Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge IGCSE™

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES **0457/11**

Paper 1 Written Examination **May/June 2020**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 70

Published

Students did not sit exam papers in the June 2020 series due to the Covid-19 global pandemic.

This mark scheme is published to support teachers and students and should be read together with the question paper. It shows the requirements of the exam. The answer column of the mark scheme shows the proposed basis on which Examiners would award marks for this exam. Where appropriate, this column also provides the most likely acceptable alternative responses expected from students. Examiners usually review the mark scheme after they have seen student responses and update the mark scheme if appropriate. In the June series, Examiners were unable to consider the acceptability of alternative responses, as there were no student responses to consider.

Mark schemes should usually be read together with the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers. However, because students did not sit exam papers, there is no Principal Examiner Report for Teachers for the June 2020 series.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™ and Cambridge International A & AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

© UCLES 2020

[Turn over

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 2020

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

All of 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 2020

Annotations

All responses within a script must be annotated to show how and where marks have been awarded. For scripts marked on RM Assessor, a selection of the following on-screen annotations are available.

Annotation	Meaning
	Correct, creditworthy point
Eval	Evaluation
	Development
	Benefit of doubt given
	Incorrect point
	Unclear/confused point
JU	Justification
	Omission mark, more required
I	Interpretation
Vertical wavy line	Irrelevant
	Highlighter

The number of ticks used does not need to tally with the mark achieved. Every question must be annotated in some way. The mark scheme indicates the most common annotation to be used with each question; others may also be used.

Annotation should be within the candidate's text rather than in the margin.

© UCLES 2020

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	Candidates may identify one of the following reasons from Source 1: • Earn money. • Pay for things. • Better lifestyle. • Make contribution to society. • Help others. • Have a fulfilling career. • To make a difference. • Meet people make friends. • Enjoy social side of employment. 1 mark should be awarded for identifying one of the above reasons. *Further guidance – the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**1**
1(b)	Candidates may identify the following consequences from Source 2: • Better quality of work. • Higher productivity. • Increased profits. • Lower staff turnover. • Better attendance. • Less conflict with workers. • Greater loyalty. 1 mark should be awarded for each correctly identified consequence up to a maximum of 2 marks. *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 consequences: • Workers work harder. • Workers are more motivated. • Workers are happier. • Workers have more self-esteem. • Workers have better health. • Workers have better relationships. • Workers have improved careers. • Better quality of work. • Higher productivity. • Increased profits. • Lower staff turnover. • Better attendance. • Less conflict with workers. • Greater loyalty. Candidates may give the following reasons, any of which could be used, to justify their choice: • Has greatest impact. • Affects most people. • Ethically or morally most acceptable. • Helps the company meet goals and targets. • Increases profits. • Increases personal well-being. • Increases self-esteem. • Helps with personal friendships and social life. • Increases happiness. *Further guidance – candidates are most likely to discuss consequences from Source 2 as listed above. However, the assessment is focused mainly upon their reasoning / justification and therefore additional points 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 a consequence with one developed point or three relevant but undeveloped points. **Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response** Some explanation with two (or more) undeveloped points. The link between the explanation and a consequence may be implicit / unclear at times. **Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response** Limited explanation. Explanation is not linked to a consequence explicitly. **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 personal causes: • Matching interests and values. • Respect and praise from managers. • Safe, secure and healthy working conditions/environment. • Getting training and support. • Feeling trusted. • Being treated fairly. • Having open and honest relationships. Candidates are likely to identify the following national causes: • Laws to ensure safe, secure and healthy working conditions. • National training schemes to provide skills for jobs. • Low taxation. 3 marks are available for the explanation of each cause. 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. **Level 3 (3 marks) Good response** A clear and full explanation of the cause explicitly related to the context – personal or national. **Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response** A basic or partial explanation of the cause generally related to the context – personal or national. **Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response** An identification of a cause with limited or no explanation related to the context – personal 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:** • Clear structure. • Reasonable tone. • Range of evidence. • Some citation. • Expert testimony with ability to know. **Weaknesses:** • Some anecdotal evidence. • Some assertion. • Not balanced with counter argument. • Citation incomplete. 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 reasoning and/or and evidence, its strengths and/or weaknesses and the way it is used to support the claim. A convincing overall assessment or conclusion is reached. **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. An overall assessment or conclusion is attempted. **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. An overall assessment or conclusion is weak or not attempted. **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. **Possible types of information:** • Compare statistics/information on factors shaping levels of job satisfaction. • Data from employers, trade unions, and governments. • Individual testimony or personal experience of employees. • Material from research reports. • Other relevant response. **Possible sources of information:** • National and local governments and their departments. • International organisations, e.g. United Nations; UNESCO. • Experts. • 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 and employees. • Management experience. • Internet search. • Questionnaires. • Case studies. • 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 contains two (or more) developed point and may contain some undeveloped points. 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 a range of 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 for the claim being tested. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material. *Responses that do not link explicitly to the issue/context are unable to score higher than Level 2.*	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	Candidates may identify one of the following from Source 4. • To make people work hard you need strong managers • Workers need to respect authority • Workers need to do what they are told • Workers sometimes have good ideas • People who make trouble, question too much and don't work hard should be dismissed • Managers must be in control and workers must work 1 mark should be awarded for identifying 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 from Source 4. • According to recent surveys, many directors in the UK say that a good leader of a company is excellent at creating relationships. • Last year, managers in Japan said that listening to workers ideas enables a company to solve problems and produce goods of higher quality • In Europe, many companies give workers a financial stake in the organisation. • Cooperatives are organisations controlled by a large number of members • In cooperatives, employees participate in setting policies and making decisions. • In 2015, cooperatives across Europe provided more than 4.7 million jobs and have an annual turnover of 1005 billion Euros – more than Finland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden combined. 1 mark should be awarded for identifying 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 from aspects of Dewi's background/experience that suggest possible bias: • Dewi owns a company. • Dewi employs large numbers of people. Candidates are likely to identify the following reasons from aspects of the statement that suggest possible bias: • Lack of balance/focus on the management perspective only. • Emotive language. • Lack of evidence to support opinion. • Focused only on personal/local experience. The following levels of response should be used to award marks: **Level 3 (3 marks) Good response** A clear and full explanation of why the statement may be biased supported with evidence from the statement. Two points, at least one developed. **Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response** A basic or partial understanding/explanation of why the statement may be biased. Identification of one point with development **or** two undeveloped points. **Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response** An identification of a point to suggest bias without clear explanation. **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 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 both arguments, with an attempt at comparison. 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 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. *Responses that give a very good evaluation of only one argument may achieve Level 3 but no higher.*	

© UCLES 2020

Question	Answer	Marks
4	Indicative content Candidates are expected to make a judgement about how to improve job satisfaction using reasons and evidence to justify their choice. 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 • reference to different consequences and implications for individuals/groups/businesses • how long it might take to make a difference • barriers to change • the power of collective action, e.g. cooperation between people at work • 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 2020