

**MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2015 series**

**9239 GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH**

**9239/01**

Paper 1 (Written Exam), maximum raw mark 30

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 October/November 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9239	01

## The Impact of the Internet

### 1 Study Document 1.

- (a) Identify two ways in which the author of Document 1 thinks that young children may be attracted by touch-screens. [2]

Examiners should be aware that candidates are asked only to identify ways and not explain or evaluate them. Therefore they should not expect lengthy responses. Candidates are not expected to put the ways into their own words and may simply copy the ways from the Document; however examiners should ensure that all the ways given in the response are taken from Document 1.

**Credit 1 mark for a correct version of the following, up to 2 marks:**

- apps open directly / no need for parents to navigate the operating system for them (1)
- no need to use a keyboard or a mouse (1)
- they control the action (1)
- immediate feedback (1)
- Videos / games / other applications (1)
- Talking software / multiple points of activity (1)

The question asks for two ways so if a candidate develops just one point they can score a maximum of one mark.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9239	01

- (b) Identify and explain two benefits that the author thinks touch-screen technology can bring to young children. [4]

Examiners should be aware that this question carries only 4 marks and should not expect a lengthy answer. Examiners should ensure that the ways given are taken from the Document, rather than own knowledge.

**Credit up to 4 marks for two correct answers.**

**Credit 1 mark each for a simple identification of a benefit and a second mark if this is correctly explained.**

**Examples of 2 mark answers:**

- Benefit – increased concentration/reading progress/help for children with ADHD (1 mark)  
Explanation – because the technology engages with talking software and multiple-activity points (1 mark)
- Benefit – mastering objects around the home/alphabet (1 mark)  
Explanation – because the technology encourages intuitive learning (1 mark)
- Benefit – effective learning – better than flash cards etc. (1 mark)  
Explanation – because the technology involves an interactive process/not passive (1 mark)
- Benefit – increased brain activity (1 mark)  
Explanation – because the technology encourages active learning in control of the process (1 mark)

The question asks for **two** benefits so a candidate can only score a maximum of two marks for identifying those benefits. The other two marks are for explanation of those identified benefits. Directly quoting a reason from the passage is not creditworthy for the explanation mark.

A candidate who identifies four benefits, but with no explanation, would score 2 marks.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9239	01

## 2 Study Document 1.

**Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used in Document 1 to support the use of touch-screen technology with young children.** [12]

Use the levels based marking grid below and the indicative content to credit marks.

<b>Level 3</b> <b>9–12 marks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Both</b> strengths and weaknesses of evidence are assessed.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence is <b>sustained</b>.</li> <li>• Assessment explicitly includes the <b>impact</b> of specific evidence upon the claims made.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>highly effective</b> – explanation and reasoning accurate and clearly expressed.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 2</b> <b>5–8 marks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers focus <b>more</b> on either strengths or weaknesses of evidence, although both are present.</li> <li>• Assessment identifies strength or weakness of evidence with <b>little explanation</b>.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence is relevant but generalised, <b>not always linked to specific</b> evidence or <b>specific</b> claims.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>accurate</b> – explanation and reasoning is limited, but clearly expressed.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 1</b> <b>1–4 marks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers show <b>little or no</b> assessment of evidence.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence if any is <b>simplistic</b>.</li> <li>• Evidence may be <b>identified</b> and weakness may be <b>named</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>limited</b> – response may be cursory or descriptive.</li> </ul>

Award 0 where there is no creditable material.

### Indicative content:

No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates are likely to include some of the following:

#### 2011 CSM US study (para 1)

Strengths:

- relevance – the evidence is used to demonstrate wide use by young children.
- neutral source – CSM as an independent not-for-profit group, would be unlikely to have vested interest to exaggerate the large numbers

Weaknesses:

- relevance – the findings may not be accurate if touch-screen usage has changed/increased since then.
- transferability – as a US study, the results may not be representative of young child touch-screen usage in countries with less well developed technology or where spending power is lower.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015</b>	<b>9239</b>	<b>01</b>

### **Lisa Guernsey’s view (para 3)**

Strengths:

- expertise in the field – as director of the Early Education Initiative, she has the ability to give an informed judgement about effects on young children, which here is very measured giving both positive and negative aspects.

### **US University study of children with ADHD (para 4)**

Strengths:

- authoritative – As a University study, it presumably has access to expertise to conduct a valid and reliable study on reading level progress.
- relevance – The assistive functions of touch-screen technology and their increase of concentration and reading skills is relevant to advancing these in young children.
- significance – The study was sustained over a 6 weeks trial, which adds weight to its findings.
- validity – Reading age is a measurable developmental outcome, which adds substance to the claims about the positive possible outcomes.

Weaknesses:

- causality – The improved reading levels may not have been due solely to the use of touch-screens – the experiment may have given children more attention/ the educational apps themselves may have been just as effective with a traditional screen.
- significance – The significance of the results would be weakened if the children selected were of high ability ready to make reading progress or almost at the next stage of reading ability.

### **Jennifer Stroud and Mark Pemberton examples (para 5)**

Strengths:

- alleged experts in their fields – One is an American education specialist, the other a Co-founder of a digital education portal, so they should be able to give informed views on the educational impact of this technology.
- relevance – The examples are directly relevant to the effects of using a touch-screen with young children, since these are youngsters using this technology.

Weaknesses:

- anecdotal – The evidence is limited to the personal experience of their own child and their opinions on their progress using touch-screen technology.
- transferability – The responses of their children may not be representative of others, if as parents they have more insight because of their backgrounds to use touch-screens well with their own children/ if their children have more exposure to learning in this way than others.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9239	01

### 3 Study Documents 1 and 2.

To what extent is the argument in Document 2 stronger than that in Document 1? [12]

Use the levels based marking grid below and the indicative content to credit marks.

<b>Level 3</b> <b>9–12 marks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The judgement about <b>relative strength</b> is <b>sustained</b> and <b>reasoned</b>.</li> <li>Alternative perspectives have <b>sustained</b> assessment.</li> <li>Critical evaluation of <b>key</b> issues is raised in the passages and has <b>explicit</b> reference.</li> <li>Explanation and reasoning is <b>highly effective</b>, accurate and clearly expressed.</li> <li>Communication is <b>highly effective</b> – clear evidence of a structured cogent argument with conclusions explicitly stated and directly linked to the assessment.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 2</b> <b>5–8 marks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judgement about relative strength is reasoned.</li> <li>One perspective may be focused upon for assessment.</li> <li>Evaluation is present but may not relate to key issues.</li> <li>Explanation and reasoning is generally accurate.</li> <li>Communication is accurate – some evidence of a structured discussion, although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment.</li> </ul>
<b>Level 1</b> <b>1–4 marks</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Judgement, if present, is unsupported or superficial.</li> <li>Alternative perspectives have little or no assessment</li> <li>Evaluation, if any, is simplistic. Answers may describe a few points comparing the two documents.</li> <li>Relevant evidence or reasons may be identified.</li> <li>Communication is limited. Response may be cursory.</li> </ul>

Award 0 where there is no creditable material.

#### Indicative Content:

No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Answers should go beyond a simple comparison of the content of the two Documents and look to evaluate a range of issues if they want to access the higher levels. In order to assess the argument in Document 2 is stronger than that in Document 1 candidates should consider not only the content of the Documents, but critically assess the arguments and views put forward through a consideration of issues such as the nature of the passages, purpose and language. Responses are likely to cover issues, such as the reliability of the Documents, by looking at their origin/source.

#### Document 2:

##### Stronger

- stronger conclusion – Gale’s argument forcibly rejects young children’s use of touch-screens, whereas Ly-ann’s conclusion is inconclusive, giving the positive and the negative.
- more scientific explanation – Gale’s argument gives an explanation of gaming and dopamine release to aid understanding of addiction and lend scientific support to her argument.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS Level – October/November 2015	9239	01

### Weaker

- weaker provenance – Gale’s argument is an article on her own website, so may lack the scrutiny of Ly-ann’s argument published in a leading newspaper.
- more emotive conclusion – Gale’s conclusion presents a charged choice, using ‘little brains’ to appeal to parental care, whereas Ly-ann’s conclusion is a measured response of both positive and negative aspects.
- weaker use of expertise – Gale’s argument uses largely journalists’ views, unlike Ly-ann’s which cites experts and academic studies.
- less academic in tone – Gale’s argument employs long lists of unsupported opinion on negative effects of iDevice and internet usage, whereas Ly-ann’s cites a reputable relevant survey and a research study.
- less relevant evidence – Gale’s argument uses evidence of the general effects of iDevice, screens and surfing the internet upon the general public, whereas Ly-ann’s evidence directly relates to young children and touch-screens.
- fewer examples – Gale’s argument lacks exemplification, whereas Ly-ann’s argument uses relevant examples of effective use of touch-screen by young children.
- questionable parallel – Gale’s argument links trance like watching TV and video games to using an iPad, whereas touch-screen technology may stimulate interactivity.

### Neither stronger nor weaker

- both have relevant expertise – both arguments may be strengthened by informed judgement, Ly-ann’s from the perspective of teaching and education, Gale’s from psychotherapy.
- neither have direct experience – both arguments are weakened by apparent lack of direct experience of young children using touch-screen technology.
- both draw a clear overall conclusion – both draw conclusions but from different perspectives: Gale against the use of touch-screens on health grounds, Ly-ann that there is a balancing negative consideration and positive outcome.
- both consider counterarguments – both consider the perspectives of educational advantages and the problems of social interaction. The difference is one of emphasis.
- both consider touch-screens and ADHD – the difference is the use of opposing evidence, Ly-ann’s argument that touch-screen technology can help ADHD sufferers, Gale’s that it can cause ADHD.

A reminder – candidates at **level 3 must make a supported judgement as to the extent to which the argument in Document 2 is stronger than the argument in Document 1**. Some candidates might offer an alternative or modified view, and if this has been supported that should be credited.