Cambridge International AS Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH   **9239/13**

Paper 1 Written Exam   **October/November 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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **12** printed pages.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance

Note

The mark scheme cannot cover all points that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases candidates may think of very strong answers which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should be credited according to their quality. If examiners are in any doubt about an answer, they should contact their Team Leader or Principal Examiner. For answers marked by levels of response:

(a) Mark grids describe the top of each level.

(b) **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer.

(c) **To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	Award mark
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level
Meets the criteria, but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level

Assessment Objectives for Global Perspectives

AO1 **Research, analysis and evaluation**	- analyse arguments to understand how they are structured and on what they are based - analyse perspectives and understand the different claims, reasons, arguments, views and evidence they contain - synthesise relevant and credible research/text in support of judgements about arguments and perspectives - critically evaluate the strengths, weaknesses and implications of reasoning in arguments and overall perspectives - critically evaluate the nature of different arguments and perspectives - use research/text to support judgements about arguments and perspectives.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	**Identify <u>two</u> types of material that can be extracted by recycling processes mentioned by the author in Document 1.** **Credit 1 mark** each for correct versions of the following, up to two marks. Copying from the text is acceptable. The questions ask for materials extracted by recycling processes: • Glass (from bottles) • Metals (from cans and other waste) • Paper/pulp (from books and boxes) **Credit 0 marks:** • For items that are upcycled, like: clothing, office appliances, furniture and old tyres. • for answers taken from the candidate's own knowledge. • for no creditworthy material.	2×1	**either** at the end of each item/material in a list, e.g**.** • glass ✓ • metals✓ **or** where the items/materials appear in continuous writing, e.g. Two materials that can be extracted from recycled products are glass✓ from bottles and paper pulp✓ from books.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)	**Explain <u>two</u> ways in which upcycling is better than recycling, mentioned by the author in Document 1.** **For each of 2 ways, credit 1 mark** for correct identification (can be copied from the text) and 1 mark for correct explanation (requires some paraphrasing/use of own words), up to a **maximum of 4 marks.** **Examples of one mark answers:** • upcycling increases value (of waste) • little or no energy and resources used /has environmental benefits • stops waste going to landfill sites • does not require reprocessing or extraction • creates work for people/allows businesses to upcycle for profit • recovers valuable resources from waste • people economise by upcycling in homes, schools and workplaces. • provides a pastime for people who enjoy arts and crafts • helps communal memory and heritage • Reduces the demand for newly-manufactured goods	4	**Credit 1 mark each: (1 + 1)** • for correctly identifying any relevant way mentioned in the text **plus** **Credit an additional 1 mark each (1 + 1)** • for a full considered explanation of the ways the author mentioned that make upcycling better than recycling. **Credit 0 marks** • for paraphrasing that distorts the meaning of the text • for a statement of a part of the text with no relevance to upcycling • for no creditworthy material

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)	**Examples of two mark answers:** • As upcycling uses old items like clothing and furniture to produce new goods, it can be done without re-processing or extraction of materials and increase its value. **(2)** • Ethiopians create their own businesses using old tyres to create the soles of their traditional shoes, which are now popular internationally. **(2)** • South African craftspeople make a living by working with wire to create such items as toys and furniture. The raw material is readily available and does not require extraction of materials that costs more and uses more energy. **(2)** • An African company upcycles old fishing boats into furniture but using teams of local craftspeople, who benefit from the social and cultural links this provides. **(2)**		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	**How convincing are the author's views in Document 1 about the benefits of upcycling?** **In your answer, you should evaluate strengths and weaknesses.** **Indicative content:** No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following: **Strengths of argument** - **Range of examples** – There are multiple examples of ways that upcycling can be used to create new items, e.g. WREN design in South Africa making fashion items from old sacks. - **Credibility of Author** – The author is from Africa and writing about Africa, so is able to write from a position of strength based on regional knowledge. - **Structure of argument** – The article is clearly structured with key points explained. It finishes with a clearly expressed and well-supported conclusion. - **Language** – The language used by the author is easily accessible and enthusiastic, which helps to convince the reader of the benefits of upcycling. **Weaknesses of argument** - **Questionable authority** – The credentials of the author are vague and the role and significance of the group, Consultancy Africa is not clear. It is not clear whether either have expertise on this topic to add credibility. - **One–sided argument** – the author argues very positively about the benefits of upcycling but gives no counter-argument.	10	Use the levels based marking grid below and the indicative content in the left hand column to credit marks. **For each bullet give a level (that can include split levels, e.g. L2/L1) to inform the overall level and mark within the available range. These should be placed at the end of the answer with the overall level in the right-hand margin. (Use X for Level 0)**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	• **Lack of sources** – None of the evidence is sourced, implying that all the research was done by the author. This may mean there has been selective choice of evidence and a possible vested interest in quoting specific companies and artisans. • **Lacks support** – Lacks any statistical evidence or time scales to assess how well or how recently upcycling has become more productive than recycling. • **Simplistic** – apart from the first paragraph and the last sentence recycling is not mentioned. The reader is required to work out the relative merits for themselves rather than being implicitly made by the author.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	**Both authors consider alternatives to recycling.** **To what extent is the argument in Document 2 stronger than that in Document 1?** **Indicative content:** No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following: **Stronger** • **Target location –** Doc 2 uses more global examples but implicit reference to range of countries. Doc 1 has a range of examples, but they are based within one continent and one type of economy. • **Evidence –** Doc 2 uses many named examples, e.g. Caterpillar, MUD jeans and Rype Office. These show "high-tech" solutions in developed economies where products are designed for future recycling into replacement products (Circular economy). Doc 1 also has many named examples, e.g. Artlantique and WREN. These show "low-tech" solutions in less-developed economies where products are upcycled from waste products. Candidates may reasonably conclude that this favours the arguments of Doc 1 or Doc 2, or they are equal. • **Supporting information –** Doc 2 uses limited statistics and dates to give context to the argument. References Rype opening in 2014, the year before publication of the article, and the charity Wrap stating that 100,000s of office desks and chairs are thrown away each year. Doc 1 uses no statistics and only vague timelines, *"Africans have been upcycling for years"*. • **Sources –** Doc 2 uses limited sources and relies mainly on the author's own research. However, Clegg does give direct information from the charity Wrap and the CEO of Rype Office. Doc 1 relies totally on his own apparent research, with no support for the evidence given.	14	**For each bullet give a level (that can include split levels e.g. L2/L1) to inform the overall level and mark within the available range. These should be placed at the end of the answer with the overall level in the right-hand margin. (Use X for Level 0)** 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. **Judgement** 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 there are more perspectives in Document 1, it is more practical and detailed, and more evidence is presented, making it slightly stronger. They may conclude that Document 2 is stronger as, better structured, more focused, has a global perspective, is written by someone who seems to have more authority and expertise.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	• **Date of publication –** Doc 2 was published in 2015 and Doc 1 in 2013. Candidates may argue that, in a rapidly changing technological world, that this makes Doc 2 more convincing as it is more recent. • **Counter-argument –** Neither Doc 1 nor Doc 2 have a counter-argument and don't analyse any downsides of the upcycling/circular economy argument. However, Doc 2 does identify some barriers to development, *"The circular economy is an attractive idea but it will not happen immediately."* **Weaker** • **Provenance –** Clegg, the author of Doc 2, is a freelance writer with no indication of background/credibility. Although being published in The Guardian shows apparent strength, as paper would not accept without reviewing. Musewe is African, writing about Africa for a consultancy company. There is no clear credibility shown for his background. • **Perspectives –** Doc 2 includes environmental and business perspectives – implied global perspective but not explicit. Doc1 includes environmental, social, cultural, business perspectives from Africa so provides a broader coverage of the impact of upcycling. • **Evidence –** Doc 1 uses numerous named examples, e.g. Artlantique and WREN. These show "low-tech" solutions in less-developed economies where products are upcycled from waste products. Doc 2 also uses many named examples, e.g. Caterpillar, MUD jeans and Rype Office. These show "high-tech" solutions in developed economies where products are designed for future recycling into replacement products (Circular economy). Candidates may reasonably conclude that this favours the arguments of Doc 1 or Doc 2, or they are equal. • **Conclusion –** Doc 1 has a clear and positive conclusion that is supported by evidence and reasoning in a well-structure argument. Doc 2 is slightly less well- structured and the conclusion is less clear and therefore, not as convincing as Doc 1.		Alternatively, they might conclude that overall, although from different perspectives, their arguments have similar levels of strengths and weaknesses. However, credit should be given to an alternative judgement on the basis of the assessment and reasoning.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	• **Language –** The author of Doc 1 uses very enthusiastic and convincing language with regard to upcycling. Doc 2 is more formal but also puts forward a convincing argument. **Same** Both arguments: • come from the perspective of establishing an alternative to recycling. • have clear conclusions and a structured argument. • offer a number of relevant examples to support their claims. • are documenting or presenting research and as such are written by authors with a possible lack of vested interest to be biased to a particular viewpoint. • Use the levels based marking grid below and the indicative content in the left hand column to credit marks.		

Question 2

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	8–10	• **Both** strengths and weaknesses are assessed. • Assessment of argument and evidence is **sustained** and a judgement is reached. • Assessment explicitly includes the **impact** of specific evidence upon the claims made. • Communication is **highly effective** – explanation and reasoning **accurate** and **clearly** expressed.
L2	4–7	• 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.
L1	1–3	• 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**.
L0 (X)	0	• no creditable material.
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.		

Question 3

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	10–14	- 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.
L2	5–9	- 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.
L1	1–4	- Judgement, if present, is **unsupported** or **superficial**. - Alternative perspectives have little or no assessment. - Evaluation, if any, is **simplistic**. Answers may **describe** a few points comparing the two documents. - Relevant evidence or reasons may be **identified**. - Communication is **limited**. Response may be cursory.
L0 (X)	0	no creditable material.
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.		