CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2

0457 GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

0457/33 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 Study Sources 1 and 2

(a) Give <u>two</u> uses of water.

Candidates may identify the following uses of water from the

Domestic – washing, cooking, drinking, showering and baths
Industrial – manufacturing, cooling/power stations, mining,
Agricultural – growing crops, for food, gardening
Tourism – swimming pools, fountains, golf courses, fishing, b
Other – animals to drink, fire fighting

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

Further guidance – note that acceptable answers are located in Source 1 and from the candidate's own experience. However candidates may use their own words.

(b) Which use of water do you think is most likely to contribute to a shortage of water? Why? [4]

Indicative Content

The following uses of water may be identified from the source:

Domestic – washing, cooking, drinking, showering and baths
Industrial – manufacturing, cooling/power stations, mining,
Agricultural – growing crops, for food, gardening
Tourism – swimming pools, fountains, golf courses, fishing, boating
Other – animals to drink, fire fighting

Candidates are likely to give the following reasons to justify their choice:

- Possible further consequences or effects
- Degree of impact/seriousness for individuals/countries/world
- How many people/groups/countries are affected
- Increasing cycle of decline
- How widespread the problem is
- How easy to solve
- Effects on natural world and human ways of life
- Other reasonable response

Further guidance – candidates may discuss ''uses' from the Sources as listed above in the Mark Scheme or others; the assessment is focussed upon their reasoning/justification.

Level of Response and Marks	Description of Level
Level 4: 4 marks **Strong Response**	Clearly reasoned, credible and structure different uses; usually at least 2 developed issue; or a range of undeveloped reasons. interrelationship of factors and the connectio
Level 3: 3 marks **Reasonable Response**	Some reasoned explanation of why one us least 1 developed argument suggested with be implicit at times; or several undeveloped reasons.
Level 2: 2 marks **Basic Response**	Identifies a use as significant but argument is weak or not linked to the issue explicitly.
Level 1: 1 mark **Limited Response**	Simple identification of a use but no attempt to justify or the reasoning is not related to the issue.
0 marks	No relevant response or creditworthy material.

(c) Give <u>two</u> consequences of a water shortage. [2]

Candidates may identify the following consequences from the Sources or their own experience:

- Drought
- Failed Crops
- Cracked Reservoirs
- Dirty Water/puddles
- Animals drink from dirty puddles
- Bush/forest fires
- Thirst
- Hunger/Starvation
- Arid land/dry riverbeds, lakes
- Civil unrest
- Disease
- Dead trees/plants
- Other reasonable response

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

Further guidance – note that acceptable answers are located in Source 1 and from the candidate's own experience. However candidates may use their own words.

.

(d) Which consequence of a water shortage do you think is

Indicative Content

The following consequences of water shortage may be identif

- Drought
- Failed Crops
- Cracked Reservoirs
- Dirty Water/puddles
- Animals drink from dirty puddles
- Bush/forest fires
- Thirst
- Hunger/Starvation
- Arid land/dry riverbeds, lakes
- Civil unrest
- Disease
- Dead trees/plants
- Other reasonable response

Candidates are likely to give the following reasons to justify their choice:

- Possible further consequences or effects
- Degree of impact/seriousness for individuals/countries/world
- How many people/groups/countries are affected
- Increasing cycle of decline
- How widespread the problem is
- How easy to solve
- Effects on natural world and human ways of life
- Other reasonable response

Level of Response and Marks	Description of Level
Level 4: 4 marks **Strong Response**	Clearly reasoned, credible and structure different consequences; usually at least 2 linked to the issue; or a range of u understanding of the interrelationship of fact
Level 3: 3 marks **Reasonable Response**	Some reasoned explanation of why one co usually at least 1 developed argument suggested with some link to the issue, but may be implicit at times; or several undeveloped reasons.
Level 2: 2 marks **Basic Response**	Identifies a consequence as significant but argument is weak or not linked to the issue explicitly.
Level 1: 1 mark **Limited Response**	Simple identification of a consequence but no attempt to justify or the reasoning is not related to the issue.
0 marks	No relevant response or creditworthy material.

Further guidance – candidates may discuss 'uses' from the Sources as listed above in the Mark Scheme or others; the assessment is focussed upon their reasoning/justification.

2 Study Source 3. You are part of a community group. You n whether you should invest in the PlayPump. What additional how will it help you decide?

(a) One thing I need to know

How it will help me to decide whether we should invest in

(b) Another thing I need to know.

How it will help me to decide whether we should invest in the PlayPump. [6]

Use the same mark scheme for both parts (a) and (b)

Indicative content

Additional Information

Possible types/areas of additional information likely to be suggested by candidates include:

- viability of the project – access to water underground e.g. depth; amount
- size and plan – to help assess impact on the locality/people in the area
- effectiveness of the technology/pump
- distance from community – access issues
- cost – how expensive to build and who will pay
- availability of children to play enough to pump water
- incentives - is there going to be any encouragement to the children to play
- public views - the opinion of other local people about this type of project
- impact of the building project - possible disruption that creating the pump is going to cause and for how long
- benefits to the environment - possible positive impact on the environment in general due to reduction in fuel emissions from more efficient gadgets or other benefit
- likelihood of boredom of children who might stop playing
- maintenance and repair issues – can local people cope with the technology?

Assessment of the identification of additional information:

Mark	Description
Level 2: Reasonable Response 2 marks	Identification of clearly relevant informatio
Level 1: Basic Response 1 mark	Identifies some information but the releva the description is very brief or lacks clarit
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.

3 Study Source 4.

(a) Identify <u>one</u> opinion in Jakob's blog post. Explain why yo

Indicative content

- Opinion - a personal view or attitude or perspective o founded on certainty or proof or evidence

Examples of opinions in Jakob's blog post are:

- I believe we need to reduce water pollution (to avoid a water shortage)
- The main problem we face is not a shortage of water but a shortage of clean drinking water
- Other reasonable response

Mark	Performance Descriptors
Level 3: 3 marks Strong Response	Clear explanation of why the statement is an opinion showing strong understanding *e.g. it's an opinion because Jakob is making a claim about the water shortages that is a personal point of view* *OR it's an opinion because it cannot be proved*
Level 2: 2 marks Reasonable Response	Clear explanation of why the statement is an opinion or a prediction i.e. only one aspect is addressed or only one aspect is clearly understood and explained. *e.g. it's an opinion because Jakob is making a claim about the water shortages*
Level 1: 1 mark Basic Response	Identifies an opinion but the explanation is unclear and does not demonstrate understanding *e.g. it is an opinion because it's what Jakob says*
0	No creditworthy material.

(b) Natalia's dad 'read somewhere that the average person has 10 litres of water every day for drinking, washing and

How reliable is this information? Explain your answer.

Indicative Content

The following evaluative points are likely to be made:

- Source is not cited or clear
- Source may not be accurate
- The evidence for the statement within the source is not clear
- Dad may have misinterpreted the source
- There is some link to the argument/issue
- Some evidence provided even if weak or tenuous
- Other reasonable response

Level and Marks	Description of Level
L4: Strong Response **3 marks**	Clearly reasoned, credible and structured evaluation; usually at least 2 developed arguments clearly linked to the issue or a wide range (3/4) of undeveloped reasons. Evaluation is clearly focussed upon the argument/evidence, its strengths and weaknesses, and the way it is used to support the opinion. **The response is balanced.** A convincing overall assessment or conclusion is reached.
L3: Reasonable Response **2 marks**	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.
L2: Basic Response **1 mark**	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) Whose reasoning works better, Heba's or Samuel's?

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

- **the reliability of their knowledge claims;**
- **how reasonable their opinions are;**
- **the likeliness of any consequences they predict;**
- **whether you accept their values and why;**
- **any other relevant issues.**

Indicative Content

Candidates are expected to evaluate the reasoning in the two statements and compare their effectiveness. They should make a supported judgement 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 marks**	Clear, credible and well supported judgements a better. Coherent, structured evaluation of how w both statements with clear comparison. The resp least 3 developed evaluative points, possibly wit The response is balanced. A clear assessment o Explicit, balanced evaluation of both statements.
L4: Strong Response **8–10 marks**	Clear, supported judgements about which reasoning works better. Evaluation of how well the reasoning works for both statements with clear comparison. 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. Explicit, balanced evaluation of both statements.
L3: Reasonable Response **5–7 marks**	Reasonable judgements about which reasoning works better. Some evaluation of how well the reasoning works for both statements with an attempt at comparison. 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 marks**	Basic examination of which reasoning works better. The response may only consider one of the statements with little if any attempt at comparison. 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 marks**	Limited, if any, unsupported discussion of which reasoning works better. The response is likely to consider only one of the statements 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

4 Do you think the water shortage problem is most likely individual action?

In your answer you should:
- **state your conclusion;**
- **give reasons for your opinion;**
- **use relevant examples to support your opinion (you may**
- **show that you have considered different points of view;**
- **explain why you disagree with some of these points of vi**

Indicative Content

Candidates are expected to argue using reasons and evidence to justify their opinion and judgement about the issue i.e. to compare and assess the effectiveness of different levels of action to help increase supply of water.

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
- how long it takes to make a difference
- the effects of cultural differences and beliefs
- barriers to change
- the power of collective action
- the difficulties of changing individual behaviour
- the influence of individuals and groups acting locally
- the role of vested interests and power differences
- potential conflict
- difficulties in coordinating globally and across different countries with independence
- cost and access to resources to implement change
- governmental responses and action
- 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 marks**	Clear, well supported and logical reasoning abou well-structured argument. The response is likely clearly reasoned arguments and/or evidence to s with at least 3/4 developed points, and some un response is balanced. A clear, balanced and cre conclusion is reached. Explicit evaluation of both Lower in the band a greater proportion of arguments will be left undeveloped.
L4: Strong Response **12–15 marks**	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. Explicit evaluation of both levels of action. Lower in the band a greater proportion of arguments will be left undeveloped.
L3: Reasonable Response **8–11 marks**	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 marks**	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 marks**	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