Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES **0457/11**

Paper 1 Written Examination **October/November 2019**

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 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© UCLES 2019

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 2019

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	Candidates should identify the following from Source 1: • 92 per cent 1 mark should be awarded for the identification of the above percentage. *Further guidance – the only acceptable answer is listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**1**
1(b)	Candidates may identify the following ways from Source 2: • use cleaner forms of energy/change to solar or wind power • buy locally produced food • make better choices about transport • support leaders in the community who care about air pollution 1 mark should be awarded for each correctly identified way. *Further guidance – the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**2**

© UCLES 2019

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	**Indicative content** Candidates may identify one of the following ways from Source 2: • use cleaner forms of energy/change to solar or wind power • buy locally produced food • make better choices about transport • support leaders in the community who care about air pollution Candidates may give the following reasons, any of which could be used, to justify their choice: • the range of impact e.g. how many different people might be affected by the change – will it just affect their own energy use, or would it have a further effect on others? • the depth of impact e.g. how much difference it could potentially make to air pollution • the timescale for making a difference • costs of the change • availability, e.g. of cleaner energy/locally produced food/cleaner transport • other reasonable response *Further guidance – candidates are most likely to discuss ways from Source 2 as listed above. However, the assessment is focused mainly upon their reasoning/justification and therefore additional ways should be credited.* The following levels of response should be used to award marks. **Level 3** **Good response** **(3 marks)** Clearly reasoned explanation explicitly linked to a way to reduce air pollution. **Level 2** **Reasonable response** **(2 marks)** Some explanation. The link between the explanation and a way to reduce air pollution may be implicit or unclear at times. **Level 1** **Limited response** **(1 mark)** Limited explanation. **Level 0** **(0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**3**

© UCLES 2019

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	**Indicative content** Candidates are likely to identify the following reasons why air pollution is an important local issue: • local action, such as taking different forms of transport and buying locally produced food, are the best ways to resolve the problem • air pollution in the local area is likely to be caused by local factories • air pollution can have effects on local resources such as more people visiting local doctors • air pollution can spoil the local environment • local politicians/leaders can help to make a difference • other reasonable response The following levels of response should be used to award marks. **Level 3** **Good response (5–6 marks)** 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 local dimension is explicit. **Level 2** **Reasonable response (3–4 marks)** 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 local dimension is implicit. **Level 1** **Limited response (1–2 marks)** Limited reasoning and explanation; the response is likely to contain only simple, undeveloped and asserted point. Arguments are partial, generalised and lack clarity. The local dimension is not apparent. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**6**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Indicative content** Candidates are likely to discuss the following evaluative points relating to Source 3: **Strengths:** • states the case at the beginning • emphasis on the health of children, emotion used • suggestion that work and businesses will suffer because of the smog • quotes from a scientific magazine • uses a named scientist in support of the argument • constant information from the news • other reasonable response **Weaknesses:** • no factual evidence • no television programme cited • a named scientist is used but no other details are given regarding the project • no reference to the name of the reports about health suffering • overall quite vague • other reasonable response The following levels of response should be used to award marks. **Level 3** **Good response** **(5–6 marks)** 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 strengths and/or weaknesses of the argument and/or the way evidence is used to support the claim. A convincing overall assessment or conclusion is reached. **Level 2** **Reasonable response** **(3–4 marks)** 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** **Limited response** **(1–2 marks)** 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.	**6**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Level 0** **(0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	
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 on local air pollution • data from local industries • individual testimony or personal experience of local residents • material from local governments other relevant response **Possible sources of information:** • national and local governments and their departments • international organisations: UN, WHO • experts in fossil fuels • research reports • environmental pressure groups, charities and NGOs • media and the internet • other relevant response **Possible methods:** • review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents • interview relevant experts, business leaders, local residents, doctors • internet search • questionnaires or surveys to industries, residents, doctors • historical data • other relevant response The following levels of response should be used to award marks. **Level 4** **Very good response** **(7–8 marks)** 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** **Good response** **(5–6 marks)** 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.	**8**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**Level 2** **Reasonable response** **(3–4 marks)** 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** **Limited response** **(1–2 marks)** 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 – If the response lists methods or sources without linking to the issue/context, then it should not be placed above Level 2.*	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	Candidates may identify **one** of the following facts from Source 4. • the power station will burn fossil fuel • the power station will create pollution • I have a breathing problem • the air is cleaner in the country • I cannot afford (to move) • power stations are noisy • my children do not want to leave their friends • the town is growing • Abdu will organise a protest march • the power station will cost more to build in the country • the power station will affect the value of our houses • doctor says I should move to the country 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 predictions from Tadean's statement. • there will be less pollution caused by people travelling to work • it will cost more to transport the materials if it is built in the countryside • government would also have to improve the roads leading to where the power station is built • this will make your energy more expensive • this may mean higher taxes for all of you • the town will need more energy in the future • without the power station there will be power shortages • the power station will burn fossil fuel • the power station will create pollution 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** 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 for bias from Abdu's background/experience: • He has a breathing problem which may have been caused by air pollution and is likely to get worse if there is more pollution *(do not reward just 'Abdu has breathing problems' – the link to the power station must be clear)* • He is likely to have to move house if there is another power station built and he cannot afford this • He believes that the value of his house is likely to be affected by a factory being built there so he will be financially affected. Candidates are likely to identify the following aspects of the statement that suggest possible bias: • Lack of balance • Very little evidence • Only disadvantages of power stations highlighted • Emotive language – 'It would be noisy and ugly' • Focus only on local evidence/arguments The following levels of response should be used to award marks: **Level 3** **Good response** **(3 marks)** A clear explanation of why the statement may be biased supported with evidence from the statement. The response contains two (or more) points. **Level 2** **Reasonable response** **(2 marks)** A basic or partial explanation of why the statement may be biased. The response contains one (or more) points. **Level 1** **Limited response** **(1 mark)** A Limited explanation of why the statement may be biased. Little clarity or relevance. **Level 0** **(0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**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 • 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 **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** **Very good response (13–15 marks)** 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** **Good response (10–12 marks)** 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** **Reasonable response (7–9 marks)** Reasonable points about which argument is more convincing. Some evaluation of one or 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** **Basic response (4–6 marks)** Basic points about which argument is more convincing. One or both arguments may be considered, but there may be with 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** **Limited response (1–3 marks)** Limited and unsupported points about which argument is more convincing. The response considers one or both 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 2019

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**Indicative content** Candidates are expected to make a choice from the suggested courses of action to reduce air pollution in the city over the next five years, 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. 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 air pollution • 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 other areas • 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 efforts to reduce air pollution • cost and access to resources to implement change • other reasonable response The following levels of response should be used to award marks. **Level 5** **Very good response (20–24 marks)** Clear, well supported 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** **Good response (15–19 marks)** Clear, supported 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 I generally well-structured and a judgement is reached.	**24**

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**Level 3** **Reasonable response (10–14 marks)** 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** **Basic response (5–9 marks)** 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** **Limited response (1–4 marks)** Limited and unsupported reasoning about the issue in general. Mainly recycling of sources without interpretation. Different arguments may be included. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	

© UCLES 2019