
GLOBAL PRESECTIVES

8030/01

Paper 1 Written Paper

October/November 2019

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 2019 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.

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.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>Identify <u>two</u> different negative effects of the illegal disposal of e-waste on children given by the author of Document 1.</p> <p>Credit 1 mark each for correct versions of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children work for very small amounts of money 'Child workers burn hundreds of kilos of electric cables to extract copper and then resell it for a very small price.' • It causes health problems 'Wolfgang Mac-Din, founder of an organisation supporting Agboglobshie's children, says 'Some die. Others have cancer.' <p>Credit answers that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quote directly from the document. • are a close paraphrase <p>Credit answers that do not separate the negative effects e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children work for very small amounts of money✓ and it then causes health problems✓ <p>Credit 0 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for answers that give problems that do not relate specifically to the negative effects on children. e.g. <i>Recycling is inefficient / 'an air control station on the Agboglobshie dumpsite detected excessive amounts of copper and lead in the air'.</i> • for answers that state the situation rather than the negative effects on children. e.g. <i>'Children extract copper, aluminium and other materials'</i> • for answers taken from the candidate's own knowledge. • for no creditworthy material 	2

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p>Explain <u>one</u> way in which Accra benefits from e-waste according to the author of Document 1.</p> <p>Credit 1 mark for a simple statement and a further mark for an explanation of this.</p> <p>Answers should focus on commercial value from resale/repair/extraction, (or a combination of these) and how specifically Accra benefits.</p> <p>Credit up to 2 marks for correct versions of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E-waste provides devices that still work ✓ and Accra sells them in its second-hand market. ✓ • E-waste provides valuable materials for repair ✓ and Accra has workshops to do this. ✓ • Accra has a dumpsite and workers ✓ that can extract materials (such as copper and aluminium) from the e-waste ✓ <p>Credit 1 mark only</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for an explanation, even if developed, if it does not explain how Accra specifically benefits e.g. <i>E-waste provides devices that still work and can be re-sold as second-hand.</i> • for an answer that simply quotes the text without any synthesis of the information. <p>Credit 0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for answers taken from the candidate's own knowledge. • for no creditworthy material. 	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the author’s argument in Document 1 about the illegal disposal of e-waste and its effects on Accra.</p> <p>Use levels based marking to credit marks. 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"> • presents a clear conclusion – he makes it clear to the reader that Agbogloboshie ‘<i>needs a solution</i>’, explains what the problems are and assesses Ghana’s solution. • gives some balance in the argument – The argument considers both the benefits and the problems of e-waste, so that the latter can be weighed up carefully. • gives the context of the evidence – He gives the figures for allowed thresholds for the pollution of the air which shows the specific extent of the problem. • uses expert sources for evidence – Ghanaian researchers, the Journal of Health and Pollution and a professor. These would probably be able to make informed judgements about e-waste and give accurate statistics. • uses claims of locals with personal insight – These have personal experience of the effects of e-waste e.g. the Accra environmental activist and the founder of the organisation supporting Agbogloboshie’s children. Or they have direct access to the effects e.g. the Ghanaian researchers, the Journal of Health and Pollution. • uses relevant examples – The examples of <i>e-waste</i> give a clear indication of the types of devices involved. The example of <i>Accra</i> illustrates benefits and problems. • uses a clear visual image – ‘<i>Seven times the great pyramid of Giza</i>’ indicates the size of the annual problem. • uses emotive language to help the reader to picture the e-waste site – ‘<i>a graveyard of plastics</i>’, ‘<i>skeletons of abandoned appliances</i>.’ • motive to be accurate – as a journalist specialising in African data, the author may have a motive to provide accurate information and balanced argument to ensure public trust in their work. • lack of motive – as the author is a journalist reporting the situation, there is no apparent motive to bias their report, either for or against the handling of e-waste. 	12

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited discussion of solutions – The argument looks only at <i>Ghana's</i> solution of demolition and not at any solution to enable recycling and repair to continue. • confusing image – the image of the pyramid of Giza conjures up size, rather than weight. • vague statistics – Some figures given are not precise ‘over 40 million tonnes’, ‘about 15%’. • assumes – that because the e-waste has commercial value, that is the only reason why it is shipped to developing countries. They may see this as the easiest way to dispose of their waste. • other causes for serious health problems – The author implies that Mac-Din’s comment about the boys’ ill health is caused by pollution at the site, but other things might have contributed such as homelessness, extreme poverty, poor diet. • use of emotive language – Expressions such as ‘a <i>graveyard</i> of plastics’ and ‘<i>skeletons</i> of abandoned appliances’ uses emotion rather than reasoning to convince the reader of the negative effects of e-waste. • some statistical evidence without sources – No authority is given for the statistics for the annual production of e-waste (40 million tonnes), or for the amount of waste recycled with efficient and environmentally safe methods (15.5% in 2014). • limited range of sources – The sources for the evidence and claims are restricted to Ghana, so limits the perspectives given on the problem. • possible lack of expertise – The author is a journalist with expertise in computer science, so he may not have the breadth of environmental knowledge to see the whole picture of the problem of global e-waste to discuss effective solutions. 	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Use the levels-based marking grid and the indicative content to credit marks.</p> <p>Note: Level 3 involves the impact of the argument upon the claim – a key characteristic 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.</p> <p>Level 3 9–12 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both strengths and weaknesses are assessed. • Assessment of argument and evidence is sustained and a judgement is reached. • Assessment explicitly includes the impact of specific evidence upon the claims made. • 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 the strengths or weaknesses, although both are present/identified. • Assessment identifies strength or weakness of argument with little explanation. • Assessment of argument is relevant but generalised, not always linked to specific evidence or specific 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 of argument/s. • Assessment if any is simplistic. • Evidence may be identified and weakness may be named. • Communication is limited – response may be cursory or descriptive. <p>Credit 0 marks where there is no creditable material.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>To what extent do the author’s views in Document 2 challenge those of the author in Document 1 about the problems of the Agbogbloshie e-waste dump in Accra? In answering the question you should compare and contrast the views of the authors of both documents.</p> <p>No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p>Challenge</p> <p>because opposing views</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • about concern – Spaul (Doc 2) challenges the views of concern because he has seen bigger dumps in Brazil and the Philippines, so looks at solutions that work with the site; whereas Ottaviani (Doc 1) has concern and can see the benefits of the government’s proposal to close the site. • about use – Spaul (Doc 2) challenges the view of the image of scavenging and takes a more positive view of ‘<i>a well organised scrapyards</i>’ which can be improved; whereas Ottaviani (Doc 1) sees it as a place of environmental and health hazards which are solved by demolishing it. • about definition of e-waste – Spaul (Doc 2) challenges the view that there is a problem of illegal e-waste dumping because devices provide ‘<i>recycled cheap second-hand electronics</i>’; whereas Ottaviani (Doc 1) feels that the media calling Agbogbloshie the ‘<i>largest e-waste dump in Africa</i>’ is an understatement. • about a solution – Spaul (Doc 2) challenges the view that the site should be closed and looks for a solution in future safer technology; whereas Ottaviani (Doc 1) agrees that demolition of Agbogbloshie solves environmental and health problems. <p>because stronger argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more balanced perspectives – Spaul (Doc 2) responds to alternative views of the concern about the size of the site; of the classification of the devices as e-waste and of the solution of demolition. He also discusses both the benefits and hazards of e-waste. However Ottaviani (Doc1) mentions the benefits but simply concentrates on the hazards. • more positive, global perspective and fundamental solution – Spaul (Doc 2) points to a solution that goes to the heart of the problem looking for safer technology in ‘<i>electronics</i>’ and for safer recycling ‘<i>equipment</i>’ which could give positive financial and environmental outcomes globally; whereas Ottaviani (Doc 1) supports a local solution proposed by Ghana’s authorities. • more direct personal perspective – Spaul (Doc 2) has visited the site so can base his judgement upon personal observations and direct experience, ‘<i>when I visited</i>’, ‘<i>I discovered</i>’, ‘<i>I saw</i>’; whereas Ottaviani (Doc 1) relies on the observations of an environmental activist in Accra and the founder of a charity there, who both may have a vested interest to exaggerate the problems to help their causes. 	14

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Not challenge</p> <p>because different perspectives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • different perspectives – Spaul (Doc 2) is comparing the size of the problem of Agbogbloshie on a global scale denying the ‘world’s biggest e-waste dump’, which makes the problem look smaller; whereas Ottaviani (Doc 1) is looking largely at Agbogbloshie within the context of Africa ‘largest e-waste dump in Africa’, which makes the problem look bigger. <p>because similar perspectives/strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both are looking for a solution to the same problem i.e. a solution for places like Agbogbloshie that treat e-waste and produce environmental and health hazards. • Both have clear conclusions and a structured argument. Spaul (Doc 2) concludes that safer technology is the answer. Ottaviani (Doc 1) concludes that demolition of such sites solves environmental and health hazards. • Both use relevant evidence from experts. Spaul (Doc 2) uses evidence from UNEP, the Basel Convention, a Canadian academic, leader of AMP and Greenpeace. Ottaviani (Doc 1) uses evidence from researchers, an environmental activist, a journal, and a charity founder. • Both have some balance in their arguments, considering the other side. Spaul (Doc 2) responds to alternative views about the size and nature of the site, the definition of e-waste, and includes the hazards as well as the benefits. Ottaviani (Doc 1) presents both sides of the coin, the benefits and hazards. <p>because weaker argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • possible greater motive – Spaul (Doc 2) as a writer for SciDev.net may have a vested interest to present an article which looks for the positive side of e-waste to help the economy and to keep jobs for the recyclers to support the <i>mission ‘to reduce poverty in the southern part of the world’</i>; whereas Ottaviani (Doc 1) appears to have less benefit in presenting the facts in a particular way. • possible greater bias – Spaul (Doc 2) dismisses the concern of the size of the site on grounds that there are worse and concentrates on the working devices or those that can be recycled rather than the amount of waste products. However, Ottaviani (Doc 1) accepts that <i>‘there is another side.’</i> 	

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>Use the levels-based marking grid below and the indicative content to credit marks.</p> <p>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.</p> <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/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. <p>Credit 0 marks where no creditable material.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Judgement Candidates should critically assess perspectives and the use of examples and evidence in order to reach a judgement.</p>	