

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
International General Certificate of Secondary Education

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2011 question paper  
for the guidance of teachers**

**0457 GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES**

**0457/03**

Paper 3 (Written paper), maximum raw mark 100

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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2011</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

### Section A

- 1 (a) Read Source 1 again. Give two ways in which the life of the child in the poem is different from his parents' childhoods. [2]

He is growing up in the cold back streets of London rather than amongst the palm trees of Jamaica.

He reads or talks on the phone instead of playing cricket or helping mum/talking.

He takes the bus or underground instead of walking/riding a donkey.

Any two, one mark each.

- (b) Suggest one reason for these changes. [1]

His parents have migrated.

People generally became richer between their parents' childhood and their own.

Technological changes

Any one, or any reasonable alternative.

- (c) Suggest one further way in which a child's life has changed since the poem was published in 1988. [1]

Children play on computers/hand-held consoles.

Children communicate by Twitter/Facebook/email/Skype, etc.

Children are driven in cars.

Any one, or any reasonable alternative.

- (d) Read Sources 2 and 4 again. Give and explain two ways in which families are changing. [6]

Families are becoming more multiracial/multicultural. We can see this from the statistics in Source 2, which show increasing numbers of children from mixed backgrounds.

Parents generally have less control over children/children generally have more freedom. We can see this by the contrast between Grandpa Joe's parents and Amala's parents, as his parents just decided his career, and Amala's parents are considering what to do. (Accept other explanations.)

Children now have knowledge that their parents don't have, which means that parents can't always tell their children what to do, as Mama Samara says.

2 × 3 marks.

**Level 1: Basic Response.**

A change is suggested but there is little or no explanation/explanation is implied.

**Level 2: Reasonable Response.**

A change is suggested and there is some explanation.

**Level 3: Strong Response.**

A relevant change is suggested and there is a considered explanation.

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2011</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

### Sample candidate answers

#### Strong response

*Families are changing because people are becoming more multicultural, as can be deduced from the graphs of Source 2. It shows that there are coming more and more people in the US that belong to 2 or more races, and more multicultural people in SK too. So families become more multicultural as well.*

A change is suggested plus there is a considered explanation which refers to the resource documents. The references to the resource booklet partly explain the change and partly explain how we can tell there is a change.

#### Reasonable response

*Families are changing in the ideas about the future of children (source 4). Older people say that you should let your child decide what he or she wants to study because you must have joy in it but people of our parents' age want to decide for their children what they do.*

A change is suggested, and paraphrase of the opinions in the resource booklet given to explain it. However, although in the resource booklet it is a grandpa who suggests that Amala should have freedom, the candidate has missed the idea that parents are generally becoming less controlling of their children.

*Parents are not deciding what their child grows up to be because of the new technology teenagers got new knowledge.*

A change is suggested and there is some explanation (taken from but not explicitly referring to the resource booklet). Although the language is weak, the candidate has captured an idea which is in the resource booklet.

#### Basic response

*Teenagers are becoming more mature and they want to learn how to make a living on their own instead of using parents as a guide.*

The candidate has suggested a change which does not really emerge from the resource booklet. The additional information adds to the change rather than explaining it. On its own this would be worth 1, but if given in addition to a point about parents not deciding on their children's future, 0.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2011</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

## 2 Read Source 3 again.

- (a) What else do you need to know about the C-Zen to help you decide whether or not it should be legal for 16-year-olds with no driving license to drive the C-Zen on the roads in your country? Explain how this information would help you to decide.

### Information

One mark for information that is either vague or relevance only implied

Two marks for precise information that is definitely relevant [2]

### Explanation of how it will help

[3]

### Level 1: Basic Response.

[1]

Statement of relevance (or which hints at relevance).

### Level 2: Reasonable Response.

[2]

Explanation of how this information would help make a decision.

### Level 3: Strong Response.

[3]

Considered explanation of how this information might be helpful, which considers 'what if' scenarios (if this, then that ...).

Note that 'what if' scenarios are not sufficient for Level 3 marks without considered explanation.

### Indicative content

**Information:** I would need to know how fast the C-Zen could go.

**Explanation:** I would be more likely to let 16-year-olds with no license drive the C-Zen on roads in my country if it did not have a very high maximum speed, as high speeds can be dangerous, especially if the driver is untrained.

**Information:** I would need to know whether it could be driven on all roads or just quiet suburban roads.

**Explanation:** I would be more inclined to allow it to be driven on quiet suburban roads than on highways or busy city roads, because the risk of accidents to the children and others would be higher on busy roads with fast traffic.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2011</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

### Sample candidate answers

#### Strong response

*I would want to know whether it has already caused problems or accidents in France where the C-Zen is already in use by 16 year olds without license.*

*If there are already a lot of problems or accidents caused by the C-Zen, I would not allow 16 year olds without a license to drive the C-Zen in my country. With very few or no problems or accidents, I would allow them.*

The candidate has identified a relevant, important piece of information and expressed it with some precision. The explanation shows that the candidate is focused on the decision to be made (allowing 16 year olds with no license to drive the C-Zen on public roads) and has considered how different scenarios would affect the decision.

#### Basic response

*The capacity of the battery.*

*The capacity of the battery will help me decide whether or not to buy the car. It would show how many miles from home the children could go until the battery is empty.*

The capacity of the battery is not a key piece of information needed to help make a decision about whether the C-Zen should be legal on the roads for 16-year olds without a license (any more than the capacity of a fuel tank as opposed to the size of the engine is relevant to whether a motor cycle should be used on the road by 16 year olds without a license). The explanation relates to a decision about buying the car rather than allowing it on the roads for young drivers without a license, and ignores the possibility of recharging the battery anywhere except home.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2011	0457	03

Refer to Source 4.

- (b) What else do you need to know about Amala's planned computer company to help you decide how to advise her parents? Explain how this information would help you to decide.

**Information** [2]

One mark for information that is either vague or relevance only implied

Two marks for precise information that is definitely relevant

**Explanation of how it will help** [3]

**Level 1: Basic Response.** [1]

Statement of relevance (or which hints at relevance).

**Level 2: Reasonable Response.** [2]

Explanation of how this information would help make a decision.

**Level 3: Strong Response.** [3]

Considered explanation of how this information might be helpful, which considers 'what if' scenarios (if this, then that ...).

Note that 'what if' scenarios are not sufficient for Level 3 marks without considered explanation.

#### Indicative content

I would need to know what sort of company Amala is planning, and whether she has the relevant expertise to run it. If Amala is a software wizard, she is more likely to be doing the right thing than if she is just setting up a website and hoping to sell some stuff.

#### Sample candidate answers

Strong response

*Does the company have a business plan or stable financial base.*

*Teenagers sometimes make bad decisions because they are impetuous. If the planned company has a business plan and financial base, that show that Amala has planned that for a long time and the plan is sustainable. If not, then the plan is probably not going to be successful.*

The candidate has identified really significant, relevant information and explained with some thought how this will affect the decision. The explanation is focused on whether the company is likely to succeed or not, but the jump from this to advising Amala's parents is very small, so this answer was accepted as strong.

Reasonable response

*Will they get a sponsorship to get it started? Will they have enough knowledge to run a company?*

*It is quite expensive to run a company and how will they get the money and the knowledge needed to run a company.*

The candidate has identified some important information which is relevant to a decision about advising Amala's parents. However, the explanation merely restates the questions and does not show how the information would help to make a decision.

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2011</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

### 3 Refer to Source 4.

- (a) Give one value judgement from Grandpa Joe's response and explain why you think it is a value judgement. [3]

1 mark for value judgement, plus:

1 mark for some explanation.

2 marks for strong explanation.

e.g.

*I think this (parents controlling children less) is a good thing.* 'Good thing' here clearly places a positive value on this new relationship between parents and children.

*(I've had a very sensible, respectable life). (But there has been no excitement.)* Either of these could be argued to place a value on Grandpa Joe's life, although they are not value judgements in the same way as 'good thing.'

*You should give Amala the freedom to live her own life.* This clearly implies the value that it is a good thing to be free and to have the power to make choices about your own life.

- (b) Is the reasoning more convincing in Grandpa Joe's response or in Aunt Rashida's response? [12]

In your answer you should:

- consider the reliability of any knowledge claims they make;
- consider whether you accept any value judgements they make;
- consider the likelihood of any consequences they suggest or predictions they make;
- use examples of their words and phrases to support your point of view.

Marks	Description of Performance
Strong 11–12	Reasonable, well supported judgement whether Grandpa Joe or Aunt Rashida's reasoning is more convincing. Coherent, structured evaluation of how well reasoning works with focus on evaluation of knowledge claims, consequences or values.
Quite strong 8–10	Reasonable, supported judgement whether Grandpa Joe or Aunt Rashida's reasoning is more convincing. Mixture of points which evaluate the reasoning and justified (dis)agreement with statements made in the stimulus material, possibly with some evaluative reference to knowledge claims, consequences or values.
Reasonable 5–7	Reasonable judgement whether Grandpa Joe or Aunt Rashida's reasoning is more convincing. Justified (dis)agreement with statements made in the stimulus material, perhaps with some reference to knowledge claims, consequences or values.
Quite reasonable 3–4	Judgement whether Grandpa Joe or Aunt Rashida's reasoning is more convincing. Some justified (dis)agreement with statements made in the stimulus material mixed with opinion and paraphrase of the stimulus material.
Basic 1–2	Opinion or (dis)agreement with statements in the resource material plus some paraphrase or quotation of the stimulus material.
0	No creditworthy material.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2011</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

### Indicative content

Neither response is fully convincing, but Grandpa Joe's is more rationally convincing:

Grandpa Joe is measured and quite thoughtful. His personal anecdote does show one way in which it is a good thing that parents don't control children the way they used to, and this would be a reason for Amala's parents to give her some freedom. However, this one personal anecdote cannot be generalised to all circumstances, and it also doesn't consider whether it would have been better for Grandpa Joe to make his own decision to be a singer. The consequences of this decision might have been worse than a respectable but unexciting life. Furthermore, it is a big leap from it being a good thing that parents don't control their children like they used to, to giving Amala the freedom to live her own life. Grandpa Joe's opinion fits with current thinking about people living their own lives, *cf* value judgements. So it is quite convincing.

Aunty Rashida, on the other hand, is very extreme and not entirely logical. She generalises unfairly about teenagers, and leaps to the extreme and unlikely conclusion that they will all waste their lives if their elders do not make decisions for them. It is likely that some or many teenagers would make poor decisions some times, but this is not the same as wasting their lives. It is also not likely that adults will always make the best decisions for their children. She is also judgemental about what makes a life worthwhile or a waste – we could argue against her that a respectable life which does not make use of a real talent for singing would be a waste. She leaps to the conclusion that Grandpa Joe would have lived a life of depravity and moral excess, but there is nothing to support this, and she is making an unfair generalisation about singers and assuming without good reason that a fairly unlikely, extreme consequence would definitely have happened. This is a form of slippery slope reasoning, leaping to extreme consequences. Aunty Rashida's recommendation to shut Amala in her room seems rather extreme and counter productive.

Accept discussions of the values they hold with regard to parental duty. It could be argued that Grandpa Joe doesn't hold the parental duty to guide children seriously enough.

### Sample candidate answers

#### Strong response

*Grandpa Joe's response has more convincing reasoning. First of all, he's more reliable in the things he says, because he has good arguments for his statements. He for example links it to his own experiences and bases his value judgements on these experiences, making them easy to accept. Aunty Rashida's reasoning is not reliable because she simply says, 'everybody knows that...' without giving any arguments, not all teenagers are immature and need their parents, there's no prove of it. So for this reason, I do not accept her value judgements. Another thing is that she bases her predictions on nothing, according to her Grandpa Joe would have lived a life of poverty when he would have become a singer instead of a lawyer, but she bases this prediction on really nothing, because as a singer he could have become rich as well, it's even quite likely when thinking of the fact that singers are mostly well off!*

This response has evaluated the reasoning, often in terms of reliability of knowledge claims, likeliness of consequences and acceptability of value judgements. The candidate recognises the need for arguments (not just statistics) to support opinions, and uses common knowledge to test a prediction about what might have happened. A little more precision in terms of supporting opinions with reference to parts of the text would have improved this answer.

<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2011</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

Borderline reasonable/Quite strong response

*I think Grandpa Joe's response is more convincing than Aunty Rashida's, because he would've probably had a more exciting life only if his parents had given him a bit more freedom. Aunty Rashida's response about teenagers making bad decisions and therefore wasting their time is a huge prejudice, as this doesn't count for all teenagers. If Amala is sure that she wants to set up a computer company, and if she's convinced that it will be a success her parents should give her permission to do it. Aunty Rashida's response about Grandpa Joe's life if he had been a singer is a purely worst case scenario. She can't be sure if he would have lived a life of poverty if his parents hadn't been responsible for him. Maybe Grandpa Joe would have had great success. If that was the case he would've had a good life and on top of that, an exciting life.*

This response is mostly justified (dis)agreement with comments in the text rather than an evaluation of the reasoning. It is lifted by the almost evaluative comments about 'huge prejudice' and 'worst case scenario, she can't be sure.'

Basic response

*As Grandpa Joe said, young people should be allowed to live their own life and learn from their mistakes. Aunty Rashida is against youngsters get to live a life of their own and wants everything to be controlled by the parents otherwise they should punish the child by sending them to their room until they sees reason. Grandpa Joe's parents chose his profession and he said he had not excitement in life. Are people willing to make their child live a life without excitement? I agree with Grandpa Joe and think youngsters should be able to decide on their own.*

This response is restatement and paraphrase of the passage with one simple opinion. It is only just creditworthy.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2011	0457	03

**4 Do you think that freedom is bad for young people?**

**[15]**

**In your answer you should:**

- **give reasons for your opinion;**
- **use relevant examples to support your opinion (you may use your own experience);**
- **show that you have considered different points of view;**
- **explain why you disagreed with some of these points of view.**

Level 5 13–15	<p>Question answered precisely and logically, supported by some or all of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logically linked, coherent structure to the reasoning.</li> <li>• Candidates have made effective use of relevant ideas in the resource booklet as reasons to support their view and/or added their own relevant ideas. These ideas may be completely new, or they may be expansion of or response to existing material.</li> <li>• Relevant different point/s of view from candidate's own ideas or selected from resource booklet.</li> <li>• Thoughtful consideration of different point/s of view AND strong explanation of why disagreed which really answers the different point of view OR possibly a suggestion of a compromise position between different points of view.</li> </ul>
Level 4 10–12	<p>Question answered generally precisely and logically, generally supported by some or all of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally logically linked, fairly coherent structure to the reasoning.</li> <li>• Candidates have made use of relevant ideas from the resource booklet as reasons to support their view, and possibly added their own ideas which have some relevance. These ideas may be expansion of or response to existing material.</li> <li>• Relevant different point/s of view from candidate's own ideas or selected from the resource booklet.</li> <li>• Consideration of different point/s of view AND explanation of why disagreed which partly answers the different point of view OR possibly an attempted suggestion of a compromise position between different points of view.</li> </ul>
Level 3 7–9	<p>Question answered broadly, partly supported by some or all of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EITHER structured reasoning with some lack of logic OR logical reasoning in parts with a lack of overall structure.</li> <li>• Candidates have included relevant ideas from the resource booklet as reasons to support their view and may have included their own ideas which have little relevance.</li> <li>• Relevant different point/s of view are taken from the resource booklet.</li> <li>• Some consideration of different point/s of view AND an attempt to explain why disagreed with different point of view.</li> </ul>

Page 11	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2011	0457	03

Level 2 4–6	<p>Question may be answered EITHER too vaguely OR too extremely, combined with some or all of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reasoning lacks structure and logic, perhaps by being exaggerated, overstated and rhetorical.</li> <li>• Candidates have included some ideas from the resource booklet in their answer, but these may lack relevance and any own ideas lack relevance.</li> <li>• Different point/s of view may be inappropriately taken from the resource material.</li> <li>• Somewhat unconsidered attempt to explain why disagreed with different point/s of view.</li> </ul>
Level 1 1–3	<p>The question may not be answered at all. Some or all of the following characteristics may be present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasoning tends to be restatement from the passage with little or no manipulation.</li> <li>• The candidate may restate alternative points of view from the resource booklet with little or no manipulation.</li> <li>• There may be simple disagreement with or rejection of different point/s of view.</li> </ul>
0	No creditworthy material.

### Indicative content

Consequences of too much freedom.  
Discussion of what too much freedom means.

### Sample candidate answers

Strong response

*No, I don't think freedom is bad for young people, because I think young people need freedom to find out what they want in their life and what they need in their life. Without freedom, they cannot develop themselves properly and they cannot find out what they want in their life, because without knowing the opportunities that life offers you and without messing around a bit to see what you want and what you like (2 things you can't do without freedom) you will never be able to decide for yourself how you want to spend your life in future. My parents have for example never told me what I should do after my primary school. I chose to go to my current school and do my current study. And the thing is, I'm perfectly happy now and that my mother not even has to push me to work for school because I do that myself.*

*However, freedom for young people can be very bad, because young people that aren't very motivated might need to get some pressure from their parents to do something, to achieve something in life. That's the other side of the story but I personally don't think that parents should give their children less freedom because they're afraid that their children will otherwise never get somewhere because this would be the choice of the child, if he or she choose to do nothing and achieve nothing.*

The question is answered precisely and mostly logically, with strong logical links in the first paragraph, relevant reasons which are explained and related to freedom and a relevant example from the candidate's own life. The alternative point of view is relevant but is disagreed with rather than answered – the candidate assumes rather than argues that choice is more important than eventual success. Because of the logical reasoning and the relevant alternative view this is a strong answer, but at the bottom of the level.

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2011</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

Reasonable response

*Freedom is bad for young people to a certain extent.*

*Some might take advantage of their freedom and waste their whole life playing and slacking and no career or future. But too little freedom makes them insecure and really stressed as they'll have to study every day.*

*If I was given too much freedom, I would just watch television all day, use the computer to surf the internet and watch videos, or even playing computer games all day long. Not only wasting my time on useless stuff, affecting my studies, in the future I might not have a successful life and a bad career. If the right amount of freedom was given, you would plan your day, giving yourself time to study and to relax so that you won't stress yourself out. This is why I disagree to too much freedom.*

*Freedom seems that teenagers would do anything they like, they would not learn in school, maybe the important of thoughts, such people that don't learn are easily affected by their curiosity and the addiction in the real world such as drugs, without education, plus the freedom to their child, it is easy to get themselves into troubles and problems such as drug addiction or alcoholic drinker. Such problems takes time to recover from and not easily resolved. But we should learn from mistakes and spread the word.*

*I think that teenagers are given certain freedoms but also rules to follow to prevent themselves getting into troubles.*

This is structured reasoning with some logically satisfactory parts and some parts where there are leaps of logic and overstated consequences. There is an attempt to show the alternative perspective that some freedom is good for young people, but there is no reasoning to support this.

Basic response

*I think youngsters should be allowed more freedom.*

*Nowadays parents decide a lot in their lives and they do not get to live the life they wanted. On the other hand far more elders discuss the opportunities and what consequences some decisions can have.*

*I, myself, have discussed with my parents what I wanted to do when I grew many times. We always end up arguing and them telling me it's a bad idea. I think parents should accept the fact that their child have other life ambitions than they had and should let the life a live of their own. Then if they make a mistake they learn from it.*

This response is rather vague and generalises from the candidate's own experience, rather than using personal experience as an example. No alternative point of view taken seriously. Statement of opinion rather than reasoning.

Page 13	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2011	0457	03

### Section B

- 5 (a) Give two reasons why cabin crew are striking. [2]

We need to show the managers that they cannot treat us this way.  
 They want to reduce our pay.  
 They want to increase our work.  
 If we stop working, managers will realise that they need us,  
 and then they might treat us like people with lives instead of just as expensive parts of their business.  
 Companies should respect people.

Credit other possible answers in the candidate's own words.  
 Any two, one mark each.

- (b) Give two reasons to oppose the strike. [2]

It is disrupting people's holiday plans.  
 If the cabin crew don't accept changes, there won't be an airline and they won't have jobs at all.  
 We should respect the people we serve.

Credit other possible answers in the candidate's own words.  
 Any two, one mark each.

- (c) To what extent do you think this is this a local dispute and to what extent an international dispute? Explain your answer. [6]

**Level 0: No creditworthy material.** [0]

**Level 1: Basic Response.** [1–2]  
 Simplistic answer with little or no explanation / the explanation is implied but not clarified.

**Level 2: Reasonable Response.** [3–4]  
 An answer (perhaps a little simple or over-stated) with an explanation which might refer to less relevant aspects of the source documents.

**Level 3: Strong Response.** [5–6]  
 A thoughtful, considered answer with convincing explanation using and drawing implications from relevant aspects of the source documents.

#### Indicative content

It's a local dispute in that it is between staff and management of a company, which would normally be thought of as local. The dispute itself is about the working conditions, which in itself is a local dispute. However, it is a dispute with international consequences because the company is an airline, so people like the man in the audience may not be able to get home.

Page 14	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2011	0457	03

- 6 You are in the audience at the television discussion. Ask one question to each main speaker. Explain how the answer to each question might help you to decide whether or not to support the strike.

Question for Ellie Turnbull: [2]

How the answer to this question might help me decide whether or not to support the strike. [3]

Question for Hosni Mahmoud: [2]

How the answer to this question might help me decide whether or not to support the strike. [3]

In each case, the **question** should be marked:

2 marks: well-phrased question which would elicit relevant information.

1 mark: question which would elicit some information on the topic.

In each case, the **explanation** should be marked:

1 mark: basic statement of relevance (or which hints at relevance).

2 marks: explanation of how this information would help make a decision.

3 marks: considered explanation of how this information might be helpful, which considers 'what if' scenarios (if this, then that ...).

Note that 'what if' scenarios are not sufficient for 3 marks without relevant explanation.

Note that candidates should ask different questions of Turnbull and Mahmoud for full marks. Note also that the questions should be focused on the role of the person and show awareness of what each person might know; a question which would gain full marks if asked of Mahmoud in his role as boss, may well not gain full marks if asked of Ellie Turnbull. Note also that candidates should ask for new information, not for information or arguments which have been provided in the stimulus material.

### Sample candidate answers

Strong response

Question for Ellie Turnbull

*Why can this problem of reducing pay and increasing work not be solved in another way than with a strike, with talking for example?*

*If she has a good reason why only a strike will help the problem I would support the strike. But if she can't come up with (a) very convincing argument(s) to the question (which I think will be the case) I would definitely not support the strike.*

This response gives a question to test Ellie Turnbull's motives and provides a considered explanation of how the information might be helpful, considering 'what if' scenarios.

Question for Hosni Mahmoud

*Is there other ways to reduce the cost of flight?*

*By knowing this, I can see whether lower the pay for cabin crew is only way to reduce the cost or there are other ways to reduce the cost without affecting people's lives. If there is some other ways to reduce the cost, then I support the strike.*

This question is relevant to Mahmoud and targets relevant information that will help to make a difference. The explanation is focused and relevant.

<b>Page 15</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2011</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

Reasonable response

Question for Ellie Turnbull

*Do you think it is fair you want more money when you already get twice as much as others doing less work?*

*The answer to this question is very important as I see them as greedy and not taking what they get many people do not even have a job!*

This is a mixed response. The question is relevant and targeted to Turnbull. The explanation is basic, expresses an opinion about the situation rather than showing how the answer might help come to a decision – but the candidate has shown an understanding that the question is important.

Basic response

Question for Hosni Mahmoud

*Why do you not rely on your customers to still buy your flight if it is higher quality?*

*He has to reply on their high quality and appreciate that he do not have to clean the planes himself.*

There is some merit in the question, although it does not really focus on the strike. The explanation does not show how the candidate would use information to decide whether or not to support the strike. There is credit only for the question.

<b>Page 16</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2011</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

- 7 (a) The Man in the audience talks of going home to visit family, including his sick grandmother. Do you think that he is typical of the people who planned to travel with Airways to the World? Explain your answer. [3]

He seems to be typical of people who fly home to see families in December, as introduced by the television presenter. However, the urgency of visiting a sick relative is probably less typical.

1 mark: basic attempt to explain.

2 marks: explanation of how typical the Man in the audience is, probably with reference to flying home.

3 marks: considered explanation of how typical the Man in the audience is, probably with reference to flying home being typical but needing to see his sick grandmother being less typical.

- (b) Ellie Turnbull says, 'Striking is truly the right thing to do. 95% of our members voted to strike. We need to show the managers that they cannot treat us this way. They want to reduce our pay and increase our work. This is unfair. It threatens our livelihood. If we stop working, managers will realise that they need us, and then they might treat us like people with lives instead of just as expensive parts of their business.'

How convincing is this part of her reasoning?

In your answer you should:

- consider one of the values she holds;
- consider the likelihood of one of the consequences she suggests;
- use examples of her words and phrases to support your point of view. [6]

**Level 0: No creditworthy material.** [0]

**Level 1: Basic Response.** [1–2]

EITHER simple opinion followed by paraphrase of or (dis)agreement with the text

OR an undeveloped point which hints at an evaluative point

OR stock, pre-learned phrases which are not well applied to this particular argument.

**Level 2: Reasonable Response.** [3–4]

EITHER justified agreement or disagreement with the argument

OR some evaluative comment relating to the quality of this particular argument which might offer some support to a conclusion about how convincing it is.

**Level 3: Strong Response.** [5–6]

A structured response which uses evaluation of the quality of this particular argument to support a conclusion about how convincing it is.

### Indicative content

Ellie Turnbull's value that it is unfair to increase work and reduce pay seems reasonable on the face of it, but it might depend on the circumstances and what the alternatives are. If the cabin crew are overpaid by comparison to other airlines' cabin crew, it might be fair to pay them in accordance with going rates. If Hosni Mahmoud is right that the airline cannot afford to pay current wages, and if the airline is likely to go bust without changes, then we would think that reducing pay and increasing work was a better option than there being no work for any of the crew.

Page 17	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2011	0457	03

Turnbull predicts that, 'If we stop working, managers will realise that they need us, and then they might treat us like people with lives instead of just as expensive parts of their business.' In the best case scenario, the consequence that managers will realise they need cabin crew and treat them better could possibly happen. However, it is also likely, and perhaps more probable, that managers will perceive cabin crew as difficult and treat them much worse.

If we also consider the additional evidence from the woman in the audience, that cabin crew voted to strike, but did not get a choice about when or for how long, then Ellie Turnbull's reasoning to support her claim that 'striking is right' seems fairly unconvincing.

### Sample candidate responses

#### Strong response

*I think she is not very convincing because one of her value is that it's unfair to reduce pay and increase work, but as the company in having too high costs at the moment, they don't really have another choice, which is something she should be able to accept as well, I think ... also, she suggests as consequence of the strike, that the managers will realise that 'they need us' and that they will then treat them like people instead of 'just as expensive parts of the business.' I think this consequences is quite unlikely, because after such a big strike of two weeks, the managers won't be very happy with them any more and might even fire them and hire new crew.*

This response evaluates Turnbull's reasoning in terms of one of her values and one of the consequences she predicts. Judgements are supported.

#### Reasonable response

*Ellie Turnbull's reasoning is convincing to a great extent as she claimed that the managers wanted to reduce pay and increase work load. She holds a value that all humans have rights to protect their rights not only to be fair but also to be reasonable. Managers took advantage of their power to add work to the cabin crew. Not only is it unreasonable, it is unfair.*

*Striking not only would make the managers realise how important they are and to treat them right as well, and not just an expensive part of the business.*

*Consequences might affect national as the Airways would stop running. I think that striking would be one of the good way to do. Maybe the manager thinks that they have not been working well enough to compete with other airline.*

This response mostly repeats the stimulus material with agreement or disagreement and comments on the situation. However, it does identify and comment on a value – the first paragraph could almost be evaluation of the value – and it does identify a consequence.

<b>Page 18</b>	<b>Mark Scheme: Teachers' version</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – May/June 2011</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

- (c) Hosni Mahmoud says, '... there won't be an airline and they won't have jobs at all.'  
Do you think this is a likely consequence of the cabin crew refusing to accept changes? Give reasons to support your point of view. [6]

**Level 0: No creditworthy material.** [0]

**Level 1: Basic Response.** [1–2]

Candidates restate material from the stimulus passage OR state an opinion supported by some reasoning, but NOT related to the likelihood of the consequence (of no airline and no jobs) following from workers refusing to accept changes.

**Level 2: Reasonable Response.** [3–4]

A response which gives a clear statement of opinion supported by an attempt at reasoning based on the likelihood of the consequence (no airline, no jobs) following from cabin crew refusing to accept changes.

**Level 3: Strong Response.** [5–6]

A structured response which gives clear and persuasive reasons based on the likelihood of the consequence (no airline, no jobs) following from the cabin crew refusing to accept changes and includes some awareness of ambiguity/the balance of probability/what if reasoning.

#### **Indicative content**

It seems like an extreme consequence that a strike will lead to no airline and no jobs. Even if the general economic climate does lead to this airline collapsing, it is likely that the staff, regarded as some of the best, will get other jobs.

#### **Sample candidate response**

Strong response

No, I don't think so. What he states here is that the airline will fail if the crew don't accept changes. This would mean that the costs are then so high that the airline just has to stop. I don't think this will happen because such big companies always have this extra money for emergencies, so it won't go that quick. When the airline really needs to quit, however, the statement that the crew then has no jobs at all then is true, but not for a very long time, I think, because they will be able to find a new job quite fast.

Page 19	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2011	0457	03

**8 Is it ever right for workers to strike?**

**[15]**

**In your answer you should:**

- **give reasons for your opinion;**
- **use relevant examples to support your opinion (you may use your own experience);**
- **show that you have considered different points of view;**
- **explain why you disagreed with some of these points of view.**

Level 5 13–15	<p>Question answered precisely and logically, supported by some or all of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logically linked, coherent structure to the reasoning.</li> <li>• Candidates have made effective use of relevant ideas in the resource booklet as reasons to support their view and/or added their own relevant ideas. These ideas may be completely new, or they may be expansion of or response to existing material.</li> <li>• Relevant different point/s of view from candidate's own ideas or selected from resource booklet.</li> <li>• Thoughtful consideration of different point/s of view AND strong explanation of why disagreed which really answers the different point of view OR possibly a suggestion of a compromise position between different points of view.</li> </ul>
Level 4 10–12	<p>Question answered generally precisely and logically, generally supported by some or all of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally logically linked, fairly coherent structure to the reasoning.</li> <li>• Candidates have made use of relevant ideas from the resource booklet as reasons to support their view, and possibly added their own ideas which have some relevance. These ideas may be expansion of or response to existing material.</li> <li>• Relevant different point/s of view from candidate's own ideas or selected from the resource booklet.</li> <li>• Consideration of different point/s of view AND explanation of why disagreed which partly answers the different point of view OR possibly an attempted suggestion of a compromise position between different points of view.</li> </ul>
Level 3 7–9	<p>Question answered broadly, partly supported by some or all of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EITHER structured reasoning with some lack of logic OR logical reasoning in parts with a lack of overall structure.</li> <li>• Candidates have included relevant ideas from the resource booklet as reasons to support their view and may have included their own ideas which have little relevance.</li> <li>• Relevant different point/s of view are taken from the resource booklet.</li> <li>• Some consideration of different point/s of view AND an attempt to explain why disagreed with different point of view.</li> </ul>
Level 2 4–6	<p>Question may be answered EITHER too vaguely OR too extremely, combined with some or all of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The reasoning lacks structure and logic, perhaps by being exaggerated, overstated and rhetorical.</li> <li>• Candidates have included some ideas from the resource booklet in their answer, but these may lack relevance and any own ideas lack relevance.</li> <li>• Different point/s of view may be inappropriately taken from the resource material.</li> <li>• Somewhat unconsidered attempt to explain why disagreed with different point/s of view.</li> </ul>

Page 20	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2011	0457	03

Level 1 1–3	<p>The question may not be answered at all. Some or all of the following characteristics may be present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reasoning tends to be restatement from the passage with little or no manipulation.</li> <li>The candidate may restate alternative points of view from the resource booklet with little or no manipulation.</li> <li>There may be simple disagreement with or rejection of different point/s of view.</li> </ul>
0	No creditworthy material.

### Sample candidate responses

Quite strong response

*No, I don't think workers are ever right to strike, because when you sign your contract somewhere at a company, you say more or less that you will accept everything that the business decides to do, so when they for example decide to go to another city or when they decide to reduce the pay, you accept that. I work at the supermarket for example, and next year the whole supermarket will move to another place, which means I will temporarily not be able to work. Of course this is not a very nice thing, but as I signed my contract I will have to accept it, or if I really think this can't go, I can quite my job there and search for something else, but there's definitely no right to strike.*

*However if your pay gets reduced quite a lot and your work gets increased, you might feel something for a strike, I can definitely understand that. But I think that you will not achieve anything with this strike then and talking with your manager will help more. And if it really doesn't suit you, you can always decide to quit your job.*

Question is answered generally precisely and logically, with coherent structure and logic. There is an attempt to empathise with a different point of view, and a suggestion of a better action with justification. Not quite logical enough or thoughtful enough for strong response.

Reasonable response

*I think it could be right to strike but only if the situation is too unacceptable. Sometimes people get paid too less for the amount of work they do. I don't think this would be a reason to strike, but imagine someone in the army. If soldiers would not be paid reasonably well, I think that should be a reason to strike. That is because these people are paid to restore peace on our planet, taking the risk that they could die to achieve this goal. So if people's jobs carry a risk with them, and they get a bad payment for it, it should be a reason to strike. For people like the cabin crew, they should be happy that they have the job. A lot of people are unemployed and they would be happy to do their jobs even with a lower payment.*

This response just edges into reasonable. The question is answered with some thought, but this answer is only partly supported by the two examples. There is quite a leap of logic from soldiers striking to anyone whose job is risky and ill paid striking – and this description could cover the cabin crew who are told to be happy with their jobs. The last paragraph is a response to the stimulus material rather than to the question; it is implied that their situation is not unacceptable enough to strike, but not argued for.