



**Cambridge International Examinations**  
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary Level

---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH**

**9239/12**

Paper 1: Written Examination

**May/June 2015**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 30

---

**IMPORTANT NOTICE**

Mark Schemes have been issued on the basis of **one** copy per Assistant examiner and **two** copies per Team Leader.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – May/June 2015	9239	12

## Question 1

### Study Document 1.

**(a) Identify two effects on people of the loss of coral reefs mentioned by the author. [2]**

Examiners should be aware that candidates are asked only to identify ways and not explain or evaluate them. Therefore they should not expect lengthy responses. Candidates are not expected to put the ways into their own words and may simply copy the ways from the Document; however examiners should ensure that all the ways given in the response are taken from Document 1.

**Credit 1 mark for a correct version of the following, up to two marks:**

- Loss of food supplies/food security badly damaged (1 mark)
- Threat to/loss of tourism industry (1 mark)

The question asks for two ways so if a candidate develops one way they can only score a maximum of one mark.

Exemplar 2 mark response:

- Will threaten tourism and be a disaster for those who depend on reefs for food.

Exemplar 1 mark response:

- Lose some food supplies and food security is badly damaged.
- Loss of tourism in Australia and Mexico.

Simply stating “Food Supplies” and “Tourism” without referring to their effect on people cannot be credited.

**(b) Identify and explain two causes that the author gives for coral reefs dying. [4]**

Examiners should be aware that this question carries only 4 marks and should not expect a lengthy answer.

**Credit 1 mark each for identifying a cause and a 2<sup>nd</sup> mark if this is explained.**

Credit up to 2 marks for identifying the causes from:

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge International AS Level – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9239</b>	<b>12</b>

Overfishing (1 mark)

Ocean acidification (1 mark)

Pollution (1 mark)

**Credit a 2<sup>nd</sup> mark for each cause if accompanied by an explanation relating to the cause such as:**

Overfishing can bring down coral reefs because fish hold reefs together. [Candidates may offer - Evidence from the University of British Columbia confirms that overfishing is taking place/accelerating.] (2 marks)

Ocean acidification affects the corals themselves. It is increasing as the oceans absorb more carbon Dioxide from the atmosphere. (2 marks)

Pollution is accelerating and corals reefs can't survive in nutrient-rich waters. (2 marks)

**Candidates can put these explanations into their own words.**

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – May/June 2015	9239	12

## Question 2

### Study Document 1.

**How convincing are the author's views on the destruction of coral reefs in Document 1? In your answer you should refer to both the strengths and weaknesses of the author's argument. [10]**

Use the levels based marking grid below and the indicative content to credit marks.

<b>Level 3</b>  <b>8-10 marks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Both</b> strengths and weakness are assessed.</li> <li>• Assessment of the arguments/s is <b>sustained</b> and a judgement is reached.</li> <li>• Assessment explicitly includes the <b>impact</b> of specific evidence upon the claims made.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>highly effective</b> - explanation and reasoning accurate and clearly expressed.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 2</b>  <b>4-7 marks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers focus <b>more</b> on either strengths or weakness, although both are present.</li> <li>• Assessment identifies strength or weakness with <b>little explanation</b>.</li> <li>• Assessment of arguments/s is relevant but generalised, <b>not always linked</b> to <b>specific</b> evidence or <b>specific</b> claims.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>accurate</b> - explanation and reasoning is limited, but clearly expressed.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 1</b>  <b>1-3 marks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers show <b>little or no</b> assessment of the arguments/s.</li> <li>• Assessment if any is <b>simplistic</b>.</li> <li>• Evidence may be <b>identified</b> and weakness may be <b>named</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>limited</b> - response may be cursory or descriptive.</li> </ul>

Credit 0 where there is no creditable material.

### Indicative content:

No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates are likely to include some of the following:

### Strengths:

- A clear conclusion is drawn to Document 1: 'That is why we need an enormous reallocation of research, government and environmental effort to understand what

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – May/June 2015	9239	12

has happened so we can respond the next time we face a disaster of this magnitude.’, ensuring the reader is in no doubt as to the writer’s point of view.

- There are a number of supported arguments as to reasons for destruction: overfishing and pollution.
- The author leaves us in no doubt about the outcome if nothing is done ‘It will be slimy and look a lot like the ecosystems of the Precambrian era, which ended more than 500 million years ago and well before fish evolved.’
- The author states that the scientific evidence is compelling and backs this up – (accelerating and decline).
- The style of writing is compelling, urgent and passionate. (e.g. discourse of death – zombies, neither dead or alive)
- The argument makes a relevant appeal to pity, claiming ‘There is no hope of saving the global coral reef ecosystem’.
- The argument makes another relevant appeal to pity, claiming ‘This is not a story that gives me any pleasure to tell. But it needs to be told urgently and widely because it will be a disaster for the hundreds of millions of people in poor, tropical countries.’
- The author is a Professor of Zoology at Australian National University writing recently in 2012.

### Weaknesses

- The argument is very one-sided, with very little acknowledgement of possible counter argument with the exception of having less certainty about the effects of unstoppable pollution.
- Candidates may argue that as this is a news article, not an academic paper, the author is writing his personal opinion.
- The article makes sweeping statements and judgements about issues where supporting evidence is neither presented nor cited e.g. ‘on the road to collapse within a human generation’, ‘The scientific evidence for this is compelling’, ‘Overfishing... is set to double and double again over the next few decades’, ‘because it will be a disaster for the hundreds of millions of people in poor, tropical countries’. There are other unsubstantiated claims - e.g. ‘the global fish catch is declining’; ‘unstoppable pollution’.
- The use of emotive language could be seen as ‘shock tactics’.
- The conclusion only states a partial solution to future problems and implies that this will happen again having already stated that we cannot save the reefs.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – May/June 2015	9239	12

### Question 3

Study Documents 1 and 2.

**To what extent is the author’s argument in Document 2 stronger than the author’s argument in Document 1?** [14]

Use the levels based marking grid below and the indicative content to credit marks.

Level 3 10-14 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The judgement is <b>sustained</b> and <b>reasoned</b>.</li> <li>• Alternative perspectives have <b>sustained</b> assessment.</li> <li>• Critical evaluation is of <b>key</b> issues raised in the passages and has <b>explicit</b> reference.</li> <li>• Explanation and reasoning is <b>highly effective</b>, accurate and clearly expressed.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>highly effective</b> - clear evidence of a structured cogent argument with conclusions explicitly stated and directly linked to the assessment.</li> </ul>
Level 2 5-9 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judgement is <b>reasoned</b>.</li> <li>• <b>One perspective</b> may be focused upon for assessment.</li> <li>• Evaluation is present but <b>may not relate to key</b> issues.</li> <li>• Explanation and reasoning is <b>generally accurate</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>accurate</b> - some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment.</li> </ul>
Level 1 1-4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judgement, if present, is <b>unsupported or superficial</b>.</li> <li>• Alternative perspectives have <b>little or no</b> assessment</li> <li>• Evaluation, if any, is <b>simplistic</b>. Answers may describe a few points comparing the two documents.</li> <li>• Relevant evidence or reasons may be <b>identified</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>limited</b>. Response may be cursory.</li> </ul>

Credit 0 where there is no creditable material.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – May/June 2015	9239	12

### Indicative Content:

No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Answers should go beyond a simple comparison of the content of the two Documents and look to evaluate a range of issues if they want to access the higher levels. In order to assess which author's argument is the stronger candidates should consider not only the content of the Documents, but critically assess the views put forward through a consideration of issues such as the nature of the passages, purpose and language. Responses are likely to cover issues such as the reliability of the Documents, by looking at their origin/source.

Candidates should critically assess perspectives and the use of examples and evidence in order to reach a judgement. In doing this they might conclude that the author's argument in Doc 2 show a little more balance and wider perspective than in Document 1. Alternatively, they might conclude that overall, although from slightly different perspectives their arguments have different strengths and weaknesses. However, credit should be given to an alternative judgement on the basis of the assessment and reasoning.

### Use the levels based marking table to credit marks.

**No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:**

#### Doc 2 stronger:

- **a more balanced perspective**

Document 2 presents a more balanced perspective including an acknowledgement of the problem and suggestions for a possible way forward (humans caused it – humans solve it, e.g. divers should record the bleaching incidents and report ... get specialised help to the reefs).

The arguments in Document 1 (overfishing/pollution/ocean acidification) are all pointing towards the overall conclusion that little can be done to save the reefs – it contains no acknowledgement of possible counter argument as to what can be done to limit or prevent damage to coral reefs.

- **a wider range of perspectives**

Author of document 2 quotes more credible scientific and statistical research (marine physicists, University led research), whilst the argument/s in Document 1 depend on unsubstantiated claims.

- **more supporting evidence**

Document 2 states favourable results in some areas – Indonesia, whilst the argument/s in Document 1 lack examples of coral reef recovery.

- **stronger conclusion**

The conclusion in Document 2 offers a clear summary and a completely workable solution. Document 1 contains a clear conclusion to its argument but only a partial solution.

#### Weaker

- **less authoritative perspective**

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge International AS Level – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9239</b>	<b>12</b>

Document 2 provide an approach to the problem. Document 1 presents arguments written in a compelling, urgent and passionate style leading to a main conclusion that there is no hope for coral reefs.

- **less authoritative perspective**

Document 2 only discusses one cause of coral reef decline (coral reef bleaching) whereas Document 1 suggests multiple causes of coral reef death (overfishing, pollution, and acidification).

- **provenance and expertise**

Document 2 is written by a journalist who has no apparent expertise and relies heavily on other authors' views. Document 1 is written by a Professor of Zoology but as an online news item not an academic paper.

### **Neither stronger or weaker**

- **Both have clear conclusions but from different perspectives**

Both Documents leave the reader in no doubt as to the stance that they are taking, containing clear arguments but from different perspectives. The overall argument in Document 2 takes a more positive perspective, focusing on possible solutions to coral reef damage. The main argument in Document 1 takes a negative perspective where nothing can be done about the current crisis.

- **Both agree there are serious problems**

Both documents agree the serious problem of decline or destruction of coral reefs and its causes and the effects.

- **Both contain unsupported assertions**

Both arguments rely on some unsupported opinions of the author although Document 1 contains far more.