

**MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2009 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.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2009 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	IGCSE – October/November 2009	0457

Section A

1 (a) Explain why some people are opposed to the Leisure Park.

(b) Explain why some people support the Leisure Park.

[5]

Mark according to levels of response:

Level 0 No creditworthy material.

Level 1: (1–2 marks) Basic Response.

Re-use of stimulus material with little or no adaptation or explanation/the explanation is implied but not clarified.

Level 2: (3–4 marks) Reasonable Response.

An explanation which makes use of some examples from the source documents, possibly less relevant examples.

Level 3: (5 marks) Strong Response.

A convincing explanation which EITHER makes strong use of relevant concepts or examples from the source documents.

Indicative content

Strong response.

This is because they believe it will influence, negatively, the behaviour of the local youth. Also they feel money will be taken out of the town and taken abroad. They feel that young people will eat junk food from the shops. They think the park will change people's values and traditions.

Reasonable response.

Because the leisure park will change everything in this city in negative ways. The cinema will play foreign movies which contain violence which is bad for local teenagers. Some people don't want the leisure park to change local conditions.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	IGCSE – October/November 2009	0457

2 As a member of the Town Planning Committee, you need to decide whether to invite a multinational corporation to set up the Leisure Park. What further information would you find useful to help you make your decision?

Need to know – who might use the Leisure Park, what proportion of the population supports it, how much support for sport v entertainment/whether the young people hanging round by the railway would actually go ice skating etc.

1 mark for each area of research.

1 mark for explaining how to find the information (this needs to go beyond 'look at the internet').

1–3 marks for explaining how this information will help you to make the decision (for each area) using levels below.

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 ...).

Indicative content

Strong response.

Find out the corporation's employment policies.

Interview managers about the policies as well as look through written policies.

If the corporation is likely to employ local people I would be more likely to support the park.

Reasonable response.

What kind of entertainment will be held.

The developer of the leisure park.

If the programmes are useful and give new information to everybody, I will support the multinational company to build the leisure park.

3 (a) 'Currently young people have nothing to do.' Is this fact or opinion? Explain your answer. [3]

This could be either fact or opinion, depending on the situation. It is most likely to be opinion.

1 mark – basic attempt to explain.

2 marks – reasonable attempt to explain.

3 marks – strong explanation, perhaps with reference to other sources OR awareness of ambiguity.

Indicative content

Strong response.

This opinion is based on seeing youth loitering at the railway. These young people might prefer to be there and others still may be engaging in other activities.

Reasonable response.

It is an opinion. This is because Miss T has not backed up her statement with proof or evidence. She has not given any statistic that shows that young people have nothing to do.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	IGCSE – October/November 2009	0457

- (b) Do you think Miss T is making a convincing argument? Give reasons for your answer. You should:
- consider the claims she makes;
 - consider possible consequences;
 - use examples of words and phrases from her letter to support your point of view.

[12]

Mark according to levels of response:

Level 0: no creditworthy material.

Level 1: (1–4 marks) Basic Response.

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.

(e.g. Miss T is convincing because she tells us that the Leisure Park would provide jobs OR Miss T is convincing because she gives reasons to support the Park.)

Level 2: (5–8 marks) Reasonable Response.

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.

(Miss T is quite convincing because it is true that training for a sport is better than making trouble. But trouble makers might not be interested in ice skating.)

Level 3: (9–12 marks) Strong Response.

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

(Miss T is quite convincing because the other sources, Mr I and Mrs J are only making predictions about the bad things that could happen, which could be from fear not facts. Also, jobs and entertainment are very important, but you would have to weigh up whether these are extra jobs or just replacing people like Mrs J).

Indicative content

The following are part responses showing performance at appropriate levels:

Strong response.

Miss T does make a convincing argument. She claims that the opposition to it is just based on fears not facts. This is true as none of the opposition has brought any facts or statistics to strengthen their argument. Also, by using 'fears' she reminds people how irrational people are when in fear.

Reasonable response.

Furthermore her statement that 'It is much better for young people to ice skate than to behave badly' is also convincing because if there was an ice rink, people would spend more time skating than loitering and causing trouble.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	IGCSE – October/November 2009	0457

4 Write an article for the local community newsletter to explain the Planning Committee's decision about the Leisure Park.

In your article you should:

- explain why you have reached the decision that you made;
- show that you have considered different points of view;
- explain why you disagreed with some of these points of view.

[15]

Mark according to levels of response:

Level 0: no creditworthy material.

Level 1: (1–5 marks) Basic Response.

May be undeveloped and/or inconclusive. Tends to use statement and exaggeration rather than reasoning, and there is very little support for a conclusion/opinion if given. Mentions alternative perspectives only vaguely or in a confused way. May simply repeat much of the stimulus material without adaptation.

Level 2: (6–10 marks) Reasonable Response.

Provides reasoning which gives some logical support to the clearly stated conclusion/ opinion. There may be occasional exaggeration. Attempts to consider alternative opinions (although may not be fully relevant) and explain why the candidate did not accept them (although this may be a simple disagreement or only a partial answer).

Level 3: (11–15 marks) Strong Response.

Clear and structured. Reasoning gives strong logical support to the candidate's conclusion/ opinion. Considers relevant alternative points of view and explains why candidate did not accept them in a way which really answers the points raised.

Indicative content

The following are part answers which indicate performance at different levels:

Strong answer.

We have come to the decision not to allow the leisure park to be set up for numerous reasons, as the disadvantages outnumber the advantages. Although this new Park would bring entertainment to our quiet town, it would also bring violent movies which could corrupt our children. We believe youth would copy behaviour they see in these violent movies and cause trouble. In addition, the Park would bring competition to local businesses. People would spend their money on new burger and pizza restaurants while local restaurants suffer. This would be very bad for our economy.

Reasonable answer.

I decided to refuse the multinational company to build the Park. Because we are locals and we are suitable with local lifestyle. For example, they want to build pizza restaurants. Pizza contains fats that can create obesity. This is really bad. Obesity will allow any virus to get inside our body. If somebody disappointed with this decision, don't worry. We can share our ideas to create the leisure park in local ways. So we will get fun by the entertainment without changing people's moral.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	IGCSE – October/November 2009	0457

Section B

- 5 (a) Look at the first section of the article, headed 'Food, Fuel and Financial Crisis.'
three reasons why more people are now living in poverty.

3 × 1:

High food and fuel prices.

(Private companies going out of business so) people are losing their jobs.

Government has less money to spend.

- (b) Look at the second section of the article headed, 'Global Food Response Program.'
Which country is receiving the most money to help it during the food crisis? [1]

Nepal.

- (c) In your own words, explain how money from the World Bank can help poor people
during the food, fuel and financial crisis? [6]

Mark according to levels of response:

0 no creditworthy material.

Level 1: (1–2 marks) simple answer giving some information.

Level 2: (3–4 marks) developed answer.

Level 3: (5–6 marks) developed answer using information. Considers how, why, if.

Indicative content

Strong answer.

This money can be used to buy materials for farming such as seeds, fertiliser and irrigation pumps. If farming is improved, more food is available. Also if the money is donated to governments they can spend it on food and education for poorer families. Also healthcare can be improved with the money. If meals at school are provided, families may need to spend a less on food for children and their poverty reduced.

Reasonable answer.

The World Bank spends a lot of money to help poor people during the food fuel and financial crisis. It spends money on food and related things like seeds and fertilisers to help the government of those countries reduce its cost of food. It can also help reduce government costs in other ways so the government can concentrate on other areas. For example, it can build schools and expand health care.

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	IGCSE – October/November 2009	0457

6 A country has asked the World Bank for an extra \$15 million. In addition to the food, fuel and financial crisis, the rains have failed and the crops have not grown. What information would it be useful for the World Bank to find out to help it make a decision whether or not to lend the money to this country?

What the World Bank needs to know and how this will help.

What the World Bank needs to know.

Scale of crisis (how many people affected); whether government is corrupt; etc.

How this information will help the World Bank make a decision.

If many people are starving Somalia might need the money more urgently than other projects/if the government is very corrupt and the money won't reach the starving people then help might need to be given another way (accept relevant, focussed answers that make sense).

Mark according to levels of response:

Level 0 No creditworthy material.

Level 1 (1–4 marks) Basic Response.

Answer which suggests (vaguely or obliquely) what information would be useful with a simple or implied explanation of relevance (or an explanation which is not focussed on the World Bank's decision about whether or not to lend the additional money).

Level 2 (5–7 marks) Reasonable Response.

Answer which suggests what information would be useful and explains how it might help the World Bank decide about whether or not to lend the additional money.

Level 3: (8–10 marks) Strong Response.

Considered answer which suggests what information would be useful and gives a focussed explanation of how it might help the World Bank make a decision about whether to lend the additional money, considering 'what if' scenarios.

Note: what if scenarios are not sufficient to gain entry into Strong Response.

Indicative content

The following are part answers indicating level of performance:

Strong answer

The Bank should find out if the farming methods are not to blame for the failing crops. If they are, the bank may donate only on conditions of improved methods or give the money to educate the farmers. The Bank should find out if the country is able to repay this money. If not, the Bank should either donate the money or offer alternatives for the methods of payment or just not give it at all.

Reasonable answer

By knowing the needs of the country. Is it really to help farmers or just for the president's leisure. The Bank will check where our money is. Is it on the right place? If they really need that amount of money, we will lend them.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	IGCSE – October/November 2009	0457

7 Look at the last section of the article with the heading 'Opposition to the World Bank'

(a) From this section, give one example of a World Bank project which has had problems.

Workers and union members were not involved in a study of how to develop Chittagong Port in Bangladesh.
In Armenia, an independent study found that corrupt state officials used World Bank money for themselves instead of spending it on water improvement projects.

(b) Give one opinion from this section. Explain why you think it is an opinion not a fact. [2]

1 mark for opinion. 1 mark for explanation.
Explanations such as "it's what someone says", so it might be true.

(c) Kris Ogumbe predicts that government officials will get the World Bank money instead of poor people. Do you think this is a likely consequence? Give reasons for your opinion. [6]

Mark according to levels of response:
Level 0: no creditworthy material.

Level 1: (1–2 marks) Basic Response.
Candidates restate material from the stimulus passage.

Level 2: (3–4 marks) Reasonable Response.
Response gives a clear statement of opinion supported by an attempt at reasoning based on the likelihood of the consequence following from the building of a dam.

Level 3: (5–6 marks) Strong Response.
Structured response which gives clear and persuasive reasons based on the likelihood of the consequence following from building the dam and includes some awareness of ambiguity/balance of probability/what if reasoning.

Indicative content

Strong answer.
This seems likely as it is well known that a lot of government officials are indeed corrupt. Also, once money has been given, the World Bank has no control of what is done with it. People think only to better themselves and so government officials are likely to keep money for themselves as they also may not be that well off.

Reasonable response.
This is a likely consequence. Kris Ogumbe has given proof of his statement. He says that corrupt government officials in Armenia.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	IGCSE – October/November 2009	0457

- (d) To what extent does it matter if some of the World Bank's money goes to government officials instead of poor people? Give reasons for your opinion.

Mark according to levels of response:

Level 0: no creditworthy material.

Level 1: (1–2 marks) Basic Response.

A simple statement of opinion/value judgement OR simple reasons which imply the candidate's opinion/value judgement.

e.g. It is very bad OR corrupt officials shouldn't steal money from starving people.

Level 2: (3–4 marks) Reasonable Response.

A statement of opinion which makes a value judgement supported by an attempt at reasoning which may attempt to deal with (ends, means and) values.

e.g. Yes it matters because corruption is bad, it takes money from poor people.

Level 3: (5–6 marks) Strong Response.

Structured response gives clear and persuasive reasons and considers/balances ends, means and values/possibly and has some awareness of ambiguity.

e.g. Yes it matters because poor people need the money, but if some people get money to help them it's better than no one getting help.

Indicative content

Strong answer.

It matters to a great extent because the intended aid targets will not be sufficiently helped. Also if donors like the bank see no progress being made they are likely to stop giving this money. Also the officials may get increasingly greedy. Ultimately the poor are left no different. Also there will be no hope as the aid will stop coming in.

Reasonable answer.

It is bad because government officials will become richer while their country falls deeper into ruin. Poor people will not receive money, food, water or fuel as it is being spent on rich government officials.

Page 10	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	IGCSE – October/November 2009	0457

- 8 Is the World Bank the best way of getting help to the poorest people in the world? **answer you should:**
- give reasons for your opinion;
 - show that you have considered different points of view;
 - explain why you disagreed with some of these points of view.
- [15]

Mark according to levels of response:
Level 0: no creditworthy material.

Level 1: (1–5 marks) Basic Response.
May be undeveloped and/or inconclusive. Tends to use statement and exaggeration rather than reasoning, and there is very little support for a conclusion/opinion if given. Mentions alternative perspectives only vaguely or in a confused way. May simply repeat much of the stimulus material without adaptation.

Level 2: (6–10 marks) Reasonable Response.
Gives reasoning which gives some logical support to clearly stated conclusion/ opinion. May be some occasional exaggeration. Attempts to consider alternative opinions (these may not be fully relevant) and explain why candidate did not accept them (although this may be a simple disagreement or only a partial answer).

Level 3: (11–15 marks) Strong Response.
Clear and structured. Provides reasoning giving strong logical support to candidate's conclusion/ opinion. Considers relevant alternative points of view and explains why the candidate did not accept them in a way which really answers the points raised.

Indicative content

The following are part answers to indicate level of performance:

Strong response.

The World Bank does not seem to be the best way. It has no evidence of any controls or effective policies to stop the misappropriation of funds by corrupt officials. Despite the fact that it has copious amounts of money available from donor countries and has been set up specifically to help the poorest, I feel it is not the best way. What good is all that money or the all the aims in the world if money is siphoned off by unscrupulous officials and people are not consulted about what is good for them.

Reasonable response.

For me, don't use this option full. There is corruption so we should know that they can't help us a lot. The best way to get help to poor people is a 50:50 system. We can get help from rich country such as UK or US. We can get a loan from the World Bank. This will make us think smart, not just take easy money.

(Note: this candidate has not fully developed their reasoning, BUT this is an attempt to answer the precise question about whether the World Bank is the best way to help the poorest rather than just listing advantages and disadvantages of the World Bank. The candidate has also thought beyond what is presented in the stimulus material and included her/his own ideas. These lift the answer into 'reasonable'.)