CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2

0457 GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

0457/32 Paper 3 (Written Paper), maximum raw mark 60

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2013 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

1 (a) Which country ate the most chocolate per person in 2007

Candidates may identify the following country: **Ireland.**

1 mark for the correct answer.

(b) Which country produced the most cocoa beans in 2009?

Candidates may identify the following country: **Ivory Coast.**

1 mark for the correct answer.

(c) Describe the trend in cocoa prices between 1980 and 2010. [2]

Candidates may identify the following aspects of the trends:

- Prices go down and then up
- There is much short term variation within the trends

1 mark for the correct answer, up to a maximum of two marks.

(d) Why do you think political problems in Ivory Coast had such a big effect on the cost of cocoa? Justify your answer. [3]

Indicative Content

The following points are likely to be made:

- Disruption to normal patterns of work
- Strikes
- Shortage of raw materials
- Damage to crops
- Transportation disrupted
- Political uncertainty affecting prices in the market
- Working to rule or 'go slow'
- Other reasonable response

Level and Marks	Description of Level
L3: **Strong Response** **3**	Clearly reasoned, credible and structured developed points clearly linked to the iss undeveloped reasons.
L2: **Reasonable Response** **2**	Some reasonable argument mainly foc response is likely to contain at least 1/2 d 1/2 other undeveloped points. A range appropriate undeveloped points may be su
L1: **Basic Response** **1**	Some basic argument which is often unsupported and asserted. The response lacks clarity, is partial and generalised. The response is likely to contain 1/2 undeveloped points only. The response is likely to be tangential to the question.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material

(e) Do you think the issue of child labour in chocolate production is mostly personal, local or global? Justify your answer. [5]

Indicative Content

The following points are likely to be made:

Personal

- People must decide individually what action to take
- Personal freedom and responsibility
- Other reasonable response

Local

- Laws can affect behaviour
- Governments can educate people
- Other reasonable response

Global

- Sale is worldwide
- Many places produce chocolate
- Interdependence of countries
- Other reasonable response

Level and Marks	Description of Level
L3: **Strong Response** **5**	Clearly reasoned, credible and structured developed points clearly linked to the iss undeveloped reasons.
L2: **Reasonable Response** **3–4**	Some reasonable argument mainly foc response is likely to contain at least 1/2 d 1/2 other undeveloped points. A range appropriate undeveloped points may be su
L1: **Basic Response** **1–2**	Some basic argument which is often unsupported and asserted. The response lacks clarity, is partial and generalised. The response is likely to contain 1/2 undeveloped points only. The response is likely to be tangential to the question.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material

2 (a) A worker at a chocolate-making company said: 'China has over a billion people. They currently don't eat much chocolate. We should sell our chocolate to China.'

What does the company need to know about people in China before it decides to sell chocolate to China and how would this information help? [6]

Indicative Content

Candidates are likely to identify and explain the following types of information:

- what proportion of people had enough money to buy chocolate if it was available
- whether there were enough well off people for it to be worth marketing chocolate
- whether people in China want to eat chocolate – is the figure increasing?
- are there cultural problems with selling chocolate?
- logistics – could the chocolate be produced in China, making it cheaper, or would it have to be transported?
- Accept other reasonable suggestions

Assessment of the identification of additional information

Mark	Description
Level 2: Reasonable Response 2 marks	Identification of clearly relevant infor description.
Level 1: Basic Response 1marks	Identifies some information but the releva the description is very brief or lacks clarity.
0 marks	No creditworthy material.

Assessment of the explanation for the selection of the information

Mark	Description
Level 4: Strong Response 4 marks	Clear, reasoned and developed explanation of how the answer/information may be used to help make a decision about whether or not to support the proposed project (often phrased as – if this information is given … then … I could decide to … because …)
Level 3: Reasonable Response 3 marks	Some explanation of how the answer/information may be used to help make a decision about whether or not to support the proposed project; reasons may be stated simply and not developed/linked explicitly to issue.
Level 2: Basic Response 2 marks	Attempts to explain how the answer/information may be used to make a decision whether or not to support the proposed project but partial and/or generalised and/or lacks clarity.
Level 1: Limited Response 1 marks	Simple statement of information without explanation or linkage to the whether or not to support the proposed project.
0 marks	No creditworthy material.

Further Guidance

Note that the questions should be focused on the issue of support for the proposal. Note also that candidates should ask for new or further development of information, not for information or arguments which have already been provided in the stimulus material.

(b) A cocoa farm inspector sees children working on a coco inspector that they are his children, just helping out.

What does the inspector need to find out to be su exploitation on this farm and how would this information

Indicative Content

Candidates are likely to identify and explain the following type

- You'd need to know how many children there were – or whether there were so many they couldn't possibly be his and might therefore be more likely to be exploited children or even slaves.
- You'd need to know what sort of hours the children worked – a couple of hours in the evening every so often, or eighteen hours a day. A couple of hours every so often might be acceptable, but very long days would be exploitation.
- You'd need to know whether the children went to school, were cared for by their parents etc. If not, then they are being exploited.
- Other reasonable response

Assessment of the identification of additional information

Mark	Description
Level 2: Reasonable Response 2 marks	Identification of clearly relevant information to the issue; full description.
Level 1: Basic Response 1marks	Identifies some information but the relevance is implicit or tangential; the description is very brief or lacks clarity.
0 marks	No creditworthy material.

Assessment of the explanation for the selection of the information

Mark	Description
Level 4: Strong Response 4 marks	Clear, reasoned and developed answer/information may be used to he whether or not to support the proposed p this information is given … then … I could
Level 3: Reasonable Response 3 marks	Some explanation of how the answer/info make a decision about whether or not to support the proposed project; reasons may be stated simply and not developed/linked explicitly to issue.
Level 2: Basic Response 2 marks	Attempts to explain how the answer/information may be used to make a decision whether or not to support the proposed project but partial and/or generalised and/or lacks clarity.
Level 1: Limited Response 1 marks	Simple statement of information without explanation or linkage to the whether or not to support the proposed project.
0 marks	No creditworthy material.

Further Guidance
Note that the questions should be focused on the issue of support for the proposal. Note also that candidates should ask for new or further development of information, not for information or arguments which have already been provided in the stimulus material.

3 (a) How reliable is the chairman of the company as a source of information about child exploitation in cocoa production? [3]

Indicative Content

The following evaluative points are likely to be made:

- defensive as accused of wrong doing
- vested interest as he wants to make money from his role in the company
- may minimize the scale and extent of the problem
- source may not be accurate
- the evidence for the statement within the source is not clear and based on an unfair/unreasonable comparison
- may have good information as an insider
- he is a successful professional and will want to maintain a reputation for honesty and integrity
- other reasonable response

Level and Marks	Description of Level
L3: **Strong Response** **3**	Clearly reasoned, credible and structure developed arguments clearly linked to th undeveloped reasons. Evaluation is clearly focussed upon strengths and weaknesses, and the w opinion. The response is balanced. A co conclusion is reached.
L2: **Reasonable Response** **2**	Some reasonable evaluation mainly focussed upon the argument/evidence, its strengths and weaknesses, and the way it is used to support the opinion. The response is likely to contain at least 1/2 developed evaluative points, usually with 1/2 other undeveloped points. A range (2/3) of brief but clearly appropriate undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this band. An overall assessment or conclusion is attempted.
L1: **Basic Response** **1**	Some basic evaluation which is often unsupported and asserted. The response lacks clarity, is partial and generalised. The response is likely to contain 1/2 undeveloped points only. An overall assessment or conclusion is very weak, asserted and unconvincing, or not attempted. The response is likely to repeat/recycle the opinion or simply assert agreement/disagreement with the views expressed. The response may not contain any clear evaluative points. The response is likely to be tangential to the question.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material

(b) How reasonable is the comparison between children in some European countries having a week's holiday from school to help with the wine harvest and children in developing countries working on cocoa farms? Justify your answer. [3]

Indicative Content

The following evaluative points are likely to be made:

- children work to some extent in many countries therefore reasonable
- based on his experience so has some value
- not a large sample so not very representative and can't be generalised
- anecdotal evidence so not strong
- the evidence for the statement within the source is not clear and based on an unfair/unreasonable comparison
- different age groups and amount of work allowed
- access to schooling and other care may be much greater in some countries than others
- countries have different levels of wealth and cultures
- other reasonable response

Level and Marks	Description of Level
L3: **Strong Response** **3**	Clearly reasoned, credible and structure developed arguments clearly linked to th undeveloped reasons. Evaluation is clearly focussed upon strengths and weaknesses, and the w opinion. The response is balanced. A co conclusion is reached.
L2: **Reasonable Response** **2**	Some reasonable evaluation mainly focussed upon the argument/evidence, its strengths and weaknesses, and the way it is used to support the opinion. The response is likely to contain at least 1/2 developed evaluative points, usually with 1/2 other undeveloped points. A range (2/3) of brief but clearly appropriate undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this band. An overall assessment or conclusion is attempted.
L1: **Basic Response** **1**	Some basic evaluation which is often unsupported and asserted. The response lacks clarity, is partial and generalised. The response is likely to contain 1/2 undeveloped points only. An overall assessment or conclusion is very weak, asserted and unconvincing, or not attempted. The response is likely to repeat/recycle the opinion or simply assert agreement/disagreement with the views expressed. The response may not contain any clear evaluative points. The response is likely to be tangential to the question.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material

(c) How well does Get_real's reasoning work to show that c a problem'?

In your answer you should support your point of view wit and you may consider:

- **how well Get_real responds to comments by the chai**
- **the relevance of child labour in Canada;**
- **how reasonable Get_real's opinions are;**
- **whether you accept any values Get_real uses and wh**
- **any other relevant issues.**

Indicative Content

Candidates are expected to evaluate the reasoning in the statements and compare their effectiveness. They should make a supported judgment with some explanation about which person has the most effective reasoning.

Candidates may consider the following types of issue:

- quality of the argument
  - clarity
  - tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise
  - language
  - balance
- quality of the evidence
  - relevance
  - sufficiency – sample
  - source – media; radio
  - date – how recent
  - factual, opinion, value, anecdote
  - testimony – from experience and expert
- knowledge claims
- ability to see
- sources of bias
  - gender
  - political
  - personal values
  - experience
- likelihood of solutions working and consequences of their ideas
- 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 and Marks	Description of Level
L5: **Very Good Response** **11–12**	Clear, credible and well supported ju Coherent, structured evaluation of how w response is likely to contain at least 3 possibly with some undeveloped points. clear assessment or conclusion is reache
L4: **Strong Response** **8–10**	Clear, supported judgements about reasoning. Evaluation of how well the reasoning works. The response is likely to contain at least 2 developed evaluative points, possibly with 1/2 undeveloped points. A range (3/4+) of brief but clearly appropriate/explained undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this band at the lower level. The response is balanced. An overall assessment or conclusion is reached.
L3: **Reasonable Response** **5–7**	Reasonable judgements about reasoning. Some evaluation of how well the reasoning works. Judgements and evaluative points are likely to be partially supported or asserted. The response is likely to contain at least 1 developed evaluative points, possibly with 1/2 undeveloped points; 2/3 brief undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this band at the lower level. An attempt is made to give an overall assessment or conclusion.
L2: **Basic Response** **3–4**	Basic examination of reasoning. Judgements and evaluative points are likely to be partially supported or asserted, and lack clarity/relevance at times. The response is likely to contain at least 1/2 undeveloped evaluative points.
L1: **Limited Response** **1–2**	Limited, if any, unsupported discussion of reasoning The response is likely to consider statement very briefly or tangentially. There is very little clarity in the argument. The response is likely to repeat the arguments simply or assert agreement/disagreement with the views expressed. The response may not contain any clear evaluative points.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material

Further guidance on indicative content

Candidates are likely to argue as follows:

Showing that there is child labour in Canada is relevant to the extent that it makes the point that we (Canadians, people in the west) can't expect standards of developing countries that we in Canada (the west) don't uphold, and shows that some child labour is not ethically problematic. On the other hand, just because it's done in Canada doesn't mean it's ok there or anywhere else.

The opinions are somewhat reasonable; if doing some work is the o their families and access schooling, then it might be better for cho children than to leave them in poverty with no education; but this doe not problematic. Better than one bad alternative is not the same because does not make a distinction between child labour and child e Sort of agrees with Nestlé chairman, so backs up the point rath undermines no_slavery by trying to show that child labour is ok – but of the confusion between child labour and child slavery.

The values seem reasonable if you are taking the view that any impr to support a minimum change view rather than a fight for true progress.

So overall, the reasoning works quite well to show that some child labour is ethically acceptable, but doesn't fully show that it is not ethically problematic.

Accept other reasonable answers.

4 Is it ever acceptable for children to work?

In your answer you should:

- **state your conclusion;**
- **give reasons for your opinion;**
- **use relevant examples to support your opinion (you may use your own experience);**
- **show that you have considered different points of view;**
- **explain why you disagreed with some of these points of view.** **[18]**

Indicative Content
Candidates are expected to argue using reasons and evidence to justify their opinion and judgment about the issue i.e. to justify children working

Candidates are expected to use and develop the material found in the Sources, but should go beyond simply repeating or recycling without adaptation. Other material may be introduced but it is not necessary to gain full marks.

Candidates are likely to consider the following arguments:

- reference to scale of impact on individual/group/governmental/global behaviour/actions
- the effects of cultural differences and beliefs
- circumstances in which children may work – amount; nature; age; location
- tradition, custom and practice
- issues of consent
- access to other human rights e.g. education
- health issues
- other reasonable response

The following levels of response should be used to award marks.

Level and Marks	Description of Level
L5: **Very Good Response** **16–18**	Clear, well supported and logical reasoni and well-structured argument. The respo range of clearly reasoned arguments an views expressed, with at least 3/4 de undeveloped points. The response is bala credible assessment or conclusion is reac Lower in the band a greater proportion of arguments will be left undeveloped.
L4: **Strong Response** **12–15**	Clear, supported reasoning about the issue. Clear argument and some structure. The response is likely to contain a range of reasoned arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with at least 2/3 developed points, and some undeveloped points. The response is balanced. An assessment or conclusion is reached. Lower in the band a greater proportion of arguments will be left undeveloped.
L3: **Reasonable Response** **8–11**	Reasonable argument about the issue. The response is likely to contain some arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with at least 1 developed point, and some undeveloped points. An assessment or conclusion is attempted but may not be convincing. Lower in the band some arguments may begin to lack clarity, and/or be partial and generalised.
L2: **Basic Response** **4–7**	Basic argument about the issue. Arguments are unlikely to be supported and mainly asserted. Arguments lack clarity at times and there is no apparent structure. The response is likely to contain only 1/2 undeveloped points. Judgements are likely to be implicit without a conclusion. Lower in the band the arguments are likely to be generalised, partial and lack relevance to the issue with a descriptive approach.
L1: **Limited Response** **1–3**	Limited and unsupported argument about the issue with very little clarity. The response describes the issue very generally and tangentially. The response is partial and lacking in relevance.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material