

**MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2012 series**

**0457 GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES**

**0457/03**

Paper 3 (Written Paper), maximum raw mark 60

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 October/November 2012 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2012</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

**1 (a) Give three ways in which the internet might have a negative effect on our thinking. [3]**

Candidates may identify the following ways from Source 1:

- We get distracted following links
- We forget what we were looking for
- We lose the ability to concentrate
- We lose the ability to think about issues in detail
- Makes us think less clearly (due to people with confused thoughts who now have a voice)
- It is filling our brains with celebrity nonsense
- It is filling our brains with pointless games
- Young people don't think about important issues any more
- Young people don't know any facts any more/they have empty heads

1 mark for each correct answer, up to a maximum of three marks.

**(b) Give one way in which the internet can help us get beyond our local perspectives. [1]**

Candidates may identify the following ways from Source 1:

- The internet allows everybody to be heard
- The internet allows everybody to have their say
- Having internet friends from other countries (connect widely geographically)
- Helps us to think more internationally
- The internet helps us in getting to know each other (depth)
- Helps us to realise that we're all people (not just enemies)
- Gives us knowledge about people and relationships
- Expands our social networks (range)
- Develops our social thinking (skills)

**(c) Give two additional ways in which the internet might have a positive effect on our thinking. [2]**

Candidates may identify the following ways from Source 1:

- We can improve problem solving skills
- We can learn skills to deal with information (distracting/large amounts)
- May give us thinking skills beyond previous generations/parents/old people
- Develops our social thinking
- Expands our social networks/relationships
- Helps us to think more internationally
- Helps us to realise that we are all people (not just enemies)
- Gives us knowledge about people and relationships (*don't accept 'knowledge' alone*)

1 mark for each correct answer, up to a maximum of two marks. Do not accept repetitions of the answer credited in the response to 1(b).

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2012</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

**(d) Give three different kinds of thinking mentioned in Source1.**

**[3]**

Candidates may identify the following kinds of thinking from Source 1:

- Concentration – intense or focused mental activity/thinking
- Connecting facts together/linking ideas
- Thinking in detail
- Thinking about issues
- Virtual/creative/fantasy
- Confused thinking/with lack of clarity
- International thinking
- Problem solving OR strategic thinking (from games)
- Knowing facts
- Dealing with information
- Social thinking
- Different kinds/ways of knowledge/knowing

1 mark for each correct answer, up to a maximum of three marks.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2012</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

- 2 (a) **keep\_us\_free blames pointless computer games for young people not thinking about important issues any more. How would you find out whether this is true? [3]**

Level 3: 3 marks Strong Response	Strong, supported reasoning and explanation of a method(s) to test and evaluate the claim. The response is clearly and explicitly related to the claim. The suggestion is likely to contain a comparison of groups or over time to explore the 'any more' dimension of the claim and clearly relate to both 'computer games' and 'thinking about issues'.
Level 2: 2 marks Reasonable Response	Some supported reasoning and explanation of a method(s) to test and evaluate the claim. Explanations may be partial and lack clarity at times. The relevance to the claim is apparent but may be implicit at times. The suggestion is likely to be general and refer mainly to computer games/gamers and thinking about issues but the impact/time dimension is likely to be implicit or missing.
Level 1: 1 mark Basic Response	Description of a method(s) to test and evaluate the claim. The response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted suggestion(s). If present, explanations are partial and lack clarity. The claim being tested is mainly implicit. The suggestion is likely to be very generalised, lack relevance to the claim and/or simply recycle/copy material from the Source without any explanation or development.
0	No creditworthy material.

### Indicative Content

#### Types of Information

- compare statistics/information on attitudes of different groups of young people – maybe past and present/those who use and don't use computer games
- compare statistics/information on young people locally, nationally and internationally to see if differences between countries and different amounts of computer usage
- questionnaire, survey and interview data from young people
- expert testimony from psychologists/educationalists/computer experts
- other relevant response

#### Sources of Information

- national and local governments and their departments
- international organizations e.g. United Nations; International Labour Organisation
- psychologists/educationalists/computer experts
- research reports
- case studies
- pressure groups, charities and non government organizations working in the sector
- media and worldwide web
- other relevant response

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2012</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

### Methods

- review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents
- interview young people
- observe young people using computers
- interview relevant experts
- internet search
- case studies of different countries/groups/ages
- other relevant response

**(b) no1gamer says that some computer games can improve problem solving skills. How would you test whether a particular game does increase problem solving skills? [3]**

Level 3: 3 marks Strong Response	Strong, supported reasoning and explanation of a method(s) to test and evaluate the claim. The response is clearly and explicitly related to the claim. The suggestion is likely to contain a comparison of groups or over different/changing levels of use of computer games to explore the 'increase' dimension of the claim and clearly relate to both 'computer games' and 'problem solving'. Responses are likely to include the idea of a 'pre and post test' of skills.
Level 2: 2 marks Reasonable Response	Some supported reasoning and explanation of a method(s) to test and evaluate the claim. Explanations may be partial and lack clarity at times. The relevance to the claim is apparent but may be implicit at times. The suggestion is likely to be general and refer mainly to computer games and problem solving but the impact/increase dimension is likely to be implicit or missing.
Level 1: 1 mark Basic Response	Simple description of a method(s) to test and evaluate the claim. The response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted suggestion(s). If present, explanations are partial and lack clarity. The claim being tested is mainly implicit. The suggestion is likely to be very generalised, lack relevance to the claim and/or simply recycle/copy material from the Source without any explanation or development.
0	No creditworthy material

### Indicative Content

#### Types of Information

- data from an experiment or test of the problem solving skills of the game players taken at different times or after playing the game
- compare data on skill levels of gamers to other groups who don't play the game
- compare statistics/information on computer gamers and skill levels in problem solving generally and for the game itself
- compare statistics/information on success of computer gamers generally
- questionnaire and interview data from gamers/non-gamers
- expert testimony e.g. psychologists/trainers
- other relevant response

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2012</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

### Sources of Information

- national and local governments and their departments
- international organizations e.g. United Nations; International Labour Organisation
- gaming or computer experts
- research reports
- case studies
- pressure groups, charities and non government organizations working in the sector
- media and worldwide web
- other relevant response

### Methods

- review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents
- experiments
- interview gamers
- observe gamers
- interview relevant experts
- internet search
- case studies of different games/groups
- other relevant response

**(c) Explain any problems you might have with your test in (b).**

**[3]**

Level 3: 3 marks Strong Response	Strong, supported reasoning and explanation of a problem(s). The response is clearly and explicitly related to the test chosen in 1b.
Level 2: 2 marks Reasonable Response	Some description of a problem generally related to the test. Explanations may be partial and lack clarity at times. The relevance to the test is apparent but may be implicit at times. The problem is likely to be generalised and refer mainly to computer games and problem solving only briefly.
Level 1: 1 mark Basic Response	Simple description of a problem in research in general terms. The response is likely to contain undeveloped and asserted suggestion(s). The issue of computer games and problem solving skills being tested is only very implicit or not clear. The suggestion is likely to be very generalised, lack relevance to the test and unclear.
0	No creditworthy material

### Indicative Content

Any research or tests of a claim/hypothesis are likely to have some potential inaccuracies, sources of bias or issues that might affect the quality, validity or reliability of the results or conclusions that might be drawn. For example, a possible correlation/cause that may be apparent may have a problem inherent e.g. it would be difficult to be sure that any improvement was due to the game and not to other activities people were doing during the day, or it would be hard to ensure that people really did spend two hours a night playing the game, so it may be that lack of improvement in problem solving skills came from not playing the game rather than the game having no benefit.

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2012</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

The problems discussed might be:

- practical e.g. time and cost
- due to the nature/limitations of the research method
- due to access to information and subjects e.g. gatekeepers
- from interpretation and analysis
- from sampling
- from possible bias
- in drawing conclusions
- level of prior learning
- validity of test

**(d) How might your answers to 2(a), 2(b) and 2(c) help solve the disagreement between keep\_us\_free and no1gamer? [6]**

Level 3: 5–6 marks Strong Response	Strong, supported reasoning and explanation of how the answers given to the previous question might solve or relate to the disagreement between keep_us_free and no1gamer. The response is clearly and explicitly related to the evidence gained in the tests of the claim and the difference of opinion between the two characters.
Level 2: 3–4 marks Reasonable Response	Some description of the relevance of the tests to the issue. Explanations may be partial and lack clarity at times. The relevance to the disagreement is apparent but may be implicit at times. The relevance to the disagreement is likely to be generalised and refer to computer games and types of thinking only briefly.
Level 1: 1–2 marks Basic Response	Description of relevance to disagreement only in very simple terms. The response is likely to contain undeveloped and asserted suggestion(s). The issue of disagreement is only very implicit or not clear. The argument is likely to be very generalised and lack relevance or may simply repeat/juxtapose the arguments.
0	No creditworthy material

### Indicative Content

If the results of the tests appear to be clear and conclusive for one person, but not the other, then we could say that they are correct and have ‘won the argument’. (Most candidates are likely to adopt this kind of argument.)

It is also possible that keep\_us\_free and no1gamer are both right. They disagree generally on whether computer games can have a positive effect on thinking, but in specifics they differ. Playing computer games could lead to less interest in thinking about important real world issues but also to better problem solving skills. It also depends on which games are played – some games might improve both kinds of thinking. However, the difficulty in assessing whether an improvement in thinking skills, or the lack of interest in important issues, is a result of the computer games, or other factors, means that it is hard to solve the disagreement between keep\_us\_free and no1gamer.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2012</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

- 3 (a) **Study Source 2. Explain why claims made online (for example on social networking sites such as Facebook, Kaixin, Harambee and Renren) might not be reliable. [3]**

Level 3: 3 marks Strong Response	Strong, supported reasoning and explanation of why online claims may not be reliable. The response is clearly and explicitly related to the internet context of the claims and the issue of reliability.
Level 2: 2 marks Reasonable Response	Some description of problems with online claims. Explanations may be partial and lack clarity at times.
Level 1: 1 mark Basic Response	Generalised, simple description of problem(s) with internet information in general. The response is likely to contain an undeveloped and asserted suggestion(s) which lacks clarity.
0	No creditworthy material

### Indicative Content

People do not always tell the truth and the anonymity of the internet makes it easier to make claims that are not true. This might be to create a persona of who we would like to be, or to deliberately mislead others, to sell something or it might even be from ignorance – gossip sweeps round the internet. Sometimes people even put false claims on sites like Facebook to be unkind to others. So there are many reasons why claims made online might not be reliable.

Credit other reasonable answers, such as anonymous editing on Wikipedia.

For marking purposes, the term 'reliable' should be interpreted broadly to encompass any problem with claims or evidence from the internet in general.

- (b) **Refer to Source 1. Zafar\_66 says, 'I've read a number of books which show the internet makes us think less clearly.'**

**Is 'a number of books' a reliable source of information about how the internet is affecting our thinking? Explain your answer. [3]**

Level 3: 3 marks Strong Response	Strong, supported reasoning and explanation of why 'a number of books' may/may not be reliable. The response is clearly and explicitly related to the nature of books as evidence/sources of information and the issue of reliability.
Level 2: Reasonable Response	Some description of an issue(s) about the reliability of this source of information. Explanations may be partial and lack clarity at times.
Level 1: 1 mark Basic Response	Generalised, simple description of an issue(s) about reliability of the source of information. The response is likely to contain an undeveloped and asserted suggestion(s) which lacks clarity.
0	No creditworthy material



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2012</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

### Indicative Content

Candidates may suggest that ‘a number of books’ is or is not reliable, or explore both points of view. Some of the arguments that may be used are:

Arguments for reliability might be:

- books may provide some independent evidence
- books may be written by people who are experts
- books may be written by people who have done some research which is more than just opinion
- there is more than one source/book that gives grounds for confidence
- other reasonable response

Arguments against reliability might be:

- sample size is small and therefore may not be representative
- books may be biased
- books may be misinterpreted
- the research in the book may not be high quality
- other reasonable response

For marking purposes, the term ‘reliable’ should be interpreted broadly to encompass any problem with ‘a number of books’ as a source of evidence/information about how the internet is affecting thinking.

**(c) Who uses stronger reasoning, keep\_us\_free or violet\_blue?**

**[12]**

Level 5: 11–12 marks Very Good Response	Very good, well supported judgements about which reasoning works better. Coherent, structured evaluation of how well the reasoning works for both statements with clear comparison. The response is likely to contain at least 3 developed evaluative points, possibly with some undeveloped points. The response is balanced. A clear assessment or conclusion is reached.
Level 4: 8–10 marks Strong Response	Clear judgements about which reasoning works better. Coherent, structured evaluation of how well the reasoning works for both statements with clear comparison. The response is likely to contain at least 2 developed evaluative points, possibly with 1/2 undeveloped points. A range (3/4+) of brief but clearly appropriate/explained undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this band at the lower level. The response is balanced. An overall assessment or conclusion is reached.
Level 3: 5–7 marks Reasonable Response	Reasonable judgements about which reasoning works better. Some evaluation of how well the reasoning works for both statements with an attempt at comparison. Judgements and evaluative points are likely to be partially supported or asserted. The response is likely to contain at least 1 developed evaluative points, possibly with 1/2 undeveloped points; 2/3 brief undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this band at the lower level. An overall assessment or conclusion is reached.

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2012</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

Level 2: 3–4 marks Basic Response	Basic examination of which reasoning works better. The response may only consider one of the statements with little if any attempt at comparison. Judgements and evaluative points are likely to be partially supported or asserted, and lack clarity/relevance at times. The response is likely to contain at least 1/2 undeveloped evaluative points.
Level 1: 1–2 marks Limited Response	Limited, if any, unsupported discussion of which reasoning works better. The response is likely to consider only one of the statements very briefly or tangentially. There is very little clarity in the argument. The response is likely to repeat the arguments simply or assert agreement/disagreement with the views expressed. The response may not contain any clear evaluative points.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material

**In your answer you should support your point of view with their words and phrases and you may consider:**

- the reasonableness of any causes they mention;
- the likeliness of any consequences they predict;
- whether you accept any values they use;
- the link between points they make and the question about whether the internet affects our thinking in a negative way;
- any other relevant issues.

### **Indicative Content**

Candidates are expected to evaluate the reasoning in the two statements and compare their strength/effectiveness. They should make a supported judgement with some explanation about which person has the stronger/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 – media; radio
- date – how recent
- factual, opinion, value, anecdote
- testimony – from experience and expert

<b>Page 11</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2012</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

- Knowledge claims
- gender
- political
- personal values
- experience
- Acceptability of their values to others
- how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view

Candidates may suggest that either argument is stronger, or not reach a conclusion. Marks are awarded for the quality of their reasoning; however most candidates are likely to argue in the following ways.

Violet\_blue's reasoning works better – it is at least an argument and some of the logical links work – it is a reasonable suggestion that the internet doesn't make people think less clearly, it just seems that way because it allows everyone, even confused people to be heard. There is some support here for the idea that allowing everyone to be heard is a good thing, and the example about thinking more internationally is reasonable to show that the internet can have a positive effect (implied). But it's only one example – she doesn't show how the internet allows the spread of hatred as well as friendship.

keep\_us\_free's reasoning does not work very well at all. It is an extreme slippery slope which has almost no link to reality and exaggerates almost every point. The links between the internet, being lost in a virtual world and destroying thinking are tenuous, and it is not reasonable to suggest that young people think about celebrities and games just because of the internet – it is a means of accessing this gossip rather than the cause of it. The X-Factor is a poor example because it is a television show. The examples of countries are poor – in Myanmar, for example, the internet has been used by freedom groups to oppose the military rulers, which shows that it can be used for real world issues. In Korea people are very concerned by the real world issue of military conflict between the north and the south. (Candidates are not required to know specifics about countries, but credit where they are used to show that keep\_us\_free's reasoning is weak).

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2012</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

**4 Do you think the internet is affecting our thinking in a mainly positive or negative way?[18]**

Level 5: 16–18 marks Very Good Response	Very good, well supported and logical reasoning and judgements about the effects of the internet. Coherent, structured argument and evaluation of a range of internet effects on thinking – usually 4 or more. The response is likely to contain a range of clearly reasoned arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with at least 4 developed points, and some undeveloped points. The response is balanced. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion is reached.
Level 4: 12–15 marks Strong Response	Supported reasoning and judgements about the effects of the internet. Some clear argument and evaluation with at least 3 internet effects on thinking explored. The response is likely to contain a range of reasoned arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with at least 3 developed points, and some undeveloped points. The response is balanced. A balanced assessment or conclusion is reached.  A wide range of 5/6 or more undeveloped brief but clear points may be sufficient to reach this level.
Level 3: 8–11 marks Reasonable Response	Reasonable argument and judgement about the effects of the internet with at least two internet effects explored. The response is likely to contain some arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with at least 1/2 developed points, and some undeveloped points. An assessment or conclusion is attempted but may not be convincing.  A wide range of 3/4 or more undeveloped brief but clear points may be sufficient to reach this level.
Level 2: 4–7 marks Basic Response	Basic argument about the effects of the internet. Arguments are unlikely to be supported and mainly asserted. There is little clarity of argument and no structure. Some attempt to make a judgement may be present; it may be implicit. The response is likely to contain only 2 undeveloped points.  Lower in the band the arguments are likely to be very generalised, lack relevance to the issue and focus on internet uses in general rather than an explanation of why the effects are mainly positive or negative; or a list of effects without interpretation.
Level 1: 1–3 marks Limited Response	Limited, if any, unsupported argument about the effects of the internet. There is very little clarity in the argument. The response is likely to assert a very simple view with one undeveloped point or describe the internet/an effect generally.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material

<b>Page 13</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>IGCSE – October/November 2012</b>	<b>0457</b>	<b>03</b>

**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.

**Indicative Content**

Candidates are expected to assess the impact of the internet on thinking. A judgment should be made about whether the impact on thinking is mainly positive or negative. 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 may consider the following positive effects:

- improves thinking skills generally
- improves problem solving skills
- develops strategic thinking
- encourages social thinking and relationships
- promotes internationalism and mutual understanding
- gives access to lots of information to inform our thinking
- other reasonable response

Candidates may consider the following negative effects:

- confuses thinking because there is too much information
- promotes lack of depth in thinking
- affects the ability to concentrate
- affects the ability to think about issues in detail
- It is filling our brains with unimportant material e.g. celebrity nonsense
- It is filling our brains with pointless games
- young people don't think about important issues any more
- young people don't know any facts any more/they have empty heads
- other reasonable response

The arguments/criteria which might be used to consider which are most significant are:

- reference to scale of impact – how many people are affected
- reference to degree of impact – how strong is the effect
- how long it takes to influence thinking
- the effects on different groups – age; gender; culture; class
- other reasonable response
- The following levels of response should be used to award marks.