



**Cambridge International Examinations**  
Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & INDEPENDENT RESEARCH**

**9777/01**

Paper 1 Written Paper

**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<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

This syllabus is approved for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

---

This document consists of **6** printed pages.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9777	01

## 1 Study Document 1.

(a) Identify and explain three reasons why the author of Document 1 is opposed to fracking.

[6]

The following are valid reasons that candidates are likely identify in their answers:

- Fracking will take away jobs – because of the decline in agriculture that will follow from contamination, the damage to the area will also impact on tourism and therefore jobs in the tourist industry will be lost.
- Fracking will impact on biodiversity/habitat – the area is a wetland and the contamination of water that will follow fracking will impact on habitats/biodiversity.
- The health and pollution effects of fracking – evidence of the impact of fracking on the contamination of areas and water have now started to emerge from the US and Australia and there is no reason why it would not be similar in the UK.
- Regulators will not control the industry – they have failed to control industries that are on the surface and therefore can be seen and should be easier to regulate, evidence for this failure can be seen with Lough Neagh and quarries. Fracking is much harder to control.
- Squeezing out people – fracking will take land away from housing developments as it would need to be industrialised with frack-pads for fracking to take off.
- Environmental need for finding renewable sources of energy – fracking is a distraction in the search for renewable energy sources because fracking still uses fossil fuels – just extracting them in a different way.
- Any jobs created by fracking are temporary – the fracking site will only last about 1 year.
- The evidence against fracking is so strong it will never become a viable industry – any piece of evidence can be used from the article to support this point.
- We can make fracking safer but never safe – there will always be doubts about the safety as the long-term effects are unknown.

Award 1 mark for each reason identified and 1 mark for the explanation. Do not reward information that is not drawn from the document. A response which identifies 3 reasons but does not explain them would receive 3 marks.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9777	01

**2 Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the argument in Document 1 against fracking.** [10]

- Responses should focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the argument about fracking put forward in Document 1.
- At Level 3 candidates must consider both the strengths and weaknesses.
- At Level 2 there is likely to be imbalance, with most of the answer focusing on the weakness of the argument, 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>8–10 marks</b>	Sustained evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of the argument and evidence, critical assessment with explicit reference to how flaws and counter argument support the argument. 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</b> <b>4–7 marks</b>	Some evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of the argument and evidence, but evaluation may focus on one aspect; assessment of flaws etc., which may not link clearly to the argument. 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</b> <b>1–3 marks</b>	Little or no evaluation of strengths and weaknesses, 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.

There is much material that candidates may consider and examiners should note that not all is required to gain maximum marks, what matters is the quality of evaluation. No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Some candidates may argue that the argument is very strong, citing some of 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.

### Strengths

- There is some attempt to address the counter argument and appear balanced, for example over jobs, pollution and regulation
- Covers a range of issues – environmental, economic, social and legal
- Structured and appears logical, it is clear and easy to follow.
- Appeal to emotion through the dangers
- Use of rhetorical question –‘Excuse me’
- Appears to answer those who support fracking
- Provides a conclusion

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016</b>	<b>9777</b>	<b>01</b>

**Weaknesses**

- Main argument is largely based on assertion
- Many assertions, with little evidence to support the claims, the only evidence is the pollution of Lough Neagh and that is not related to fracking
- No support for claims made about the region of Fermanagh
- No support for claim about the need to phase out fossil fuels
- No support for claim that fracking will take away jobs or affect house prices
- Use of emotive words – ‘absurd statements’, ‘demonise the opposition’, ‘promised land’, ‘ridiculous assertion’
- Focused on one country – Northern Ireland
- Does the author have a vested interest (Friends of the Earth)?

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016	9777	01

### 3 Study Documents 1 and 2.

**To what extent is Document 2 more convincing than Document 1 in its argument about fracking? In your answer you should consider the evidence and reasoning used in both documents.** [14]

Responses should focus on key reasons and evidence in both documents in order to compare the perspectives and synthesise them in order to reach a reasoned judgement. In order to assess whether Document 2 is more convincing than 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 judgement regarding which document is the most convincing in its view about fracking. In order to do this they will have covered a significant range of issues, and evaluated them clearly. Response offering some high quality evaluative points may be placed lower in this level. To reach the top of this level the full descriptor must be met.
- 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.

<b>Level 3</b> <b>11–14 marks</b>	Answers at this level will demonstrate a sustained judgement about the view. There will be sustained evaluation of alternative perspectives; critical assessment with explicit reference to key issues raised in the passages leading to a reasoned and sustained judgement. 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</b> <b>6–10 marks</b>	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. Effective and generally accurate explanation and reasoning; some evidence of structured argument/discussion; conclusions may not be explicitly stated or link directly to analysis.
<b>Level 1</b> <b>1–5 marks</b>	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. Level of communication is limited; response may be cursory or descriptive; communication does not deal with complex subject matter.

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 examples to help support this line of argument. No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2016</b>	<b>9777</b>	<b>01</b>

Candidates might consider some of the following:

- Lack of evidence in Document 1 to support the claim, much of it is assertion, but the same might be argued about Document 2, where there is no evidence to support claims that gas can reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by more than 50%.
- There is no evidence to support the claim that the impact on the US environment has been minimal. The author of Document 2 claims that there is 200 years' worth of supply of gas, but this is not supported.
- No evidence to support the claims in Document 2 about temporary building sites or the fear that Texan oil fields are scaremongering.
- Candidates might consider the attempts to offer counter arguments in both documents and how successful or convincing they are.
- Candidates might consider the origins and purpose of both documents. Both authors have strong views about fracking and are trying to persuade audiences of their point of view – an energy/management consultant is likely to have different interests/motivation that the Director of Friends of the Earth (FoE).
- The use of emotive language in Document 1 might make the argument less convincing – 'demonise the opposition', 'squeezing out people'
- Linguistic techniques used, such as 'Excuse me?' in Document 1, probably makes the argument less convincing.
- Candidates might consider that both authors appear to be reasonable in their views and address the concerns of their opponents.
- Expertise or otherwise of the authors might be considered – expertise in shale energy may be more convincing than FoE.
- Both claim that the other side is exaggerating and lack evidence for their claims.
- Document 2 claims that environmental groups have misunderstood the arguments for fracking, but no evidence is given to support the claim.
- Document 2 makes large claims for fracking – the best energy story since the transition from coal to oil/global revolution. This may weaken the argument and make it appear less convincing.
- Candidates might consider the range of perspectives in both documents.
- Candidates might consider the specific examples used to support the claims made and note that they are limited, although the slightly more detailed consideration of Northern Ireland might make that more convincing.

Candidates need to evaluate some of the above and at the top level should reach a judgement based on their evaluation.