Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education

GLOBAL PERSECTIVES **0457/11**

Paper 1 Written Examination **October/November 2018**

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 October/November 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© UCLES 2018

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 2018

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	Candidates should identify the following trend from Source 1: • 57 million • 9 per cent 1 mark should be awarded for the identification of one of the above answers. *Further guidance – the only acceptable answers are listed above.*	**1**
1(b)	Candidates may identify the following ways from source 2: • encourage them to talk • read stories • play games 1 mark should be awarded for each correctly identified way up to 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 the following effects from source 2: • learn language • start to communicate • more confident when they start school • more likely to be healthier and happier • less likely to commit crime • more likely to have well paid job when older • more productive citizens • able to fill important roles in society • able to become informed and active citizens Candidates may give the following reasons, any of which could be used, to justify their choice: • the degree of impact on the family as a whole • the degree of impact on children • the degree of impact on the local community • the degree of impact on their future *Further guidance – candidates are most likely to discuss effects from the source as listed above. However, the assessment is focused mainly upon their reasoning / justification and therefore additional effects 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 an effect 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 an effect may be unclear at times. **Level 1 (1 mark)** **Limited response** Limited explanation. Explanation is not linked to an effect explicitly. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**3**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	**Indicative content** Candidates are likely to discuss the following reasons drawing upon the information in Sources 1 and 2: • more productive employees • fill important roles that a country needs for example doctors and teachers • literacy rates will increase • children will become informed and active citizens • other credible reason **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 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 dimension is may be 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 national dimension is not apparent. *Further Guidance – If the source is copied without interpretation or further elaboration/development, then L0 - 0 marks should be awarded.*	**6**

© UCLES 2018

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Indicative content** Candidates are likely to discuss the following evaluative points relating to Source 3 **Strengths:** • states the view at the beginning by personal comments • persuasive argument • appeals to parents' emotions about their children **Weaknesses:** • no evidence cited • no reference to specific skills • very little reference to his/her expertise 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 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 stated in Source 3. **Possible types of information:** • compare statistics/information from different schools about how much money a school receives • data from local council about what qualifications the children have achieved • comparison with previous years • individual testimony or personal experience • material from local media who might report on these issues • other relevant response. **Possible sources of information:** • national and local governments and their departments • international organisations, e.g. United Nations; UNESCO • expert teachers' views • media and the internet • other relevant response. **Possible methods:** • review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents • interview relevant experts, teachers, parents, council • 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. **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. A wide range of undeveloped points linked to the claim may enter this level of response. The response is generally related to testing the claim at times.	**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 implicitly 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. *Further Guidance – 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: • children should be at school every day so that they learn more skills • education helps you to get a better job when you leave school • better attendance leads to better qualifications 1 mark should be awarded for the identification of 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: • It doesn't matter if children do not go to school everyday • Some things are more important than education • We think it is important to support our parents • Helping on the farm will result in skills that are more important for us in the future than some of things we learn in school 1 mark should be awarded for the identification of 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** A value judgement is a view or decision about what is right, wrong or important, based upon a particular set of standards, principles, or values. The following examples are found in Chika's statement. • Some things are more important than education • We think it's important for us to support our parents • Running the farm is more important than some of the things we learn in school • Its Okay if children do not go to school every single day Award 1 mark for correctly identifying an example of a value judgement from the list above. However, candidates may use their own words. Award an additional 1 mark for a response that demonstrates some understanding of a value judgement. Or Award an additional 2 marks for a clear understanding of value judgements. *Further Guidance – The response must include a correct example of a value judgement to be awarded additional marks for the explanation.*	**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 • 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 marks)** **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.	

© UCLES 2018

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**Indicative content** Candidates are expected to make a judgement about the best course of action to improve education, using reasoning 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 on improving education • reference to different consequences and implications for individuals/groups/government • how long it might take to make a difference • barriers to change • the power of collective action, e.g. cooperation between countries over improving education • 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 proposed 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 proposed 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 I 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 proposed 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 generally 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 proposed 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 through 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 2018