Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge IGCSE™

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES **0457/11**

Paper 1 Written Examination **May/June 2021**

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 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© UCLES 2021

[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 2021

Social Science-Specific Marking Principles (for point-based marking)

1 Components using point-based marking:

- Point marking is often used to reward knowledge, understanding and application of skills. We give credit where the candidate's answer shows relevant knowledge, understanding and application of skills in answering the question. We do not give credit where the answer shows confusion.

From this it follows that we:

a DO credit answers which are worded differently from the mark scheme if they clearly convey the same meaning (unless the mark scheme requires a specific term)

b DO credit alternative answers/examples which are not written in the mark scheme if they are correct

c DO credit answers where candidates give more than one correct answer in one prompt/numbered/scaffolded space where extended writing is required rather than list-type answers. For example, questions that require *n* reasons (e.g. State two reasons …).

d DO NOT credit answers simply for using a 'key term' unless that is all that is required. (Check for evidence it is understood and not used wrongly.)

e DO NOT credit answers which are obviously self-contradicting or trying to cover all possibilities

f DO NOT give further credit for what is effectively repetition of a correct point already credited unless the language itself is being tested. This applies equally to 'mirror statements' (i.e. polluted/not polluted).

g DO NOT require spellings to be correct, unless this is part of the test. However spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. Corrasion/Corrosion)

2 Presentation of mark scheme:

- Slashes (/) or the word 'or' separate alternative ways of making the same point.
- Semi colons (;) bullet points (•) or figures in brackets (1) separate different points.
- Content in the answer column in brackets is for examiner information/context to clarify the marking but is not required to earn the mark (except Accounting syllabuses where they indicate negative numbers).

3 Annotation:

- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
- For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
- Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

© UCLES 2021

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 2021

Annotations

All scripts and responses must be annotated to show how and where marks have been awarded.

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
REP	Repetition
	Comment Box

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 likely annotation to be used with each question.

Annotation should be within the candidate's text.

© UCLES 2021

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**Main Annotations**  • $1.7 billion. 1 mark should be awarded for identifying the above. *Further guidance – the only acceptable answer is listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**1**
1(b)	**Main Annotations**  Candidates may identify the following reasons from Source 2: • Raise the achievement of students. • Select people for university and higher education. • Measure the quality of schools. • Improve the work of teachers. • Help parents to compare schools. • Measure the quality of teaching. • Measure progress in learning. 1 mark should be awarded for each correctly identified reason 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)	**Main Annotations**  Indicative content Candidates may identify one of the following reasons: • Raise the achievement of students. • Select people for university and higher education. • Measure the quality of schools. • Improve the work of teachers. • Help parents to compare schools. • Measure the quality of teaching. • Measure progress in learning. 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 significant. • Has multiple positive consequences. • Creates a virtuous circle. • Affects other aspects of life for young people and society. • Reflects public opinion. • 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 a reason. **Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response** Some explanation; the link between the explanation and a reason may be implicit or unclear at times. **Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response** A reason is identified; there may be some limited explanation, though not necessary for award at this level. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**3**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	**Main Annotations**  Indicative content Candidates are likely to identify the following reasons drawing upon the information in Sources 1,2 and 3: • Success and failure in education/school affect a person throughout life. • Tests affect enjoyment of education of individuals. • Personal mental health can be affected by tests. • Tests may motivate individuals. • Everyone is affected as everyone has to take the tests. • Tests affect personal learning. • Tests affect self-esteem/self-image. • Other reasonable responses. The following levels of response should be used to award marks: **Level 3 (5–6 marks) Good response** Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of importance; usually two (or more) developed arguments clearly linked to the issue; or three (or more) undeveloped reasons. The personal dimension is explicit. **Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response** Some reasoned explanation of importance; 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 personal dimension is implicit at times. **Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response** Limited reasoning and explanation; the response is likely to contain only simple, undeveloped and asserted points. Arguments are partial, generalised and lack clarity. The personal dimension is not apparent. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**6**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Main Annotations**  Indicative content Candidates are likely to discuss the following evaluative points relating to Source 3: **Strengths:** • Uses a source as evidence – television. • Uses expert source from reputable organisation. • Reports positively about school without tests. • Uses first-hand, personal experience. • Recent – up to date. • Other reasonable response. **Weaknesses:** • Some assertion. • Some appeal to emotion. • Little factual/statistical evidence. • Does not acknowledge counter arguments. • Small sample/case study – may not be representative of others. • 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 reasoning and/or evidence, its strengths and weaknesses and the way it is used to support the 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. **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. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**6**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**Main Annotations**  Indicative content Candidates are likely to discuss the following ways to test the claim stated in Source 3. **Possible types of information:** • Statistics/information on attitudes of children to testing. • Data from social surveys. • Individual testimony or personal experience. • Material from organisations that work with children e.g. schools; health centres; doctors. • Other relevant response. **Possible sources of information:** • National and local governments and their departments. • International organisations, e.g. United nations; UNESCO. • Experts in childhood education and assessment. • 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, young people. • 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.	**8**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**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 points and may contain some undeveloped points. The response is explicitly related to testing the claim. **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 and are simply a list of research methods/sources/types of information should not score higher than Level 2.*	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	**Main Annotations**  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 Olav's statement • It is right that students work hard. • It is important for schools to provide a supportive, caring environment. • Schools should be places where children have fun. • Schools need to develop 21st century skills and lifelong learning. Award 1 mark for correctly identifying a value judgement from the list above. Award an additional 1 mark for a response that demonstrates a clear understanding of value judgements. *Further guidance – note that the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**2**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)(i)	**Main Annotations**  Candidates may identify one of the following opinions: • *My teacher says* that tests encourage students to work harder. • *My parents* think a good school is where children get excellent grades. • *I think that* tests show which teachers are good and bad. • *A recent newspaper article claimed that* we should not be afraid of hard work and discipline. • *Tests tell teachers what to teach and ensure high standards.* This is just common sense. [The words in italics in the bullet points above are not needed in the responses as they only provide the source of the opinion.] 1 mark should be awarded for identifying one of the above. *Further guidance – note that the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**1**
3(b)(ii)	**Main Annotations**  Examples of the points that could be made when explaining how well the opinion supports the argument: • Very good support as this opinion is based on evidence from personal experience and other people that gives confidence to the reader about the claim. • Some support as the opinion is relevant to the argument but may be slightly out-of-date, is not cited and the situation or trend may have changed since it was made. • Limited support as the opinion is asserted without evidence and is based on local experience which may not be the same as other places or schools due to cultural differences. Use the following levels of response to award a maximum of two marks. **Level 2 (2 marks) Good response** An opinion is identified correctly and there is clear, well explained evaluation of how well the opinion supports the argument. The evaluation is explicitly related to the argument. **Level 1 (1 marks) Reasonable response** An opinion is identified correctly and there is some evaluation of how well the opinion supports the argument. The response may lack clarity. The evaluation is mainly descriptive and only implicitly related to the argument. **Level 0 (0 marks)** An opinion has not been correctly identified or there is no relevant evaluation of how well the opinion supports the argument.	**2**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	**Main Annotations**  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. **Possible consequences of the ideas presented** **Acceptability of their values to others** • How likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view.	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	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. Some evaluation of both arguments, with an attempt at comparison or a very good evaluation of only one argument. 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.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	**Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material. *Further Guidance* *Responses that give a very good evaluation of only one argument may achieve Level 3 but no higher.*	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**Main Annotations J**  Indicative content Candidates are expected to make a judgement about the recommended course of action 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/interpretation. 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 students. • Reference to different consequences and implications for individuals/different age groups/government. • How long it might take to make a difference. • Barriers to change e.g. power of teachers and parents. • 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.	**24**

Question	Answer	Marks
4	The following levels of response should be used to award marks: **Level 5 (20–24 marks) Very good response** Clear, well supported and credible 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 and credible 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. **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.	