Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge IGCSE™

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES **0457/13**

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

Scripts 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.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**Main Annotations**  • (around) 3 per cent 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 issues from Source 2: • No access to legal advice. • Victims of disease and injury. • Restricted freedom of movement. • Poor working conditions. • Low pay. • Lack of clean water. • Lack of sanitation. • Victims of crime, violence and abuse. • Overcrowded, dirty living conditions. • Inadequate food and nutrition. 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 issues: • No access to legal advice. • Victims of disease and injury. • Restricted freedom of movement. • Poor working conditions. • Low pay. • Lack of clean water. • Lack of sanitation. • Victims of crime, violence and abuse. • Overcrowded, dirty living conditions. • Inadequate food and nutrition. 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 vicious circle. • Affects other aspects of life for people. • Reflects public opinion. • Research findings suggest. • 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.	**3**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	**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.	
1(d)	**Main Annotations**  Indicative content Candidates are likely to identify the following reasons drawing upon the information in Sources 1,2 and 3: • Can be a cause of conflict within countries. • Leaves many people living in poverty that can't be solved by one country alone. • Suffering is an important moral and ethical issue. • We share a moral/ethical responsibility to people from other countries in need. • Migration is across regional borders within and between countries. • Migration affects many people. • Migration has very serious impacts/effects on people's lives. • 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 national/government 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 national/government 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 may be tangential, partial, generalised and lack clarity. The national/government dimension may not be present/discussed. **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 expert source – UN worker. • Uses first-hand, personal experience. • Recent – up to date. • Powerful, emotive use of language. • Newspaper/media material gives credibility/authenticity. • Other reasonable response. **Weaknesses:** • Some assertion. • Some appeal to emotion. • Little factual/statistical evidence. • Doesn't acknowledges counter arguments. • Small sample/case study – may not be representative of others. • Only the negative aspects described. • 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 of the argument/evidence; usually 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 of the argument/evidence, its strengths and/or weaknesses, and the way it is used to support the claim. The response may usually contain one (or more) developed point(s), with some other undeveloped points. Some (two or more) undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this level.	**6**
2(a)	**Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response** Limited evaluation of the argument/evidence which is often unsupported and asserted. The response may be tangential, partial, generalised and lack clarity. It contains one or two undeveloped points only. It usually 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.	

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 people towards refugees. • Data from social surveys. • Individual testimony or personal experience. • Material from organisations that work with refugees. • Other relevant response. **Possible sources of information:** • National and local governments and their departments. • International organisations, e.g. United nations; UNHCR. • Experts in refugees. • 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, people in migration. • 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 usually contains three (or more) developed points and may contain some undeveloped points. The response is clearly and explicitly related to testing the claim. The response is 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 usually contains two (or more) developed points and may contain some undeveloped points. **Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response** Some reasoning and explanation of ways to test the claim. The response usually contains one (or more) developed point(s), and/or a range of undeveloped points. The response may lack clarity at times. The response is implicitly related to testing the claim and may be a list of methods, sources and types of information. The response is related to testing the claim only implicitly. **Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response** Limited explanation of ways to test the claim. The response usually 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.*	
3(a)	**Main Annotations**  Candidates may identify one of the following: • The financial crisis/globalisation has harmed the economy. • *The financial crisis/globalisation has left* us struggling to pay for public services. • Some countries are putting up walls to keep migrants out. • Some countries want to protect their own citizens from illegal entry/international crime/drug smuggling/people trafficking/robbery/violence. • Jose agrees with politicians that say immigration is a problem. Award 1 mark for correctly identifying a fact from the list above. Award **an additional 1 mark** for a response that demonstrates a clear understanding of a fact applied accurately to the example identified. *Further guidance – note that the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**2**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	**Main Annotations**  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 Paola's background/experience that suggest possible bias: • Paola has been a refugee; this may make her argument biased towards supporting other refugees – people like herself. Candidates are likely to identify the following reasons from aspects of the statement that suggest possible bias: • Unbalanced argument – very little consideration of other perspectives or counterarguments. • Use of exaggerated language and phrases shows bias e.g. Would you try to rescue your children from starvation? • Use of rhetorical questions pressurises listeners. • Use of leading statements e.g. you will expect others to help if you are in trouble in the future. • Not much evidence. • Mainly opinion. • Use of value judgements e.g. It is only right that we help people at risk. 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. **Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response** A basic or partial explanation of why the statement may be biased. **Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response** A limited explanation of why the statement may be biased. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**3**

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.	**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 usually contains three (or more) developed evaluative points, and may include some undeveloped points. Material from the sources is used as evidence to support the evaluation; clear reference to the evidence and/or arguments in the source e.g. quotation/summary of ideas. 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 usually 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. Material from the sources is used as evidence to support the evaluation; some reference to the evidence and/or arguments in the source e.g. quotation/summary of ideas. 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. The response usually contains 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. Some material from the sources may be used as evidence to support the evaluation. The response may occasionally lack some clarity and by difficult to follow.	

© UCLES 2021

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	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 usually 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* *Responses that give a very good evaluation of only one argument may achieve Level 3 but no higher.*	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**Main Annotations**  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 and 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 refugees. • Reference to different consequences and implications for individuals/different groups/government. • How long it might take to make a difference. • Barriers to change e.g. power of local people and large companies. • 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 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, usually 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, usually 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, usually 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 and usually 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.	