



GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

0457/31

Paper 3 Written Paper

May/June 2017

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

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 May/June 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| 1(a) | <p>Candidates may identify one of the following continents where annual wealth produced is high:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Europe • Asia <p>Candidates may identify one of the following continents where annual wealth produced is low:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Africa • South America <p>1 mark for each correct answer, up to a maximum of 2 marks.</p> | 2 | <p>Further Guidance</p> <p>(a) The only acceptable answers are located in Source 1. However, candidates may use their own words.</p> <p>(b) Candidates must give the full name of the continent from Source 1.</p> |
| 1(b) | <p>The following consequences of poverty may be identified from the source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to get a job • Unemployment • Grow their own food • Build their own shelter or housing • May not get any education or go to government schools <p>Candidates are likely to give the following reasons to justify their choice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible further consequences or effects • Degree of impact/seriousness for individuals/countries/world • How many people/groups/countries are affected • Increasing cycle of poverty • How widespread the problem is • How easy to solve • Effects on political life and social stability • Increase in crime • Other reasonable response | 4 | <p>Further Guidance</p> <p>(a) Candidates should discuss consequences from the sources as listed; however, the assessment is focussed upon their reasoning/justification and therefore additional consequences should be credited.</p> |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|----------|
| | <p>Level 4 (4 marks) Strong response Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of why one consequence has the most impact on people’s lives; may compare different consequences; with two (or more) developed points or a range of relevant but undeveloped points, clearly linked to a consequence.</p> <p>Level 3 (3 marks) Reasonable response Some reasoned explanation of why one consequence has the most impact on people’s lives, with one (or more) developed point(s) or several undeveloped reasons. The link between the explanation and a consequence may be implicit at times.</p> <p>Level 2 (2 marks) Basic response Identifies a consequence as significant but argument is weak or not linked to the issue explicitly.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response Simple identification of a consequence but no attempt to justify or the reasoning is not related to the issue.</p> <p>Source material copied or recycled without development/explanation.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p> | | |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|----------|----------|
| 1(c) | <p>Candidates are likely to discuss the following reasons drawing upon the information in the sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The benefits/consequences of unequal distribution of wealth for individuals, countries and the world • The benefits/consequences for economic growth – sustainability issues • The benefits/consequences for human welfare – food, security, health, opportunities, life chances, etc. • Issues of value and beliefs about equality and wealth - fairness • Human rights • Morality – issues of right and wrong from different cultures • In response to government, United Nations and other NGO aims and goals for development • Security and conflict issues • Other reasonable responses <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Strong response Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of significance; usually two (or more) developed arguments clearly linked to the issue; or three (or more) undeveloped reasons. The global dimension is explicit.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response Some reasoned explanation of significance; usually one (or more) developed argument(s) with some link to the issue, but may be implicit at times; or two (or more) undeveloped reasons. The global dimension is mainly implicit.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Basic response Basic reasoning and explanation; the response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted points. Arguments are partial, generalised and lack clarity. The global dimension may not be apparent. Source material copied or recycled without development/explanation.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No relevant or creditworthy material</p> | 6 | |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|--|
| 2(a) | <p>Candidates are likely to discuss the following evaluative points:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some factual evidence is used • several different types of evidence are used – opinion, fact, statistics, values • the evidence is generally relevant • the evidence is related clearly and explicitly to the argument • the evidence is used forcefully in a strongly worded argument • research evidence is cited • personal experience used • other reasonable response <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • research evidence is partially cited – the source and authorship are not clear • level of expertise of the author is not clear – may have poor knowledge claims • method of research is alleged/unclear • there is only a little clear, specific statistical/numerical evidence • the evidence is not easy to verify/check from the information provided • too much reliance on opinion and personal anecdote • evidence may be out of date • personal testimony/anecdote/values may not apply to other places/countries etc. • other reasonable responses | 6 | <p>Further Guidance</p> <p>(a) The candidate does not need to discuss both strengths and weaknesses to reach Level 3.</p> |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|----------|
| | <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Good response Clearly reasoned, credible and structured evaluation; two (or more) developed points clearly linked to the issue, with some other undeveloped points; or a wide range (four or more) of undeveloped points.</p> <p>Evaluation is clearly focused on the evidence, its strengths and/or weaknesses and the way it is used to support the claim.</p> <p>A convincing overall assessment or conclusion is reached.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response Reasonable evaluation mainly focused on the evidence, its strengths and/or weaknesses, and the way it is used to support the claim. The response may contain one (or more) developed point(s), with some other undeveloped points. Some (two or more) undeveloped points may be sufficient.</p> <p>An overall assessment or conclusion is attempted.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response Limited evaluation which is often unsupported and asserted. The response is clear in part but is incomplete and generalised. It contains one undeveloped point only. Answers at this level may repeat source material with little understanding.</p> <p>An overall assessment or conclusion is weak or not attempted.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p> | | |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|----------|
| 2(b) | <p>Possible Types of Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • compare statistics/information on poverty and health – for individuals, countries and globally • interview or questionnaire data • expert testimony • material from international NGOs and pressure groups • other relevant response <p>Possible Sources of Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • national and local governments and their departments • international organizations e.g. United Nations; UNESCO • health experts • research reports • pressure groups, charities and non government organizations • media and worldwide web • other relevant response <p>Possible Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents • interviews • interview relevant experts • internet search • questionnaires • surveys • other relevant response | 6 | |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|----------|
| | <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Strong response Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of ways to test the claim. The response is likely to contain two (or more) developed points, and may contain some undeveloped points. The response is clearly and explicitly related to testing the claim.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response Reasoned and mainly credible explanation of ways to test the claim. The response is likely to contain one (or more) developed point(s), and/or a range of undeveloped points. The response is implicitly related to testing the claim.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Basic response Basic explanation of ways to test the claim. The response is likely to contain one or two simple, undeveloped and asserted points. There is little relevance in the response to testing the claim – the methods, sources and types of information are generally not appropriate for the claim being tested.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p> | | |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|---|
| 3(a) | <p>A value judgement is a view or belief about what is important/ethical/moral/right or wrong.</p> <p>The following examples of value judgements may be found in Source 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is nothing wrong with earning lots of money and having wealth. • People are more important than money. • It is right to have a choice about how we use our income and wealth. • If you work hard you should be rewarded. • It is not reasonable that 800 million people go to bed hungry every night. <p>Level 3 (3 marks) Strong response The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of value judgements and applies this accurately to a correct example identified from the source.</p> <p>Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response The response demonstrates some understanding of the nature of value judgements and attempts to apply this to a correct example identified from the source. The explanation lacks some clarity and accuracy.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Basic response The candidate identifies one value judgement from the source correctly but does not explain the reason; the response demonstrates very little or no understanding of the nature of values.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p> | 3 | <p>Further Guidance</p> <p>(a) If the example is incorrect the candidate must score 0 even if the reasoning suggests some understanding of the nature of value judgements.</p> |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|----------|---|
| 3(b) | <p>A fact is information or data that can be verified or proven to be true.</p> <p>The following examples of facts may be found in Source 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Top footballers have talents that entertain millions of people all over the world. • People in banks take risks to create jobs for other people. • 800 million people go to bed hungry every night. • Most people don't realise that the rich have so much money that only a very small amount of their wealth could transform the lives of millions of poorer people. <p>Level 3 (3 marks) Strong response The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of facts and applies this accurately to a correct example identified from the source.</p> <p>Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response The response demonstrates some understanding of the nature of facts and attempts to apply this to a correct example identified from the source. The explanation lacks some clarity and accuracy.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Basic response The candidate identifies one fact from the source correctly but does not explain the reason; the response demonstrates very little or no understanding of the nature of facts.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p> | 3 | <p>Further Guidance</p> <p>(a) If the example is incorrect the candidate must score 0 even if the reasoning suggests some understanding of the nature of value judgements.</p> |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|----------|
| 3(c) | <p>Candidates are expected to evaluate the reasoning in the two statements and compare their effectiveness. They should make a supported judgement with some explanation about which person has the most effective reasoning.</p> <p>Candidates may consider the following types of issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • quality of the argument • clarity • tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise • language • balance • quality of the evidence • relevance • sufficiency – sample • source – media; radio • date – how recent • factual, opinion, value, anecdote • testimony – from experience and expert • knowledge claims • ability to see • sources of bias • gender • political • personal values • experience • likelihood of solutions working and consequences of their ideas • acceptability of their values to others • how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view <p>Level 5 (11–12 marks) Very good response Clear, credible and well supported points about which reasoning works better. Coherent, structured evaluation of both arguments with clear comparison. The response is likely to contain three (or more) developed evaluative points, and may include some undeveloped points.</p> <p>A clear judgement is reached.</p> | 12 | |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|----------|
| | <p>Level 4 (8–10 marks) Strong response Clear, supported points about which reasoning works better. Evaluation of how well the reasoning works for both arguments with comparison. The response is likely to contain two (or more) developed evaluative points and may include some undeveloped points. A wide range (four or more) of undeveloped but clearly appropriate points may be sufficient to enter this band at the lower level. A judgement is reached.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–7 marks) Reasonable response Reasonable points about which reasoning works better. Some evaluation of how well the reasoning works for one or both arguments with an attempt at comparison. Judgements and evaluative points are likely to be partially supported or asserted. One (or more) developed evaluative point(s), possibly with some undeveloped points; a range (three or more) of undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this band at the lower level. An attempt is made to give an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Basic response Basic points about which reasoning works better. There may be only one argument considered in any detail, with little attempt at comparison. Judgements and evaluative points are likely to be partially supported and lack clarity/relevance at times. The response is likely to contain two (or more) undeveloped points. A basic judgement may be reached.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response Limited and unsupported points about which reasoning works better. The response is likely to consider the arguments briefly and/or tangentially. There is little clarity. Answers at this level may repeat source material with little understanding or simply agree/disagree with the arguments presented. The response may not contain any clear evaluative points.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p> | | |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-----------|--|
| 4 | <p>Candidates are expected to argue using reasons and evidence to justify their opinion and judgement about the issue i.e. to compare and assess the effectiveness of different forms of action to reduce poverty.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use and develop the material found in the sources, but should go beyond simply repeating or recycling without adaptation. Other material may be introduced but it is not necessary to gain full marks.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to consider the following arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reference to scale of impact on individual/group/governmental behaviour/actions • how long it takes to make a difference • the effects of cultural differences and beliefs • barriers to change • the power of collective action • the difficulties of changing individual behaviour • the influence of individuals and groups acting locally • the role of vested interests and power differences • potential conflict • difficulties in coordinating globally and across different countries with independence • cost and access to resources to implement change • governmental responses and action • other reasonable response | 18 | <p>Further Guidance</p> <p>(a) The second set of bullet points in the question are to guide candidates and do not have to be specifically addressed to gain full marks.</p> |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|---|-------|----------|
| | <p>Level 5 (16–18 marks) Very good response Clear, well supported and structured reasoning about the recommended course of action. Different arguments and perspectives are clearly considered. The response is likely to contain a range of clearly reasoned points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with three (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points. A clear judgement is reached.</p> <p>Level 4 (12–15 marks) Strong response Clear, supported reasoning with some structure about the recommended course of action. Different arguments and perspectives are considered. The response is likely to contain some reasoned points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with two (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points. A judgement is reached.</p> <p>Level 3 (8–11 marks) Reasonable response Some supported reasoning about the recommended course of action. Different arguments and perspectives are included. The response is likely to contain points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with one (or more) developed point(s), and some undeveloped points. An attempt is made to give an overall judgement.</p> | | |

| Question | Answer | Marks | Guidance |
|----------|--|-------|----------|
| | <p>Level 2 (4–7 marks) Basic response Basic reasoning about the recommended course of action. Different arguments are included; perspectives, if present, are unclear. The response is likely to rely on assertion rather than evidence and contain some undeveloped points. A basic judgement may be attempted.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–3 marks) Limited response Limited and unsupported reasoning about the issue in general. Different arguments may be included.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p> | | |