorial expertise/authority** – as a UN programme, UNDP: China (Doc 2) has the benefit of the UN's international authority, reputation and expertise to convince readers, whereas Lacy (Doc 1) is less well known as a single investigative journalist. **Less convincing :** • **less engaging personal tone** – UNDP: China (Doc 2) is written as a report by several authors, so has a less engaging tone; whereas Lacy (Doc 1) writes the findings of an investigative journalist, written in a personal tone, which readers might find more engaging, *Whilst in China for a summer investigating this…. I was surprised by…. My favourite part….*	14

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**lacks a personal interest story –** UNDP: China (Doc 2) relates a series of research findings, whereas Lacy (Doc 1) includes the personal story of *Chen Xiaohong* and her success as a mother with young children and work, which readers might find more convincing. **possibly more vested interest –** UNDP: China (Doc 2) has the stated aim *to raise awareness of gender stereotypes in science and technology,* so it may be more selective in choosing evidence to support this; whereas Lacy (Doc 1) is an *investigative journalist* whose job is to explore the situation. **Neither more or less convincing because different:** **Different perspectives –** UNDP: China (Doc 2) looks at women in the tech industry in China from the inside. The authors *are UNDP resident representatives in China and UNDP: China consultants* and so have an internal perspective of how it can improve; whereas Lacy (Doc 1) is looking at the lessons that can be learned from China's successes from the outside, *we need to be more like China and include women at senior levels in the US tech industry.* Both perspectives could be true at the same time. **Neither more or less convincing because similar:** **Both arguments present relevant, clear statistics –** Both UNDP: China (Doc 2) and Lacy (Doc 1) give statistics from the US Silicon Valley bank study *examining how women got on at senior levels.* **Both give clear examples –** UNDP: China (Doc 2) claims *car safety products, including seat belts and air bags, are modelled to fit the typical male* as an example of why women's judgements are necessary in tech; likewise, Lacy (Doc 1) cites of *Chen Xiaohong as* an example of *Chinese success of having women at senior levels* **Judgement** Candidates they might conclude: - that overall UNDP: China (Doc 2) presents a more convincing argument because it uses more first-hand personal testimony, has more authorial expertise and presents more solutions. **or** - that Lacy (Doc 1) presents a more convincing argument with an engaging tone, personal interest story. Credit should be given to any alternative judgement on the basis of the assessment and reasoning e.g., that both arguments are equally strong. There is no requirement to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the assessments made.	

Level Descriptors. Skills level tables for Questions 2 and 3 (Please see page 6-7 for guidance on annotations)
Use the levels table to determine an appropriate level and mark:

Question 2

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	8–12	• **Both** strengths and weaknesses are assessed. • Assessment of evidence is **sustained, and a judgement is reached.** • Assessment explicitly includes the **impact** of specific evidence upon the claims made. • Communication is **highly effective** – explanation and reasoning **accurate** and **clearly** expressed.
L2	4–7	• Answers focus more on **either** the strengths **or** weakness, although **both** are present/identified. • Assessment identifies strength **or** weakness of evidence with little explanation. • Assessment of evidence is relevant but **generalised, not always linked** to specific claims. • Communication is **accurate** – explanation and reasoning is **limited**, but **clearly** expressed.
L1	1–3	• Answers show **little** or **no** assessment of argument/s. • Assessment, if any, is **simplistic**. • Evidence may be **identified,** and weakness may be **named**. • Communication is **limited** – response may be **cursory** or **descriptive**.
	0	• no creditable material.
Note: Each point of assessment of evidence requires a clear statement of the strength or weakness, an illustration from the text, plus an explanation of the assessment / its impact.		

Question 3

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	10–14	- The judgement is **sustained** and **reasoned**. - Alternative perspectives have **sustained** assessment. - Critical evaluation is of **key** issues raised in the passages and has **explicit** reference. - Explanation and reasoning are **highly effective**, accurate and clearly expressed. - Communication is **highly effective** – clear evidence of a structured cogent argument with conclusions explicitly stated and directly linked to the assessment.
L2	5–9	- Judgement is **reasoned**. **One perspective** may be focused upon for assessment. - Evaluation is present but may **not relate to key** issues. - Explanation and reasoning are **generally accurate**. - Communication is **accurate** – some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment.
L1	1–4	- Judgement, if present, is **unsupported** or **superficial**. - Alternative perspectives have little or no assessment - Evaluation, if any, is **simplistic/undeveloped**. Answers may **describe** a few points comparing the two documents. - Relevant evidence or reasons may be **identified**. - Communication is **limited**. Response may be cursory.
X	0	no creditable material.
Note: Each point of comparative evaluation requires a clear statement of the strength or weakness for both documents, illustration from the text and explanation of the comparison (strength/weakness)		