



Pearson

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2017

GCE Global Development (6GL02/01)

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 2017

Publications Code 6GL02_01_1706_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

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)	Development that does not compromise the ability of future generations (1) to access a world with similar environmental systems as today (1) whilst also satisfying the needs of today (1) example of same, e.g. protection of coral reefs (1) climate change and biosystem destruction (6 th extinction) a major threat (1) largely a consequence of economic development/growth model (1)	(4)

Question Number	Indicative Content	Mark
1 (a) (ii)	Economic growth inevitably impacts on the environment both directly and indirectly. Legitimizing power comes about through delivering better 'living standards', which is likely to involve more resource consumption. The logic of corporate capitalism is built around higher consumption which satisfies the aspirations of populations that are expectant of rising living standards. Politics is necessarily short-term and driven by the threat from below (China) or the need for democratic endorsement (India) both of which will be most acquiescent in times of economic growth. International competition will exacerbate this situation.	(6)

Level	Mark	Descriptors
0	0	No rewardable content
Level 1	1-2	A basic answer to the question with very little data of detail. At least one reason described but in general terms. Explanation limited to simple assertive statement. Very limited use of appropriate specialist terminology. Many errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 2	3-4	A sound answer to the question with some data and detail to support. General grasp of at least one reason with some illustration of its impact on environmental sustainability. Uses some appropriate specialist terminology. A few errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 3	5-6	A good answer to the question with impressive data and detail to support. At least two detailed causes of government 'neglect' identified and developed. Explanation contextual and detailed. Uses good range of appropriate specialist terminology. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Question Number	Indicative Content		Mark
1 (b)	<p>Population growth is intuitively a threat given that it places a greater strain on a fixed base of resources. More people = more demand on basic services/resources such as water, land and shelter. Malthusian and neo-Malthusian argument about inability of the planet to provide so ultimately collapse comes that reduces social and economic development.</p> <p>However the evidence is more nuanced with the periods of rapid population growth corresponding with significant advances in both economic and social sustainability (19th and 20th centuries).</p> <p>The environmental issue is obviously more problematic, for the increases in living standards have, in the view of many, precipitated a sixth extinction event that threatens the sustainability of the planet as a whole.</p>		(10)
Level	Mark	Descriptors	
0	0	No rewardable content	
Level 1	1-3	A basic answer to the question with very little data or detail to support the answer. At least one plausible impact is identified. Explanation of links to sustainability asserted but not explained. Very limited use of appropriate specialist terminology. Many errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.	
Level 2	4-7	A sound answer to the question with some data and detail to support the answer. At least two links between population growth and sustainability asserted although weakly supported with sustainability partially deconstructed, e.g. economic sustainability. Uses some appropriate specialist terminology. A few errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.	
Level 3	8-10	A good answer to the question with impressive data and detail to support. Good range of links between population growth and sustainability explained with at least two different aspects of sustainability addressed, e.g. economic and environmental. A good range of appropriate specialist terminology. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.	

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2 (a)	<p>Allow both independent state action, e.g. Vietnam, Iraq, Chile or UN action, e.g. Bosnia.</p> <p>Expect a basic reason, e.g. to stop the spread of communism (1) which would threaten the balance of power. (1)</p> <p>Allow varied interpretations, e.g. invading Iraq (1) to secure the oilfields or Invading Iraq (1) to eradicate weapons of mass destruction. (1)</p>	(4)

Question Number	Indicative Content		Mark
2 (b)	<p>Likely to be based on case-study knowledge of specific conflicts so impacts will depend on chosen example(s) but might well include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disruption to education • Disruption to health services • Inevitable disruption to economic activities, which in turn impact on social development • Life expectancy likely to decline in time of conflict both because of death of combatants but also secondary impacts on civilian population, e.g. Syria. <p>Good answers will develop the idea of the breakdown of good governance, which will, in turn, have negative impact on all parts of society although:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women and children more likely to be affected so gender equality issue • Human rights likely to be affected. 		(6)
Level	Mark	Descriptors	
0	0	No rewardable content	
Level 1	1-2	A basic answer to the question with very little data or detail to support the answer. At least one description of an impact of conflict but no explicit link to social development. Explanation 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 with some data and detail to support the answer. At least one description of an impact on social development. Explanation of process is partial with some links made but not always convincingly. Uses some appropriate specialist terminology. A few errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.	
Level 3	5-6	A good answer to the question with impressive data and detail to support the answer. At least two impacts described with excellent supportive detail from clearly identifiable crises. Explanation is strong with good analysis of processes. Uses good range of appropriate specialist terminology. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.	

Question Number	Indicative Content		Mark
2 (c)	<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. Better candidates might assess the criteria for 'success'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negotiated resolution has a patchy history but there are diplomatic successes. • Military intervention either directly, e.g. UN forces, or proxy intervention, e.g. US in first Iraq war has patchier history. • Much depends on perspective of what constitutes success. • Conflict is often destructive of infrastructure, which can exacerbate conflict in the longer term. • It leads to loss of productive output in the areas physically affected by conflict, which might disadvantage particular groups, e.g. Kurdish minority. • There will be short-term and long-term differences in costs/benefits in terms of political stability and the human rights of the population, e.g. Afghanistan. <p>Examination should involve some descriptive detail of particular conflicts and particular interventions to illustrate and explain more general points – the examination twist should involve a reflection on 'the view' – perhaps qualifying the positive impact in terms of spatial impact (some places see resolution but others do not or identifying a difference between long- term and short- term resolution).</p>		(10)
Level	Mark	Descriptors	
0	0	No rewardable content	
Level 1	1-3	A basic answer to the question with very little data and detail to support the answer. Some descriptive points about economic impact of conflict. Explanation is a simple statement but with no development beyond an assertive 'yes/no' point. Very limited use of appropriate specialist terminology. Many errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.	
Level 2	4-7	A sound answer to the question with some data and detail to support the answer. Good descriptive points about the impact of conflict. Explanation is good on at least one reason why impacts are either positive and/or negative. Uses some appropriate specialist terminology. A few errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.	
Level 3	8-10	A good answer to the question with impressive data and detail to support the answer. 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. Uses good range	

		of appropriate specialist terminology. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
--	--	--

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3 (a) (i)	<p>Much to be gathered from the RB:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depends on size of event but... • Vulnerability a big issue • Exposure... • Resistance... • Adaptive capacity • Might use Katrina information as part of answer or own research based on pre-release materials. 	(6)
Level	Mark	Descriptors
0	0	No rewardable content
Level 1	1-2	A basic answer to the question with very little data and detail to support the answer. At least one reason offered but processes linking hazard to disaster are weakly developed. Very limited use of appropriate specialist terminology. Many errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 2	3-4	A sound answer to the question with some data and detail to support the answer. At least one reason offered with sound process links established linking hazard to disaster adequately. Uses some appropriate specialist terminology. A few errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 3	5-6	A good answer to the question with impressive data and detail to support the answer. At least two different reasons why hazards do not necessarily result in disasters well developed with clear understanding of processes. Uses good range of appropriate specialist terminology. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Question Number	Indicative Content	Mark
3 (a)(ii)	<p>From taught content</p> <p>The reasons for crises and humanitarian disasters and the global patterns and trends of crises and humanitarian disasters and the relationship to the development status of countries. The development of these themes will be tied to particular examples of hazards/disasters.</p> <p>From the RB</p> <p>Good detail from both Issue 1 and Issue 2, especially Issue 1.</p> <p>Major reasons include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global climate change • Growing populations so increased exposure • Financial constraints so decreased resistance in some communities • Same problem for adaptive capacity • However increased reporting may have impact on figures so growth may be partly illusory. 	(8)
Level	Mark	Descriptors
0	0	No rewardable content
Level 1	1-3	A basic answer to the question with limited data and detail to support the answer. Some descriptive points about the impact of hazards. A simple statement of explanation linking hazards with disasters but limited exploration of processes. Very limited use of appropriate specialist terminology. Many errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 2	3-5	A sound answer to the question with some data and detail to support the answer. Good descriptive points about the varied impact of hazards. Some detail in the exploration of processes with at least two variables addressed. Uses some appropriate specialist terminology. A few errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 3	6-8	A good answer to the question with impressive data and detail to support the answer. Very full descriptive points about the varied impact of hazards. Thoughtful explanation linking hazards with disasters showing good understanding of processes. Comment on possible difficulties of data base or similar reflective comment. Uses good range of appropriate specialist terminology. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.

Question Number	Indicative Content		Mark
3 (b)	<p>Source A is an overview that includes comments on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The uneven impact on the population of New Orleans • This was uneven in terms of age, colour and income • Much data offered to support. <p>Source B, whilst largely an account of the future plans, also offers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappearance of the wetlands • Reduction of sediment from the Mississippi • Subsidence of the city • Sea level changes due in part to global warming • Might also suggest greater hurricane frequency. <p>Issue 1 and 2 both offer information on general causes of under-investment – state neglect and poor management as contributory factors.</p> <p>Very hard to disagree with the view but two ideas here</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Man-made? 2. Uneven socially? <p>The second is undeniable – data to support in Source A. The first more arguable but largely correct.</p>		(16)
Level	Mark	Descriptors	
0	0	No rewardable content	
Level 1	1-5	A basic answer to the question with limited data and detail to support the answer. Patchy description of both sources. A few points asserted but without any supportive evidence. No evaluation. No evidence of research beyond the RB. Very limited use of appropriate specialist terminology. Many errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.	
Level 2	6- 11	A sound answer to the question with some data and detail to support the answer. Good description of both sources. A number of points asserted with supportive evidence for at least one in some detail. Takes a view on one of the ideas. Selectively quotes RB with at least one qualification using own language with some suggestion of research. Uses some appropriate specialist terminology. A few errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.	
Level 3	12-16	A good answer to the question with impressive data and detail to support the answer. Very full description of both sources. Many points asserted with supportive evidence for at least two with some relevant detail. Takes a view on both of the ideas. Quotes RB with both qualifications and added complexity using own language suggesting well- focused research. Hardly any errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.	

Question Number	Indicative Content		Mark
*3 (c)	<p>There is a good amount of material throughout the RB. The arguments for might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is sinking, which is irreversible • Sea level rise is also inevitable at least for the foreseeable future • So the cost of maintaining New Orleans as a viable city will rise • Whilst its economy continues to falter. <p>On the other hand Sources B and C suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That there is a decent intellectual argument for saving the city – the Dutch argument? • That the costs may not be as high as the \$50 billion postulated elsewhere in the RB. <p>Better candidates might address the time frame involved – in the (very) long term no city has a future so some qualification is needed.</p> <p>Discussion should involve an assessment of arguments both for and against the proposition.</p>		(20)
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 RB 'sources'. No clear view linked to other resources. Generic comments about New Orleans but proposition not addressed directly or indirectly. 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 the future of New Orleans. Proposition is not directly addressed/answered with equivocal position dominant. 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' of the future of New Orleans is stated with some supportive argument although not consistently coherent. 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 the future of New Orleans. 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.	

