Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES **0457/12**

Paper 1 Written Examination **March 2018**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 70

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the March 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is a registered trademark.

© UCLES 2018

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

© UCLES 2018

Introduction

Most questions are marked holistically using levels of response mark schemes. The marks awarded for an answer are usually based on a judgement of the overall quality of the response, rather than on awarding marks for specific points and accumulating a total mark by adding points.

Inevitably, the mark scheme cannot cover all responses that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases, candidates may make very strong responses which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should nevertheless be credited according to their quality.

Levels of response

For answers marked by levels of response, the following is intended to describe the quality of the response required (level of skill that should be demonstrated) for the award of marks at different points in the mark range for the question.

In the levels of response mark scheme positive achievement is being rewarded.
For answers marked by levels of response:

a. Marking grids describe the top of each level.
b. **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer.
c. **To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	Award mark
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level

Mark scheme

The questions are based on sources which are available to candidates as an Insert to the examination paper. It is therefore very important to study this material prior to marking to become familiar with the context of the questions.

© UCLES 2018

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	Candidates should identify the following from Source 1: • USA 1 mark should be awarded for the correct answer. *Further guidance – note that the only acceptable answer is listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**1**
1(b)	Candidates should identify two of the following from Source 2: • Gap between rich and poor • Living in poverty • Not enough money to buy food • Do not know the law • Under the influence of drugs/alcohol • Protest • When human rights are denied 1 mark should be awarded for each correct answer up to a maximum of 2 marks. *Further guidance – note that the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**2**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	Indicative content Candidates may identify one of the following causes: • gap between rich and poor • living in poverty • not enough money to buy food • do not know the law • under the influence of drugs/alcohol • protest • when human rights are denied Candidates may give the following explanations, any of which could be used, to justify their choice: • the number of people affected • the range of impact e.g. number of communities/ages etc • the depth of impact e.g. how much difference will be made to life • costs of associated crimes • availability of resources to prevent crime • other aspects of life affected • local or government priorities • other reasonable response *Further guidance – candidates are most likely to discuss reasons from the Source as listed above. However, the assessment is focused mainly upon their reasoning / justification and therefore additional reasons should be credited.* The following levels of response should be used to award marks. **Level 3 (3 marks) Good response** Clearly reasoned explanation explicitly linked to the cause with one developed point or three relevant but undeveloped points. Issue of significance clearly explicit. **Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response** Some explanation with two (or more) undeveloped points. The link between the explanation and the cause may be implicit or unclear at times. Issue of significance clearly implicit. **Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response** Limited explanation. Explanation is not linked to the cause or significance. A cause identified. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**3**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	Indicative content Candidates are likely to identify the following local consequences: • loss of local property • local businesses lose money and make less profit • people live in fear • harm to local environment • parents protect children more / give them less freedom • other reasonable response Candidates are likely to identify the following national consequences: • less tax paid to government • hurts national economy • less to spend on social services/education/hospitals • Increased cost to government to police crime/pay for prisons • other reasonable response 3 marks are available for the explanation of each consequence. A total of 6 marks (3 marks + 3 marks) are therefore available for the questions as a whole. The following levels of response should be used to award marks for each consequence: **Level 3 (3 marks) Good response** A clear and full explanation of the consequence explicitly related to the context – local or national. **Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response** A basic or partial explanation of the consequence generally related to the context – local or national. **Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response** An identification of a consequence with limited or no explanation related to the context – local or national. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**6**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	Indicative content Candidates are likely to discuss the following evaluative points relating to Source 3: **Strengths:** • strong tone of language – passionate • clear argument and easy to follow • uses a research source as evidence • expert testimony – Professor Strong • refers to teacher experience as evidence • other reasonable response **Weaknesses:** • few facts and statistics to back up claim • source not referenced • potential newspaper bias • author unknown • author expertise unknown • research method not clear • other reasonable response The following levels of response should be used to award marks: **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. Evaluation is clearly focused on the evidence, its strengths and/or weaknesses and the way it is used to support the argument or claim. **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. A listed response without explicit linking to the claim/argument. **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. The response discusses/describes the argument/claim or the candidate's opinion on the issue. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**6**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	Indicative content Candidates are likely to discuss the following ways to test the claim stated in Source 3. **Possible types of information:** • compare statistics/information on parental behaviour and children • data from government or pressure groups • research reports • expert testimony • individual testimony or personal experience • material from relevant organisations • other relevant response **Possible sources of information:** • national and local governments and their departments • international organisations, e.g. United Nations; UNESCO • experts in crime studies/attitudes towards crime • research reports • pressure groups, charities and NGOs • media and the internet • other relevant response **Possible methods:** • review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents • interview relevant experts, parents, carers, families • internet search • questionnaires • surveys • other relevant response The following levels of response should be used to award marks: **Level 4 (7–8 marks) Very good response** Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of a range of ways to research the claim. The response contains three (or more) developed points, and may contain some undeveloped points. The response is clearly and explicitly related to researching the claim. **Level 3 (5–6 marks) Good response** Reasoned and mainly credible explanation of ways to research the claim. The response contains two (or more) developed points, and may contain some undeveloped points. The response is explicitly related to researching the claim.	**8**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response** Some reasoning and explanation of ways to research the claim. The response contains one (or more) developed point(s), and/or a range of undeveloped points. The response may lack clarity. The response is implicitly related to researching the claim. A listed response without explicit linking to the claim/argument. **Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response** Limited explanation of ways to research the claim. The response contains one or two simple, undeveloped and asserted points. There is little relevance in the response to researching the claim or the methods, sources and types of information are generally not appropriate for the claim being tested. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	Candidates may identify one of the following from Source 4: • Most crime is committed by individuals • Some individuals do commit crime due to the risk • Some individuals do commit crime due to the influence of drugs and alcohol. • Countries with low crime rates, like Denmark, usually have high levels of employment with good incomes for all. • In Denmark education and health care are available to everyone/People feel valued by their countries and share wealth/The gap between rich and poor is low • In 2015, the United Nations said, 'Justice (and sustainable development) for all was a critical … tool to fight criminal activities, terrorism and violence … around the world.' • Other reasonable interpretation 1 mark should be awarded for the identification of one of the above. *Further guidance – not that the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**1**
3(b)	Candidates may identify one of the following from Source 4: • If you commit crime and get caught, it is right that you should be punished. It is as simple as that • You only have yourself to blame (for committing a crime) • If we are going to reduce crime, then we must start with individuals. • We need to educate them (criminals) and give them the strength of character to say, 'No', to crime. • Some individuals do commit crime due to the risk, or the influence of drugs and alcohol. But I do not agree that these are the main causes of crime. • To reduce crime, you need to develop the economy of a country, ensure everyone pays fair taxes and spend money to benefit everyone. • People choose to break the law • Other reasonable interpretation 1 mark should be awarded for the identification of one of the above. *Further guidance – not that the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**1**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	A value judgement is a view or decision about what is right, wrong or important, based a particular set of standards, principles, or values. The following examples are found in Source 4: • If you commit crime and get caught, it is right that you should be punished. • They are personally responsible for their own behavior. • ensure everyone pays fair taxes • spend money to benefit everyone • 'Justice (and sustainable development) for all was a critical … tool to fight criminal activities, terrorism and violence … around the world.' • To reduce crime, you need to develop the economy of a country, ensure everyone pays fair taxes and spend money to benefit everyone. • Other reasonable interpretation Award 1 mark for correctly identifying a value judgement from the list above. However, candidates may use their own words. Award an additional 1 mark for a response that demonstrates some understanding of a value judgement. For example: It is a value judgement that people should be punished if they commit a crime because this it is based on moral principles. Or Award an additional 2 marks for a clear understanding of a value judgement applied accurately to the example identified from Source 4. For example: It is a value judgement that people should be punished if they commit a crime because Ria is taking the view on whether something is right (punishment of criminals) based on her own moral principles.	**3**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(d)	Indicative content Candidates are expected to evaluate the arguments presented in Source 4 and compare their effectiveness. They should make a supported judgement with some explanation about which person has the most convincing argument. Candidates may support their judgement by considering: **Strength of reasoning:** • logic • structure • balance • claims **Authority and expertise** • ability to know **Use of language:** • tone – emotive, exaggerated, precise, measured • clarity **Evidence:** • range of information and depth • relevance • sufficiency – sample • source – media; internet • date – how recent • different types of information – fact, opinion, value, anecdote • testimony – from experience and expert **Sources of bias or vested interest:** • local interest • personal interest • political • economic • personal values • experience **Likely consequences or implications of the ideas presented** **Acceptability of their values to others** • how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view • the extent to which the views expressed are supported by the candidate	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(d)	The following levels of response should be used to award marks: **Level 5 (13–15 marks) Very good response** Clear, credible and well supported points about which argument is more convincing. Coherent, structured evaluation of both arguments with clear comparison. The response contains three (or more) developed evaluative points, and may include some undeveloped points. A clear judgement is reached. **Level 4 (10–12 marks) Good response** Clear, supported points about which argument is more convincing. Evaluation of both arguments, with comparison. The response contains 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 judgment is reached. **Level 3 (7–9 marks) Reasonable response** Reasonable points about which argument is more convincing. Judgements and evaluative points are partially supported or asserted. May only evaluate one argument. One (or more) developed evaluative points, possibly with some undeveloped points; three (or more) undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this band at the lower level. An attempt is made to give an overall judgement. **Level 2 (4–6) Basic response** Basic points about which argument is more convincing. There may be only one argument considered in any detail, with little attempt at comparison. Judgements and evaluative points are partially supported and lack clarity/relevance at times. The response contains two (or more) undeveloped points. A basic judgement may be reached. **Level 1 (1–3 marks) Limited response** Limited and unsupported points about which argument is more convincing. The response considers 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. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	

© UCLES 2018

Question	Answer	Marks
4	Indicative content Candidates are expected to argue using reasons and evidence to justify their opinion and judgement about the issue, i.e. the best way to reduce crime. Candidates are expected to use and develop the material found in Sources 1–4, but should go beyond simply repeating or recycling without adaptation. Other material may be introduced but is not necessary to gain full marks. Candidates may consider some of the following: • reference to scale of impact on crime – types/amount • reference to different consequences and implications for individuals/groups/government/world • how long it might take to make a difference • barriers to change • the influence of individuals and groups on decision making • the role of vested interests and power differences • potential conflicts of interest • difficulties in planning and coordinating improvements • cost and access to resources to implement change • other reasonable response The following levels of response should be used to award marks. **Level 5 (20–24 marks) Very good response** Clear, well supported reasoning about the issue. Different arguments and perspectives are clearly considered. The response contains a wide range of clearly reasoned points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with four (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points. The response is well-structured and a clear judgement is reached. **Level 4 (15–19 marks) Good response** Clear, supported reasoning about the issue. Different arguments and perspectives are considered. The response contains a range of reasoned points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with three (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points. The response is structured and a judgement is reached.	**24**

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**Level 3 (10–14 marks) Reasonable response** Some supported reasoning about the issue. Different arguments and perspectives are included. The response contains some points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with two (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points. The response has some structure but at times is difficult to follow; an attempt is made to give an overall judgement. **Level 2 (5–9 marks) Basic response** Basic reasoning about the issue. Different arguments are included; perspectives, if present, are unclear. The response relies on assertion rather than evidence but contains one (or more) developed point(s) or a range of undeveloped points. The response lacks structure and is difficult to follow though a basic judgement may be attempted. **Level 1 (1–4 marks) Limited response** Limited and unsupported reasoning about the topic in general. Different arguments may be included.	

© UCLES 2018