Cambridge Assessment International Education

Cambridge IGCSE™

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES **0457/12**

Paper 1 Written Examination **October/November 2023**

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 2023 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

© UCLES 2023

[Turn over

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 2023

Social Science-Specific Marking Principles (for point-based marking)

1 Components using point-based marking:

- Point marking is often used to reward knowledge, understanding and application of skills. We give credit where the candidate's answer shows relevant knowledge, understanding and application of skills in answering the question. We do not give credit where the answer shows confusion.

From this it follows that we:

a DO credit answers which are worded differently from the mark scheme if they clearly convey the same meaning (unless the mark scheme requires a specific term)

b DO credit alternative answers/examples which are not written in the mark scheme if they are correct

c DO credit answers where candidates give more than one correct answer in one prompt/numbered/scaffolded space where extended writing is required rather than list-type answers. For example, questions that require *n* reasons (e.g. State two reasons …).

d DO NOT credit answers simply for using a 'key term' unless that is all that is required. (Check for evidence it is understood and not used wrongly.)

e DO NOT credit answers which are obviously self-contradicting or trying to cover all possibilities

f DO NOT give further credit for what is effectively repetition of a correct point already credited unless the language itself is being tested. This applies equally to 'mirror statements' (i.e. polluted/not polluted).

g DO NOT require spellings to be correct, unless this is part of the test. However spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. Corrasion/Corrosion)

2 Presentation of mark scheme:

- Slashes (/) or the word 'or' separate alternative ways of making the same point.
- Semi colons (;) bullet points (•) or figures in brackets (1) separate different points.
- Content in the answer column in brackets is for examiner information/context to clarify the marking but is not required to earn the mark (except Accounting syllabuses where they indicate negative numbers).

3 Calculation questions:

- The mark scheme will show the steps in the most likely correct method(s), the mark for each step, the correct answer(s) and the mark for each answer
- If working/explanation is considered essential for full credit, this will be indicated in the question paper and in the mark scheme. In all other instances, the correct answer to a calculation should be given full credit, even if no supporting working is shown.
- Where the candidate uses a valid method which is not covered by the mark scheme, award equivalent marks for reaching equivalent stages.
- Where an answer makes use of a candidate's own incorrect figure from previous working, the 'own figure rule' applies: full marks will be given if a correct and complete method is used. Further guidance will be included in the mark scheme where necessary and any exceptions to this general principle will be noted.

© UCLES 2023

4 Annotation:

- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
- For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
- Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

Introduction

Some questions are marked holistically using levels of response mark schemes. The marks awarded for an answer are usually based on a judgement of the overall quality of the response, rather than on awarding marks for specific points and accumulating a total mark by adding points.

Inevitably, the mark scheme cannot cover all responses that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases candidates may make very strong responses which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should nevertheless be credited according to their quality.

Levels of response

For answers marked by levels of response, the following is intended to describe the quality of the response required (level of skill that should be demonstrated) for the award of marks at different points in the mark range for the question.

In the levels of response mark scheme positive achievement is being rewarded.
For answers marked by levels of response:

a Marking grids describe the top of each level.
b **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer.
c **To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	Award mark
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level

© UCLES 2023

Mark scheme

All of the questions are based on sources which are available to candidates as an Insert to the examination paper. It is therefore very important to study this material prior to marking to become familiar with the context of the questions.

Annotations

All scripts and questions must be annotated to show how and where marks have been awarded.
For scripts marked on RM Assessor, a selection of the following on-screen annotations are available.

Annotation	Meaning
	Correct, creditworthy point
Eval	Evaluation
	Development
	Benefit of doubt given
	Incorrect point
	Unclear / confused point
J	Justification
	Omission mark, more required
I	Interpretation
Vertical wavy line	Irrelevant
	Highlighter
REP	Repetition
	Comment box
NAQ	Not answered question


The number of ticks used does not need to tally with the mark achieved. Every question must be annotated in some way. The mark scheme indicates the most likely annotation to be used with each question.
Annotation should be within the candidate's text rather than in the margin.

© UCLES 2023

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**From Source 1, identify how many megacities there will be in the world by 2030.** **Main Annotations**  Candidates should identify the following from Source 1: • 43 1 mark should be awarded for identifying the above. *Further guidance – the only acceptable answer is listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**1**
1(b)	**From Source 2, identify <u>two</u> benefits of living in a city.** **Main Annotations**  Candidates may identify the following from source 2: • Better healthcare • More educational opportunities • Better employment opportunities • Greater diversity • Better public transport • More leisure and cultural activities. 1 mark should be awarded for each correctly identified benefit. *Further guidance – the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**2**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	**Which benefit of living in a city do you think is most significant? Explain why.** **Main Annotations**  **Indicative content** Candidates may identify one of the following: • Better healthcare • More educational opportunities • Better employment opportunities • Greater diversity • Better public transport • More leisure and cultural activities Candidates may give the following reasons, any of which could be used, to justify their choice: • has greatest impact • affects most people • ethically or morally most justifiable • has multiple positive consequences • creates spiral of virtue • other reasonable response *Further guidance – candidates are most likely to discuss benefits from the source as listed above. However, the assessment is focused mainly upon their reasoning / justification and therefore additional benefits 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. **Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response** Some explanation. The link between the explanation and a reason may be implicit / unclear at times. **Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response** A reason is identified. There may be some limited explanation. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**3**

© UCLES 2023

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	**Explain why increased migration to cities is an important national issue.** **Main Annotations**  **Indicative Content** Candidates are likely to discuss the following reasons drawing upon the information in Sources 1 and 2: • More crime • Larger gap between rich and poor • More air and noise pollution and the effect on the climate worldwide • Increased numbers of poor housing may mean more diseases • Overcrowding • Higher demand on health and education services • Higher living cost may affect the economy • Impact on rural areas that migrants are leaving The following levels of response should be used to award marks: **Level 3 (5–6 marks) Good response** Clearly reasoned, credible explanation; clearly linked to the issue. The national dimension is consistently explicit. **Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response** Some reasoned explanation: with some link to the issue but may be implicit at times. The national dimension is 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 implicit or not apparent. Answers at this level may repeat source material with little understanding. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**6**


Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**'The growth of cities is damaging the environment.'** **What are the strengths and weaknesses of the argument supporting this claim?** **Main Annotations**  **Indicative Content** Candidates are likely to discuss the following evaluative points relating to Source 3. **Strengths:** • gives his length of experience • mentions his television and magazine interviews • visual evidence • refers to families and livelihoods • quotes a famous scientist • offers a solution **Weaknesses:** • does not say exactly where he works • no details about the programmes or magazines • no evidence for the increase in pollution • no further details about Dr Perez Discussion of the arguments/reasons and the evidence in the Source should both be credited. The following levels of response should be used to award marks: **Level 3 (5–6 marks) Good response** Clearly reasoned and credible evaluation. Usually, 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 and arguments, their strengths and/or weaknesses and the way they are used to support the claim. There is usually some clear reference to the evidence and arguments in the source e.g. quotation/summary **Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response** Reasonable evaluation mainly focused on the evidence and arguments, their strengths and/or weaknesses, and the way they are used to support the claim; there may be some lack of clarity and the answer may be difficult to follow at times. Usually, the response contains one (or more) developed point(s), with some other undeveloped points. Some (two or more) undeveloped points may be sufficient to reach this level.	**6**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response** Limited evaluation which is often unsupported and asserted. The response is often unclear, tangential, and generalised. Usually contains one or two undeveloped points. Answers at this level may repeat source material with little understanding. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material. *Further guidance - if the claim is implicit then the response is unlikely to be awarded above Level 2.*	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**'Cities have become more polluted.'** **How could you test this claim? You may consider the types of information, sources of evidence or methods you might use.** **Main Annotations**  **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 the environment • data from local government • individual testimony or personal experience • material from opinion polls • other relevant response **Possible sources of information:** • national and local governments and their departments • international organisations, e.g. United Nations; UNESCO • experts in the environment • research reports • pressure groups, charities and NGOs • media and the internet • other relevant response **Possible methods:** • review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents • interview relevant experts • 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 usually 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 usually 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 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response** Some reasoning and explanation of ways to test the claim. The response usually contains one (or more) developed point(s), and/or a few undeveloped points. There may be some lack of clarity and the answer may be difficult to follow at times. The response is related to testing the claim. **Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response** Limited explanation of ways to test the claim. The response usually 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. *If the response lists or describes methods, sources and types of data without linking to the issue/context, then it should not be placed above Level 2.*	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	**Identify <u>one</u> fact from Elena's statement. Explain why this is a fact.** **Main Annotations**    **Indicative Content** A fact is a statement which is true or accurate; can be verified; is objective and proven by research; or similar. Candidates may identify one of the following from Source 4. • some cities face lots of problems • my friend moved to our nearest city • so many people were trying to get a job • many cars and people on the streets • he saw a lot of crime • there were many homeless people • he returned to our village last month • he is much happier now • research for the UN confirms this point • other reasonable response Award 1 mark for correctly identifying a fact from the list above. Award 1 mark for a response that demonstrates a clear understanding of a fact. *Further guidance –note that the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.*	**2**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	**Explain why Juan's statement might be biased.** **Main Annotations**  **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; or similar. Candidates are likely to identify the following possible reasons for bias from Juan's statement • refers to his grandparents • details their experience • refers to his and his family's future living with them • says he will be able to work in their business • mentions he can live with them Candidates are likely to identify the following evidence of bias from Juan's statement: • Lack of focus on negative aspects of living in the city • Emotive language • Lack of evidence to support his opinion • Focused only on personal experience • refers to his future • vested interest. The following levels of response should be used to award marks: **Level 3 (3 marks) Good response** A clear explanation of why the statement may be biased supported with evidence from the statement. **Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response** A basic or partial understanding/explanation of why the statement may be biased. **Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response** A Limited explanation of why the statement may be biased. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	**3**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	**Which argument is more convincing, Elena's or Juan's?** **Your answer should consider both arguments, and you should support your point of view with their words.** **You should also consider:** • **the strength of their reasoning and evidence** • **their use of language** • **the different types of information used.** **Main Annotations J**  **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:	**15**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	**Level 5 (13–15 marks) Very good response** Clear, credible, and well supported points/explanation about which argument is more convincing. Coherent, structured evaluation of both arguments with clear comparison. The response usually contains three (or more) developed evaluative points and may include some undeveloped points. Material from the sources is used as evidence to support the evaluation; clear reference to the evidence and/or arguments in the source e.g. quotation/summary of ideas. A clear judgement is reached. **Level 4 (10–12 marks) Good response** Clear, supported points/explanation about which argument is more convincing. Evaluation of both arguments, with comparison. The response usually 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. Material from the sources is used as evidence to support the evaluation; some reference to the evidence and/or arguments in the source e.g. quotation/summary of ideas. A judgment is reached. **Level 3 (7–9 marks) Reasonable response** Reasonable points/explanation about which argument is more convincing. Some evaluation of both arguments, with an attempt at comparison or very good evaluation of only one argument. Some judgements and evaluative points are partially supported or asserted. Usually 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. Some material from the sources may be used as evidence to support the evaluation. The response may occasionally lack some clarity and by difficult to follow. An attempt is made to give a 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 usually contains two (or more) undeveloped points. A basic judgement may be reached.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	**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. *Responses that give a very good evaluation of only one argument may achieve Level 3 but no higher.*	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**A government wants to improve the lives of migrants in cities.** **The following suggestions have been made:** • **Encourage businesses in cities to employ migrants.** • **Build better-quality housing for migrants.** • **Limit the number of migrants who can move to the city.** **Which <u>one</u> of these would you recommend to the government?** **In your answer, you should:** • **state your opinion** • **give reasons and evidence to support your opinion** • **use the material in the sources and/or any of your own ideas** • **consider different arguments and perspectives.** **Main Annotations J**  **Indicative Content** Candidates are expected to make a judgement about improving the lives of migrants in cities. Candidates may use and develop the material found in Sources 1 to 4 but should go beyond 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 cities • reference to different consequences and implications for individuals/groups/government • how long it might take to make a difference • barriers to change • 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 and credible reasoning about the actions. Different arguments and perspectives are clearly considered. The response usually 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.	**24**

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**Level 4 (15–19 marks) Good response** Clear, supported and credible reasoning about the actions. Different arguments and perspectives are considered. The response usually 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. **Level 3 (10–14 marks) Reasonable response** Some supported reasoning about the actions. Different arguments and perspectives are included. The response usually 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 actions. Different arguments are included; perspectives, if present, are unclear. The response relies on assertion rather than evidence but usually 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. Different arguments may be included. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	

© UCLES 2023