



---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES**

**0457/31**

Paper 3 Written Paper

**October/November 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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

This document consists of **15** printed pages.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	<p>Candidates identify any two of the following from Source 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improves confidence</li> <li>• Develops fitness</li> <li>• Brings people together</li> <li>• Provides entertainment</li> <li>• Relieves stress</li> </ul> <p>1 mark for each correct answer, up to a maximum of 2 marks</p>	<b>2</b>	<p><b>Further Guidance</b></p> <p>The only acceptable answers are located in Source 1. Candidates may use their own words and the answers can be in any order.</p>
1(b)	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates are likely to discuss the following effects drawing upon the information in the sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too competitive</li> <li>• Can cause injuries</li> <li>• Encourages bullying</li> <li>• Too time-consuming</li> <li>• Costs too much</li> </ul> <p>Candidates are likely to give the following reasons to justify their choice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible further consequences or effects</li> <li>• Degree of impact/seriousness for individuals/groups</li> <li>• How many people/groups/countries are affected</li> <li>• Increasing cycle of disadvantage</li> <li>• Other reasonable response.</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	<p><b>Further guidance</b></p> <p>Candidates must discuss one of the negative effects from Source 1 as listed; the assessment is focussed upon their reasoning/justification</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)	<p>The following levels of response should be used to award marks.</p> <p><b>Level 4 (4 marks) Strong response</b> Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation; may compare different negative effects; usually two (or more) developed arguments clearly linked to the issue; or a range of undeveloped reasons.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (3 marks) Reasonable response</b> Some reasoned explanation of why one negative effect is more serious; usually one (or more) developed argument(s) suggested with some link to the issue, but may be implicit at times; or several undeveloped reasons.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2 marks) Basic response</b> Identifies a negative effect as serious but argument is weak or not linked to the issue explicitly.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response</b> Simple identification of a negative effect but no attempt to justify or the reasoning is not related to the issue.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(c)	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates are likely to discuss the following reasons drawing upon the information in Sources 1 and 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The positive effects of sport at a local level</li> <li>• The negative effects of sport at a local level</li> <li>• Issues of value and beliefs about sport, health and community</li> <li>• Other reasonable responses</li> </ul> <p>The following levels of response should be used to award marks:</p> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Strong response</b> Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of significance; usually two (or more) developed arguments clearly linked to the issue; or three (or more) undeveloped reasons.</p> <p>The local dimension is explicit.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response</b> Some reasoned explanation of significance; 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.</p> <p>The local dimension is mainly implicit.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Basic response</b> Basic reasoning and explanation; the response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted points. Arguments are partial, generalised and lack clarity.</p> <p>The local dimension may not be apparent.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant or creditworthy material</p>	<b>6</b>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	<p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible types of information               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– compare statistics/information</li> <li>– interview or questionnaire data</li> <li>– expert testimony</li> <li>– case studies</li> <li>– other relevant response</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Possible sources of information               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– national and local governments and their departments</li> <li>– international organizations e.g. United Nations; UNESCO</li> <li>– experts</li> <li>– research reports</li> <li>– pressure groups, charities and non government organizations</li> <li>– media and worldwide web</li> <li>– other relevant response</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Possible methods               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents</li> <li>– interviews</li> <li>– interview relevant experts</li> <li>– internet search</li> <li>– questionnaires</li> <li>– surveys</li> <li>– other relevant response</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>6</b>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	<p>The following levels of response should be used to award marks:</p> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Strong response</b> 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.</p> <p>The response is clearly and explicitly related to testing the claim.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response</b> 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.</p> <p>The response is implicitly related to testing the claim.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Basic response</b> Basic explanation of ways to test the claim. The response is likely to contain one or two simple, undeveloped and asserted points.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(b)	<p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People you would need to persuade; businesses, parents, young people, local council, etc.</li> <li>• These people have the power to do something about the situation.</li> <li>• Reasons for the need</li> <li>• Advertising, interviews, posters, etc.</li> </ul> <p>The following levels of response should be used to award marks.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Strong Response</b> Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of how you could persuade people. The response is likely to have developed a response for two (or more) points, and some undeveloped points. The response is clearly and explicitly related to the issue.</p> <p>Lower in the band a greater proportion of the points will be left undeveloped.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable Response</b> Some supported reasoning and explanation. The response is likely to have a developed response for one (or more) point(s), and some undeveloped points. The relevance to the issue is apparent but may be implicit at times.</p> <p>Lower in the band points may begin to lack clarity, and/or be partial and generalised.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Basic Response</b> Basic reasoning and explanation. The response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted suggestions, with only one (or more) undeveloped point(s). Explanations are partial and lack clarity. There is little relevance to the issue.</p> <p>Lower in the band the points are likely to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and/or simply recycle/copy material from the source without any explanation or development.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant or creditworthy material</p>	<b>6</b>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(a)	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>It's an opinion as this what the person thinks or what she believes and/or she doesn't verify what she says with any evidence or proof.</p> <p><b><i>The statement is not a fact and this response should not be rewarded.</i></b></p> <p>The following levels of response should be used to award marks.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (3 marks) Strong response</b> The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of opinion.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response</b> The response demonstrates some understanding of the nature of opinion. The explanation lacks some clarity and accuracy.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark) Basic response</b> The candidate identifies an opinion but does not explain the nature of opinion; the response demonstrates very little understanding.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>	3	<p><b>Further Guidance</b></p> <p>1 Only award marks when opinion has been identified, even if the explanation of a wrong answer reveals some understanding of opinions.</p> <p>2 If the response only justifies 'opinion' by suggesting the statement starts with 'I think' and does not explain that an opinion <b><i>is what a person thinks</i></b>, then partial understanding at L2.</p>



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(b)	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>A value judgement is a view or belief about what is important.</p> <p>The following examples of value judgements may be found in Source 3:</p> <p>Brigit: 'it's just not fair' – being made to do sport at school/it's so embarrassing ...</p> <p>Bruno: 'I will continue to take part in sporting events to raise money for good causes, because it's the right thing to do.'</p> <p>The following levels of response should be used to award marks.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (3 marks) Strong response</b> The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of value judgements and applies this accurately to a correct example identified from the source.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response</b> The response demonstrates some understanding of the nature of value judgements and attempts to apply this to a correct example identified from the source. The explanation lacks some clarity and accuracy.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark) Basic response</b> The candidate identifies one value judgement from the source correctly but does not explain the reason; the response demonstrates very little or no understanding of the nature of values.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>	3	<p><b>Further Guidance</b></p> <p>If the selected example is incorrect the candidate must score 0 even if the reasoning suggests some understanding of the nature of value judgements.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(c)	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Candidates may consider the following types of issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of the argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– clarity</li> <li>– tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise</li> <li>– language</li> <li>– balance</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Quality of the evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– relevance</li> <li>– sufficiency – sample</li> <li>– source – media; radio</li> <li>– date – how recent</li> <li>– factual, opinion, value, anecdote</li> <li>– testimony – from experience and expert</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Knowledge claims</li> <li>• Ability to see</li> <li>• Sources of bias <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– gender</li> <li>– political</li> <li>– personal values</li> <li>– experience</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Likelihood of solutions working and consequences of their ideas</li> <li>• Acceptability of their values to others <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>12</b>	<p><b>Further Guidance</b></p> <p>If the response only discusses one of the statements then L3 is the maximum that can be awarded.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(c)	<p>The following levels of response should be used to award marks.</p> <p><b>Level 5 (11–12 marks) Very good response</b> Clear, credible and well supported points about which reasoning works better. Coherent, structured evaluation of both arguments with clear comparison.</p> <p>The response is likely to contain three (or more) developed evaluative points, and may include some undeveloped points.</p> <p>A clear judgement is reached.</p> <p><b>Level 4 (8–10 marks) Strong response</b> Clear, supported points about which reasoning works better. Evaluation of how well the reasoning works for both arguments with some comparison. The response is likely to contain two (or more) developed evaluative points and may include some undeveloped points.</p> <p>A wide range (four or more) of undeveloped but clearly appropriate points may be sufficient to enter this band at the lower level.</p> <p>A judgement is reached.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (5–7 marks) Reasonable response</b> 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.</p> <p>An attempt is made to give an overall judgement.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(c)	<p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Basic response</b> Basic points about which reasoning works better. Only one argument may be considered in any detail, with little attempt at comparison or undeveloped discussion of both statements with little explanation and significant assertion.</p> <p>Judgements and evaluative points are likely to be partially supported and lack clarity/relevance at times.</p> <p>The response is likely to contain two (or more) undeveloped points.</p> <p>A basic judgement may be reached.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response</b> 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.</p> <p>The response may not contain any clear evaluative points.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates are expected to argue using reasons and evidence to justify their opinion and judgement about the issue i.e. whether young people should be made to take part in sport at school.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to consider the following arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reference to scale of impact on individual/group/governmental behaviour/actions</li> <li>• how long it takes to make a difference</li> <li>• the effects of cultural differences and beliefs</li> <li>• barriers to change</li> <li>• the power of collective action</li> <li>• the difficulties of changing individual behaviour</li> <li>• the influence of individuals and groups acting locally</li> <li>• the role of vested interests and power differences</li> <li>• potential conflict</li> <li>• difficulties in coordinating globally and across different countries with independence</li> <li>• cost and access to resources to implement change</li> <li>• governmental responses and action</li> <li>• other reasonable response</li> </ul>	12	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>The following levels of response should be used to award marks:</p> <p><b>Level 5 (16–18 marks) Very good response</b> Clear, well supported and structured reasoning about the issue. Different arguments and perspectives are clearly considered.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A clear judgement is reached.</p> <p><b>Level 4 (12–15 marks) Strong response</b> Clear, supported reasoning with some structure about the issue. Different arguments and perspectives are considered.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A judgement is reached.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (8–11 marks) Reasonable response</b> Some supported reasoning about the issue. Different arguments and perspectives are included.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>An attempt is made to give an overall judgement.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p><b>Level 2 (4–7 marks) Basic response</b> Basic reasoning about the issue. Different arguments are included; perspectives, if present, are unclear.</p> <p>The response is likely to rely on assertion rather than evidence and contain some undeveloped points.</p> <p>A basic judgement may be attempted.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–3 marks) Limited response</b> Limited and unsupported reasoning about the issue in general. Different arguments may be included.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>		