Cambridge International AS Level

Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH **9239/11**

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.

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> countries with polluted rivers mentioned by the author in Document 1.** **Two countries mentioned** **Credit 1 mark each for a correct version of up to two of the following:** • China • India *or* • *'*over half of China's lakes and rivers are not clean enough' • 'China and India both have water-pollution problems (2 countries mentioned in the sentence = 2 marks)	**2**	**either** at the end of each country in a list, e.g.: • China ✓ • India✓ **or** where the countries appear in continuous writing, e.g.: • China ✓ and India ✓ both have water-pollution problems **Credit 0 marks:** • for a statement of an incorrect part of the text, e.g. 'Pollution of drinking-water supplies has led to severe health problems' (where country is not mentioned). • for answers taken from the candidate's own knowledge (not part of the text), or no creditworthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)	**The author states that international organisations are confused about water.**		
1(b)(i)	**Identify <u>two</u> ways they are confused.** **Two issues that confuse international organisations.** **Credit 1 mark each for a correct version of one confusion, where the answer:** **Identification** *either* quotes from the text: • International organisations confuse increased water supply with clean, safe drinking water. • (Even worse) they confuse sanitation with wastewater management *or* closely paraphrases the text correctly: • They do not understand the difference between more water and clean water. • They do not understand the difference between sanitation and sewage systems.	**2**	**Credit one mark each: (1 + 1)** • for correctly identifying a confusion mentioned in the text. **plus** • Credit up to 2 marks for any logical explanation of the confusion and the difference between the factors confused. **Credit 0 marks:** • for paraphrasing that alters the meaning of the text • for a statement of a part of the text with no relevance to confusion/international organisations. • for answers drawn from candidate's own knowledge and not related to any part of the text, (*except where candidate uses own knowledge in explanation)* • for no creditworthy material

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)(ii)	**Explain <u>one</u> of these two confusions.** **Explanation** • They think that supplying water to houses is the same as supplying clean water to houses. This is seen to be false in the Indian region of Delhi where waste water ends up in the Yumuna river, which is a source of drinking water and so likely to be polluted. • They think that everything is okay if people have indoor toilets and don't understand that they need systems to take wastewater away safely, so untreated wastewater ends up in the drinking supply, e.g. the Yumuna River in the Delhi region (Indian example as above), or Mexico City has high level of sanitation but untreated wastewater goes to the Mezquital Valley to water crops. • Give one mark for putting the idea in context and one mark for the consequences/impact. • Candidates may paraphrase, but not copy verbatim the author's words. • Candidates can use their own words and develop a reasonable explanation based on the text of the document.	**2**	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	**How convincing is the evidence in Document 1 that there is a global problem with drinking water?** **In your answer, you should evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence.** **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:** • **The evidence supports the argument** – The author uses a variety of examples to challenge the UN's assertion that 88% of the world's population has access to drinking water. • **The evidence is relevant to claims made** – The author focuses on varied examples to show that, despite vast sums of money being spent, water supplies in some countries, e.g. Nepal, India and China, remain heavily polluted. • **Evidence is drawn from a range of authoritative sources** – e.g. Central Pollution Control Board of India and China's Ministry of Housing and Urban-Rural Development give Government level of evidence, implying that it is authoritative. The World Economic Forum, the Third World Center for Water Management and AquaFed are also likely to be credible. • **Evidence includes factual examples and quotes specific statistics** – There are numerous examples of statistics supporting the statements made. These are apparently accurate as they are not subject to rounding or approximation, e.g. *"Pakistan's National Assembly heard that 77% of urban water and 86% of rural water was unsafe." "China spent $112.4 billion on water infrastructure in 2006–2011."* • **Evidence is drawn from a range of countries and international agencies (global perspectives)** – e.g. India, China, Pakistan, Nepal and Mexico. • **Recent evidence** – The article was written in 2014 with much of the evidence coming from the period up to 2012, so relatively recent and unlikely to have changed significantly.	**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 (this 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	• **Ability of authors to select evidence –** The authors hold senior positions in organisations related to global water issues and therefore should be in a good position to choose appropriate evidence to support their argument. **Weaknesses of Evidence:** • **Evidence is not balanced** – Most of the passage provides evidence that water quality is poor. There is only a brief mention of the UN's claim that most people have access to lean water, but this is not developed or challenged. • **Some unsubstantiated evidence/sweeping statements** – '*international organisations confuse increased water supply with clean, safe, drinking water'.* Unclear which organisations and how they came to that conclusion. • **Some unexplained evidence** – *'Mexico City is considered to have a high level of sanitation….'* with no explanation of who considers/who says this. • **Outdated data/evidence** – Some of the data and associated claims date back to 2006, but some candidates may claim that 2012 is 2 years before the date of publication of the paper and so is unreliable, as recent improvements may have been made.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	**Both authors discuss the issue of lack of clean, safe drinking water and give possible solutions to the problem. To what extent is the argument in Document 2 stronger than that in Document 1?** **Use the levels-based marking opposite to credit marks.** No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include and assess some of the following: **<u>More Convincing</u>** **Clearer structure** – Document 2 (Doc 2) gives a step-by-step approach to threats related to bottled water, which makes the argument clear to follow. Doc 1 lists much evidence, but the structure is less supportive of the conclusion. **No vested interest** – The author of Doc 2 is not shown to be representing any organisation so could be assumed to be suggesting solutions without a vested interest. The authors of Doc 1 have more of a vested interest, especially the Chairman of Nestlé, a food and drink company. **Focus on specific location and perspective** – Doc 2 looks in detail at one country, China, and reflects on the benefits and threats of bottled water. Doc 1 has a more global view (although generally restricted to Asia) on water supply and wastewater. (See below as this could also correctly be viewed as a weakness of the argument). **<u>Less Convincing</u>** **Quality of Evidence** – Doc 2 provides a limited number of statistics, that are also rounded so are less accurate than those in Doc 1. E.g. *"….70% of fresh water is polluted". "One brand contained 9000 times the permitted level."* [of bacteria]. Doc 1 provides many statistics that are apparently not rounded, e.g. *"China spent $112.4 billion…."* and therefore likely to be more reliable.	**14**	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).** There is no requirement to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use <u>unless</u> 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 is a little more balance in Doc 1 and more evidence presented, making it stronger. They may conclude that Doc 1 is stronger as it is more focussed, includes a more global perspective and provides more specific solutions. 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	**Lack of named sources** – Doc 2 uses some data, but there is no indication of its origin. There is no reference to named sources, so the data may have been obtained independently by the author meaning there is no check on its reliability. There is some anecdotal evidence from *"an employee in the bottled water business"* which is equally unsupported. **Assertion** – With no named sources and lack of support for the argument, Doc 2 consists mainly of unsubstantiated assertions. Document 1 provides many reliable sources and apparently accurate statistics so the argument is supported. **Narrow focus** – Some candidates will argue that concentrating on China and bottled water only is a weakness of Doc 2. However, Doc 2 links reference to advice given in 2014 in Lanzhou and a recognition that China has severe water pollution to the development of the bottled water industry. . Doc 1 has a wider view within Asia by including evidence relating to countries other than China, (i.e. India, Pakistan and Nepal) **One-sided argument –** The author of Doc 2 only addresses the problems with the bottled water industry and offers no counter-argument. There is some balance in Doc 1, with reference to the UN's claim on access to clean drinking water in contrast to the problems of water quality and waste water. **Unsupported conclusion** – The conclusion in Doc 2, while offering some strong solutions, is very dogmatic, e.g. *"...China's government must address these threats to water quality"* but without any indication of how they will be achieved. **Expertise of authors –** The author of Doc 2 has qualifications that are not directly related to water management or health. There is no indication of her authority to write this article. The authors of Doc 1 both lead global water organisations and have apparent expertise in that area. **<u>Same (neither more or less convincing)</u>** Both arguments: • come from the perspective of trying to suggest solutions to low water quality in developing countries. • have clear conclusions and a structured argument.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	• offer a number of relevant examples to support their claims. • have no indication of where the articles were published which questions their credibility.		

Question 2

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	8–10	• **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.
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 evidence 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 evidence. • 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/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.
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.		