Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES **0457/12**

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: • 250 million 1 mark should be awarded for the identification the above. *Further guidance – the only acceptable answer is listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**1**
1(b)	Candidates may identify the following benefits from Source 2: • allows us to learn more effectively • improves our understanding of the world • improves our understanding of ourselves • helps us to be healthy • allows people to share information and ideas • people can learn from the past • people can understand what is going on in other parts of their country • helps to reduce poverty • improves job prospects • allows us to benefit from technological advances 1 mark should be awarded for each correctly identified benefit 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)	Indicative content Candidates may identify **one** of the following benefits: • allows us to learn more effectively • improves our understanding of the world • improves our understanding of ourselves • helps us to be healthy • allows people to share information and ideas • people can learn from the past • people can understand what is going on in other parts of their country • helps to reduce poverty • improves job prospects • allows us to benefit from technological advances Candidates may give the following reasons, any of which could be used to justify their choice: • degree of impact, e.g. reducing poverty has further impact on lives • number of people affected, e.g. sharing information and ideas has benefits beyond the individual • significance of the benefit, e.g. learning more effectively will impact on all areas of a person's life • link to wider changes, e.g. being able to benefit from technological advances will all people to benefit from globalisation; understanding what is going on in other parts of the country allows people to participate in democracy and be a more active and informed citizen *Further guidance – candidates are most likely to discuss effects from Source 2 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 a benefit of literacy. **Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response** Some explanation. The link between the explanation and a benefit may be implicit or unclear at times. **Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response** Limited explanation. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**3**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	Indicative content Candidates are likely to identify the following reasons: • health of families will improve so the government may not have to spend as much money on healthcare • an increase in the understanding of what happens in the country will impact on how people vote in elections • poverty will be reduced so less money is needed for the population from the government • there will be a healthier workforce so the country should prosper • the country will be able to adapt to technological changes so less money is needed for training • other relevant response 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 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 government dimension is mainly implicit. **Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response** Limited reasoning and explanation; the response is likely to contain only simple, undeveloped and asserted point. Arguments are partial, generalised and lack clarity. The government 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 view at the beginning • refers to scientific magazines and teachers • gives an example of an activity outside of the classroom • looks at the global picture • emotional aspect at the end • other relevant response **Weaknesses:** • does not give the title of the role in education or the village school • no facts quoted about the magazines, etc. • no evidence about the improvement of communication • other relevant 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; 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 (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 on teaching methods • data from local authorities and different schools/teachers • individual testimony or personal experience of teachers/students • material from government or education websites • other relevant response **Possible sources of information:** • teacher training colleges/universities • international organisations, e.g. United Nations; UNESCO • experts in education • research reports • media and the internet • other relevant response **Possible methods:** • review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents • interview relevant experts, teachers and pupils • 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. The response is explicitly related to testing the claim. **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 related to testing the claim.	**8**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**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* *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 from Tuaco's statement: • I will be successful because I have good qualifications • I will be going to university in two years 1 mark should be awarded for the identification of one of the above predictions. *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: • I have good qualifications from school • Tuaco's father owns a local business • Tuaco's father does not believe in training • Tuaco disagrees with others in the debate • Abina believes we should experience the local environment • Abina has been to villages where they don't have clean water • Abina has seen the effects of pollution (from cars) on the countryside • Abina's understanding of the climate and pollution has been improved • Abina is now interested in science and enjoys these lessons more • Abina has learnt more about history • Abina's grandparents talked to her about history • Abina believes it is important to communicate with your family • Abina's grandparents talked to her about culture • Abina's grandparents talked to her about what life was like when they were younger 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 a particular set of standards, principles, or values. The following examples are found in Abina's statement: • it is important to communicate with your family • this is important for our heritage (accept as this phrase alone) • Abina has learnt more about history … this is important for our heritage (accept with introductory stem) • Abina's grandparents talked to her about history … this is important for our heritage (accept with introductory stem) • Abina's grandparents talked to her about what life was like in the community … this is important for our heritage (accept with introductory stem) Award 1 mark for correctly identifying 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. For example: It is a value judgement that it is important to communicate with your family because it is based on Abina's own values. Or Award an additional 2 marks for a clear understanding of a value judgement applied accurately to the example identify from Source 3. For example: It is a value judgement that it is important to communicate with your family because Abina is making a judgement about something being important (learning from your grandparents) based on her own value system. *The response must include a correct example of a value judgement to be awarded additional marks for the explanation.*	**3**

© UCLES 2019

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 (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) 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 2019

Question	Answer	Marks
4	Indicative content Candidates are expected to make a judgement about the best course of action to improve the quality of education for all learners, 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 the quality of 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 schools • the influence of individuals and groups on decision making • potential conflicts of interest • difficulties in planning and coordinating the improvement • cost and access to resources to implement change • other relevant 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 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 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 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 though a basic judgement may be attempted. **Level 1 (1–4 marks) Limited response** Limited and unsupported reasoning about the topic 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