GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES 0457/32

Paper 3 Written Paper May/June 2017

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

[Turn over

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
1(a)	Candidates may identify the following trend: Going Up/Rising/Increasing 1 mark for the correct answer.	1	**Further Guidance** (a) The only acceptable answer is located in Source 1. However, candidates may use their own words.
1(b)	Candidates may identify the following country: Norway 1 mark for the correct answer.	1	**Further Guidance** (a) The only acceptable answer is located in Source 1. (b) Candidates must give the full name of the country from Source 1.

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
1(c)	Indicative content The following benefits of trading with other countries may be identified from the source: • increased opportunity to find a job • increased standard of living. • people get better housing • improved health. • stimulates the economy • businesses can grow and become successful • increased tax income from larger businesses • governments can spend more money on education, health and transport. • closer communication and cultural exchange between countries. • builds relationships and promotes global peace Candidates are likely to give the following reasons to justify their choice: • possible further consequences or effects or benefits • degree of impact/seriousness for individuals/countries/world • how many people/groups/countries are affected • increasing cycle of poverty • how widespread the problem is • how easy to solve • effects on political life and social stability • increase in crime • other reasonable response	4	**Further Guidance** (a) Candidates may discuss 'benefits' from the sources as listed above; However, the assessment is focussed upon their reasoning/justification and so other benefits should be credited.

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
1(c)	**Level 4 (4 marks) Strong response** Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of why one benefit is more important; may compare different benefits; with two (or more) developed points or a range of undeveloped points, clearly linked to a benefit. **Level 3 (3 marks) Reasonable response** Some reasoned explanation of why one benefit is more important, with one (or more) developed point(s) or several undeveloped points. The link between the explanation and a benefit may be implicit at times. **Level 2 (2 marks) Basic response** Identifies a benefit as important but argument is weak or not linked to the issue explicitly. **Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response** Simple identification of a benefit but no attempt to justify or the reasoning is not related to the issue. Source material copied or recycled without development/explanation. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
1(d)	Indicative content Candidates are likely to discuss the following reasons drawing upon the information in the sources: • The benefits/consequences of world trade for individuals, countries and the world • The benefits/consequences of world trade for economic growth – sustainability issues • The benefits/consequences of world trade for human welfare – food, security, health, opportunities, life chances, etc. • Issues of value and beliefs about equality and trade - fairness • Human rights • Morality – issues of right and wrong from different cultures • In response to government, United Nations and other NGO aims and goals for development • Security and conflict issues • Other reasonable responses **Level 3 (5–6 marks) Strong 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 link to governments 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 link to governments is mainly implicit.	6	**Further Guidance** (a) To reach L3 the response should address inequalities in world trade and governments. (b) For L1 and L2 accept trade in general.

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
1(d)	**Level 1 (1–2 marks) Basic response** Basic reasoning and explanation; the response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted points. Arguments are partial, generalised and lack clarity. The link to governments may not be apparent. Source material copied or recycled without development/ explanation. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant or creditworthy material		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
2(a)	Indicative content Candidates are likely to discuss the following evaluative points: **Strengths** • some factual evidence is used • several different types of evidence are used – opinion, fact, statistics, values • the evidence is generally relevant • the evidence is related clearly and explicitly to the argument • the evidence is used forcefully in a strongly worded argument • research evidence is cited • personal experience used • other reasonable response **Weaknesses** • research evidence is partially cited – the source and authorship are not clear • level of expertise of the author is not clear – may have poor knowledge claims • method of research is alleged/unclear • there is only a little clear, specific statistical/numerical evidence • the evidence is not easy to verify/check from the information provided • too much reliance on opinion and personal anecdote • evidence may be out of date • personal testimony/anecdote/values may not apply to other places/countries etc. • other reasonable responses	6	**Further Guidance** (a) The candidate does not need to discuss both strengths and weaknesses to reach Level 3.

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
2(a)	**Level 3 (5–6 marks) Good response** Clearly reasoned, credible and structured evaluation; usually two (or more) developed points clearly linked to the issue, usually with some other undeveloped points; or a range (four or more) of undeveloped points. Evaluation is clearly focussed on the evidence, its strengths and/or weaknesses, and the way it is used to support the view. 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 view. 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. Source material copied or recycled without development/explanation. An overall assessment or conclusion is weak or not attempted. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
2(b)	Indicative content **Possible Types of Information** • compare statistics/information on research – for individuals, countries and globally • interview or questionnaire data • expert testimony • material from international NGOs and pressure groups • other relevant response **Possible Sources of Information** • national and local governments and their departments • international organisations e.g. United Nations; UNESCO • research experts • research reports • pressure groups, charities and non government organisations • media and worldwide web • other relevant response **Possible Methods** • review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents • interviews • interview relevant experts • internet search • questionnaires • surveys • other relevant response **Level 3 (5–6 marks) Strong response** Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of ways to test the claim. The response is likely to contain two (or more) developed points, and may contain some undeveloped points. The response is clearly and explicitly related to testing the claim.	**6**	

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
2(b)	**Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response** Reasoned and mainly credible explanation of ways to test the claim. The response is likely to contain one (or more) developed point(s), and/or a range of undeveloped points. The response is implicitly related to testing the claim. **Level 1 (1–2 marks) Basic response** Basic explanation of ways to test the claim. The response is likely to contain one or two simple, undeveloped and asserted points. There is little relevance in the response to testing the claim – 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.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
3(a)	Indicative content An opinion is a point of view, belief, judgement or something that someone thinks but which cannot be verified or proven to be true. The following examples of opinions may be found in Source 4: • Fairtrade cannot help all workers • (fair trade) is too small to make a difference • (fair trade) will not make trade fairer. • There are better ways to improve world trade than fair trade • Fair trade is just a dream. • The market alone should set prices. • I believe that 'survival of the fittest' works best • Everybody Wins **Level 3 (3 marks) Strong response** The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of opinion and applies this accurately to a correct example identified from the source. **Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response** The response demonstrates some understanding of the nature of opinion and attempts to apply this to a correct example identified from the source. The explanation lacks some clarity and accuracy. **Level 1 (1 mark) Basic response** The candidate identifies one opinion from the source correctly but does not explain the reason; the response demonstrates very little or no understanding of the nature of opinion. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant or creditworthy material.	3	**Further Guidance** (a) If the example is incorrect the candidate must score 0 even if the reasoning suggests some understanding of the nature of opinion.

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
3(b)	**Indicative Content** A prediction is generally defined as a statement suggesting something which is likely to happen in the future. The following examples of predictions may be found in Source 4: • Fair trade will continue to grow in the future. • It (fair trade) is too small to make a difference and will not make trade fairer. **Level 3 (3 marks) Strong response** The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of prediction and applies this accurately to a correct example identified from the source. **Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response** The response demonstrates some understanding of the nature of prediction and attempts to apply this to a correct example identified from the source. The explanation lacks some clarity and accuracy. **Level 1 (1 mark) Basic response** The candidate identifies one prediction from the source correctly but does not explain the reason; the response demonstrates very little or no understanding of the nature of prediction. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.	3	**Further Guidance** (a) If the example is incorrect the candidate must score 0 even if the reasoning suggests some understanding of the nature of prediction.

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
3(c)	Indicative content Candidates are expected to evaluate the reasoning in the two statements and compare their effectiveness. They should make a supported judgement with some explanation about which person has the most effective reasoning. Candidates may consider the following types of issue: • quality of the argument • clarity • tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise • language • balance • quality of the evidence • relevance • sufficiency – sample • source • date – how recent • factual, opinion, value, anecdote • testimony – from experience and expert • knowledge claims • ability to see • sources of bias • gender • political • personal values • experience • likelihood of solutions working and consequences of their ideas • acceptability of their values to others • how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view	12	

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
3(c)	**Level 5 (11–12 marks) Very good response** Clear, credible and well supported points about which reasoning works better. Coherent, structured evaluation of both arguments with clear comparison. The response is likely to contain three (or more) developed evaluative points, and may include some undeveloped points. A clear judgement is reached. **Level 4 (8–10 marks) Strong response** Clear, supported points about which reasoning works better. Evaluation of how well the reasoning works for both arguments with comparison. The response is likely to contain 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 judgement is reached. **Level 3 (5–7 marks) Reasonable response** Reasonable points about which reasoning works better. Some evaluation of how well the reasoning works for one or both arguments with an attempt at comparison. Judgements and evaluative points are likely to be partially supported or asserted. One (or more) developed evaluative point(s), possibly with some undeveloped points; a range (three or more) of undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this band at the lower level. An attempt is made to give an overall judgement.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
3(c)	**Level 2 (3–4 marks) Basic response** Basic points about which reasoning works better. There may be only one argument considered in any detail, with little attempt at comparison. Judgements and evaluative points are likely to be partially supported and lack clarity/relevance at times. The response is likely to contain two (or more) undeveloped points. A basic judgement may be reached. **Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response** Limited and unsupported points about which reasoning works better. The response is likely to consider 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. Source material copied or recycled without development/explanation at the lower point in the range. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
4	**Indicative content** Candidates are expected to argue using reasons and evidence to justify their opinion and judgement about the issue i.e. to compare and assess the effectiveness of different forms of action to reduce inequality in world trade. Candidates are expected to use and develop the material found in the sources, but should go beyond simply repeating or recycling without adaptation. Other material may be introduced but it is not necessary to gain full marks. Candidates are likely to consider the following arguments: - reference to scale of impact on individual/group/governmental behaviour/actions - how long it takes to make a difference - the effects of cultural differences and beliefs - barriers to change - the power of collective action - the difficulties of changing individual behaviour - the influence of individuals and groups acting locally - the role of vested interests and power differences - potential conflict - difficulties in coordinating globally and across different countries with independence - cost and access to resources to implement change - governmental responses and action - other reasonable response	18	**Further Guidance** (a) The second set of bullet points in the question are to guide candidates and do not have to be specifically addressed to gain full marks.

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
4	**Level 5 (16–18 marks) Very good response** Clear, well supported and structured reasoning about the recommended course of action. Different arguments and perspectives are clearly considered. The response is likely to contain a range of clearly reasoned points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with three (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points. A clear judgement is reached. **Level 4 (12–15 marks) Strong response** Clear, supported reasoning with some structure about the recommended course of action. Different arguments and perspectives are considered. The response is likely to contain some reasoned points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with two (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points. A judgement is reached. **Level 3 (8–11 marks) Reasonable response** Some supported reasoning about the recommended course of action. Different arguments and perspectives are included. The response is likely to contain points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with one (or more) developed point(s), and some undeveloped points. An attempt is made to give an overall judgement. **Level 2 (4–7 marks) Basic response** Basic reasoning about the recommended course of action. Different arguments are included; perspectives, if present, are unclear. The response is likely to rely on assertion rather than evidence and contain some undeveloped points. A basic judgement may be attempted.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
4	**Level 1 (1–3 marks) Limited response** Limited and unsupported reasoning about the issue in general. Different arguments may be included. **Level 0 (0 marks)** No relevant response or creditworthy material.		