

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2014

Pearson Edexcel GCE in
Global Development
(6GL02)
Unit 2: Global Development
Challenges

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

www.edexcel.com/contactus

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2014

Publications Code US039005*

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1 (a) (i)	<p>1. Methods used by government or other representative officials e.g. recognition that it is a group of 'people' who do the management (1) to cope with a crisis/challenge (1) development through an example (1)</p> <p>2. A gift or loan or donation e.g. recognition that it involves a transfer of money and/or resources (1) from private individuals or NGOs or government agencies (1) to alleviate the immediate impact of a crisis (1) example of same (1)</p> <p>2 marks available for each part</p>	(1+1) + (1+1)

Question Number	Indicative Content	
1 (a) (ii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural disasters disrupt the infrastructure • This inevitably includes hospitals, relief services and schools • The level of impact is dependent on the resources available – a conventional distinction is between LEDC and MEDC resources • It also costs money to put systems right which impacts on spending elsewhere • Reduced health and education spending is a likely consequence of disaster management 	
Level	Mark	Descriptors
0	0	No rewardable content
Level 1	1-2	A basic answer to the question. At least one long term impact identified. Explanation of links between disasters and impacts is absent. Very limited use of appropriate specialist terminology. Many errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 2	3-4	A sound answer to the question. At least two impacts described. Links with natural disasters made although largely asserted. Uses some appropriate specialist terminology. A few errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 3	5-6	A good answer to the question. Range of impacts fully described with good detail. Links with impact on health and education services fully explained. Uses good range of appropriate specialist terminology. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Question Number	Indicative Content	
1 (b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technology can intervene on several levels before, during and after the event • Preparation for disasters to help mitigate their impact e.g. improved building design • Management during the event e.g. use of IT and advanced communication systems and the technology used in combating primary impacts • Post-event response including search and rescue using high-tech equipment • Disasters can be either human or natural • Technology is expensive so expect contrasts between LEDC and MEDC ability to cope • Success of management heavily dependent on scale of event – large events (Japanese tsunami 2012) might challenge technological responses 	
Level	Mark	Descriptors
0	0	No rewardable content
Level 1	1-3	A basic answer to the question. At least one example of the role of technology. Explanation of role of management is absent. Very limited use of appropriate specialist terminology. Many errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 2	4-7	A sound answer to the question. The role of technology is clearly described. At least two of before, during and after addressed. Role of management are stated/asserted rather than explained. Examples used to illustrate. Uses some appropriate specialist terminology. A few errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 3	8-10	A good answer to the question. Range of technologies described with good detail of variation about their impact. All three of before, during and after addressed. Role of management explained. Detailed examples used to illustrate and explain. Uses good range of appropriate specialist terminology. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2 (a)	Identifies appropriate conflict or conflicts (1) nature of abuse of human rights outlined accurately (1) example of same - e.g. women in Darfur (1) allow further mark for historical detail of background to conflict or conflicts e.g. named groups-individuals – organisations) (1) allow further mark for detail of abuse of human rights (1) If no identifiable conflict(s) then limit to 2 marks	(1+1+) + (1+1+) or (1+1 +1) + 1 or 1+1+1+1

Question Number	Indicative Content	
2 (b)	<p>Likely to be based on case-study knowledge of specific historical interventions/attempted resolutions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UN likely to feature but might also include regional groups such as NATO and the EU. • Description of interventions likely to feature. • Modern history of conflict resolution dates back to 1st World War and formation of league of Nations in its aftermath • Better answers will move beyond the motive for intervention being, 'ending wars because wars are dreadful' <p>Explanation of why intervention has taken place is a product of;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Possibility of success 2. Perceived risks of instability either globally or regionally 3. Preservation of superpower interests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation will revolve around perceived negative impact of conflict. • Also humanitarian motives e.g. Syria 2011-. • Resource issues may stimulate intervention/resolution 	
Level	Mark	Descriptors
0	0	No rewardable content
Level 1	1-2	A basic answer to the question. At least one description of an attempted intervention. Explanation of reasons for that intervention is absent. Very limited use of appropriate specialist terminology. Many errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 2	3-4	A sound answer to the question. A number of interventions described with some detail included. Motivation for intervention suggested but not extended. Uses some appropriate specialist terminology. A few errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Level 3	5-6	A good answer to the question. Convincing description of several interventions. Motivation clearly explained with some attempt to draw general conclusions. Uses good range of appropriate specialist terminology. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
---------	-----	--

Question Number	Indicative Content	
2 (c)	<p>Much depends on example chosen but impacts are likely to be negative and manifest in a range of areas of development; social, economic, political and possibly environmental. However there are examples of benefits through acquisition of territory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic impacts are likely to be disruption of economic output which leads to loss of income • But might be positive if it adds to resource base by capture of territory • Social impacts highly disruptive – loss of life, disruption of family life, costs of separation etc. • Political stability likely to be an issue • Environmental damage at a number of levels especially in 'resource wars'. 	
Level	Mark	Descriptors
0	0	No rewardable content
Level 1	1-3	A basic answer to the question. Some descriptive points about impact of conflict. Impact on long term development can only be inferred. Very limited use of appropriate specialist terminology. Many errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 2	4-7	A sound answer to the question. Good description of impacts of conflict. Impact on long term development clearly identified with a limited explanation. Uses some appropriate specialist terminology. A few errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 3	8-10	A good answer to the question. Range of impacts of conflict discussed in some detail. Variation in impact on long term development examined in detail. Uses good range of appropriate specialist terminology. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3 (a) (i)	<p>Richer countries consume more resources (1) example of same e.g oil (1)</p> <p>Richer countries produce more (1) therefore produce more waste (1)</p> <p>Do not credit simple description as in 'richer countries have larger Ecological Footprint.</p> <p>Allow any reasonable explanation of the relationship</p>	(1+1) + (1+1)

Question Number	Indicative Content	
3 (a) (ii)	<p>Sustainable development was a term coined by the 'Brundtland' Commission in 1987.</p> <p>'Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. It contains within it two key concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the concept of needs, in particular the essential needs of the world's poor, to which overriding priority should be given; and • the idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organization on the environment's ability to meet present and future needs.' <p>There are frequently three elements identified, social, environmental and economic and delivering each of these poses problems for the other two elements. The definition is contested on several grounds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has three elements that are often mutually contradictory • Inter-generational equity is a lot easier to 'sign up' to than intra-generational equity because the latter means addressing existing inequalities – see highlight above • Environmental 'sustainability' is more often supported when economies are doing well • Many organisations have adopted 'sustainability' into their vocabulary of 'mission' statements so the term has become both diluted and distorted • Differences very much depend on interest group and their ideologies • Contested because there different views about the reality of environmental threats (e.g. climate change deniers) • Contested because some feel best solution to social problems is economic growth • Contested because of self-interest e.g. multinational companies pursuit of profit 	
Level	Mark	Descriptors
0	0	No rewardable content.
Level 1	1-3	A basic answer to the question. Sustainability defined but variations not addressed. Very limited use of appropriate specialist terminology. Many errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 2	4-7	A sound answer to the question. A number of views described with some detail included. Reasons for differences suggested but not extended. Uses some appropriate specialist terminology. A few errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 3	8-10	A good answer to the question. Convincing description of views of sustainability. Reasons for differences in view clearly explained with some attempt to draw general conclusions. Uses good range of appropriate specialist terminology. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Question Number	Indicative Content	
3 (b)	<p>Sources A, B and C give different perspectives on Ecuadoran attitudes, especially that of the government and the impact on people. 'Compare the impact...' should trigger some identification of different groups</p> <p>Source A recounts the history of Chevron-Texaco's very well known litigation involving the despoliation of much of the Oriente and the negative impact on local tribes but profits for others. By inference the Ecuadoran government did little or nothing to prevent this catastrophe.</p> <p>Source B describes the Yasuni project; an inventive and original idea that seeks to preserve the environment but in an innovative manner that has stalled a little in the current economic environment. This will benefit local tribes in some respects – preservation of lifestyle but not necessarily in terms of 'economic development'.</p> <p>Source C suggests that the Ecuadoran government is not entirely consistent in its attitude to its oil reserves or to indigenous peoples given that it is auctioning off vast tracts of rainforest whilst preserving others – albeit to a different set of companies than with the Oriente. The beneficiaries of these plans may include some locals who gain employment but more likely to benefit wealthy elite.</p> <p>Comparison should involve both a description of the impacts on different groups of people and some explanation of the tensions between different policies.</p>	
Level	Mark	Descriptors
0	0	No rewardable content
Level 1	1-5	A basic answer to the question. Some descriptive points about at least two of the three sources. Differences might be claimed not supported by evidence. Some statements quoted verbatim from the text but without qualification. Very limited use of appropriate specialist terminology. Many errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 2	6- 11	A sound answer to the question. Good description of at least two impacts on the people. At least one comparison addressed with a limited range of evidence to support the contrast. Selectively quotes RB with some qualifications using own language. Uses some appropriate specialist terminology. A few errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 3	12-16	A good answer to the question. Wide ranging description of impact of the three different approaches. Contrasting impacts addressed explicitly with a wide range of evidence to assist an explanation. Quotes RB with many critical qualifications using own language. Uses good range of appropriate specialist terminology. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Question Number	Indicative Content	
3 (c)	<p>The issues here are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What exactly is 'progress' (page 2) – sustainable communities • Social and economic progress may not be compatible (page 4) • Economic 'progress' as measured by GDP or GHNI per capita disguises internal inequalities • Social 'progress' should include inclusion of native Americans, largely ignored until recently • If we define social development in terms of preserving local cultures then the Yasuni approach satisfies that although that suggests no intrusion of improved health care, education etc. • If increased life expectancy and better education is an issue then money is needed • That promotes the idea of Source 3 – making money from oil by greater state involvement and thus higher tax revenues • As opposed to Source 1 which suggests that the revenues from oil largely accrue to foreign based TNCs • Environmental damage might extend beyond 'local' damage as with carbon footprint of burning oil <p>So an effective answer requires deconstruction of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Economic progress and social progress 2. Some environmental damage – what is it and how much is 'some'? <p>Answer should be 'yes' but there are damage limitation possibilities available. Allow others and reward according to quality of argument used to support.</p>	
Level	Mark	Descriptors
0	0	No rewardable content
Level 1	1-5	Very little analysis in the answer. One or two statements taken more or less verbatim from the RB. Very limited attention to the three 'sources'. No clear view linked to other resources. Generic comments about sustainability. Hardly any use of appropriate specialist terminology. Many errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 2	6-10	A limited analysis with some supportive evidence. Several comments about economic and social progress although hazy over detail. Links with environment are unconvincing. A generalised response about sustainability as a whole. Uses a little appropriate specialist terminology. A significant number of errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Level 3	11-15	A good analysis with a reasonable range of supportive evidence although uneven. Some theory based on understanding of sustainability is included. A 'view' is stated with some minor qualifications. Some implicit reference to tensions in achieving social and economic goals. Several references to environmental impact. Uses some appropriate specialist terminology. A few errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 4	16-20	A very strong analysis with a wide range of supportive evidence. Theoretical scaffolding is explicit and accurate. A clear 'view' is taken. Qualifications and counter arguments are addressed. Tensions are addressed in some detail. The links with environmental damage are explicit and well argued. Uses good range of appropriate specialist terminology. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

