Cambridge International AS Level

Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH **9239/12**

Paper 1 Written Examination **May/June 2017**

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 May/June 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**Identify <u>two</u> negative effects of smoking, as given by the author of Document 1** Credit **1 mark** each for correct versions of two of the following: • causes death (through smoking related diseases) • reduces quality of life (through smoking related diseases) Also allow: • causes smoking related diseases but ONLY IF this is given as a separate point and not included as an explanation in either of the two above effects	**2×1**
1(b)	**Identify and explain the <u>two</u> different approaches to reducing smoking given by the author of Document 1.** **Credit 1 mark** for each correct identification and for each correct explanation, up to 4 marks. **The explanation must include reference to the impact of the approach in terms of reducing smoking and should not solely quote the author.** **Identify:** Public information campaigns / education on cigarettes [1] **Explain:** This informs people of the risks / negative effects of smoking cigarettes which gives them an informed choice of whether to stop. [1] **AND** **Identify:** Restrictions to advertising of cigarettes **OR** the use of plain packaging for cigarettes [1] **Explain:** These reduce the visual appeal of cigarettes which makes smoking less attractive so fewer people may not start to smoke or more will stop [1] Candidates that **ONLY** consider advertising **AND** plain packaging award up to **2 marks**, 1 for identify and 1 for explanation. Mark both and credit the best up to 2 marks.	**2×1+1**

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>
How convincing is the evidence in Document 1 that plain packaging of cigarettes is counterproductive?

In your answer, you should evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence.

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

<table>
<tr><th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptor</th></tr>
<tr><td>L3</td><td>8–10</td><td>• Both strengths and weaknesses are assessed.
• Assessment of evidence is sustained.
• Assessment explicitly includes the impact of specific evidence upon the claims made.
• Communication is highly effective – explanation and reasoning accurate and clearly expressed.</td></tr>
<tr><td>L2</td><td>4–7</td><td>• Answers focus more on either the strengths or weaknesses, although both are present / identified.
• Assessment identifies strength or weakness of evidence with little explanation.
• Assessment of argument is relevant but generalised, not always linked to specific evidence or specific claims.
• Communication is accurate – explanation and reasoning is limited, but clearly expressed.</td></tr>
<tr><td>L1</td><td>1–3</td><td>• 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.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>0</td><td>• no creditable material.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">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.</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>10</td></tr>
</table>

Question	Answer	Marks
2	**Indicative content:** No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following: **Strengths of evidence** • **Relevant survey** – The online survey of smokers is directly relevant to the impact of the policy, as it surveyed smokers before and after the policy was implemented, thus allowing a comparison of attitudes towards quitting. • **Importance of a control group** – The above gives a control group and therefore a valid comparison which gives significance to the lack of a great/increased tendency to quit. • **Precise figures** – The discarded pack study gives specific figures of an increase in sales of 7.5 %, which strengthens the significance of the impact of plain packaging upon the illicit cigarette market. • **Balanced perspectives** – The author gives a balanced account of the evidence, giving both the counter evidence to support an increase in thoughts of quitting, but also evidence of increased discarded packs and illicit cigarettes. • **Expertise** – The evidence from the annual report of Australia's Customs and Border Protection Service is likely to have the expertise of a government agency to identify an increase in illicit cigarettes coming into the country, making the claims credible. • **Motive for accuracy** – As a government agency, Australia's Customs and Border Protection Service is likely to have a vested interest to be accurate in its figures in order to maintain public confidence in its reports. This makes its claims credible. **Weaknesses of evidence** • **May not be typical of smokers in general** – Nothing is said about the size and nature of the samples of smokers used in the surveys to know whether the findings about quitting would be representative of smokers in general. • **Limited relevance** – The evidence about the rise in illicit cigarettes may have little relevance to the effect of the plain packet policy upon the rates of smoking. It demonstrates a possible negative effect of the policy, but not that it has failed in its aim of reducing the rates of smoking. • **Unclear** – No previous figures are given for illicit cigarettes as a percentage of cigarette sales to know whether 7.5% represents a significant rise or not. • **Other causes** – The author uses the evidence of the discarded packs of cigarettes and of the Customs and Border Protection Service to claim that the rise in illicit cigarettes is due to the plain packet policy, as these occurred within the same period. However, this may be correlation rather than cause. There may be another reason for this rise, which weakens the basis for his claim.	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	• **Lack of precise figures** – Much of the evidence e.g. the discarded pack study makes general claims about quitting and the increase of illicit cigarettes without statistics to support these, which weakens their impact. • **Lack of directly quoted evidence** – The evidence is reported without any direct claims from the sources, which limits the authenticity of the claims. • **Little sourced evidence** – No sources are given for the surveys or the discarded pack study, which limits the credibility/authority of their claims. • **Vested interest** – As VP of a think tank working towards liberty and individual choice, the author has a vested interest to select evidence to support this aim, which may lead to an unbalanced selection of evidence, or exaggeration of claims. • **Does not consider alternative options** – The evidence is used to support the view that the plain package policy has been counterproductive, but no evidence is given to support that education is the better way forward. There may be other more effective options such as banning the sale of cigarettes altogether. This weakens the conclusion drawn from the evidence as a whole.	

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>
Both authors discuss the effects of plain packaging of cigarettes upon smoking.

To what extent does the author's argument in Document 2 challenge that of the author in Document 1?

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

<table>
<tr><th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptor</th></tr>
<tr><td>L3</td><td>10–14</td><td>• 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 is 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.</td></tr>
<tr><td>L2</td><td>5–9</td><td>• Judgement is reasoned.
• One perspective may be focused upon for assessment.
• Evaluation is present but may not relate to key issues.
• Explanation and reasoning is generally accurate.
• Communication is accurate – some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment.</td></tr>
<tr><td>L1</td><td>1–4</td><td>• 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.</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>0</td><td>• no creditable material.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">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.</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>14</td></tr>
</table>

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Indicative content:** No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following: **Strong challenge** • **Direct challenge to 'limited experimental evidence'** – Currow (Doc 2) gives extensive evidence of the research from the AANPHT, the Cancer Council and the Australian government which formed the basis for the decision that the policy going ahead. This challenges Morris's (Doc 1) claim that the policy resulted from '*limited* experimental research'. • **Direct challenge to 'a small influence on the decline in smoking'** – Currow (Doc 2) gives evidence from the Cancer Institute NSW, Melanie Wakefield and the Australian Bureau of Statistics to evidence 'solid evidence of effectiveness' of this policy. This challenges Morris's (Doc 1) claim that the impact of the policy *'was probably small".* • **Wider authority in evidence given** – Currow (Doc 2) uses named sources of evidence with relevant authority to support his claims throughout his argument e.g. ANPHT, Cancel Council Victoria, Cancer Institute NSW, BMJ research and Australian Bureau of Statistics; as compared with Morris (Doc 1) who names only one source, The Australian Customs and Border Protection Service. This gives wider authority to Currow's claims. • **Stronger expertise in evidence used** – as above, Currow's sources have expertise in the area of health in general and specifically in cancer to provide greater credibility in their claims than the lack of sourced evidence that Morris provides. • **Stronger use of statistics and quoted evidence** – Currow (Doc 2) quotes claims and precise statistics from BMJ research, the Australian Bureau of Statistics and the tobacco industry. Morris's (Doc 1) evidence lacks both precise figures and precise claims. • **Stronger support for the conclusion** – Currow's argument (Doc 2) has a measured conclusion that we are *'seeing smoking rates drop'* so we should continue with the policy, whereas Morris's in Doc 1 jumps from the policy being counterproductive to education being the '*better way forward*' which is unsupported. This makes Currow's overall argument stronger. • **Stronger authorial expertise** – Currow (Doc 2), as a CEO of the Cancer Institute working to curb smoking habits to reduce cancer, has potentially more relevant experience of policies to reduce cancer than Morris (Doc 1), as president of a think-tank advancing a free society.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Weak challenge** • **Doesn't address all the evidence** – Currow (Doc 2) defends the evidence to implement the policy and the evidence that it has led to a drop in smoking rates, but does not respond to any claims about the possible negative effects of the plain packaging policy upon illicit cigarette smoking. This weakens the challenge of his argument to Morris's claims in Doc 1. **Different (not a challenge)** **Different perspectives** – The authors approach the same issue from different perspectives, Currow (Doc 2) from the effects of the policy upon smoking rates only and Morris (Doc 1) from its impact also upon the use of illicit cigarettes. **Same (not a challenge)** Both arguments: • recognise the detrimental effects of smoking illnesses upon the quality of life. • come from the perspective of trying to determine the effect of plain packaging of cigarettes in Australia. • have clear conclusions and a structured argument. • offer a number of relevant studies, surveys or reports to support their claims. • are written by authors with a possible vested interest to be selective in what they present in order to advance their case: Currow, as a CEO of the Cancer Institute working to curb smoking habits to reduce cancer and Morris, as president of the think-tank advancing a free society, to promote a libertarian attitude to the problem. • are written by authors with expertise in their fields to make informed judgements: Currow, as a CEO of the Cancer Institute to judge evidence to support effective policies to combat cancer and Morris, as president of the think-tank advancing a free society, to judge evidence to support best policies for freedom of choice.	