

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series**

**8987 GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES**

**8987/11**

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, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>8987</b>	<b>11</b>

**1 (a) Study Document 1**

**Identify four problems that Document 1 suggests may result from the development of cities. [4]**

Examiners should note that the question is worth only four marks and therefore candidates are asked to simply identify the problems presented in the passage; it is not expected that they will develop or explain their ideas.

The following are valid problems which candidates might identify in their answers:

- A huge increase in the number of squatters
- More poverty and squalor
- More chaos on the streets
- Systems breaking down
- Quality of life decreasing
- Much more congestion
- Less water and electricity
- Much more pollution
- An increase in migrants
- Development of slums
- Cities become uglier to look at
- The loss of cultures
- Problems become so big they can't be fixed easily, if at all

Award ONE mark for each problem given up to maximum of 4. Candidates can either summarise the points or take quotations directly from the document. The information must be drawn from the passage.

**Exemplar 4 mark response:**

The development of cities led to the following problems: more poverty and squalor, slum development, a decrease in the quality of life and a huge increase in the number of squatters.

**Exemplar 3 mark response:**

Spread of urban poverty; worsening chaos in the streets and breakdown of systems.

**Exemplar 2 mark response:**

It led to an increase in the number of squatters and a decrease in the quality of life.

**Exemplar 1 mark response:**

A wider spread of urban poverty and squalor

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>8987</b>	<b>11</b>

**(b) How strong is the evidence used in Document 1 to support its claims about these problems? [6]**

Responses should focus on the strengths of the evidence put forward in Document 1 and there may also be some consideration of the weakness of the evidence presented.

Level 3: candidates are likely to consider both the strengths and weaknesses.

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

Level 1: candidates are likely to consider one strength and/or weakness of the evidence.

<b>Level 3 5–6 marks</b>	Sustained evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of the evidence. 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.
<b>Level 2 3–4 marks</b>	Some evaluation of strengths and/or weaknesses of the evidence, but evaluation may focus on one aspect. 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.
<b>Level 1 1–2 marks</b>	Little or no evaluation of strengths and/or weaknesses of the evidence, 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.

**Strengths and weaknesses of the evidence**

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

- Candidates might point to the reliability of the figures such as the 'hard facts' that '13 out of 27' mega cities are in Asia.
- The comment that 'the region is urbanising at a speed that no other region in the world currently matches' and the prediction that 'By 2050, Asia will have 3.4 billion people living in its urban areas' are not supported by any concrete evidence.
- It may be pointed out that some of the evidence comes from a seemingly reliable source, President Haruhiko Kuroda, although he may be biased and his figures, such as '80 per cent of Asia's GDP currently emanates from its urban areas' may be selective for his own purposes.
- They might suggest that the article uses evidence from more than one country but may also point to the one-sided nature of the argument, which is very negative about mega-cities.
- They might point to the nature of the source: the Indian website Business Standard offers a point of view from a source close to the problems and therefore is more convincing.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>8987</b>	<b>11</b>

- Candidates might suggest that many of the comments are very generalised and lack specific support, e.g. much of the argument is based on assumption; no evidence is given to support the view that ‘Mega cities can’t be contained’.
- The use of exaggerated, emotive language such as ‘chance-erected hell-holes’ can make an argument more convincing, but is not supported by real evidence.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>8987</b>	<b>11</b>

## 2 Study Document 1.

**Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the argument about the development of urban centres presented in Document 1. [8]**

- Responses should focus on the strengths **and** weaknesses of the argument put forward 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. 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.

<b>Level 3</b> <b>7–8 marks</b>	<p>Sustained evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of reasoning and evidence, critical assessment with explicit reference to how flaws and counter argument support the argument.</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>
<b>Level 2</b> <b>4–6 marks</b>	<p>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.</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 the analysis.</p>
<b>Level 1</b> <b>1–3 marks</b>	<p>Little or no evaluation of strengths and weaknesses, although flaws, etc. may be identified.</p> <p>Level of communication is limited, response may be cursory or descriptive; communication does not deal with complex subject matter.</p>

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.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>8987</b>	<b>11</b>

### **Strengths:**

- Candidates might explore the use of factual information within the document, such as the opening factual paragraph containing several statistics which is immediately convincing for a reader and the statement 'These are the facts and well known' add conviction to the argument.
- The use of emotive language throughout could be explored, such as 'overwhelming position' 'rapidly urbanising landscape' 'permanently disfigure a country's landscape' 'chance erected hell-holes, ugly to look at, dismal to live in' 'the task is stupendous'. Indeed the listing of emotive phrases in the penultimate paragraph emphasises how great the problem of India's urbanisation is.
- The use of other voices to add support to the argument is vital, such as President Kuroda, speaking at the Manila urban forum, using a statistic to support the point that '80 per cent of Asia's GDP currently comes from its urban areas.' This makes it clear and convincing that urban areas are very important to a country's economy.
- The use of a list of nine key issues in the third paragraph adds power to the argument that there are a lot of problems awaiting Asia's governments if they do nothing about their 'urban future' now.
- The use of statements such as 'Mega cities can't be contained' shows the conviction of the writer and leaves the reader in no doubt as to his point of view.
- The fact that many problems in India are highlighted in the last two paragraphs emphasises how great the problem of urbanisation is. Indeed, we are given a list of problems in the penultimate paragraph only for an additional, major one, to be added at the start of the last paragraph, drawing attention to the issue of 'fragmented thinking' and showing how big an issue this is.
- The ending makes it clear that the writer has no confidence in any plan, in this case 'the Twelfth Five-Year Plan', making any difference to the overall issues of increased urbanisation.

### **Weaknesses:**

- There is a lot of conjecture in the argument. For instance in the opening paragraph the observation that 'by 2050 Asia will have 3.4 billion people living in its urban areas against the 1.7 billion now' cannot be proved. The opening comment 'These are the facts and well known' is a little presumptive, not all the readers will know these 'facts' and this could appear as an aggressive opening to some readers.
- The comment 'the migration to cities of large chunks of people is no longer possible to stop' is debatable and needs actual evidence of why this is the case.
- The use of the list in paragraph 3 does not contain any supporting examples to illustrate the issues raised and is, therefore, not totally convincing.
- There are many assertive statements such as 'Mega cities can't be contained...' which are the opinion of the writer, but need factual support to make them more balanced.
- The whole document is very one-sided and offers little balanced reasoning on the topic.
- The ending is also very negative and does not offer a balanced point of view.
- There is mention of twelve five year plans, but no detail is given about what these are or what they set out to achieve.

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>8987</b>	<b>11</b>

### 3 Study Documents 1 and 2.

**To what extent is Document 2’s view of urban development more convincing than the view 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.

<b>Level 3 9–12 marks</b>	<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>
<b>Level 2 5–8 marks</b>	<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>
<b>Level 1 1–4 marks</b>	<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>

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>8987</b>	<b>11</b>

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:

- Candidates might suggest that the argument presented in Document 2 is more convincing than the argument put forward in Document 1 as the writer uses a clear example of Vietnam, which tends ‘to suck in talented people...’ which leads to a concentration of people in one area, meaning there are many resources in these areas and not as many in other areas of the country.
- The use of language such as ‘suck in’ adds to the image of cities overpowering everything else. It could be argued, however, that this is less convincing as an argument as it is attributed to ‘geographers’ rather than a specific named person and that it deals with just one city, rather than a range, thus restricting the scope of the argument.
- There are many facts in Document 2, which helps add power to the argument; for example we are told of Vietnam’s economic growth of an average of ‘7 per cent per year over the past two decades’ which support the facts put forward in Document 1 such as ‘half the world’s mega cities – 13 out of 27 ... are in Asia’.
- Other facts which could be explored include: ‘About 60-70 per cent of Vietnam’s 87 million people live and work in the countryside ...’ and ‘only a few cities can claim populations of more than one million people’ with exploration of how these make this more or less convincing than the argument put forward in Document 1.
- The use of other voices also adds power to Document 2 with a seemingly academic and, therefore, important source: Jamie Gillen, ‘an assistant professor ... at the National University of Singapore’. His comment that city/rural life is more balanced seems to refute Document 1’s argument that urbanisation is out of control, although he does emphasise the negative aspects using the word ‘crippling’ which further supports Document 1’s arguments. The balance given, it could be argued, makes this a more convincing argument.
- Comment may be made about the range of voices used in Document 2 which make this article potentially more convincing than Document 1’s more restricted range of sources, thus helping to refute the claims made in it.
- Comment could be made that Document 2 does not explain how life is better for those living across the country in Vietnam (hinted at in paragraph 6), thus leaving areas of uncertainty in the line of reasoning.
- It might be suggested that Document 2 presents a more balanced argument than Document 1, which is a very negative examination of the dangers of increased urbanisation.
- It could be argued that Document 1 is dismissing the rural sector totally and making the assumption that developing cities are the key to developing the country whilst Document 2 is offering a more balanced view on the topic, thus making it a more convincing argument.