

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

**9766 GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & INDEPENDENT
RESEARCH**

9766/01

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 2013 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 2013	9766	01

- 1 (a) (i) Summarise the arguments of the writer of Document 1 against the work of the work of the IPCC. [4]

Examiners should note that this question carries only four marks and therefore candidates are not expected to write in great detail. The question asks candidates to summarise and therefore they should not be overly rewarded for copying out or quoting large amounts of text. Candidates are required to put the author's argument into their own words.

- The author's main line of argument is that the independence of the IPCC has been undermined by political interference.
- He argues that the process of drafting reports by the IPCC is flawed as governments are able to have the drafts altered to suit their own aims.
- He argues that this happened on a regular basis as governments always want to expand their control and authority.
- He therefore concludes that the IPCC reports cannot be trusted and that the media does not report the whole truth as much of their, and our, knowledge is taken from the IPCC.

Examiners should award one mark for identifying a main point of the argument and then **may award** a further mark for the quality and development of support, giving a maximum of two marks for each developed point.

Exemplar 4 mark response:

The author feels that the IPCC is not a reliable source. It was accused of misconduct over the revision to Chapter 8 of the 2nd Report. Once the IPCC has submitted the chapter, revisions were made by a lead author without consultation. Bays states that this amounted to 'deliberate fraud' and corruption of the peer review process as the whole meaning of the chapter was changed by one author. The chapter originally stated that there is no evidence that we are to blame for the increase in greenhouse gases, but was changed to state that human influence was to blame. In short, Bays states that the work of the IPCC can't be trusted and called a scientific body whilst the government has an input on decision making.

Exemplar 3 mark response:

The writer argues that the IPCC cannot be trusted as a scientific as it has too much influence from the government. He accuses the IPCC of altering their reports in order to form the required conclusion. His argument concludes that the government should not be part of the IPCC reports, and that if we cannot trust the people generating such reports we must question the validity of claims about global warming.

Exemplar 2 mark response:

The arguments that the writer of document one makes are tat the IPCC can't be trusted as an objective scientific body. Also that the government are using global warming as an excuse to expand their control and authority,

Exemplar 1 mark response:

The author argues that the IPCC cannot claim to be an objective and trusted scientific body.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9766	01

- (ii) Identify two pieces of evidence he uses to support his arguments about the work of the IPCC. [2]

Examiners should note that candidates are required only to identify evidence and not explain or assess it. Candidates can simply quote two pieces of evidence in order to achieve two marks. However, examiners should note that the evidence identified MUST be used to support the argument.

Candidates might mention:

- The revision to Chapter 8 in the Second Report.
- The following statement was deleted, 'None of the studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases'.
- The following statement was added, 'The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global warming'.
- For the 2007 Fourth Assessment Report, the summary was released months before the text being summarised was completed.
- A coalition of oil, coal and utility companies quickly accuse the IPCC of misconduct.

Exemplar 2 mark response:

The author refers to the '2007 fourth assessment report' and its changes; as well as revision of the Second Assessment Report (Chapter 8) in order to support his arguments. Both are referred to and quoted within the document, to prove inconsistency of the report.

Exemplar 1 mark response:

Revision to Chapter 8 in the Second Report

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9766	01

(b) Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Document 1. [10]

- Responses should focus on the strengths **and** weaknesses of the evidence and reasoning offered in Document 1.
- At Level 3 candidates must consider both the strengths and weaknesses and **should reach a 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.
- 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.
- Candidates who focus on only the strengths **or** weaknesses can achieve any mark up to the top of level 2 depending upon the quality of the evaluation.

Level 3 8–10 marks	Sustained evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of reasoning and evidence, critical assessment with explicit reference to how flaws and counter argument are used in the Document. 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 5–7 marks	Some evaluation of strengths and/or weaknesses of reasoning and evidence, but evaluation may focus on one aspect; assessment of flaws etc may not link clearly to the strengths and/or weaknesses of the Document. 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 1–4 marks	Little or no evaluation of strengths and/or weaknesses, although flaws etc may be identified. Level of communication may be limited, response may be cursory or descriptive; communication does not deal with complex subject matter.

No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. 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. Indicative strengths and weakness:

Strengths:

We know of no reason why the author would be biased. He produces precise examples of where IPCC reports have been changed and quotes directly sections that were deleted and the replacements to support his case. He points out the shortcomings of the press in reporting the debate and facts that we have not been told, adding credibility to his argument that we are being misled. His argument against the IPCC is logical; the signing of the Kyoto Protocol might support his view that governments are looking to increase their scope and authority.

Weaknesses:

In places he does not support his argument. At the start he provides no evidence to support his claims that the Press is not always reporting both sides of the debate and the claims he makes about ice caps etc. are not supported. He states that the IPCC was to be an objective scientific body that could produce reports on climate change for politicians worldwide, this is simply asserted. He does not acknowledge that oil and utility companies had a vested interest in attacking the Reports and therefore their claims might not be entirely valid. When

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9766	01

he claims there was deliberate fraud no evidence is provided, it is simply an assertion. The claims that the alterations continue to this day are not supported by precise evidence, but only by a sweeping comment about texts being changed to suit the summary. There is also no evidence or reasoning given to support the claim that governments want to expand their control and authority. Although the IPCC has been shown to be undermined by political pressures, this does not mean that global warming is not happening. The attribution of the source: the writer is not shown to be an expert and is writing the article as part of a degree course in journalism.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9766	01

2 Study Documents 1 and 2. To what extent is Document 2 more convincing than Document 1 in its view about global warming? [14]

Candidates may adopt a variety of approaches to answering this question. Candidates might consider issues such as reasoning, the evidence used and the credibility of the passages. If candidates do approach it in this way, examiners should **not** expect equal weight to be given to each element, what matters is the quality of the evaluation.

Responses should focus on key reasons, evidence and credibility in both documents in order to compare and synthesise them in order to reach a reasoned judgement. In order to assess whether the Documents are convincing in their views about global warming 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 whether Document 2 is more convincing than Document 1 in its view about global warming. In order to do this they will have covered a significant range of issues, and evaluated them.
- 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 clearly 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 11–14 marks	Answers at this level will demonstrate a sustained judgement about whether Document 2 is more convincing than Document 1. There will be sustained evaluation; critical assessment with explicit reference to key issues raised in the passages leading to a reasoned and sustained judgement. 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 6–10 marks	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; assessment may not link key reasons and evidence clearly to the perspective or to the reasoned judgement. Effective and generally accurate explanation and reasoning; some evidence of structured argument/discussion; conclusions may not be explicitly stated or link directly to analysis.
Level 1 1–5 marks	Answers at this level will describe a few points and there will be little or no evaluation, although some relevant evidence or reasons may be identified. If there is any judgement it will be unsupported or superficial. Level of communication is limited; response may be cursory or descriptive; communication does not deal with complex subject matter.

No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Indicative points include:

- It might be argued that Document 2 has a stronger case through its appeal to authority, arguing that large numbers of scientists from a range of countries support the views about greenhouse gases. However, this might be balanced against the claim in Document 1 that the process through which reports go can be flawed and therefore cannot always be trusted.
- It might also be argued that Document 2 appears to be more balanced or considers other possible causes, as it acknowledges that there was consideration of the role changing winds in causing the melting, but that appears to have been discredited as a major cause. However,

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2013	9766	01

it goes on to show that the evidence for natural forces has been questioned because of recent developments.

- Document 2 appears to successfully challenge the arguments in Document 1 as it provides a great deal of evidence to support its claims and candidates are likely to refer to some of the evidence to support the argument.
- The evidence provided in Document 2 is often very precise and detailed. They might refer to examples such as the Arctic shipping routes that have opened up or the exposure of one million square miles of open water beyond the average.
- Some may note that there are places where the evidence is sweeping or generalised and that this weakens the argument; they might point to comments such as: 'Many scientists' or 'some scientists' without any names, using an appeal to authority to try and strengthen the argument.
- It could be argued that some of the claims made in Document 2 are acknowledged not to be proven and the author uses words and phrases such as 'likely to be' or 'this may be where the rising influence of humans on the global climate system could be exerting the biggest regional influence.' In these cases the argument in Document 2 relies on speculation or limited evidence of change occurring. Some might balance this against some of the unsubstantiated claims made in Document 1, particularly those concerning government authority. It also notes that things might change and that the influence of global warming is based on 'all we can tell right now.'
- Document 2 also states that many scientists are 'becoming' convinced, suggesting that they are not completely convinced, whilst it also states that 'some' scientists believe it is impossible to ascribe the changes to anything else, suggesting that perhaps there are some others who feel it can be.
- Some answers might consider the origins of the Documents and argue that Document 2, coming from a Senior Fellow for Environmental Understanding may more have credible scientific support than an article written by someone who has no known scientific background. Although, some might balance this against the fact he has no apparent motive to exaggerate or ignore counter-arguments.