
GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

9239/11

Paper 1 Written Examination

May/June 2016

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2016 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9239	11

1 Study Document 1.

- (a) Identify two benefits of eco-cities mentioned by the author of Document 1. [2]

Examiners should be aware that candidates are asked only to identify benefits and not explain or evaluate them. Therefore, they should not expect lengthy responses.

Candidates are not expected to put the ways into their own words and may simply copy the benefits from the Document.

However, examiners should ensure that each benefit given in the response is taken from Document 1.

Credit 1 mark for a correct version of the following, up to 2 marks:

Tackling problems faced by urban growth.

They can provide us with the world's smartest city or cities.

They might help end national conflicts.

They provide a model for a new form of urban living for other cities.

The question asks for two benefits so if a candidate identifies just one benefit they can score a maximum of 1 mark.

- (b) Identify and explain two reasons why the author thinks eco-cities may not bring benefits for all. [4]

Examiners should be aware that this question carries only 4 marks and should not expect a lengthy answer.

Credit 1 mark each for identifying a reason and a second mark if this is explained.

For identifying, candidates can simply copy reasons from Document 1.

Candidates should put the explanations into their own words/paraphrase the author but, allow candidates to selectively quote part of the document if it appropriately explains the reason identified.

Credit up to 2 of these reasons and explanations:

Reason – 'None has yet achieved its primary aim of becoming a fully-operational community.' [1]

Explanation – As the eco-cities haven't yet had time to meet their goals, it is difficult to see who will benefit. [1]

Reason – 'Eco-cities don't tackle the problem of urban growth.' [1]

Explanation – Eco-cities might benefit those living there, but they don't help those facing problems in the growing cities. [1]

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9239	11

Reason – Eco-cities ‘merely provide an escape for the wealthier managerial class/resembles apartheid/segregation’. [1]

Explanation – Living in eco-cities is only affordable by some, so they don’t benefit the less wealthy. [1]

Candidates can put these explanations into their own words.

2 Study Document 1.

Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence about eco-cities used by the author in Document 1. [10]

Use the levels-based marking grid below and the indicative content to credit marks.

Level 3 8–10 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both strengths and weaknesses 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.
Level 2 4–7 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers focus more on either strengths or weaknesses, although both are present. • Assessment identifies strength or weakness with little explanation. • Assessment of evidence is relevant but generalised, not always linked to specific evidence or specific claims. • Communication is accurate – explanation and reasoning is limited, but clearly expressed.
Level 1 1–3 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers show little or no assessment of the evidence. • Assessment if any is simplistic. • Evidence may be identified and weakness may be named. • Communication is limited – response may be cursory or descriptive.

Credit 0 marks where there is no creditable material.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9239	11

Indicative content:

No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates are likely to include some of the following:

University of Westminster eco-city count

Strengths

Credibility – possible authority of a university source and a vested interest to be accurate to maintain their standing within academia.

Relevance – the large number of projects worldwide are relevant to support their global extent.

Weaknesses

Significance – 174 projects lack the context of other urban growth, to demonstrate what part it is playing in this sector.

Insufficient – numbers alone are not sufficient to demonstrate popularity or a belief in building ideal communities.

Varosha as ‘the power to neutralise national feuds’

Strengths

Relevance – of an historical example to illustrate where there was a clash which is now being resolved through the proposed building of an eco-city.

Weaknesses

Hypothetical – this is a proposal which has yet to be achieved to end the conflict.

Songdo as ‘the world’s smartest city’

Strengths

Credibility – the claim is sourced as World Finance.com, which may have a vested interest to assess this accurately to maintain its professionalism.

Weaknesses

Credibility – the claim is sourced as World Finance.com, which may have expertise to assess the eco-city’s economic status, but not necessarily its technological capabilities in a worldwide context.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9239	11

Songdo as a move ‘towards a dystopian future’

Strengths

Credibility – sourced with a brochure which has first-hand experience of the new community.

Relevant – highlighting clientele expected to be attracted to Songdo, demonstrates that it is likely to attract and benefit largely those with money.

Significance – 37% as living in the slums sets the context of the many whom will not benefit.

Masdar & Tianjin have not yet achieved ‘a fully operational community’

Strengths

Credibility (Masdar) – an eyewitness account gives strength from being in the city to be able to assess its lack of realization first hand.

Sourced claim (Masdar) – reporter for Wired magazine could be verified.

Significance – large numbers unrealised – 344 000 residents (Tianjin) and 20% of commercial buildings (Songdo) – supports them not yet being operational.

Weaknesses

Significance – use of numbers alone without an indication of the rate of progress, weakens the significance of the use of these, as the rate of completion may be increasing.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9239	11

3 Study Documents 1 and 2.

To what extent is the author’s argument about the future of urbanisation in Document 2 more convincing than that of the author in Document 1? [14]

Use the levels-based marking grid below and the indicative content to credit marks.

Level 3 10–14 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The judgement is sustained and reasoned with conclusions made throughout. Both authors’ perspectives are assessed throughout. 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.
Level 2 5–9 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgement is reasoned. One document is assessed explicitly; the other only by implication. Evaluation of a range of issues is present but may not be fully supported. 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.
Level 1 1–4 marks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgement, if present, is unsupported or superficial. 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.

Credit 0 marks where there is no creditable material.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9239	11

Indicative content:

No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Answers should go beyond a simple comparison of the content of the two Documents and look to evaluate a range of issues if they want to access the higher levels. In order to assess which author's argument is the stronger, candidates should consider not only the content of the Documents, but critically assess the views put forward through a consideration of issues such as the nature of the passages, purpose and language. Responses are likely to cover issues such as the reliability of the Documents, by looking at their origin/source.

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 the author's argument in Document 2 shows a little more balance and wider perspective than in Document 1. Alternatively, they might conclude that overall, although from slightly different perspectives, their arguments have different strengths and weaknesses. However, credit should be given to an alternative judgement on the basis of the assessment and reasoning.

Candidates may include some of the following:

Document 2 more convincing:

Stronger authority

Having led a national development planning agency and being COO and MD of the World Bank Group which, if successful, gives the author of Document 2 wider expertise in the field and perhaps makes her claims have more authority than the author of Document 1. He writes for the UK CIB magazine which has a narrower focus and his credentials are not stated.

Wider perspective

Indrawati's argument takes into consideration the whole question of new urbanisation to draw a conclusion, whereas Rogers only considers eco-cities. This may give her argument more weight.

Document 2 less convincing:

Narrower perspective

Indrawati's argument concentrates on future urbanisation in *China*, where she predicts, 'Citizens will be able to benefit equally from urban growth', whereas Rogers uses *global evidence* from Cyprus, Korea, Abu Dhabi and China, to conclude that this is unlikely. Roger's global perspective might make his conclusion more plausible.

Less use of evidence and examples

Indrawati's argument relies on *one example* of China. Rogers' argument uses *global evidence and extensive exemplification* of Masdar, Songdo and Varosha, which supports the global situation of urbanisation through eco-cities thus far, as an indication of what its future will be.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2016	9239	11

Less use of stated sources

Indrawati's argument presents figures as unsourced and self-evident, whereas those of Rogers are sourced via reference to the Wired magazine, the brochure from Songdo and an article from World Finance.com. This may make Rogers' arguments more convincing.

Based on claims not yet achieved

Indrawati's argument focuses on advice to China about how they can improve on their future urbanisation with a positive prediction in an area which has previously had little success. Rogers' argument in contrast is based upon what has been the case so far, which may be more realistic in determining the success of new urbanisation.

Less reference to opposing argument

Indrawati's argument does refer, albeit briefly, to the problems that China has faced in its past urbanisation policies, as an indication of how it needs to move forward, whereas Rogers seeks to develop the counter argument that eco-cities bring benefits, with exemplification, explanation and evidence, presenting a much more balanced and perhaps more convincing argument.

Perhaps stronger vested interest

As COO and MD of the World Bank advising China, Indrawati has a motive to promote their ideas at the international conference and possibly exaggerate the positive future, whereas Rogers appears to have no personal stake in what he concludes, although his background is unstated.

Neither more convincing nor less convincing:

Both reasoned arguments

Both are clearly argued with an overall conclusion leaving the reader in no doubt of what they want to persuade – Indrawati that China can ensure that 'all citizens will benefit equally from urban growth' and Rogers that the evidence is that eco-cities doesn't support the belief that 'mankind can create such an ideal and perfect community'.

Both use prediction

Both arguments are predicting the future of urbanisation commenting on the possibility of either a utopian community or equal benefit and as such involve an element of doubt.

Shared perspective

They share a belief that new urban developments' pave the way for future urbanisation elsewhere – Rogers that eco-cities, and Indrawati that China's new urbanisation, form a prototype from which other cities can learn and benefit.