Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND INDEPENDENT RESEARCH **9777/01**

Paper 1 Written Paper **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 **10** printed pages.

Cambridge Assessment International Education

[Turn over

Assessment Objectives for Global Perspectives written paper

There are two assessment objectives assessed in this paper:

AO1
Deconstruction: Analyse and evaluate conclusions, arguments, reasoning or claims

- critically compare different perspectives
- analyse the structure of arguments, reasoning or claims and identify the key components
- evaluate the implications of the conclusions, arguments, reasoning or claims
- analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of arguments, reasoning or claims
- evaluate the validity of the conclusions, arguments, reasoning or claims

AO2
Reconstruction: Analyse the evidence for conclusions, arguments, reasoning or claims

- research and analyse evidence to support conclusions, arguments, reasoning or claims
- evaluate sources used to support conclusions, arguments, reasoning or claims
- research and analyse alternative perspectives and conclusions against the supporting evidence
- identify and analyse the context upon which arguments have been based
- evaluate the reliability and credibility of sources

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	**Study Document 1. Summarise the reasons given in Document 1 to explain why the Internet should be regulated.** **Candidates may give some of the following reasons/explanations:** • Some of the content on the Internet (whilst not being illegal) is harmful and offensive (R) • The industry must regulate such content – so as to be credible when it insists people should protect themselves from this harmful/offensive content. (R+E) (also implication of child protection) (they cannot expect people to do things they do not want to/cannot do themselves) • We already regulate other communication networks, (E) the internet is universal (becoming *the* network) so *not* regulating content of the Net risks abandoning all content regulation (R) • We need proper arrangements in place for regulating harmful and illegal content if we wish to argue that users have to exercise control in relation to material that they find offensive (R and E) (see conclusion: users should be given the tools) • The range (illegal/harmful/offensive) of problematic content must not be ignored (R) (range = implication that there may be different approaches)	6	Use up to 6 ticks to indicate where marks have been awarded in the candidate's answer. • Examiners should be aware that this question carries only six marks and should expect a succinct answer. • Candidates should use their own words and should not be rewarded for simply copying out *large sections* of the Document. However, where they are identifying reasons given by the author, wording may be similar/the same. • Candidates should be awarded **one** mark for each reason listed; alternatively: responses which cite a reason and provide an explanation of that reason should be awarded **two** marks for each. • Do not reward information that is not drawn from the Document (candidate's own knowledge). However, candidates may need to draw reasonable inferences or link material to explain the author's reasons.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	**Study Document 1. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the author's argument in Document 1 for the regulation of the Internet.** There is much material that candidates may consider and examiners should note that not all is required to gain maximum marks, what matters is the *quality of evaluation*. No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Some candidates may argue that the argument is very strong, citing some of strengths below, whilst others may be less convinced highlighting more of the weaknesses exemplified. **Candidates are likely to draw on some of the following points:** **Strengths:** • The author has experience and his arguments are based on his experience as Chair of the Internet Watch Foundation • The argument put forward appears reasonable, difficult to disagree with idea of regulation because of pornography or harmful images • Appears to address questions about the feasibility of regulation, e.g. how can it be regulated • Awareness of different areas of content regulation (illegal, offensive, harmful clearly distinguished) • Appeal to emotion to make argument more convincing – examples of problematic content • Appears to be balanced, does suggest that users have some responsibility, so rational approach • Recognising and promoting responsibility to provide guidance on tools and techniques to manage controls	10	• At Level 3 candidates must evaluate both the strengths and weaknesses. • At Level 2 there is likely to be imbalance between strengths and weaknesses. Candidates who focus on only the strengths or weaknesses can still achieve any mark within this level depending upon the quality of the evaluation. The evaluation may focus on one aspect: e.g. <u>only</u> evidence or <u>only</u> the arguments. • 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 generalized. Responses should focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the author's argument put forward in Document 1. Examiners should use the levels grid below to assign the mark. 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.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	**<u>Weaknesses:</u>** • As Chair of the Internet Watch Foundation he may be biased in arguing for regulations (mitigated by being an _Independent_ Chair) • Lack of evidence/statistics to support claims – assumption that harmful content is not all illegal. • Exaggerated claim of implications of non-regulation – abandoning the notion of content regulation • Vague claim about (unnamed) consulting bodies – which bodies should be consulted? • Solution offered is vague/generalised and little comment as to how it would work • Appeals to emotion such as imagery – this can weaken the argument • No expert view (appeal to authority), it is a personal **Level 3** **8–10 marks** Sustained evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of arguments 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 Conclusions reached/explicitly stated in a cogent and convincing manner.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	**Level 2** **5–7 marks** Some evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of arguments 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** **1–4 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.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	**Study Documents 1 and 2.** **To what extent is the author's argument in Document 2 more convincing than the author's argument in Document 1?** 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 examples to help support this line of argument. No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may draw their own conclusions about some of the following: • The perspectives of the two Documents are different, Document 1 is concerned about controlling harmful content, whereas Document 2 is concerned about freedom from control and the impact on business and innovation in the US. • Audience/Readership: the two documents clearly present different perspectives (welfare and safety of users/American national interests) and may convince different readers. • The author of Document 2 is less of an expert on Internet regulation, but may also have a political purpose in their views in appealing to voters. The author of Document 1 has experience of monitoring the Internet and is probably more aware of content. This may make Doc 1 more convincing. • Document 2 has a strong appeal to emotion, through issues such as nationalism, the American dream, threat to freedom, but Document 1 also appeals to emotion about offensive content/ impact on children	14	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 question. 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, or only address strengths *or* weaknesses, or focus only on Doc 2. • At Level 1 there will be very limited evaluation, comparison will be of the content and candidates may simply describe the documents, with little link to the question. Any evaluative comments are undeveloped or unsupported Examiners should use the levels grid below to assign the mark.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	• Document 2 appears to be less balanced in its argument, whereas Document 1 does consider the role that the user should play once a framework is in place - again this may convince/persuade • Document 2 does not directly address the issue of **_harmful content_**, (ref to Doc 1) perhaps implying that freedom is more important – this may make the argument less convincing. • Document 1 does address a counter-argument (How can one draw the line?) whereas Document 2 does not consider any counter-arguments. This balance strengthens the argument in Document 1. • Both documents provide examples to support their arguments. Document 2 provides examples of where regulation has caused damage. Document 1 provides examples of other regulated communications. **Level 3** **11–14 marks** Answers at this level will demonstrate a sustained judgement about the view. There will be sustained evaluation of alternative perspectives; 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		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	**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 and may focus on one perspective; 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 of perspectives, although some relevant evidence 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 dos not deal with complex subject matter		

Question 2 Levels Marking Grid		Question 3 Levels Marking Grid	
Level 3 **8–10 marks**	Sustained evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of arguments 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 3** **11–14 marks**	Answers at this level will demonstrate a sustained judgement about the view. There will be sustained evaluation of alternative perspectives; 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 **5–7 marks**	Some evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of arguments 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 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 and may focus on one perspective; 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 **1–4 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.	**Level 1** **1–5 marks**	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. Level of communication is limited; response may be cursory or descriptive; communication does not deal with complex subject matter.