Teacher Guide Section 4

16 Trade and aid

General

The chapters in Section 4 differ from those in earlier sections. They contain suggestions for individual research and group projects, as in earlier sections. However, instead of structured activities to support these, each chapter contains a practice written examination.

Encourage students to use their responses to the activities in chapters 13, 14 and 15 to help them to work independently on individual research and group projects.

Encourage students to refer to Skills Sections 3 and 4 to remind themselves of the skills they need to apply and the processes they have learned for planning a line of enquiry and planning a project.

Always download and use the most recent mark scheme to help students to assess their practice written examinations.

Guidance to practice written examination

Skills not knowledge

Remember that the written examination is testing Global Perspectives skills, not knowledge of the topic content. To date the questions have always followed the pattern below.

Question 1: Identify and analyse issues, considering problems, solutions, causes, consequences, perspectives and opinions. This can include identifying reasons, specific bits of evidence, perspectives and so on, and also making suggestions and giving explanations.

Question 2: Plan a line of inquiry. This is usually about identifying gaps in knowledge or things students need to know, and working out how to find this information. This can be by framing questions to particular people, designing a small survey or suggesting an experiment or research project. It often requires students to identify specific information that they need to know for a particular purpose, and explain how this information will help. This question could address the project planning process.

Question 3: Question information and reasoning. This section can include questions about the reliability of sources, about the difference between facts, opinions and value judgments and about the quality of reasoning.

Question 4: Develop a line of reasoning. There is usually one long question, which may be a standard essay-type question. Other kinds of question may appear, such as a debate in which students have to make a case for one proposal, one use of energy and so on. Students may use, develop or argue against material from the resource booklet. They may also use any knowledge they have or opinions and perspectives of their own. No specific knowledge is required.
Note that the questions more or less follow the Global Perspectives learning process of: collect; question; reflect and plan; present and act. The skill of reflecting is rarely tested specifically but students who reflect on the issues tend to develop better reasoning in question 4.

**Vocabulary and concepts**

No specific knowledge, vocabulary or concepts are required for the written paper. In fact, specific knowledge can lead a student to write down what they know rather than responding to the questions. However, students may be more within their comfort zones if some subject-specific vocabulary and concepts are familiar to them. For this reason, it may be useful to do skills development exercises from a variety of topics that haven’t otherwise been used in the course. Another possible activity would be to organise debates and discussions on topics that haven’t been formally studied, in order to familiarise students with key concepts and vocabulary. Students can evaluate each others’ reasoning (using red cards for a weakness, perhaps), and the activity leads nicely into development of written reasoning.

**Mark schemes**

Always download and use the most recent CIE Global Perspectives mark scheme to help prepare students for assessment. Most of the questions are marked by levels, so you can adapt the marking grids to the questions in this chapter. For instance, quite a number of question parts, especially in questions 1, 2 and 3 in 2012 were marked according to levels which can be summarised as:

- Level 3: Strong and supported reasoning, directly relevant to the question.
- Level 2: Some description generally relevant to the question.
- Level 1: Simple description, general and not specific to the question.

This general guide can be adapted to each question. Students can use this to learn what counts as simple description, what counts as relevant to the question and so on. Even weaker students, given the tools to understand how their answers are marked, can often identify what they need to do to achieve the next level.

Question papers and mark schemes evolve over time, and it is in students’ interests to use the most recent versions. For instance, in June 2011, the top level of the mark scheme for question 4 looked like this:
Question answered precisely and logically, supported by some or all of the following characteristics:

- Logically linked, coherent structure to the reasoning.
- Candidates have made effective use of relevant ideas in the resource booklet as reasons to support their view and/or added their own relevant ideas. These ideas may be completely new, or they may be expansion of or response to existing material.
- Relevant different point/s of view from candidate’s own ideas or selected from resource booklet.
- Thoughtful consideration of different point/s of view AND strong explanation of why disagreed which really answers the different point of view OR possibly a suggestion of a compromise position between different points of view.

However, in November 2012 the top level of the mark scheme for question 4 looked like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16–18 marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very good, well supported and logical reasoning and judgments about the effects of the internet. Coherent, structured argument and evaluation of a range of internet effects on thinking – usually 4 or more. The response is likely to contain a range of clearly reasoned arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with at least 4 developed points, and some undeveloped points. The response is balanced. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion is reached.

Note that there is now a quantitative element: “usually 4 or more”. This works down through the levels. Note also that the specific detail on how students deal with different points of view has been replaced with “the response is balanced”.

Look out for further developments, and make sure that your students are as prepared as possible.

**Indicative content**

This section provides indicative content for the practice paper. Accept other reasonable responses (and allow students to discuss what a reasonable response might be and why). Accept a variety of levels of sophistication, and encourage students to find the level on the most recent mark scheme that matches their performance.

**Question 1**

(a) Cartoon 1 – Poverty, exploitation and aid. Personal perspectives might include individual opinions about poverty, exploitation and the usefulness of aid in trying to prevent poverty. National perspectives include: countries may be harmed by trying to use aid to prevent poverty; governments are unlikely to be successful in attempts to use aid to hold back poverty; governments should address the way they exploit the poor rather than providing aid; governments are posturing when providing aid rather than addressing the real problems. Global Perspectives include countries, NGOs and supranational organisations need to work together to address the exploitation which drives poverty, rather than using aid to stop it.
Cartoon 2 – “Thank God – it’s a panel of experts”. Personal perspectives include people in the disaster-stricken place are likely to be unimpressed by a panel of experts instead of food, shelter, clean water. But the experts are likely to have a different personal perspective – they will probably believe that their contribution is highly valuable (as research, in directing relief efforts and so on). National perspectives include: governments are likely to believe that experts have a valuable contribution, and it makes them look good; the country must be seen to be doing something. Global perspectives include it would be rash to send aid without expert coordination – if each nation just sent relief supplies without the expertise of specialists, the relief effort would probably be ineffective.

Cartoon 3 – This cartoon expresses a range of different personal perspectives on the issue of inequality. People in HEDCs agonise over food and guilt, while people elsewhere have a different perspective – there are more important issues. One national perspective would be to sort out priorities for national action on pressing world problems, and to persuade people to buy into these priorities. One global perspective would be to consider the issues that really matter to people around the world and persuade individuals to buy into the solutions to these, rather than emoting over very personal issues like their dinner. Or you could argue that the whole cartoon is based on one person’s personal perspective – there may be people who value the arms trade, for example, because it feeds their families, or who would rather have slave wages than no wages. How do we feel about these perspectives?

(b) Cartoon 1 – Issues here include: Is aid any use? Can it help with poverty or will it simply be crushed? Should we address exploitation instead? If so, how? How else can we deal with poverty?

Cartoon 2 – What is the best way to provide disaster relief? Do we waste resources on useless panels of experts (and other attempts to help), when water is needed? Or are experts essential to guiding relief efforts? Should relief efforts be guided by locals or by global experts? Are “experts” just self-serving?

Cartoon 3 – How can individuals in HEDCs best help those in need? Is food more important than justice, debt, arms or slave wages? To whom? In what circumstances? In what ways can addressing our eating habits and food management in HEDCs have an effect on those in LEDCs? How can individuals have an effect on global justice, debt, arms and slave wages? Is emotional agonising over LEDC problems effective? How can it be translated into effective action? Whose perspectives/opinions on LEDC problems should we listen to?

Question 2

(a) Disaster relief concert

I need to know whether the celebrity organising the concert has a good track record of making valuable use of proceeds from relief concerts – will the money transfer be efficient? What sort of projects will it fund? How much of the money that I give will actually go to the disaster relief fund? Will I share the values of the projects? If the celebrity has a history of taking (too much of) the money for themselves, or taking too
long to donate the money, or of funding projects that aren’t much use, then I would be better off donating in a different way. But if I share the values of the celebrity, and if they get relief to people quickly without the bureaucracy of the big NGOs, then this could be a good way for me to donate. Also, I’d have to ask if I like their music. If I don’t, I would be better off just donating money.

(b) Red Cross/Red Crescent

I need to know exactly what projects the Red Cross is funding, and whether these are likely to be useful and in line with my values. I also need to know how efficient they are compared to the celebrity concert. I might also ask what I get out of donating to the Red Cross – does it matter to me whether I get to go to a concert or is just knowledge that I’ve helped sufficient?

Question 3

(a) Opinion/value judgment. You can agree or disagree with this, argue it either way, and it can’t be verified. Therefore it’s an opinion, not a fact. Also, it deals with unfairness, so it’s dealing with values, which makes it a value judgment.

(b) Christian Aid is likely to have experience, expertise and access to research evidence and first-hand eyewitness accounts of the effects of aid and trade. This gives them some reliability. On the other hand, they are a religious charity which gives a priority to helping people via aid, so they are likely to be biased somewhat, and perhaps give more weight to evidence which accords with their perspective. So there is no reason to believe that they are lying about Kofi Eliasa, for example, or any other facts, but we need to bear in mind that there might be additional facts to take into consideration.

(c) There isn’t an easy answer to whose reasoning is better – both give reasons and evidence, are quite thoughtful, make reasonable points, and suggest plausible consequences. @musiclover makes a good point when he or she says that disaster concerts can raise money quickly – there is plenty of evidence out there for this. It is plausible to suggest that a concert can raise more money than a celebrity simply donating, although personally, I’d be more convinced of their genuineness if they also donated a significant sum of money. @musiclover does raise the question of values – is it selfish to want to feel good about giving or to hear music? It’s not developed much, but we can say from our own experience, that people are more likely to be generous if they feel they get something from it. @cynicalrealist starts with loaded questions, which raise plausible possible alternative consequences, but aren’t well argued in themselves. It is possible that money from disaster concerts ends up in the wrong place, but to really make this point, they would need evidence and examples of when this has happened. The argument that disaster concerts distract from real charity is more reasonable. It relies on the value that it’s wrong to sing and dance when people are mourning – you could argue for or against this, but it is a reasonable value to use here. It’s also reasonable to say that (at least sometimes) charity disaster concerts do become about us and how we feel rather than about the people in need. You could argue about how much this matters if help gets to the people in need.
A weakness in this argument is that there’s no reason given for why charities should be leading charity campaigns rather than celebrities.

Question 4

Some points that students could make include the following.

● Some aid does aim to treat the causes of poverty, inequality and injustice, for example, education projects, microfinance projects which empower women economically, development projects which aim to improve educational and legal infrastructure.

● Problems with addressing the causes: they are complex and varied, and no one is quite sure what they are. There are limited resources. Addressing the causes might mean that we lose out.

● Some aid deals with disaster relief, providing clean water, shelter, food, blankets and medical care to people in immediate need. You can’t address the causes of earthquakes or tsunamis – you just have to deal with the consequences.

● Yes, we need to address the causes of poverty, injustice and inequality. This means a major change in how the world is organised. (You can agree with this and still not be able to do it – think about the practical issues.)

● Trade can address some of the issues. If people trade they get richer, and then have the means to address injustice. But trade can make inequality worse.