ECONOMICS

Paper 9708/12
Multiple Choice

Question Number	Key	Question Number	Key	Question Number	Key
1	B	11	A	21	B
2	D	12	A	22	D
3	B	13	A	23	A
4	D	14	B	24	C
5	D	15	C	25	D
6	B	16	C	26	D
7	A	17	B	27	B
8	C	18	D	28	B
9	D	19	C	29	D
10	C	20	D	30	A

General comments

Overall performance was very good with 17 per cent of the candidates answering more than 25 of the questions correctly. In contrast, only 14 per cent of the candidates correctly identified less than half of the answers.

Candidates performed significantly less well in the macroeconomic section. **Questions 1**, **3**, **5**, **6**, **13**, **17**, **20**, **23** and **27** were answered most successfully, with a correct response rate of more than 80 per cent in each case. Five of these nine questions related to the microeconomic section. **Questions 8**, **15** and **24** were answered correctly by fewer than a third of the candidates. Two of these questions were based on macroeconomic concepts.

Comments on specific questions

Question 8 was answered correctly by 19 per cent of the candidates. The question required candidates to identify what was correct about two straight line demand curves. Option **A** is describing unitary price elasticity of demand which requires a rectangular hyperbola shaped schedule. Option **B** is also incorrect, as any straight line demand schedule will have a declining value for price elasticity of demand as price decreases. These two options were each chosen by approximately 30 per cent of the candidates. It is not possible to ascertain the degree of substitutability from a demand schedule, so option **D** is ruled out as a correct answer. This leaves option **C** as the correct answer.

Question 15 required candidates to interpret real GDP data in index number form over the four quarters of one year. Option **D** was the most popular with 41 per cent of the candidates choosing it. However, this option is incorrect as conclusions about the standard of living would require data for real GDP per head, rather than

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

total real GDP which is provided in the table. Option **A** was also popular, wrongly chosen by 25 per cent of the candidates. Although inflation will have been used to calculate the value of real GDP, it is not possible to say that it is the cause of the reduction in the first half of 2021. The value of real GDP has fallen in both **Question 1** and **Question 2** of 2021, a technical recession, so that option **C** was correct, although only chosen by 29 per cent of the candidates.

Question 24 was answered correctly by 32 per cent of the candidates, who chose option **C**. This was correct as country Y is less inefficient (compared to country X) at producing wheat than producing cars, giving it a comparative advantage in producing wheat. Options **A** and **B** were chosen by 30 per cent and 23 per cent of the candidates, respectively. This was due to a misreading of the question which asked what made it possible for both countries to benefit from trade. Country X does have an absolute advantage, but it is not this fact which makes trade beneficial for both countries.

Question 28 required candidates to calculate the change in trade balance per year to identify when it changed the most. However, 53 per cent of the candidates chose option **C** as the balance changed by only $30bn between 2017 and 2018 compared to $40 bn between 2016 and 2017 (regardless of the direction of the change). Hence, option **B** was correct, although only 40 per cent of the candidates chose it.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

ECONOMICS

Paper 9708/22
AS Level Data Response and Essays

Key messages

- For **Question 1**, data response, one important change within the new syllabus is that 4–s and 6-mark questions will contain a requirement for explained analysis and evaluation. Similarly, knowledge and understanding marks will only be awarded if they are relevant to the question and, where possible, within the context of the data itself.
- **Part (a)** of essay questions is now split on a 3,3 2 basis. AO1 gains up to 3 marks, AO2 up to 3 marks and AO3 up to 2 marks. Candidates need to organise their answers based on this split and must be encouraged to apply all knowledge and understanding to the question that is set. Furthermore, all analysis should be relevant and fully explained to gain credit. Answers that simply state facts without any explanation are very unlikely to gain credit. Finally, evaluation must compare and contrast the preceding analysis and make a judgement to answer the question to be awarded marks.
- In **part (b)** of essay questions, answers which examine one side of the question only will be highly unlikely to gain more than mid-level 2 analysis and will not be awarded evaluation marks as they are unlikely to fully answer the question.
- Candidates therefore need to be fully prepared by centres to follow this approach to maximise their marks.
- Centres are further reminded that questions may be drawn from any part of the syllabus and therefore full coverage of the syllabus is essential.

General comments

- Overall, a full range of marks was in evidence and there was a pleasing number of high marks within the whole cohort.
- Equally, there was a significant minority of candidates who were underprepared for the examination and achieved low marks despite, in some circumstances, writing a great deal.
- Rubric errors were rare, and most candidates answered the correct number of questions from the correct sections of the paper.
- For most candidates, time did not appear to be a problem and most appeared to finish with enough time. However, there is still a tendency to spend too much time on the 2-mark questions and also on detailed discussions within essays of information that is not relevant to the question.
- Although most scripts were legible, there was still a significant minority where handwriting was indistinct. Every candidate will want their hard work to be accredited but need to take more care in certain instances, to ensure that it can be clearly read by examiners.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

(a) Many candidates appeared to miss the command word **compare** and the emphasis on change in projected real growth between 2022 and 2025 and simply listed changes in trends within the countries over the entire period with no attempt at comparison. A further common error was to misinterpret the data as showing a decline in economic growth when in fact economic growth continued albeit at a slower rate. Consequently, full marks were rare, and many answers were too long and contained irrelevant detail. For such a question, all that is needed for 2 marks are two separate clear points of comparison and nothing else.

© 2024

(b) The command word here was **demonstrate** (on a diagram). All that was needed was a diagram that was correctly labelled with 2 goods (one on each axis) with 2 accurate curves (with a clear shift to the right) each touching the axes labelled PPC 1 and PPC 2 with the direction of travel indicated by an arrow. Nothing else was needed with such a command word for 2 marks and if drawn as stated, no further explanation was necessary. Simple responses such as this were rare, and a significant number of responses labelled the axes as P and Q or did not provide labels at all and some failed to move the curve to the right. The curves were frequently unlabelled and relied on explanations to identify them as PPC curves although this was accepted for a second mark. Candidates should be reminded to take note of and understand the different command words.

(c) The first three marks for this question should have been straightforward i.e., a simple, correctly labelled S and D diagram showing an expected shift to the right of the supply curve together with the original equilibrium price and quantity and the new equilibrium price and quantity and a valid explanation of the cause of the shift. This was the expected change resulting from an increase in investment and not a shift to the left of the supply curve nor a shift to the right of the demand curve. Although many candidates did gain these first three marks, a significant number did not either because of inaccurate shifts in the supply and demand curves or no shifts at all or did not offer a valid explanation for the cause of the shift. The final mark was reserved for an evaluation of why this might not happen (the command word being consider) but this was largely ignored in most cases.

(d) The focus of this question was firmly on the impact of increased investment in AI on unemployment in Japan. It was not concerned with the impact on the economy (except insofar as this impacted on unemployment) nor government spending nor the social impact of unemployment – all of which were explored in some detail by some candidates. It also did not require definitions of unemployment or different types of unemployment beyond structural unemployment. Many answers spent far too long in a discussion of these aspects rather than answering the question. Candidates also need to be reminded of the need to explain and justify statements – e.g., it is not enough to state that unemployment will reduce as AI will create new jobs without giving examples. However, despite some irrelevance at times, most candidates were able to score 1 mark for both perspectives. Normally 1 for explaining that AI would lead to mainly lower skilled, repetitive jobs disappearing and 1 for explaining the new roles that may appear, e.g., AI programmers. Evaluation was rare but better answers suggested that the overall impact would depend on the rate of AI development and the structure of the economy e.g., a stronger service sector would see smaller reductions in employment than one with a high level of manufacturing. The amount of government budget that could be used for training etc., was also discussed by some candidates within the evaluation but again, this was not common.

(e) This question was not answered particularly well, and many candidates attempted to repeat the answer for **1(d)** by discussing the impact on unemployment. The main focus should have been on specialisation and trade as evident from the question, but many candidates missed or ignored the link to trade. Where trade was discussed at all, assertions were often made suggesting that specialisation would lead e.g., to increased exports without explaining why and this could not be credited. Often a brief reference was made to a reduction in costs/increased price competitiveness for 1 mark. Candidates were also often able to suggest some problems with over specialisation e.g., the depletion of non-renewables or over reliance on other countries, but again this was not always explained by linking this to the growth of AI. Consequently, overall, total marks for this question were rarely above 2 as effective evaluation was rare.

Section B

Question 2

(a) Candidates appeared to find this question accessible with many gaining 5 marks or more. Most were able to accurately define what an indirect tax is and provide accurate examples although a clear explanation of what is meant by the incidence of indirect tax or what one is used for was rarer. Diagrams were generally accurate although some candidates wrongly shifted the demand curve because of the price rise. The rise in price was generally shown correctly although the fall in quantity demanded was often less clear with many simply referring to a fall in Q or even quantity supplied when the question was focused on the impact on consumers. The evaluation was often generally quite good and correctly identified PED as the main determinant of the incidence. Development was occasionally marred by an inability to explain why this was so in terms of the

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

responsiveness of demand in relation to whether the PED value was elastic or inelastic. Some candidates also discussed the incidence on producers which was irrelevant.

(b) Full and explained analysis was quite rare within answers to this question. Many candidates asserted outcomes which generally suggested that provision of information was not the best way without explaining why and preferring alternative methods of reducing the consumption of demerit goods which effectively had the same problem attached, namely inelastic PED. Candidates also spent a great deal of unproductive time explaining what demerit goods are, which should have been dealt with very briefly instead of explaining the advantages and disadvantages of providing information from an economics perspective. Balanced evaluation that carefully considers all sides of the various arguments continue to be rare and balanced conclusions rarer. Candidates should note that summative comments with little or no attempt to compare the strength of arguments are not considered to be evaluation.

Question 3

(a) Despite some errors with incorrectly reversing the formula, most candidates were able to gain the first three knowledge and understanding marks – formula + definition in terms of percentage or proportionate responsiveness + a clear distinction between the responsiveness of demand for normal and inferior goods OR elastic and inelastic YED. Most were able to identify and link a positive coefficient to normal goods and many were able to refer to an appropriate example although some examples were far too generic to be credited. However, few referred back to the formula or an explained diagram to provide more developed analysis or the significance of the positive coefficient when explaining the responsiveness of normal goods. For evaluation, many candidates simply stated that the existence of inferior goods meant that a rise in income leading to a decrease in their consumption proved that not all goods and services experienced a rise without developing this point. This should have been developed to explain that this was due to a switch to normal goods for credit together with a justified conclusion as to the extent of the shift.

(b) Similar questions about the use businesses make of various elasticity measures have been set for a number of years. Most candidates adopted an approach by describing all they know about, in this case, PED and PES regardless of its relevance to the question. This involved exhaustive lists of formulae and different measures of elasticity, often with diagrams and with little or no attempt to relate the information to the question – the majority of which gained little or no credit. Candidates often claimed that PED helped businesses to set prices or even, correctly, that e.g., an inelastic PED meant that prices could be increased without explaining why. Such approaches did not gain high marks, PES was often dealt with in a more obscure way and clear explanations of its use were rare and often restricted to a vague understanding that it related to a relationship between price and the ability to quickly adjust output levels. Evaluation was generally assertive and rarely gained many marks.

Section C

Question 4

(a) Most candidates were able to gain 2 – 3 marks for knowledge and understanding i.e., for a definition of an exchange rate plus what is meant by a depreciation (often grouped together) together with a cause of a depreciation either as a fall in demand or a rise in supply of the currency. Most candidates were able to recognise the perceived fall in the price of exports and the perceived rise in the price of imports. However, many candidates struggled to explain the link between these price changes and the value of net exports and from there, the possible increase in domestic real output. Many seemed to assert such changes without explaining why they may occur which in turn reduced overall marks. There was some pleasing evaluation mainly based on the impact on raw material import prices causing cost push inflation and therefore limiting any increase in domestic real output. Other evaluation related to the PED for imports and export and the need for the values being price elastic. The overall message to candidates is that statements/conclusions must be explained to gain credit.

(b) Responses often focused on knowledge and understanding of what is meant by contractionary fiscal policy and a current account deficit rather than analysing how the former may reduce the latter. Many candidates approached the question from a perspective of reducing inflation which was not the point of this question. Even candidates who recognised the significance of reducing a current account deficit provided quite assertive answers suggesting that any reduced consumption

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

would clearly only reduce imports without any assessment of PED values. Some confused contractionary fiscal policy designed to reduce AD with protectionist policy i.e., increasing tariffs. Alternative policies were often asserted e.g., monetarist and supply side policies without any explanation as to how they might reduce the current account deficit. Genuine evaluation was rare. Candidates in such questions would be better advised to focus on the policy suggested and compare this with another and assess the strengths and weaknesses of both in order to come to a valid conclusion.

Question 5

(a) A large proportion of candidates spent a great deal of time defining AD and AS rather than the key terms in the question namely, a decrease in interest rates, economic growth, and inflation. Once again there was a tendency to assert outcomes rather than explain them, for example a decrease in interest rates may well increase AD but it is essential that the candidate says why, step by step. Some candidates also continue to label AS and AD diagrams incorrectly and label axes as price and quantity rather than price level and RGDP and/or the curves as S and D. However, there were some very good answers including some strong evaluation at times that focused on the possible increase in AS offsetting the increase in inflation if the decrease in interest rates led to more capital investment. The level of spare capacity was also often cited in the evaluation and this in turn led to many marks of 7 or 8 in total.

(b) This question was also generally well answered with level 2 marks for AO1and AO2 being common. References to reductions in unemployment and improvements in material standards of living were common and it was pleasing to also see comments about possible improvements in public finances leading to increased investment in e.g., education, healthcare, and infrastructure to make growth more long term. The downsides to growth were frequently inflation, pollution, and the depletion of resources. However, many answers did not get into level 3 because of a lack of development, e.g., those who selected 2 or 3 arguments on each side and discussed the likelihood of each one were far more likely to get into level 3. For example, living standards may not improve if the benefits were not shared or unemployment may not fall if the growth was sustained by capital investment. Such an approach meant evaluation was more meaningful but was comparatively rare, The overall message to candidates is that a shorter list of arguments works better than a wider approach provided they are fully discussed.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

ECONOMICS

Paper 9708/32
Multiple Choice

Question Number	Key	Question Number	Key	Question Number	Key	Question Number	Key
1	B	11	C	21	C	31	C
2	B	12	D	22	D	32	C
3	B	13	D	23	D	33	C
4	C	14	C	24	C	34	C
5	B	15	C	25	C	35	C
6	C	16	B	26	B	36	A
7	D	17	C	27	C	37	D
8	B	18	A	28	A	38	C
9	A	19	A	29	A	39	A
10	D	20	D	30	D	40	B

General comments

Overall performance was very good with 15 per cent of the candidates answering more than 25 of the questions correctly. In contrast, 15 per cent of the candidates correctly identified less than half of the answers.

Candidates performed almost identically across the microeconomic and macroeconomic sections. **Questions 4**, **5**, **10**, **12**, **21**, **24** and **30** were answered most successfully, with a correct response rate of more than 80 per cent in each case. Questions **16** and **27** were answered correctly by fewer than a third of the candidates; both questions were based on macroeconomic concepts.

Comments on specific questions

Question 3 required candidates to calculate the marginal social benefit. Although nearly half of the candidates correctly answered option **B**, two options, **A** and **D**, were each chosen by a fifth of the candidates. Option **A** is incorrect as it only measures the marginal external benefit. Option **D** is also incorrect as it is measuring the total social benefit. Marginal social benefit requires the change in both the private benefits and external benefits to be included to arrive at the correct answer.

Question 14 about the cause of a shift in the marginal revenue product (MRP) curve of electric vehicles was answered correctly by 40 per cent of the candidates. MRP is made up of the marginal physical product and the price of the product. Option **C**, a change in the price of the product, is the correct option. However, option **D** was the most popular answer, wrongly chosen by 48 per cent of the candidates. An increase in the wage rate is not part of MRP and would, instead, affect the firm's supply curve.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question 16 was answered correctly by only 25 per cent of the candidates, who chose option **B**. This is correct as switching from monthly to weekly payment of wages will mean less money is physically demanded at any single point in time. Option **D** was chosen by more than 40 per cent of the candidates, but an increase in the perceived risk of holding government bonds will mean that individuals are more likely to hold their liquid assets in the form of money. Option **A** was also popular, selected by 22 per cent of the candidates, but a decrease in the use of credit cards will switch more payments to money, so demand for money will increase.

Question 27 tested candidates' knowledge of what is not included in the current account. The correct answer, chosen by 31 per cent of the candidates, was option **D**. Any investment in an overseas pipeline will be part of the financial account, rather than the current account. Nearly 40 per cent of candidates chose option **C**. However, transfer of aid to less developed countries is secondary income which is part of the current account. Option **B** was also a popular answer. However, it is incorrect as earnings from foreign exchange are part of trade in services, a major part of the current account.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

ECONOMICS

Paper 9708/42
A Level Data Response and Essays

General comments

It is worth reminding Centres that although the structure and mark scheme for Data Response part **Question 1** has remained the same as the pre-2023 examination, the essay paper and associated mark scheme has undergone some key changes. Candidates now have to choose one essay from two microeconomic essays in ***Section B*** and one essay from two macroeconomic essays in ***Section C***. Before 2023 candidates could choose any two questions from a total of six essays. Like last year this may have had some impact on the performance of candidates in this examination session.

In addition, the transition has been made from a standard 'levels' mark scheme, to a scheme which uses generic marking plus a given number of marks available for evaluative comment. Essays are now marked out of 20, instead of being marked out of 25. Generic marked levels cover 0 to 14 marks and 6 marks are available for evaluation.

There appeared to be a general overall improvement in performance compared to last year. In ***Sections B*** and ***C*** in particular, more candidates were able to provide sufficiently well-structured analysis to enable them to gain a level 3 grade on the generic part of the mark scheme. Diagrams were generally accurate and frequently supported by well-developed analysis based on extended chains of reasoning.

However, ***Section A*** was not dealt with effectively. **Question 1** in this section was compulsory and relatively demanding. Few candidates gained high marks on this section. Thus, there was a clear distinction between performance regarding the ***Section A*** Data Response section of this paper and the ***Section B*** and ***Section C*** essay questions.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

(a) Most candidates were able to gain 2 marks for identifying two causes of the rise in electricity prices. Also, many candidates were able to gain an additional mark for providing a brief explanation of market failure. However, few candidates were unable to distinguish between a price rise cause by normal adjustments to supply and a price rise caused by market failure. Therefore, few candidates gained full marks for this question.

(b) Responses to this question frequently focused on the effects of competition and the majority referred to the article which referred specifically to the fact that competitors were able to benefit from a discounted market price from the large electricity company. Very few candidates addressed the part of the question relating to efficiency, for example there were few references to alternative renewable energy projects being stopped. Some really good responses did link a possible fall in monopoly profits to a subsequent fall in dynamic efficiency and gained marks accordingly.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

(c) (i) This question required candidates to distinguish between equity and equality.

Although this topic has been covered many times, a significant number of responses failed to make a clear distinction between the two concepts. Many failed to gain full marks because they failed to develop their explanation of at least one of the two concepts. A significant number of candidates confused the term 'equity' in the sense of it representing 'fairness' and 'equity' described in a financial accounting sense.

(ii) This question required candidates to use the evidence in the article to assess whether the actions of the French government on electricity prices might increase either equality or equity for consumers and producers. This question was dealt with very ineffectively. It was clear that an overwhelming number of candidates had simply failed to read the question carefully enough. It was essential that candidate responses needed to refer to the article very carefully to decide whether equality and/or equity had actually increased as a result of the actions of the French government on electricity prices. This was a demanding question because it required candidates to apply two concepts to two separate stakeholders in the text to draw any specific conclusions. Particularly with respect to the extent to which either equality or equity, or both might have increased. Very few candidates gained more than 3/8 marks for this question. Marks were gained most frequently for recognising that producer small firms will get cheaper electricity at the expense of large firms and this might suggest that an increase in equality between producers might be obtained. Many responses made 'far reaching' assumptions to justify their conclusions which could not be deduced from the evidence in the text. Some, of the better responses correctly pointed out that a reduction in an indirect tax, which is regressive will increase equity in relation to consumers. Accurate, relevant conclusions were rarely provided.

Section B

Question 2

This was a very popular question. It was clear that many students had been well prepared to answer a question relating to negative externalities. This was quite evident when considering the depth of the analysis provided. There were many excellent responses which combined accurate, clearly labelled diagram with some detailed supporting analysis. Diagrams relating to negative externalities in production and negative externalities in consumption were both acceptable. Some candidates provided both diagrams. Good links between economic theory and the problems associated with climate change were frequently established. In addition, many candidates were able to identify at least two types of government policy, and, and more importantly, proceed to evaluate the effectiveness of each policy identified. Further marks were gained for appropriate conclusions based on the preceding analysis. Hence, it was pleasing to note the high number of candidates who gain high marks for this question.

Question 3

This question was not dealt with entirely effectively. Marks tended to be 'bunched' into the middle mark range. Learners were generally able to identify the key characteristics of a perfectly competitive market structure and also identify the role and main aims of a Trade Union. This would have gained lower level 2 marks. However, an important element within the statement considered related to the need to provide a diagram. To some extent a significant number of learners were able to provide relevant, accurately labelled diagrams but frequently failed to fully utilise their diagram to fully develop an appropriate level of analysis. Better candidates recognised the importance of discussing the impact on unemployment of different elasticities of the supply of labour and the demand for labour.

There were two main reasons why a significant number of learners failed to gain a high mark. First, many learners did not appear to be able to assess whether trade union intervention in a perfectly competitive would **always** lead to higher wage levels and a higher level of unemployment. For example, very few learners considered how easy it might be to substitute capital for labour or whether trade union membership, through the provision of additional skills training, might allow a trade union to increase labour productivity and thus allow higher wages without reducing employment. Also, many responses failed to gain a high mark because they failed to focus on the specific question. Candidates frequently commentated on the role of government setting a minimum wage or discussed how a trade union might operate in a monopolistic labour mark. Neither of these aspects were relevant. Therefore, all no marks were lost, much time was wasted discussing non relevant material.

© 2024

www.dynamicpapers.com

Section C

Question 4

Approximately 50 per cent of candidates chose to answer this question. Although a fairly high proportion of responses gained a reasonably high mark for the knowledge, understanding and analysis part of the paper. Better responses focused upon supply side policies rather than alternative monetary/fiscal alternatives. A surprisingly large number of candidates examined demand side policies in great detail while giving insufficient attention to more effective supply side polices. Marks were gained for reference to demand side policies but this alone would not be sufficient to gain a level 3 grade for analysis. It was also essential that candidates provided a relevant, accurately labelled diagram to ensure a level 3 mark was gained. Again, somewhat surprisingly, many candidates provided micro diagrams instead of the required AS/AD diagram and this prevented high marks being gained. It is important to note that if a question specifically asks for a diagram, then a correct diagram is essential to gain a level 3 mark. Candidates found it easier to provide evaluative comment relating to demand side policies rather than the expected supply side policies. Candidates were not penalized for this approach. Evaluation relating to supply side polices invariably tended to undeveloped. Often, brief one sentence statements were provided instead of any detailed developed comment. This confined many learners to a level 1 evaluation mark and made level 2 evaluation marks relatively rare. Attempts to provide a conclusion were disappointing. A significant number of candidates simply provided a brief summary of what had already been stated, instead of attempting to draw upon the preceding analysis to assess the effectiveness of each type of policy approach.

Question 5

This question worked well as a discriminator. Responses varied across a wide mark range. There were four related elements in this question that learners were expected to refer to indicate knowledge, understanding and analysis. Some learners recognised this and proceeded to identify and explain what is meant by the term globalisation and did so in sufficient depth. For example, understanding that globalisation is more than simply an increase in international trade but that it also involves the free movement of capital and labour plus the transfer of technology. It was also important that learners demonstrated detailed knowledge of the key characteristics of high-income countries. This requirement which, although frequently referred to, was often not fully integrated into the overall response and this led to fewer marks for analysis. The links between the key characteristics of high-income countries and living standards needed to be clearly established. For example, the reliance on the production of and export of secondary and tertiary goods, compared to primary goods in evidence in low-income countries. Good responses produced more extended chains of reasoning to enable them to assess the impact of globalisation on the standard of living in high-income countries. For example, some learners suggested that an increase in international trade and subsequent economic growth would be likely to increase tax revenues which would then enable high-income country governments to spend more on health care, housing and education and that these elements are generally associated with a rise in the standard of living.

Evaluative comment was introduced, albeit indirectly, through a consideration of the role and importance of multinational corporations (MNCs). This approach wasn't that relevant in many cases because candidates were linking it to low-income countries instead of high-income countries indicated in the specific question.

It was pleasing to note that many learners, while being aware of the positive contribution to living standards, such a job creation, economic growth and increases in productivity, not all aspects of globalisation contributed to an increase in living standards. Good responses referred to resource depletion, negative effects on the environment and possible labour exploitation. A conclusion which then attempted to form a judgement based on each of the above explanations of alternative outcomes would also have potentially gained a level 2 evaluation mark.

© 2024