
GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

9239/01

Component 1 Written Examination

For Examination from 2015

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

1 hour 30 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK: 30

This document consists of **9** printed pages and **1** blank page.

For answers marked by levels of response:

- a. **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
- b. **To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	Award mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
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)
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)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

AO1: Research, analysis and evaluation – 30 marks

© UCLES 2014
Written Examination

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>(a) Two basic Human Rights mentioned</p> <p>Credit 1 mark each for a correct version of up to two of the following where the answer <i>either</i> names the basic Human Right, <i>or</i> quotes from the text <i>or</i> correctly paraphrases the text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • freedom and equality or 'All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.' • free education or 'Everyone has a right to education. Education shall be free ...' • freedom of opinion and expression or 'Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression ...' • cultural participation or 'Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts, to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.' 	2 × 1	<p>Use up to 2 ticks ✓ to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate's answer:</p> <p>either at the end of each way in a list e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • freedom and equality. ✓ • free education. ✓ <p>or within continuous writing where the rights are run together e.g. 'Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression ...' ✓ and 'Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts, to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.' ✓</p> <p>Credit 0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for a paraphrase that distorts the meaning. • for a statement of an incorrect part of the text. • for answers taken from the candidate's own knowledge. • for no creditworthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Two ways the author thinks access to the internet meets basic human rights</p> <p>Credit 1 mark each for a correct version of two of the following where the answer either quotes from the text or correctly paraphrases the text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • freedom and equality ‘The internet helps put power into the hands of every single person that has access to it, for once finally giving people the power over their own lives in a very raw democratic way.’ • free education ‘It is a free resource with access to a multitude of educational materials.’ • freedom of opinion and speech ‘It is a forum for expression, ideas and opinions to share with the rest of the world.’ • cultural participation ‘The internet is a global network of shared cultural life stored in bits of information on computers not owned by any one person or organization.’ 	2 × 1	<p>Use up to 2 ticks ✓ to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate’s answer:</p> <p>Credit full marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for correctly identifying how access to the internet meets basic human rights. • for a correct answer amidst <i>minimal</i> additional material. <p>N.B. The answer in Q1(b) does not need to be based on the Human Rights identified in Q1(a).</p> <p>Credit 0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for a paraphrase that distorts the meaning. • for a statement of an incorrect part of the text. • for answers taken from the candidate’s own knowledge. • for no creditworthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>Strengths and weaknesses – Document 1 argument:</p> <p>Use the levels-based marking opposite to credit marks.</p> <p>No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear conclusion is drawn: <i>‘To limit any one person.... is taking away one of their basic human rights’</i>, ensuring the reader is in no doubt as to the writer’s point of view. • The use of relevant quotations from the UN’s Declaration of Human Rights grounds the argument in an authoritative context re. the specifics of human rights that need to be met. • The claims about the internet are relevant to the Human Rights stated in paragraph 4. • The example of Egypt in 2011 is relevant and clearly illustrates the role the internet can play in meeting basic human rights. • The article is written in a direct, passionate style. • The argument makes a relevant appeal to history, claiming that history testifies to the possibility of working together to end tyranny and oppression. 	12	<p>Level 3 9–12 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengths and weaknesses are assessed. • Assessment of argument and evidence is sustained. • Assessment explicitly includes the impact of counter-argument and flaws within the arguments. • Communication is highly effective – explanation and reasoning accurate and clearly expressed. <p>Level 2 5–8 marks</p> <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 argument is relevant but not always linked to the claims. • Communication is accurate – explanation and reasoning is limited, but clearly expressed. <p>Level 1 1–4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Answers show little or no assessment. • Assessment if any is simplistic. • Flaws may be named and counter-argument may be identified. • Communication is limited – response may be cursory or descriptive. <p>Credit 0 marks where there is no creditable material.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The argument is one-sided, with no acknowledgement of possible counter argument as to why access to the internet might be restricted. Cuba and North Korea are mentioned but not their arguments for restriction. • The article makes sweeping generalisations in the opening paragraph about corrupt leaders, governments and powerful men. These are not supported by immediate examples of who controlled the information and in what ways. • Exemplification is minimal to support the argument, using only the illustration of Egypt. • The appeal to history re. the possibility of working together to end tyranny and oppression appears as an assertion unsupported by any examples. • The use of the emotive word ‘weapon’ may make the internet sound threatening and dangerous to some which may weaken the impact of the argument. 		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>Document 2 – argument stronger?</p> <p>Use the levels-based marking opposite to credit marks.</p> <p>No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p>Stronger</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a more balanced perspective Whilst the argument in Document 1 is one-sided, with no acknowledgement of possible counter argument as to why access to the internet might be restricted, Document 2 presents a more balanced perspective, with the second paragraph listing the benefits of the internet. The use of a question to open the argument in Document 2 also suggests that the article may be a balanced one, as an answer is sought. • a wider range of perspectives Whilst the argument in Document 1 depends on the author's own opinion of the internet in relation to the Article from the UN's Declaration of Human Rights, Document 2 contains a number of different opinions: respondent Nicholas Carr, the writer Jay Rayner, and the theorist Rushkoff. • more supporting evidence Whilst the argument in Document 1 lacks examples as to how people have worked together to end tyranny and oppression and also which countries have prevented their citizens from accessing the internet, Document 2 provides examples of the internet's negative effects from respondents on Twitter. 		<p>Level 3 10–14 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Level 2 5–9 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Level 1 1–4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judgement, if present, is unsupported or superficial. • Alternative perspectives have little or no assessment. • Evaluation, if any, is simplistic. Answers may describe a few points comparing the two documents. • Relevant evidence or reasons may be identified. • Communication is limited. Response may be cursory. <p>Credit 0 marks where there is no creditable material.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Weaker</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>less authoritative perspective Document 1 quotes from the UN’s Declaration of Human Rights which grounds the argument in an authoritative context, whereas Document 2 consists of the opinions of respondents on a social media website, Twitter, which gives less authority to its argument.</p> <p>Neither stronger or weaker</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Both have clear conclusions but from different perspectives Both arguments leave the reader in no doubt as to the stance that they are taking, with clear arguments but from different perspectives. The argument in Document 1 takes a positive perspective on the internet focusing upon the human right to have access to the internet because of its democratic, educational, and cultural benefits. The argument in Document 2 takes a more negative perspective, focusing upon the need to limit the use of the internet.</p> <p>Both give an unbalanced perspective The argument in Document 1 does not give the counter argument of those who seek to restrict access to the internet. Although the argument in Document 2 lists the benefits of the internet, those who think this way are labelled as ‘idealists’, undermining their importance. Also, the vast majority of the argument solely examines the negatives of the internet.</p> <p>Both contain unsupported assertions Both arguments rely on the unsupported opinion of the author. Although the argument in Document 2 contains more sources, their claims offered on Twitter are also opinion.</p> 		<p>Judgement</p> <p>Candidates should critically assess perspectives and the use of examples and evidence in order to reach a judgement.</p> <p>In doing this they might conclude that there is a little more balance in Document 2 and a wider perspective presented, making it slightly stronger.</p> <p>Alternatively, they might conclude that overall, although from different perspectives, their arguments have similar strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>However, credit should be given to an alternative judgement on the basis of the assessment and reasoning.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both use emotive language Both use emotive language to persuade the reader. The argument in Document 1 uses the word 'weapon' to describe the internet, which is emotionally charged in favour of access to the internet. The argument in Document 2 uses words such as 'dissenters' and 'worriers' to describe those who dislike the way the internet has taken over our lives, making them seem negative and almost irritants. • Neither provenance gives expertise Nothing is presented about the background of either author that would indicate that they have any expertise in the effects of the internet, whether positive or negative. 		

BLANK PAGE

Copyright Acknowledgements:

Document 1 © adapted: Ryan Moore; *Should Internet Access Be a Basic Human Right?*; <http://www.examiner.com/technology-in-cincinnati/should-internet-access-be-a-basic-human-right>; 21 February 2011.

Document 2 © adapted: J Freedland; *We owe the internet for changing the world. Now let's learn how to turn off*; www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/feb/22/internet-learn-to-turn-off; The Guardian News and Media Ltd; 22 February 2011.

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.