Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES **0457/12**

Paper 1 Written Perspectives **May/June 2019**

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 May/June 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

© UCLES 2019

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 2019

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	Candidates should identify the following trend in global child mortality from Source 1: Decreasing; going down; getting less; or similar 1 mark should be awarded for the identification of the above. *Further guidance – the only acceptable answer is listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**1**
1(b)	Candidates may identify the following causes of child mortality from Source 2: • Unclean drinking water • Poor sanitation • Disease • Poor health education • Poverty • High unemployment 1 mark should be awarded for each correctly identified cause up to a maximum of 2. *Further guidance – 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 ways to improve child mortality: • Provide water treatment services • Build more toilets • Increase access to doctors and medicines • Improve health education and training of parents • Provide higher incomes • Increase opportunities for jobs Candidates may give the following reasons, any of which could be used, to justify their choice: • The number of people affected • The range of impact e.g. number of countries/regions/cities • The depth of impact e.g. how much difference will be made to lifespan • The timescale for making a difference • Costs • Availability of resources • Other reasonable response The following levels of response should be used to award marks. **Level 3 (3 marks) Good response** Clearly reasoned, credible explanation explicitly linked to a way to improve child mortality. **Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response** A basic or partial explanation. The link between the explanation and a way to improve child mortality is usually apparent but may be implicit or unclear at times. **Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response** Limited explanation. The link between the identified way to improve child mortality and explanation is implicit or tangential. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material. *Further Guidance* *1. Do not award a mark for identifying a way to reduce child mortality. The levels are focused on the quality of the explanation.* *2. Further guidance – candidates are most likely to discuss reasons from Source 2 as listed above. However, the assessment is focused mainly upon their reasoning/justification and therefore additional causes should be credited.*	**3**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	Indicative content Candidates are likely to explain the following reasons drawing upon Sources 1 and 2: • The causes of child mortality at a local level • The consequences of child mortality at a local level • Possible responses to child mortality which require local action/organisation • Issues of value and beliefs about child mortality • Other reasonable responses The following levels of response should be used to award marks. **Level 3 (5–6 marks) Good response** A clear, credible and full explanation explicitly related to the local context. **Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response** A basic or partial explanation which may be implicitly related to the local context and unclear at times. **Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response** A limited or tangential explanation only implicitly related to the local context. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material. *Further Guidance* *Local refers to neighbourhood or a particular area in which people live and is related typically to concepts like community, family, district, and region. Local culture, economic activity, workplaces, schools and other local organisations/activities may also be discussed as part of the local community.*	**6**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	Indicative content Candidates are likely to discuss the following evaluative points relating to Source **3**. **Strengths:** • strongly worded • uses rhetorical questions • passionate argument • uses WHO as evidence • refers to local doctor as evidence • uses expert views • gives an example to illustrate • other reasonable response **Weaknesses:** • much opinion • anecdotal evidence • a rant • exaggerated • little authority • poor knowledge claims • little if any factual evidence • no references or citation • not much evidence • emotional • 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 strengths and/or weaknesses of the evidence and/or reasons within the argument and/or the way evidence is used to support the claim. **Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response** Reasonable evaluation mainly focused on the evidence and/or reasons, 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 to reach the lower point of this level.	**6**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response** Limited evaluation which is often unsupported and asserted. The response is clear in part but is incomplete, tangential and generalised. It usually contains one or two undeveloped points only. Answers at this level may repeat or describe source material with little understanding. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	

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 child mortality and access to clean water in the area, past and present • data from government, city authorities, charities on water and health • individual testimony or personal experience • material like statistics, studies, media articles, images, video clips • other relevant response **Possible sources of information:** • national and local governments and their departments • international organisations, e.g. United Nations; UNESCO • experts in child mortality and/or water and health • 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, carers, homeless • 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 test the claim. The response contains three (or more) developed points, and may contain some undeveloped points. The response is clearly and explicitly related to testing the claim. **Level 3 (5–6 marks) Good response** Reasoned and mainly credible explanation of ways to test the claim. The response usually contains two (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points. A range of undeveloped strengths and/or weaknesses may be sufficient to enter this level. The response is explicitly related to testing the claim.	**8**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response** Some reasoning and explanation of ways to test the claim. The response contains one (or more) developed point(s), and/or some undeveloped points. The response may lack clarity. The response is related to testing the claim. **Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response** Limited explanation of ways to test the claim. The response contains one or two simple, undeveloped and asserted points. There is little relevance in the response to testing the claim or the methods, sources and types of information are generally not appropriate to the claim being tested. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material. *Further Guidance* *If the response lists methods or sources without linking to the issue/context, then it should not be placed above Level 2.*	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	Candidates may identify one of the following opinions from Source 4. • It is one of the world's greatest challenges • It is right to help • There will be conflict between countries over water • We must help local communities to help themselves • These are long lasting solutions that give people dignity and self-respect • Local people need to be educated • Only governments can afford to develop national strategies • Only governments can make a real difference • Everyone can help achieve this through paying taxes 1 mark should be awarded for the identification of one of the above. *Further guidance – the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**1**
3(b)	Candidates may identify one of the following facts from Source 4. • Water is becoming a scarce resource • Mamo has read many media sources • Water Aid helps people to … • 2.4 billion people do not have a safe place to go to the toilet • Twinning gives people … • Governments can get advice from international agencies • Some charities use simple technology to improve water supplies • The 2017 UN report on water asks governments to work together to … 1 mark should be awarded for the identification of one of the above. *Further guidance – the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**1**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	Indicative Content Bias is a tendency or prejudice for or against something; an attitude of strong like or dislike; an unbalanced approach not prepared to consider counter-arguments or other points of view. Candidates are likely to identify the following reasons for bias from Saba's background/experience: • Saba works for the government (and so is likely to think that governments are best placed to make a difference). Candidates are likely to identify the following features of the statement that suggest possible bias: • Lack of balance in his argument – 'It is only governments that can make a real difference', 'Charities only help a few people', 'Only governments can afford national strategies' • Little objective research or evidence to support • The source/statement contains much opinion and personal ideas **Level 3 (3 marks) Good response** A clear and full explanation of why the statement may be biased supported with evidence from the statement. The response contains two (or more) points, with one (or more) of these developed. **Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response** A basic or partial explanation of why the statement may be biased. The response contains one developed point or two undeveloped points. **Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response** A Limited explanation of why the statement may be biased. The response contains one undeveloped point. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**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 **Use of language:** • tone – emotive, exaggerated, precise • 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** • local interest • economic • personal values • experience **Likely consequences of the ideas presented** **Acceptability of their values to others** • how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view 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.	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(d)	**Level 4 (10–12 marks) Good response** Clear, supported points about which argument is more convincing. Evaluation of both arguments, with some 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. Some evaluation of one or both arguments. Judgements and evaluative points are partially supported or asserted. 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, with little or no 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. *Further Guidance* *If only one argument is discussed then a maximum of L3 9 marks can be awarded.*	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	Indicative content Candidates are expected to make a judgement about the issue, i.e. which action is most likely to improve the quality of water in the area. Candidates may use and develop the material found in Sources 1 to 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 water quality • reference to different consequences and implications for individuals/groups/government • how long it might take to make a difference • barriers to change • the power of collective action, e.g. cooperation between countries over water issues • 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 recommended course of action. 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 very well-structured and a clear judgement is reached. **Level 4 (15–19 marks) Good response** Clear, supported reasoning about the recommended course of action. 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 generally well-structured and a judgement is reached.	**24**

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**Level 3 (10–14 marks) Reasonable response** Some supported reasoning about the recommended course of action. 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 is structured but at times difficult to follow and an attempt is made to give an overall judgement. **Level 2 (5–9 marks) Basic response** Basic reasoning about the recommended course of action. 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. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	

© UCLES 2019