

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

**9777 GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES &
INDEPENDENT RESEARCH**

9777/01

Paper 1 (Written Paper), maximum raw mark 30

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 2014 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9777	01

1 (a) Summarise the impact, according to Document 1, of the rise in food prices. [4]

Candidates can either summarise the points or take quotations directly from the document. Do not reward information that is not drawn from the passage. Candidates are asked to summarise and examiners should be aware that this question carries only four marks and should not expect a lengthy answer.

Candidates should consider a range of arguments, but do not expect all of the points below to be covered. In order to achieve four marks candidates can develop two points or briefly explain four points.

They might consider some of the following:

- Serious problem in US
- Crisis in the developing world
- Harder for the less well off to make ends meet
- Eat less/cutting back on other necessities
- Hunger and malnourishment
- Matter of life and death

Exemplar 4 mark response:

Firstly, the rise in food prices led to 'concern in the US' with many families finding it hard to 'make ends meet'. Secondly, the rise in food prices led to hunger and malnutrition on a global scale - it became a 'crisis in much of the developing world'.

Exemplar 3 mark response:

Document 1 states that the rise in food prices became for some a 'matter of life and death'. It was not only a serious problem in the US but a 'crisis in much of the developing world.'

Exemplar 2 mark response:

Hunger and malnutrition meant that rising food prices are becoming a serious problem in the US and in much of the developing world.

Exemplar 1 mark response:

Food prices increased and led to hunger and malnutrition.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9777	01

- (b) Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used to show there was a rise in food prices. [6]

Responses should focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used in Document 1 to show there was a rise in food prices.

Level 3: candidates will consider the strengths **and** weaknesses.

Level 2: there is likely to be imbalance, with most of the answer focusing on the strengths of the evidence.

Level 1: candidates are likely to consider only strengths and/or weaknesses of the evidence.

Level 3 5–6 marks	<p>Sustained evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of the evidence and its use.</p> <p>Highly effective, accurate and clearly expressed explanation and reasoning.</p> <p>Clear evidence of structured argument/discussion, with conclusions reached/explicitly stated in a cogent and convincing manner.</p>
Level 2 3–4 marks	<p>Some evaluation of strengths and/or weaknesses of the evidence, but evaluation may focus on one aspect.</p> <p>Effective and generally accurate explanation and reasoning; some evidence of structured argument/discussion.</p> <p>Conclusions may not be explicitly stated or link directly to the analysis.</p>
Level 1 1–2 marks	<p>Little or no evaluation of strengths and/or weaknesses of the evidence, although flaws, etc. may be identified.</p> <p>Level of communication is limited, response may be cursory or descriptive.</p> <p>Communication does not deal with complex subject matter.</p>

Strengths and weaknesses of the evidence

No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach.

Strengths:

- The Economist a respected journal
- Price index figures provide statistics for rate of increase
- Figures for how much an average family spends
- Numbers who will become malnourished are from the FAO

Weaknesses:

- No source for some of the statistics
- No evidence for some of the claims, such as eat less or cut back other necessities
- FAO figures are estimates

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9777	01

2 Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the argument about biofuels in Document 1. [8]

- Responses should focus on the strengths **and** weaknesses of the argument about biofuels put forward in Document 1.
- At Level 3 candidates must consider both the strengths and weaknesses and should reach judgement.
- At Level 2 there is likely to be imbalance, with most of the answer focusing on the weakness of the arguments, although some answers may focus largely on the strengths. Candidates who focus on only the strengths or weaknesses can still achieve any mark within this level depending upon the quality of the evaluation.
- At Level 1 it is likely that candidates will consider only either the strengths or weaknesses. At this level candidates' answers are likely to be descriptive in approach, particularly at the lower end, if there is evaluation it may be very generalised.

Level 3 7–8 marks	Sustained evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of reasoning and evidence; critical assessment with explicit reference to how flaws and counter argument support the argument. Highly effective, accurate and clearly expressed explanation and reasoning; clear evidence of structured argument/discussion, with conclusions reached/explicitly stated in a cogent and convincing manner.
Level 2 4–6 marks	Some evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of reasoning and evidence, but evaluation may focus on one aspect; assessment of flaws etc. may not link clearly to the argument. Effective and generally accurate explanation and reasoning; some evidence of structured argument/discussion; conclusions may not be explicitly stated or link directly to the analysis.
Level 1 1–3 marks	Little or no evaluation of strengths and weaknesses, although flaws etc. may be identified. Level of communication is limited, response may be cursory or descriptive; communication does not deal with complex subject matter.

There is much material that candidates might consider and examiners should note that not all is required to gain maximum marks, what matters is the quality of the evaluation. No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Some candidates may argue that the argument is very convincing citing some of the strengths below, whilst others may be less convinced highlighting more of the weaknesses exemplified. 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 demands of the question.

Strengths:

- Balanced argument, there is a counter argument
- Counter argument about role of biofuels is developed
- Acknowledges strengths and weaknesses of both arguments and makes it clear that argument and counter argument is present
- Avoids emotional/exaggerated language
- Logic/structure of argument, clear/easy to follow

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9777	01

Weaknesses:

- Many assertions, no evidence provided to support the claims e.g. ‘food prices are a matter of life and death for some’, ‘the rise in food prices was a concern in the United States’
- Where statistics are used, the source is not acknowledged: US consumer food prices rose by 4%
- Even the main argument is largely assertion; farmers can and will produce more so no crisis
- Assertions where author claims reporters did get the story right; no evidence for any of the claims

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9777	01

3 To what extent are the arguments in Document 2 more convincing than those in Document 1? [12]

Responses should focus on key arguments and evidence in both documents in order to compare alternative perspectives and synthesise them in order to reach a reasoned judgement. In order to assess whether Document 2 is more convincing than the argument in Document 1 candidates should consider not only the content of the Documents, but critically assess the arguments put forward through a consideration of issues such as the nature of the passages, purpose and language.

- At Level 3 candidates will reach a sustained judgement about the view in the question and the extent to which this is true. In order to do this they will have covered a significant range of issues, and evaluated them clearly.
- At Level 2 there will be some evaluation and comparison, but it will be either poorly developed or limited in the areas covered.
- At Level 1 there will be very little comparison of the passages or evaluation and candidates may simply describe the documents or identify areas of similarity and difference, with little link to the question.

Level 3 9–12 marks	<p>Answers at this level will demonstrate a sustained judgement about how convincing the views expressed in each document are. There will be sustained evaluation of alternative perspectives; critical assessment with explicit reference to key issues raised in the documents leading to a reasoned and sustained judgement.</p> <p>Highly effective, accurate and clearly expressed explanation and reasoning; clear evidence of structured argument/ discussion, with conclusions reached/explicitly stated in a cogent and convincing manner.</p>
Level 2 5–8 marks	<p>Answers at this level will be more than just a comparison of the two documents; there will be some evaluation, but this will not be sustained and may focus on one perspective; assessment may not link key reasons and evidence clearly to the perspective or to the reasoned judgement.</p> <p>Effective and generally accurate explanation and reasoning; some evidence of structured argument/discussion; conclusions may not be explicitly stated or link directly to analysis.</p>
Level 1 1–4 marks	<p>Answers at this level will describe a few points and there will be little or no evaluation of perspectives, although some relevant evidence or reasons may be identified. If there is any judgement it will be unsupported or superficial.</p> <p>Level of communication is limited; response may be cursory or descriptive; communication does not deal with complex subject matter.</p>

Candidates should critically assess the use of examples and evidence in order to reach a judgement. In doing this they might conclude that Document 2 is a more or less convincing argument than that put forward in Document 1 with a range of well-chosen sources used to help develop this line of argument. No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Relevant points include:

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9777	01

Candidates might consider some of the following:

- Lack of evidence in Document 1 to support the claim, much of it is assertion: claims that biofuel production has increased the demand for grain and vegetable oil, but no evidence is given; claims that higher energy prices do increase the price of producing, processing and transporting food, but no evidence is given; claims that government policies did contribute to the increase in world food prices, but again no evidence is given
- Counter argument and other factors such as weather, economic growth and government policies that are offered in Document 1, however they might also question the evidence used to support alternative claims made in Document 1
- Document 2 considers the energy costs of exports/imports and the sustainability- some such schemes are supported by examples making it more convincing
- Influence of agribusiness
- Producing for local markets rather than international
- Environmental and social problems created
- Waste of energy in present system of exports/import
- Need to reform food production/supply
- Expertise or otherwise of the writers and whether their arguments can be trusted, trying to argue a particular point.

Candidates need to evaluate the evidence for all these possibilities and at the top level should reach a judgement based on their evaluation.