
GENERAL PAPER (MAURITIUS)

8009/02

Paper 2

October/November 2019

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 50

Published

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 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **8** printed pages.

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 descriptors 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.

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--------|-------|
| 1 | C | 1 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--------|-------|
| 2 | D | 1 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 3 | <p>Hilde:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Previous experience in two other universities should make her a safe pair of hands. • Good relationships with students should make for a happy department with good results. • The gender balance in the department is poor; this would address it, and is in line with university policy • The presence of a female in the department should encourage more girls into the subject, and is in line with the government report • STEM priority for females may attract extra government money (which would also help the university's financial position) • As she is popular with students is likely to be a good hall tutor. • Would make a statement supporting the university's equal opportunities policy. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Her feminist views may upset colleagues (she has previous) and rock the departmental boat. • She may not wish to work with predominantly male students. • As an experienced lecturer, she would be expensive in her third year and the university has some financial difficulties. • The student/staff ratio in physics is already the lowest/best of the three subjects, and adding another physicist would make it even lower (better), to the detriment of other depts. • Possibly not benefactor's choice of department to receive funds <p>Gunther:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a newcomer to the profession, his salary would be the lowest of the three candidates – favourable to the university's finances in his third year. • As the youngest of the three candidates (or as a recent graduate) he might be able to relate to the students the best regarding their welfare. • As a disabled person his appointment would support the university's equal opportunities policy. • His appointment would highlight the access issue and, hopefully, get something done. | |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the other philosophy department in the city has closed, this is an opportunity to fill any gap. • Is passionate about his subject and would be a good teacher • His enthusiasm for schools liaison work could lead to a revival of the subject. • The benefactor may be pleased with the appointment of a philosopher and provide additional funding to cover the 3rd year. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The subject could be in decline as a neighbouring university has closed its department. • As his subject isn't on most schools' curriculum, it could be difficult to attract students anyway. • As he is a newcomer, without a track record, his appointment could be a risk. • Unless something is done quickly, access might be a problem and cause him frustration. • In theory, he would have to be separated from his pet were he to take up residence on campus. <p>Hagen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As applications to languages could be on the rise (promotion in schools) this could be seen as a necessary (and safe) appointment. • His versatility means that he could likely cover work in the language(s) that were popular in a given year. • Industrial experience could be useful in advising students on their career path. • Extra funding could be available from government as expansion of languages is in line with government policy. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He might be unable to act as a residential tutor as he will be reluctant to move from his house onto campus so soon. • As the only candidate without a further degree he has no experience of research. • As he has no experience of work in the sector his appointment could be a risk. • Possibly not benefactor's choice of department to receive funds? | |
| 3(a) | <u>Using continuous prose</u>, explain which one of the three candidates you consider to be best suited to the post. You should restrict your discussion to the strengths of your chosen candidate. | 10 |
| 3(b) | <u>Using continuous prose</u>, explain which one of the three candidates you consider to be least suited for this post. You should restrict your discussion to the weaknesses of your rejected candidate. | 10 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 4 | Point 10 (Gunther's A Level language) [1] would appear irrelevant as it's a qualification at the same level as new students already possess [1] and would be inadequate to teach them to a higher level [1]. He's a philosophy teacher and a language qualification isn't necessary [1]. The range of potential languages on campus is wide and his language might not be one of them [1]. | 3 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--------|-------|
| 5 | B | 1 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--------|-------|
| 6 | D | 1 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--------|-------|
| 7 | B | 1 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--------|-------|
| 8 | A | 1 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--------|-------|
| 9 | C | 1 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 10 | <p>Using your own words as far as possible, give reasons why the author, in paragraphs 2 and 3, describes the prison system as a ‘gaping wound [...] that clearly needs major surgery’. You may answer using continuous prose or bullet points.</p> <p>Accept up to 10 points from the following.</p> <p>‘The penal system is in’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rapid decline • in a worse position now than any time in the recent past • accommodation is insufficient for the number of prisoners • there aren’t enough prison officers • drugs are easily available • many prisoners have mental health issues • physical assaults are common / prisoner safety & security threatened • Very costly to run • High proportion of young prisoners commit further offences (within a year of release) • Government proposals to improve the system lack detailed methodology / no proper plan • or the resources / means to address the deficiency (accommodation, staff, finance...) <p>10 × 1 = 10</p> | 10 |

| Question | Answer | Marks | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------------|----------------------|---|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|---|--|---|----|
| 11 | <p>What recommendations are suggested by the author and why might these improve the <u>adult</u> penal system in England and Wales? Answer in about 100 words using continuous prose or bullet points.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Recommendation</th> <th>Possible improvement</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> Close existing women's prisons / scrapping the existing system [1] No credit for simple idea of separation (need to say into what) </td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td> Put dangerous women in smaller units [1] in their home regions [1] </td> <td> Nearer families/friends to support them [1]; fewer prisoners to be a danger to [1]; more support to help them rehabilitate [1] </td> </tr> <tr> <td> Place (less dangerous or other) women prisoners (with drug / alcohol / abuse problems) in less secure residential units [1] with the involvement of the local community [1] Guidance. Needs to have a sense that these are women of lower risk. </td> <td> more help with various problems [1]; women would feel part of local community [1] and local community would feel more responsibility towards the women [1] </td> </tr> <tr> <td> Scrap short (less than 12 months) sentences [1] </td> <td> It frees up the system (by reducing prisoner numbers) [1] </td> </tr> <tr> <td> (Increase) the use of community service [1] </td> <td> community service give better results (reducing reoffending) [1] </td> </tr> <tr> <td> Remove prisoners with mental health problems in to special psychiatric units [1] </td> <td> It would reduce problems in prisons [1]; remove their bad reputation [1]; they could receive more specialist care [1]; reduce adult prison population [1] </td> </tr> <tr> <td> Scrap life sentences/review current life sentences [1] </td> <td> Allows people to have chance to redeem themselves [1] </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Recommendation | Possible improvement | Close existing women's prisons / scrapping the existing system [1] No credit for simple idea of separation (need to say into what) | | Put dangerous women in smaller units [1] in their home regions [1] | Nearer families/friends to support them [1]; fewer prisoners to be a danger to [1]; more support to help them rehabilitate [1] | Place (less dangerous or other) women prisoners (with drug / alcohol / abuse problems) in less secure residential units [1] with the involvement of the local community [1] Guidance. Needs to have a sense that these are women of lower risk. | more help with various problems [1]; women would feel part of local community [1] and local community would feel more responsibility towards the women [1] | Scrap short (less than 12 months) sentences [1] | It frees up the system (by reducing prisoner numbers) [1] | (Increase) the use of community service [1] | community service give better results (reducing reoffending) [1] | Remove prisoners with mental health problems in to special psychiatric units [1] | It would reduce problems in prisons [1]; remove their bad reputation [1]; they could receive more specialist care [1]; reduce adult prison population [1] | Scrap life sentences/review current life sentences [1] | Allows people to have chance to redeem themselves [1] | 10 |
| Recommendation | Possible improvement | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Close existing women's prisons / scrapping the existing system [1] No credit for simple idea of separation (need to say into what) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Put dangerous women in smaller units [1] in their home regions [1] | Nearer families/friends to support them [1]; fewer prisoners to be a danger to [1]; more support to help them rehabilitate [1] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Place (less dangerous or other) women prisoners (with drug / alcohol / abuse problems) in less secure residential units [1] with the involvement of the local community [1] Guidance. Needs to have a sense that these are women of lower risk. | more help with various problems [1]; women would feel part of local community [1] and local community would feel more responsibility towards the women [1] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scrap short (less than 12 months) sentences [1] | It frees up the system (by reducing prisoner numbers) [1] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (Increase) the use of community service [1] | community service give better results (reducing reoffending) [1] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Remove prisoners with mental health problems in to special psychiatric units [1] | It would reduce problems in prisons [1]; remove their bad reputation [1]; they could receive more specialist care [1]; reduce adult prison population [1] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scrap life sentences/review current life sentences [1] | Allows people to have chance to redeem themselves [1] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Question | Answer | | Marks | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|-------|--|
| 11 | Recommendation | Possible improvement | | |
| | Split up less dangerous prisoners from those who are more dangerous [1] and place the latter in appropriate small/Grendon style units [1] | Enables group therapy (for more dangerous ones) [1] and subsequent reduction in reoffending [1], improved health / less violent behaviour [1] | | |
| | Don't need to specify gender, but must say whether they are more or less dangerous. | Face up to shared responsibility [1] | | |
| | No credit for just saying 'leave dangerous prisoners behind bars' | Improved safety for all [1] | | |
| | Allocate mentors to released prisoners [1] | More personalised care/treatment/rehabilitation [1] | | |
| | Allocate mentors to released prisoners [1] | To help them cope with normal society [1] | | |
| Reduction of prison population [1] | Cost saving [1] | | | |
| And/or any other valid point(s). | | | | |