

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2016

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

## **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](http://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](http://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 candidates at:

[www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2016

Publications Code: 6GL02\_01\_1606\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## 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
<b>1 (a) (i)</b>	Economic Development is measured through GNI per capita (allow GDP per capita) (1). Social development is measured through life expectancy (1) which is an indirect measure of the health of a population (1). Social development is also measured through education – years in education and/or literacy (1) these are combined in one index = HDI (1)	(1+1) + (1+1) or (1+1+1) + 1 <b>(4)</b>

Question Number	Indicative Content	Mark
<b>1 (a) (ii)</b>	The groups affected most are often poor, elderly and infirm who are frequently the least mobile and most exposed to threat. There is also a gender issue in many crises and also, where applicable, ethnic minority groups are also frequently more affected than the controlling majority. The 'geography' of the disaster will also have a differential impact on groups which might 'trump' patterns of social and economic deprivation.	<b>(6)</b>
Level	Mark	Descriptors
0	0	No rewardable content
Level 1	1-2	A basic answer to the question. At least one group identified. Explanation limited to simple statement.
Level 2	3-4	A sound answer to the question. General grasp of different patterns of impact with some examples developed. Explanation partial and largely asserted.
Level 3	5-6	A good answer to the question. At least two detailed causes of variation in impact identified and developed. Explanation contextual and detailed.

Question Number	Indicative Content		Mark
<b>1 (b)</b>	Climate change is measurable and uncontested. Anthropogenic climate change is more controversial although scepticism is weakening. However, beware answers that stray into this debate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disasters are a consequence of hazard risks, the ability of a population to cope and their vulnerability</li> <li>• Climate change may lead to sea-level changes which threaten coastal cities</li> <li>• It might increase the number of extreme events such as hurricanes</li> <li>• El Nino events might become more frequent</li> <li>• These changes will impact on global food production and consequentially impact on international relations and geopolitics.</li> </ul>		<b>(10)</b>
Level	Mark	Descriptors	
0	0	No rewardable content	
Level 1	1-3	A basic answer to the question. At least one plausible increase in risk identified. Explanation of connection of risk and climate change asserted.	
Level 2	4-7	A sound answer to the question. At least two increases in risk identified with some development. Explanation of links to climate change are asserted.	
Level 3	8-10	A good answer to the question. Good range of impacts with some developed using examples of disasters. Explanatory links to climate change are clear and well-argued.	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>2 (a)</b>	Depends on chosen example.  Legitimate location chosen (1) legitimate religious cause (1) basic idea, e.g. minority group persecuted (1) any other legitimate point to extend (1) with supportive example/evidence (1).  Example:  Islamic state in Iraq and Syria (1) were largely made up of Sunni Muslims (1) who were a minority in Iraq and felt themselves to be persecuted (1) they announced a Caliphate in 2014 (1) and are regarded as a terrorist organisation by the UN (1).	1+1+1+1  (1+1) +1+1  <b>(4)</b>

Question Number	Indicative Content		Mark
<b>2 (b)</b>	<p>Likely to be based on case-study knowledge of specific conflicts so impacts will be dependent on chosen example(s) but might well include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Out-migration of the population as a consequence of conflict – many examples for current Iraq/Syria conflict or Balkans in 90s</li> <li>• Creation of refugee encampments across borders</li> <li>• Urbanisation and the creation of ghettos</li> <li>• Redrawing of international borders – Kosovo, Pakistan/India at partition</li> <li>• Gender differences as women leave areas of conflict</li> </ul>		<b>(6)</b>
Level	Mark	Descriptors	
0	0	No rewardable content	
Level 1	1-2	A basic answer to the question. At least one description of a population shift for a recognisable and identified crisis. Explanation is absent.	
Level 2	3-4	A sound answer to the question. At least one description of a population movement described with some supportive detail from an identifiable crisis. Explanation is partial with some links made but not always convincingly.	
Level 3	5-6	A good answer to the question. At least two impacts described with excellent supportive detail from clearly identifiable crises. Explanation is strong with good links made convincingly.	

Question Number	Indicative Content		Mark
<b>2 (c)</b>	<p>There are generic points that can be made but much will depend on the quality of the supportive evidence drawn from the 'case-studies' used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conflict is often destructive of infrastructure</li> <li>• It leads to loss of productive output in the areas physically affected by conflict</li> <li>• It leads to skill shortages in the population because of recruitment to armed services</li> <li>• It is costly to fight wars and can lead to indebtedness</li> <li>• However if countries are not physically affected it can lead to economic growth because of rearmament, e.g. US in the early 40s</li> <li>• There will be short-term and long-term differences in costs/benefits in economic terms</li> </ul> <p>Examination should involve some descriptive detail of particular conflicts and particular economies to illustrate and explain more general points – the examination twist should involve a reflection on 'the view' – perhaps qualifying the negative impact or identifying differences between long term and short term impacts?</p>		<b>(10)</b>
Level	Mark	Descriptors	
0	0	No rewardable content	
Level 1	1-3	A basic answer to the question. Some descriptive points about economic impact of conflict. Explanation is a simple statement but with no development beyond an assertive 'yes/no' point'.	
Level 2	4-7	A sound answer to the question. Good descriptive points about the impact of conflict. Explanation is good on at least one reason why impacts are either positive and/or negative.	
Level 3	8-10	A good answer to the question. Detailed descriptive points about the economic impact of conflicts(s). Explanation is convincing on at least two reasons why conflict has these impacts. Offers some qualifying comment.	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>3 (a) (i)</b>	<p>Much to be gathered from the RB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview points from RB</li> <li>• Source of food</li> <li>• Source of power</li> <li>• Routeway</li> <li>• But different land areas in MRB</li> <li>• so different levels of dependency - China (Yunnan) v Lao (PDR)</li> <li>• different levels of development as shown in HDI rankings</li> <li>• so some countries 'need' the natural environment more</li> <li>• additional data and detail/or development of idea, e.g. about Tonle Sap lake from Figure 3.</li> </ul>	<b>(6)</b>
Level	Mark	Descriptors
0	0	No rewardable content
Level 1	1-2	A basic answer to the question. At least one description of dependency on the river probably generalised. Explanation is absent.
Level 2	3-4	A sound answer to the question. At least one description of a countries dependency described with some supportive detail from an identifiable crisis. Explanation is partial with some links made to the reasons for dependency.
Level 3	5-6	A good answer to the question. At least two different types of dependency identified. Explanation is strong with good links to the relationship(s) between people and the river made convincingly.

Question Number	Indicative Content	Mark
<b>3 (a) (ii)</b>	<p>From RB – basic data about different population growth rates country by country. May reflect on significance of these growth rates for longer term population increases. Key point is that fastest growth is in those countries that are most dependent on MRB in terms of population and land area. These are also two of the three fastest growing economies, albeit from a low base.</p> <p>Likely impact on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demand for food</li> <li>• demand for water for irrigation</li> <li>• demand for protein from fish</li> <li>• demand for power for industrialisation</li> <li>• demand for flood control.</li> </ul> <p>But much variety from country to country:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• only a relatively small (and remote) part of China</li> <li>• Very significance in the Lao PDR and Cambodia.</li> </ul> <p>And climate change may impact on the possibility of meeting these demands</p> <p>Examination should involve the use of available and researched information to show how future changes in the population and economies of these countries will result on different and sometimes conflicting usages of the river.</p>	<b>(8)</b>
Level	Mark	Descriptors
0	0	No rewardable content
Level 1	1-3	A basic answer to the question. Some descriptive points about the population growth rates. A simple statement of explanation.
Level 2	3-5	A sound answer to the question. Good description seeing variations in likely impact from country to country - may spot key point. Reasons for differences suggested but not extended with some attempt at overarching explanation.
Level 3	6-8	A good answer to the question. Good description including detailed coverage of varying demands made on the river with some comparison between states. Good use of information to include other economic and political data/detail to help explain impacts. Comment on possible difficulties of predicting future trends or similar reflective comment.

Question Number	Indicative Content		Mark
<b>3 (b)</b>	<p>Sources A and B different perspectives on the impact of dam construction. The 'issue' text also offers some perspectives, especially on the historic significance of big dam projects, notably the TVA programme.</p> <p>Source A is an overview which includes comments on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chinese dams getting the blame</li> <li>• The impact on hydrology according to the Save the Mekong Coalition</li> <li>• The Chinese response about Lancang/Mekong river discharge</li> <li>• The role of drought</li> <li>• Opinion of MRC</li> <li>• Response about Chinese secrecy</li> <li>• Key point about non-participation of Myanmar and China in MRC</li> </ul> <p>Source B is an assessment of the Lao governments programme to build dams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Covers the usual objections to such projects</li> <li>• But also points out that there is an element of hypocrisy over such views when written from a western point of view</li> <li>• Addresses the 'what else should poor countries do?' question.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates own research may involve the legacy of the TVA, the Three Gorges project and other 'big' dam projects.</p>		<b>(16)</b>
Level	Mark	Descriptors	
0	0	No rewardable content	
Level 1	1-5	A basic answer to the question. Some descriptive points about the two sources. Differences might be claimed but not supported by evidence. Some statements quoted verbatim from the text but without qualification. Focus on political impact is unclear. 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 both sources. At least one difference addressed with a limited range of evidence to support the contrast. Selectively quotes RB with some qualifications using own language with some evidence of research. Political focus is clear. 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 the several opinions in the two sources. Contrasts addressed explicitly with a wide range of evidence to assist an explanation. Quotes RB with many critical qualifications using own language and strongly supported by research. Uses good range of appropriate specialist terminology. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
---------	-------	--

Question Number	Indicative Content	
*3 (c)	<p>Answer should be 'yes' but there are many qualifications and complexities to be addressed – not least a little examination of what constitutes sustainability. The basic definition of sustainable development needs establishing to frame this answer. Many will use:</p> <p><i>"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:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>the concept of <b>needs</b>, in particular the essential needs of the world's poor, to which overriding priority should be given; and</i></li> <li>• <i>the idea of <b>limitations</b> imposed by the state of technology and social organization on the environment's ability to meet present and future needs.</i></li> </ul> <p>The two concepts of inter- and intra-generational equity may be contrasted. Other candidates will follow the division of sustainable development into:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• economic development</li> <li>• social development</li> <li>• environmental development.</li> </ul> <p>Some will deconstruct the term 'country' to recognise the fact that different groups in different countries will take a different view as exemplified by Sources A and B.</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 two '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 descriptive comments about (lack of) sustainable development. Concept of what constitutes a threat limited to statement of impact of dams but without detail. A generalised response which takes a view about countries as a whole with limited focus on economic, social or

		environmental factors in particular. 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. Good use of RB with some signs of additional research. A 'view' is stated with some minor qualifications. Sustainable development is partially deconstructed with some economic versus environmental points most likely. 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. Excellent use of relevant detail and data which is closely tied to a sophisticated view of sustainable development. A clear 'view' is taken. Qualifications and counter arguments are addressed. Tensions are addressed in some detail. Uses good range of appropriate specialist terminology. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

