

---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH**

**9239/11**

Paper 1 Written Examination

**October/November 2016**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 30

---

**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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2016 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2016	9239	11

## 1 Study Document 1.

- (a) Identify two objections to hosting the World Cup referred to by the author in Document 1. [2]

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

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

- The event increasing (government) corruption
- The amount of money spent
- Will the benefits be felt beyond the 12 host cities?
- Rising prices in the run up to the World Cup

The question asks for two objections so if a candidate develops just one benefit they can score a maximum of one mark.

- (b) Explain two ways in which hosting the World Cup will benefit Brazil's tourist industry according to the author of Document 1. [4]

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

**Credit up to 2 marks for a correct version of two of the following:**

**Simply giving a direct quote without development would be worth 1 mark only. For the second mark, appropriate development or explanation in the candidates' own words is required.**

**Some examples are:**

- Foreign delegations/visitors will no doubt advertise in their own countries the services they used in Brazil (1) thus creating a new tourism demand from abroad (2)
- Tourists will benefit from expanded airports (1) that will make their entry to the country easier and more enjoyable (2)
- Tourists will benefit from improved transport systems (1) that will allow them to travel around the country, especially between the 12 host cities, more efficiently. (2)
- Tourists will benefit from better telecommunication services (1) that will allow them to use their mobile devices to access the internet and contact people at home (2)
- More international languages will be spoken so workers will be better able to meet tourists' needs (1) by being able to communicate with them better to provide an improved service (2)

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

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2016	9239	11

## 2 Study Document 1.

**Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the author’s argument in Document 1 about the benefits of hosting the World Cup.** [12]

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

<b>Level 3</b> <b>9–12 marks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Both</b> strengths and weaknesses are assessed.</li> <li>• Assessment of the argument/s is <b>sustained</b>.</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>5–8 marks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers focus <b>more</b> on either strengths or weaknesses, although both are present.</li> <li>• Assessment identifies strength or weakness with <b>little explanation</b>.</li> <li>• Assessment of argument/s is relevant but generalised, <b>not always linked to 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>1–4 marks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers show <b>little or no</b> assessment of the argument/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

- The conclusion is drawn from the reasoning. ‘The benefits to the economic future of Brazil are indisputable and will be permanent.’ This ensures the reader is in no doubt as to the writer’s point of view.
- The author quotes statistics and evidence to back up his claim that there are economic benefits to hosting the World Cup. ‘The 12 host cities will benefit from expanded airports, improved transport systems and better telecommunication services.’ ‘Long-term development could emerge in several key industries and markets... This is particularly important in Brazil, where under 1% of exports come from small and medium-sized businesses.’
- The argument is written in a compelling and logical style.
- The argument is written with some expertise – the author is an economist with the largest investment bank in Latin America.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2016</b>	<b>9239</b>	<b>11</b>

- The counter argument is given at the outset. ‘Much has been said about the economic and social situation of the country, especially after the recent protests against government corruption and rising prices in the run up to the World Cup. ... there were criticisms about the amount of money spent on hosting the event.’

### **Weaknesses**

- The article makes assumptions and judgements about issues where supporting evidence is neither presented nor cited e.g. ‘Weaknesses in infrastructure and productivity have been holding back the progress of the economy’; ‘The 12 host cities will benefit from expanded airports, improved transport systems and better telecommunication services. Although these upgrades were necessary, they hardly would have taken place simultaneously if it wasn’t for the World Cup.’ ‘The impact on the productivity of these workers could be substantial and lead to significantly higher wages.’
- The conclusion is a sweeping statement with no statistical evidence to back up its claims. ‘The benefits to the economic future of Brazil are indisputable and will be permanent.’
- Statistics are given in only one instance but they are not substantiated or cited. ‘This is particularly important in Brazil, where under 1% of exports come from small and medium-sized businesses.’

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2016	9239	11

### 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?

[12]

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

Level 3 9–12 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 5–8 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.

#### 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 Document 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.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2016</b>	<b>9239</b>	<b>11</b>

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

- Document 2 argues that hosting major sports events does not bring about community and economic benefits.
- Document 1 argues that it does.

### **Stronger**

- **more authoritative perspective**

Document 2 uses statistical evidence that is also substantiated in one case.

Document 2 uses an appeal to pity with the forced relocation of people and businesses.

The author of Document 2 has a more authoritative voice as a building designer.

Document 2 gives four different points whereas Document 1 only gives three.

### **Weaker**

- **less authoritative perspective**

Document 2 presents an argument with quotes and economic statistics with only one set from a substantiated source. Document 1 is based solely on personal opinion but from an economist.

Whilst the argument in Document 2 does briefly mention a counter argument, it is based mainly on the negative aspects of hosting events. Document 1 presents a slightly more balanced perspective by including more counter arguments.

### **Neither stronger or weaker**

- **relevant expertise**

Both authors are experts in their fields.

- **authoritative perspective**

Both authors hold positions of authority.

- **both give reasoned arguments.**

Both arguments are set out in a similar sectioned and logical way.

- **both use emotive language**

Both documents use persuasive language.

- **bias**

Both documents are very biased, Document 1 for and Document 2 against.

- **equal conclusions**

The conclusions in both Documents are given as personal opinions.