



Cambridge International AS & A Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

9239/11

Paper 1 Written Examination

May/June 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 30

Published

Students did not sit exam papers in the June 2020 series due to the Covid-19 global pandemic.

This mark scheme is published to support teachers and students and should be read together with the question paper. It shows the requirements of the exam. The answer column of the mark scheme shows the proposed basis on which Examiners would award marks for this exam. Where appropriate, this column also provides the most likely acceptable alternative responses expected from students. Examiners usually review the mark scheme after they have seen student responses and update the mark scheme if appropriate. In the June series, Examiners were unable to consider the acceptability of alternative responses, as there were no student responses to consider.

Mark schemes should usually be read together with the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers. However, because students did not sit exam papers, there is no Principal Examiner Report for Teachers for the June 2020 series.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™ and Cambridge International A & AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **17** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Annotations

Scripts must be annotated to show how and where marks have been awarded. For scripts marked on RM Assessor, the following on-screen annotations are available. Please follow the guidance within the mark scheme on how to annotate each question.

Annotation	Meaning
✓	Correct, creditworthy point
X	Incorrect point or no creditable material (L0 – level 0 response)
?	Unclear/confused point
EVAL	Evaluation
J	Judgement
+	Strength
-	Weakness
ND	Needs developing
On page comment	Space for summative comment if needed
NAQ	Not answering the question
REP	Repetition (same point made with different example, but not used to enhance the explanation)
SEEN	Seen
L1	Level 1 response
L2	Level 2 response
L3	Level 3 response
C	Undeveloped comparison of content

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
---	--

Coverage of Assessment Objectives:**1.a** Q1 (a), Q1 (b), Q2, Q3**1.b** Q2, Q3**1.c** Q2, Q3**1.d** Q2, Q3**1.e** Q2, Q3**1.f** Q2, Q3

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	Identify <u>two</u> countries that have experienced far-reaching consequences from growing genetically modified (GM) crops, as claimed by the author of Document 1. Credit 1 mark for each correct country identified, up to 2 marks. • Mexico • Argentina Credit 0 marks for answers with no creditworthy material e.g. <i>Peru, Brazil, Paraguay, Ecuador, Lima, Latin America.</i> 2 × 1	2
	RM Assessor annotation: ✓ for each correct country identified. The annotation should be placed within the body of the text to indicate where the marks were awarded.	

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	Explain <u>two</u> negative effects that growing GM crops has already had, as given by the author of Document 1. Credit 1 mark for correctly identifying a negative effect plus 1 mark if this is correctly explained. e.g. • There have been negative environmental effects / bio-diversity of wild and non-GM crops has been reduced. ✓ because DNA from GM crops has entered local crops. ✓ • There has been a negative financial effect on farmers / farmers have had to buy larger quantities of herbicide ✓ because growing GM crops has required an annual spraying of 50 million gallons of Roundup. ✓ • The cost for the growers has increased / GM growers have been forced to buy GM seeds from the company every year ✓ because they have been banned from harvesting / using seeds from the previous year. ✓ Allow the inference from common knowledge: • The environment has been damaged ✓ because growing GM crops has required an annual spraying of large quantities of herbicides / 50 million gallons of Roundup . ✓ Note: Credit two answers that relate to the same generic negative impact e.g. two different explanations about increased cost. Examples of 1 mark answers of an undeveloped statement of a negative consequence: • Bio-diversity of wild and non-GM crops has been reduced. ✓ • Farmers have had to buy larger quantities of herbicide. ✓ • GM growers have been forced to buy GM seeds from the company every year. ✓ 2 × 1 + 1 RM Assessor annotation: ✓ for each mark credited. The annotation should be placed within the body of the text to indicate where the marks were awarded	4

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the author's evidence in Document 1 to support his argument about genetically modified organisms (GMOs). Use the levels-based marking below to credit marks. No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following: Strengths • gives some balance of counter-evidence – both the claims of potential benefits of <i>increase yields</i> and <i>help farmers adapt to climate change</i> and also the claims of risks of e.g. allergies, reduced <i>biodiversity</i>, increased <i>herbicides</i> and increased cost to growers. • gives wide / balanced evidence – of many Latin American countries for and against GM crops. e.g. <i>Ecuador</i> prohibits, <i>Peru's</i> 10 yr delay, <i>Argentina's</i> GM expansion and its impact. • uses sources with authority – both for e.g. <i>Bayer, Germany's pharmaceuticals giant</i> and against e.g. <i>University of California scientists and spokesperson from Grain</i>– to give informed evidence of the benefits and risks. • uses sourced statistics – e.g. <i>Grain</i> on 60% of Argentina's agricultural surface, and <i>50 million gallons</i> of roundup annually – to give credibility to claim the impact has been brutal, <i>because of Grain's non-profit status and experience in the field</i>. • uses relevant example – of research in <i>2003 in Mexico</i> – found DNA from GM corn <i>in local crops</i>. • uses relevant emotional expression in claims – to convince readers of the negatives of GM foods... <i>Franken-foods, brutal, forced</i>. • uses an historical perspective in evidence – to explain to the reader how the unregulated position of GM foods in Argentina came about, without any legislation. • uses the evidence to draw a realistic conclusion– <i>Only time will tell</i> – supported by evidence <i>might, could</i>. It admits the unknown aspect in line with evidence. • experience of author to assess impact of evidence of GM crops – Tegel is a journalist in <i>Peru</i> and has a degree in <i>Latin American studies</i>, so is likely to have the background to select relevant evidence about GM foods in the area and make relevant judgements. • first-hand evidence – Tegel presents information directly gathered from Grain about the impact of GM food on Argentina, and from Bayer on the impact of GM crops on health and genetic diversity.... <i>told us, PRI contacted, in a written response</i>. This may give him more personal understanding of the evidence. • vested interest to present accurate evidence – <i>Tegel</i>, as a <i>journalist</i> presenting information for PRI, would have vested interest to present evidence accurately, about the attitudes of Latin American countries to GM crops and their impact, to maintain both their professional standing as a journalist and that of <i>the global news platform</i> in the public's eyes.	12

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Weaknesses • lacks global perspective in evidence – uses evidence from the specifics of <i>Latin America</i> then draws a general conclusion about '<i>global food supply</i>'. GMO producers in other parts of the world may have different experiences and evidence. • lacks balance in evidence – focuses on providing evidence for the negatives of GMOs without evidence for the positives mentioned of helping adapt '<i>to climate change</i>' or feeding '<i>a growing population</i>'. • lacks significance in evidence – claims '<i>vast quantities</i>' with '<i>roughly 120 million acres in three countries</i>' of GM crops, which indicates the extent of the issue. However, without the context of total number of acres being cultivated, it is difficult to know the scale of the issue of GM as against conventionally grown crops. • uses undeveloped claims – claims possible negatives: '<i>might affect human health</i>', '<i>could cause new allergies</i>' without any evidence to support or exemplify this, which limits confidence in the claims. • uses the evidence to draw an indecisive conclusion – it looks to the future for an answer as to whether there will be overall harm or benefit...<i>Only time will tell...</i>, leaving the reader in limbo as to what to believe. • uses unsupported claims and unsupported statistics – e.g. <i>Together, Argentina, Brazil and Paraguay have roughly 120 million acres of GM crops; Ecuador actually prohibits them; Peru recently voted to delay</i>, which limits their authority. • the views of the sources may not be typical – if the negative views of <i>Grain</i> are not representative of how others view the brutal impact of GM crops, then this weakens the evidence presented from the critics of GM crops. Similarly of <i>Bayer</i> on the defense of GM crops, if the vast majority reject that it is farming techniques that is endangering biodiversity rather than GMOs, then this weakens the claim given in support of GMOs. • vested interest of sources to select the positives and negatives – <i>Grain</i> which supports small farmers, and <i>Bayer</i> producing pharmaceuticals both may have a vested interest to present GM foods in a particular light to persuade the general public so that their professions might benefit. • 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	Answer	Marks
3	Both authors consider the effects of growing GM crops in Latin America. To what extent is the author's argument in Document 2 more convincing than that of the author in Document 1? No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following: More convincing because stronger argument • More definite belief – Norero (Doc 2) concentrates on the <i>biosafety</i> of GM foods and concludes <i>All these economic and environmental benefits can be further improved if Brazil continues...</i> which implies a definite positive belief in the impact of GM foods; whereas Tegel's argument (Doc1) <i>concludes only time will tell</i> which leaves the reader in limbo as to the impact. • more authorial expertise – Norero (Doc 2) is a university <i>biochemist</i> and <i>founder</i> of a movement that <i>advocates transgenics</i> <i>Sí Quiero Transgénicos</i>, so is likely to have more expertise to make judgements about the biosafety regulations in Brazil. Tegel (Doc1) is a journalist in Peru with a <i>degree in Latin American Studies</i> who is less likely to have this specialised knowledge to assess the impact of GM crops. • greater range of independent authorities – Norero (Doc 2) uses an <i>international advisor</i>, <i>agricultural economics consultants</i>, a <i>Brazilian consultancy</i> and quotes <i>biosafety framework 1.105 law</i>. These have greater independent knowledge than Tegel's argument (Doc1) which uses sources with vested interest e.g. <i>Grain</i> to support its small farmers and <i>Bayer</i> to support its products. • greater use of statistics – Norero (Doc 2) gives greater detail about GM crops – <i>104 million acres</i>, <i>93%</i>, <i>90%</i>, <i>60</i>; detailed economic benefits – <i>11,8 billion dollars</i>, <i>3.4 billion dollars</i>, and savings of <i>12 billion liters</i> and <i>105 million liters</i> which gives a more precise convincing picture than Tegel's argument (Doc1). The latter is vaguer giving more general claims – <i>brutal</i> impact, farmers <i>forced</i>, <i>vast agricultural areas</i>. Less convincing because weaker argument • less balance – Norero (Doc 2) looks only at the <i>economic and environmental benefits</i> with no discussion of the negative impact; whereas Tegel (Doc1) gives the views of <i>Bayer</i> for GM crops and <i>Grain</i> against, providing a more balanced discussion. • narrower perspective Norero (Doc 2) looks only at the impact of GM foods in <i>Brazil</i>, which may not be typical of that in wider <i>Latin America</i>, as given by Tegel (Doc1).	12

Question	Answer	Marks
3	• less first-hand evidence Norero (Doc 2) provides reports claims from <i>consultants</i>; whereas Tegel (Doc1) appears to have more direct access to <i>Grain spokesperson</i> and <i>Bayer, told us, we contacted</i>, perhaps giving a more personal understanding of views. • possible greater motive – Norero (Doc 2) is the <i>founder</i> of a <i>bio-technology advocacy movement</i>, so perhaps has more vested interest to select views in favour of GM crops than Tegel (Doc1), who as a <i>journalist</i> has no apparent gain from presenting one side over the other. Neither is more convincing because different perspectives • different geographical perspectives – The impact on Brazil may be different from that of the rest of Latin America. Norero (Doc 2) concentrates on Brazil where the Biosafety checks are said to be <i>internationally recognised as one of the strictest approval processes</i>; whereas Tegel (Doc1) is assessing the impact on Latin America in general <i>-Only time will tell. Both these perspectives may be accepted at once.</i> • conclusions may not conflict – Norero (Doc 2) concludes <i>All these economic and environmental benefits can be further improved if Brazil continues...</i> which does not necessarily conflict with Tegel's conclusion (Doc1) <i>Only time will tell what their effects on human health and the environment really are</i>, as the future may not be negative. because similar perspectives/strengths • Both discuss economic and environmental perspectives – Both Norero (Doc 2) and Tegel (Doc1) discuss bio-safety and economics but concentrate on different locations, Norero – <i>Brazil</i> and Tegel – wider <i>Latin America</i>, so their arguments both contribute to a greater picture. • Both have clear conclusions and a structured argument – Norero (Doc 2) concludes <i>All these economic and environmental benefits can be further improved if Brazil continues</i> supported by evidence of effective biosafety measures; whereas Tegel (Doc1) concludes <i>Only time will tell what their effects on human health and the environment really are</i>, supported by evidence that points to future detrimental effects. • Both use relevant views – Norero (Doc 2) supports his claims about bio-safety and economic advantages with an international adviser, agricultural economics consultants and the Brazilian consultancy '<i>Céleres Ambiental</i>'; and Tegel (Doc1) uses e.g. <i>Bayer, Germany's pharmaceuticals giant</i> and against e.g. <i>University of California scientists, Grain</i> – to give informed views of the benefits and risks. • Both use sourced statistics – Norero (Doc 2) uses '<i>Céleres Ambiental</i>' to give authority to the claim that millions of water and diesel fuel are saved; and Tegel (Doc1) uses <i>Grain on 60% of Argentina's agricultural surface, and 50 million gallons of roundup annually</i> to give credibility to claim the impact has been brutal.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	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 Dr Norero's argument (Doc 2) is more convincing because of more expert sources, more authorial expertise, a greater use of statistics and a stronger specific belief. Alternatively, they might conclude that overall, despite Tegel's (Doc 1) lack of expertise, his argument is stronger because it is more balanced and open to future developments. Credit should be given to any alternative judgement on the basis of the assessment and reasoning e.g. that both arguments are equally strong.	

Marking and annotation guidance – Question 2 – 12 marks**Annotate in the left-hand margin as below:**

- a) ND (needs developing) when a point has been mentioned but not developed (simplistic),
- b) ND+ or ND- when a strength or weakness has been partially developed (generalised) and
- c) + or - for a fully developed and explained point of strength or weakness of the evidence used by the author. (detailed) **[Point made, point explained, point illustrated with clear example (s) from the document to show impact of the evidence.]**

Use the levels table and the guidance to determine an appropriate level and mark:

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	9–12	• Both strengths and weaknesses of evidence 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	5–8	• Answers focus more on either the strengths or weakness of the evidence, 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 claims. • Communication is accurate – explanation and reasoning is limited, but clearly expressed.
L1	1–4	• Answers show little or no assessment of evidence. • Assessment of evidence, if any, is simplistic. • Evidence may be identified and weakness may be named. • Communication is limited – response may be cursory or descriptive.
X	0	• no creditable material.

- In Question 2 there are 4 bullet points on the levels grid. They reflect:
 - How much assessment of evidence there is
 - The quality/sophistication/consistency of the assessment of the evidence
 - How the evidence is linked to the author's claims
 - Effectiveness of communication

- In simple terms the levels are:
 - Level 3 – detailed and sustained
 - Level 2 – generalised and lacking some assessment/explanation
 - Level 1 – simplistic or descriptive
 - Level 0 – have no creditable material (Mark X)
- **You are required to make a judgement of the level that is the best fit for each bullet point. This can include split levels. These will then inform the overall level and mark within it as illustrated below. The notes for awarding marks on page 3 of the mark scheme are for general guidance that reflect the more detailed approach below.**
- These should be listed at the bottom of the answer in the correct order.
 - e.g. L3 L2 L2 L2

This would be a L3 answer as it fulfils all the L2 criteria and has one in L3. It is, however, only just in L3 so would be at the bottom of the level and be awarded 9 marks out of 12.

- In the right-hand margin (away from the other 4 level marks) please insert the overall level, in this case L3, then add the mark (9) to the mark grid on the right-hand side.
- Other examples:
 - e.g. L3 L3 L3 L3 Overall Level 3 – Mark 12
 This fulfils all L3 criteria so is at the top of L3.
 - e.g. L2 L1 L2 L1 Overall Level 2 – Mark 6
 This is a low middle L2 as the L2 criteria have only been partially met.
 - e.g. L2 L1 L1 L1 Overall Level 2 – Mark 5
 This is a low L2 so the mark is at the bottom of the range.
 - e.g. L2 L3/L2 L3/L2 L2 Overall Level 3 – Mark 9
 Split grades are allowed where the best fit is a combination of the criteria for two different levels. Treat the L3/L2 as low L3 so overall this would just reach L3 at 9.
 - e.g. L1 X L1 L1 Overall Level 1 – Mark 3
 Use X where there is no creditworthy material (L0)

Marking and annotation guidance – Question 3 – 12 marks**Annotate in the left-hand margin as below:**

- a) ND (needs developing) when a point has been mentioned but not developed or exemplified,
- b) ND EVAL when a point of evaluation has been partially developed (e.g. may make and explain a valid point but without appropriately referencing the documents)
- c) EVAL for a fully developed point that looks at documents and perspectives and uses illustration (perhaps with a quote) from the authors
(Evaluation point made, point explained, point illustrated with clear example (s) from the document as explicit reference.)
- d) C for a direct descriptive comparison of the documents that contains no evaluation. (e.g. X said 'this' and Y said 'that')
- e) ? for an unclear or confused answer
- f) J for where judgement is recognised.

Level	Marks	Descriptor
L3	9–12	- 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	5–8	- 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.
X	0	no creditable material.

- In Question 3 there are 5 bullet points on the levels grid. They reflect:
 - The level of judgement (i.e. how convincing is one document over the other, if at all)
 - Level of perspective (i.e. different viewpoints based on argument, evidence and assumptions within a particular context)
 - Evaluation
 - Explanation and reasoning
 - Communication
- In simple terms the levels are:
 - Level 3 – Sustained, explicit, highly effective
 - Level 2 – Generalised, generally accurate, less focussed on perspectives and evaluation than L3
 - Level 1 – Superficial, simplistic/undeveloped, descriptive
 - Level 0 – No creditable material. Use X as the annotation for this.
- Judgement can be covered throughout the answer with direct evaluation between the documents but can also be achieved by evaluation of the documents separately with a thorough judgement paragraph at the end.
- As in Question 2, put the levels for the 5 bullet points at the end of the answer:
 - e.g. L2 L3 L2 L2 L2
 This would be a L3 answer as it fulfils all the criteria for L2 and has one L3. This puts it at the bottom of the L3 range of marks –i.e 9.
- Other examples:
 - e.g. L2 L2 L2 L2 L2 Overall Level 2 – mark 8
 Having 5 L2 marks gives the top of L2 (8 marks) as all level 2 criteria have been met.
 - e.g. L2 L2 L1 L1 L2 Overall Level 2 – mark 6/7
 Having 5 L2 marks would give the top of L2 (9 marks) but this has two L1 grades (ignoring the communication level) bringing it to a mid L2 – 6 or 7 marks. [The L2 for communication might inform your judgement to give the higher mark]
- Split grades are allowed e.g. L2/L1 or L1/X when the answer does not exactly fit the level descriptors. Treat them as low level, so L2/L1 would be a low level 2 when deciding on the overall level and mark.
- **In all levels there is a range of 4 marks so make your judgement mainly on the first 4 criteria, saving the communication mark as final guidance.**