



# Cambridge Pre-U

---

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND INDEPENDENT RESEARCH

9777/01

Paper 1 Written Paper

October/November 2020

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 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

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

This document consists of **12** printed pages.

**PUBLISHED****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.

**Assessment Objectives**

<b>Annotation</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
	Use a ✓ to indicate the separate marks given in <b>Question 1</b>
<b>L1 or L2 or L3</b>	an overall level – Level 1 or Level 2 or Level 3 at the end of Question 2 and Question 3
<b>ILL</b>	Illustration (Not Assessment or Evaluation) where candidate quotes or refers to passage, relevant to their assessment/evaluation/comparison
<b>A</b>	Assertion (unsupported statement of assessment or candidate's opinion)
<b>+ or –</b>	Use in Question 2 to indicate strength or weakness of Document 1 addressed by candidate. Use in Question 3 to indicate strengths or weaknesses of the two documents. (more convincing, less convincing)
<b>=</b>	Use in Question 3 to indicate similarities in strengths/weaknesses of two arguments, to support the ways in which neither is more convincing than the other/they are equally convincing.
<b>JU</b>	Judgement In Question 2 at the end Question 3 at the end, also in the margin where there are interim judgements
<b>C</b>	Comparison
<b>EVAL</b>	Evaluation
<b>ND</b>	Needs developing
<b>NAQ</b>	Not answering the question
<b>On page comment</b>	Space for summative comment if needed – particularly where an answer has just achieved a level.
	Use on any blank pages or extra sheets to indicate that these continuation sheets have been looked at. Also, where a candidate has written relevant material but no other annotations are appropriate, to indicate that the work has been read.

**Note:** The AOs are inter-dependent and it is thus not feasible to see them discretely so the marking of all answers will be holistic.

**PUBLISHED**

AO1  Analysis and evaluation of arguments	Critical analysis and evaluation of argument structure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To understand and apply the language of reasoning;</li><li>• To analyse the structure of argument, by identifying the conclusion, reasons (premises), assumptions and any counter argument;</li><li>• To assess the technical strength/weakness of the argument by testing the acceptability, relevance and sufficiency of the premises to support the conclusion.</li></ul>
AO2  Analysis and evaluation of contexts	Situating the argument in its context: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Identify and evaluate the use of key expressions and ideas, clarifying them as needed;</li><li>• Assess the credibility of sources (collected by the candidate);</li><li>• Identify alternative/rival perspectives and assess their relationship to the case presented;</li><li>• Identify desirable ends/outcomes from which to judge rival perspectives.</li></ul>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p><b>Identify and explain <u>three</u> dangers of ethical-political consumption given in Document 1.</b></p> <p>Candidates might consider some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shopping becomes a political act</li> <li>• Removing unethical practices from food production becomes a matter of consumer choice rather than holding companies and governments to account</li> <li>• Consumers can be manipulated by producers and corporations. The large corporations are able to keep profitable unethical goods alongside less profitable ethical goods</li> </ul>	6	<p>Candidates are required to identify and explain three dangers of ethical-political consumption. Examiners should note that the question is worth only six marks, one mark should be awarded for each danger identified and a further mark for each explanation. Examiners should ensure that the information is drawn only from Document 1 and should not credit material that is not in the Document.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p><b>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the author's argument in Document 1.</b></p> <p><i>Strengths</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognises the weakness of relying on consumer choice, it has not worked so far.</li> <li>• The author appeals to the emotions of the reader by raising issues such as slavery and animal cruelty.</li> <li>• Explains why action from governments is needed, reliance on self-regulation and consumer choice has failed.</li> <li>• Explains the complexity of the situation.</li> <li>• The author discusses both sides of the argument, explaining why it might be expected we would respond to the labels and why we don't.</li> <li>• The opening paragraph can be easily related to by readers, will engage the audience.</li> <li>• The argument is logical in its structure, well set out and points are made clearly – first, second, etc.</li> <li>• Appeal to authority with Naomi Klein to support argument</li> </ul>	10	<p>Responses should focus on the strengths and weaknesses put forward in Document 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At Level 3 candidates must consider both the strengths and weaknesses.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>No set answer is expected; and examiners should be flexible in their approach. 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.</p> <p>Grid for use in Appendix 1</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p><i>Weaknesses</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a lack of precise evidence/examples to support the claims.</li> <li>• The author relies on an appeal to emotion, (fair trade, animal cruelty, environmental degradation).</li> <li>• Some of the language used is exaggerated, for example ‘unleashed’, ‘transformed’.</li> <li>• The link between consumer choice and the issue of slavery is not fully explained.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that ethical-political food labelling is the work of public health experts, consumer advocates, governments or food ethicists – this is just asserted.</li> <li>• Does not state what international and domestic legislation is needed.</li> <li>• No evidence that there has been an over-reliance on self-regulation or corporate social responsibility.</li> </ul>		



**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p><b>Which, of Documents 1 and 2, is more convincing in its view about the role of the consumer in addressing ethical-political issues in the food industry?</b></p> <p>Candidates might consider some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both Documents argue that ethical-political issues should <i>not</i> be left to the consumer, but that action should be taken by governments and producers.</li> <li>• Both Documents suggest that governments/international law should take responsibility for these issues and not the consumer</li> <li>• Document 2 makes reference to how the supply chain is in breach of specific UN reports.</li> <li>• The claims made in Document 2 are supported by specific evidence, whereas In Document 1 they rely on generalisations and assertions.</li> <li>• Much of Document 2 focuses on the failings of the suppliers and governments rather than the consumer, whereas document 1 focuses more on the consumer.</li> <li>• Document 1 asserts that the consumer has not used their buying power to force change and that the consumer can be manipulated by the companies.</li> <li>• Document 2 argues that it is unreasonable to expect consumers to have access to information that supermarkets find too complex to investigate.</li> <li>• Document 2 does have precise evidence to support its claims about the prawn industry, whereas Document 1 has no precise evidence about food labels.</li> </ul>	14	<p>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 which Document is more convincing, 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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At Level 3 candidates will reach a judgement regarding which Document is the most convincing in its view about the role of the consumer in addressing ethical-political issues. 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.</li> <li>• At Level 2 there will be some evaluation and comparison, but it will be either poorly developed or limited in the areas covered.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>Grid for use in Appendix 2</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The argument in Document 1 does appear more balanced and deals with the food industry as a whole, whereas Document 2 is focused on one incident.</li> <li>• Document 2 uses an appeal history (the abolition of slavery) to support its argument.</li> <li>• Responses might consider the backgrounds of the authors and whether that impacts on their reliability.</li> <li>• Document 2 focuses on the issue of slavery whereas Document 1 considers other ethical issues such as nutrition, environmental degradation, fair trade and animal cruelty.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should evaluate the evidence for some of these issues and at the top level will reach a judgement based on their evaluation.</p>		

**Appendix 1: Level descriptors for Question 2**

<b>Level 3 8–10 marks</b>	Sustained evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of arguments 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 4–7 marks</b>	Some evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of arguments and evidence, but evaluation may focus on one aspect; assessment of flaws, etc. 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 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

**Appendix 2: Level descriptors for Question 3**

<p><b>Level 3</b> <b>11–14</b> <b>marks</b></p>	<p>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.</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>
<p><b>Level 2</b> <b>6–10</b> <b>marks</b></p>	<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>
<p><b>Level 1</b> <b>1–5</b> <b>marks</b></p>	<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>