Cambridge IGCSE

MAXIMUM MARK: 70

This document consists of **14** printed pages.

Introduction

Most questions are marked holistically using levels of response mark schemes. The marks awarded for an answer are usually based on a judgement of the overall quality of the response, rather than on awarding marks for specific points and accumulating a total mark by adding points.

Inevitably, the mark scheme cannot cover all responses that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases candidates may make very strong responses which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should nevertheless be credited according to their quality.

Levels of response

For answers marked by levels of response, the following is intended to describe the quality of the response required (level of skill that should be demonstrated) for the award of marks at different points in the mark range for the question.

In the levels of response mark scheme positive achievement is being rewarded.
For answers marked by levels of response:

a. Marking 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 of level 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

Mark scheme

All of the questions are based on Sources which are available to candidates as an Insert to the examination paper. It is therefore very important to study this material prior to marking to become familiar with the context of the questions.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	Candidates may identify one of the following from Source 1: • The number of people travelling by air is growing/increasing/going up. 1 mark should be awarded for the identification of the above. *Further guidance – note that the only acceptable answer is listed above. However, candidates may use their own words. Numerical data is not needed – a simple identification/brief description of the trend is all that is required.*	1
1(b)	Candidates may identify the following causes of the change in the number of international passengers from Source 2: • technological change • larger ships • more fuel-efficient ships • people becoming richer/can afford to travel • people have higher levels of education • media/internet have increased awareness of other cultures/environments • people more interested in international travel/holidays 1 mark should be awarded for each correctly identified cause. *Further guidance – note that the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	2

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	**Indicative content** Candidates may identify one of the following causes of the change in the number of international passengers: • technological change • larger ships • more fuel-efficient ships • people becoming richer • people have higher levels of education • media/internet • people more interested in international travel/holidays/increased awareness of other cultures/environments Candidates may give the following reasons, any of which could be used, to justify their choice: • degree of impact of the number of international passengers • degree of impact on individuals/countries/world • number of people/groups/countries affected • promoting and increasing frequency of travel • impact of one cause upon another cause/s • other reasonable response *Further guidance – candidates are most likely to discuss 'causes' from the Source as listed above. However, the assessment is focused mainly upon their reasoning/justification, and therefore additional causes should be credited.* The following levels of response should be used to award marks. **Level 3 (3 marks) Good response** Clearly reasoned explanation explicitly linked to a cause with one developed point or three relevant but undeveloped points. **Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response** Some explanation with two (or more) undeveloped points. The link between the explanation and a cause may be unclear at times. **Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response** Limited explanation. Explanation is not linked to a cause explicitly. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**3**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	**Indicative content**	**6**
	Candidates are likely to identify the following consequences which can be explained as both global and local:	
	• environmental, e.g. increased pollution and resource depletion • economic, e.g. new employment opportunities and international trade • social, e.g. different patterns of tourism and opening of educational opportunities abroad • cultural, e.g. ethnic intermarriage and growth of a globalised mass culture • political, e.g. need for international laws and control of migration	
	Three marks are available for the explanation of each consequence. A total of six marks (3 marks + 3 marks) are therefore available for the question as a whole.	
	Further guidance – candidates may make use of information from Sources 3 and 4, and this should be given credit where appropriate.	
	The following levels of response should be used to award marks.	
	Level 3 (3 marks) Good response A clear and full explanation of the consequence explicitly related to the context – global or local.	
	Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response A basic or partial explanation of the consequence generally related to the context – global or local.	
	Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response An identification of a consequence with limited or no explanation related to the context – global or local.	
	Level 0 (0 marks) No relevant response or creditworthy material.	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Indicative content** Candidates are likely to discuss the following evaluative points relating to Source 3: **Strengths:** • some factual evidence is used/referred to generally • there is some cited evidence from the UN • several different types of evidence are used – opinion, research, personal experience • the evidence is generally relevant • the evidence is related clearly and explicitly to the argument • the evidence is used forcefully in a strongly worded argument • uses many examples • language used to present evidence is positive and enthusiastic • other reasonable response **Weaknesses:** • research evidence is partially cited – the date, title, author and source are not fully clear • level of expertise of the author is not clear and only asserted – may have poor knowledge claims in practice • method of research of source/citation is unclear • there is no clear, specific statistical/numerical evidence • the evidence is not easy to verify/check from the information provided • too much reliance on opinion • evidence may be out of date • personal testimony/anecdote/values may not apply to other places/ countries etc. • the evidence may be presented in a biased way (self interest from the point of view of a tourist industry professional) • use of examples is anecdotal • language used to support evidence is exaggerated • other reasonable response The following levels of response should be used to award marks. **Level 3 (5–6 marks) Good response** Clearly reasoned, credible and structured evaluation; two (or more) developed points clearly linked to the issue, with some other undeveloped points; or a wide range (four or more) of undeveloped points. Evaluation is clearly focused on the evidence, its strengths and/or weaknesses, and the way it is used to support the claim. A convincing overall assessment or conclusion is reached.	**6**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response** Reasonable evaluation mainly focused on the evidence, its strengths and/or weaknesses, and the way it is used to support the claim. The response may contain one (or more) developed point(s), with some other undeveloped points. Some (two or more) undeveloped points may be sufficient. An overall assessment or conclusion is attempted. **Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response** Limited evaluation which is often unsupported and asserted. The response is clear in part but is incomplete and generalised. It contains one undeveloped point only. Answers at this level may repeat source material with little understanding. An overall assessment or conclusion is weak or not attempted. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	Indicative content Candidates are likely to discuss the following ways to test the claim stated in Source 3. **Possible types of information:** • compare statistics/information on cost and time taken for travel to identified places past and present • data from travellers, professionals in the travel industry or experts in the field • individual testimony or personal experience • material from international organisations, NGOs and pressure groups linked to travel issues • other relevant response **Possible sources of information:** • national and local governments and their departments • international organisations, e.g. United Nations; UNESCO • travel experts • research reports • pressure groups, charities and NGOs • media and worldwide web • other relevant response **Possible methods:** • review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents • interview relevant experts, travellers, professionals • internet search • questionnaires • surveys • other relevant response The following levels of response should be used to award marks. **Level 4 (7–8 marks) Very good response** Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of a range of ways to test the claim. The response contains three (or more) developed points, and may contain some undeveloped points. The response is clearly and explicitly related to testing the claim. **Level 3 (5–6 marks) Good response** Reasoned and mainly credible explanation of ways to test the claim. The response contains two (or more) developed points, and may contain some undeveloped points. The response is explicitly related to testing the claim. **Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response** Some reasoning and explanation of ways to test the claim. The response contains one (or more) developed point(s), and/or a range of undeveloped points. The response may lack clarity.	8

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response** Limited explanation of ways to test the claim. The response contains one or two simple, undeveloped and asserted points. There is little relevance in the response to testing the claim. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	Candidates may identify one of the following from Source 4: • Everyone who visits will learn a lot. • The paintings will be destroyed soon. 1 mark should be awarded for the identification of one of the above. *Further guidance – note that the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**1**
3(b)	Candidates may identify one of the following from Source 4: • Donna lives near the castle, and so is personally affected • Donna works for a company studying the damage caused by tourism on the local community. 1 mark should be awarded for the identification of one of the above. *Further guidance – note that the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**1**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	An opinion is generally defined as an individual's point of view or belief which is not necessarily shared by others/supported by evidence. The following opinions are in Source 4: • everyone should visit the castle • it's easy to get there • I think this place is brilliant • was the best part of our trip • the exhibition was very educational • everyone could learn a lot • the cost of the exhibition was expensive • the exhibition was worth it • his mother thinks the castle is great (and he does too) Award one mark for correctly identifying an opinion from the list above. However, candidates may use their own words. Award two marks for a clear understanding of an opinion applied accurately to the example identified from the sources. For example: It is an opinion that 'everyone should visit the castle' because this is Miguel's personal point of view, but others like Donna may disagree. Award one mark for a response that demonstrates some understanding of an opinion. For example: It is an opinion that 'everyone should visit the castle' because this is Miguel's personal point of view.	3

Question	Answer	Marks
3(d)	**Indicative content** Candidates are expected to evaluate the arguments presented in Source 4 and compare their effectiveness. They should make a supported judgement with some explanation about which person has the most convincing argument. Candidates may support their judgement by considering: **Strength of reasoning:** • logic • structure • balance • claims **Use of language:** • tone – emotive, exaggerated; precise • clarity **Evidence:** • range of information and depth • relevance • sufficiency – sample • source – media; internet • date – how recent • different types of information – fact, opinion, value, anecdote • testimony – from experience and expert **Sources of bias:** • local interest • economic • personal values • experience **Likely consequences of the ideas presented** **Acceptability of their values to others:** • how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view • other reasonable response The following levels of response should be used to award marks. **Level 5 (13–15 marks) Very good response** Clear, credible and well supported points about which argument is most convincing. Coherent, structured evaluation of both arguments with clear comparison. The response contains three (or more) developed evaluative points, and may include some undeveloped points. A clear judgement is reached.	15

Question	Answer	Marks
3(d)	**Level 4 (10–12 marks) Good response** Clear, supported points about which argument is more convincing. Evaluation of both arguments, with comparison. The response contains two (or more) developed evaluative points and may include some undeveloped points. A wide range (four or more) of undeveloped but clearly appropriate points may be sufficient to enter this band at the lower level. A judgement is reached. **Level 3 (7–9 marks) Reasonable response** Reasonable points about which argument is more convincing. Some evaluation of both arguments, with an attempt at comparison. Judgements and evaluative points are partially supported or asserted. One (or more) developed evaluative points, possibly with some undeveloped points; three (or more) undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this band at the lower level. An attempt is made to give an overall judgement. **Level 2 (4–6 marks) Basic response** Basic points about which argument is more convincing. There may be only one argument considered in any detail, with little attempt at comparison. Judgements and evaluative points are partially supported and lack clarity/relevance at times. The response contains two (or more) undeveloped points. A basic judgement may be reached. **Level 1 (1–3 marks) Limited response** Limited and unsupported points about which argument is more convincing. The response considers the arguments briefly and/or tangentially. There is little clarity. Answers at this level may repeat source material with little understanding or simply agree/disagree with the arguments presented. The response may not contain any clear evaluative points. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**Indicative content** Candidates are expected to argue using reasons and evidence to justify their opinion and judgement about the issue, i.e. the best way to preserve a historical site for the future. Candidates are expected to use and develop the material found in Sources 1–4, but should go beyond simply repeating or recycling without adaptation. Other material may be introduced but it is not necessary to gain full marks. Candidates may consider some of the following: • reference to scale of impact on the problem • reference to different consequences and implications for individuals/ groups/government • impact on patterns of trade and employment locally, nationally or globally • how long it might take to make a difference • the effects of cultural differences and beliefs on action and its outcomes • barriers to change • the power of collective action, e.g. cooperation between countries over heritage issues • the difficulties of changing individual behaviour • the influence of individuals and groups acting locally • the role of vested interests and power differences • potential conflicts of interest • difficulties in coordinating globally and across multiple independent countries • cost and access to resources to implement change • alternative local and global responses and action • other reasonable response The following levels of response should be used to award marks. **Level 5 (20–24 marks) Very good response** Clear, well supported reasoning about the recommended course of action. Different arguments and perspectives are clearly considered. The response contains a wide range of clearly reasoned points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with four (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points. The response is very well-structured. **Level 4 (15–19 marks) Good response** Clear, supported reasoning about the recommended course of action. Different arguments and perspectives are considered. The response contains a range of reasoned points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with three (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points. The response is generally well-structured.	24

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**Level 3 (10–14 marks) Reasonable response** Some supported reasoning about the recommended course of action. Different arguments and perspectives are included. The response contains some points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with two (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points. The response is structured but at times difficult to follow. **Level 2 (5–9 marks) Basic response** Basic reasoning about the recommended course of action. Different arguments are included; perspectives, if present, are unclear. The response relies on assertion rather than evidence but contains one (or more) developed point(s) or a range of undeveloped points. The response lacks structure and is difficult to follow. **Level 1 (1–4 marks) Limited response** Limited and unsupported reasoning about the issue in general. Different arguments may be included. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant or creditworthy material.	