MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

0457 GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

0457/31   Paper 3 (Written Paper), maximum raw mark 60

1 Introduction

Most questions are marked holistically using levels of response mark schemes. The marks awarded for an answer are usually based on a judgement of the overall quality of the response, rather than on awarding marks for specific points and accumulating a total mark by adding points.

Inevitably, the mark scheme cannot cover all responses that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases candidates may make very strong responses which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should nevertheless be credited according to their quality. If examiners are in any doubt about an answer they should contact their Team Leader or Principal Examiner.

2 Levels of Response

The mark schemes are based on levels of response. These are intended to describe the quality of the response required (level of skill that should be demonstrated) for the award of marks at different points in the mark range for the question.

In the levels of response mark scheme positive achievement is being rewarded.
Therefore, to award the mark, examiners should:

a.   determine the level – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer
b.   determine the mark within the level, by considering the following:

Level of Response Descriptor	Award Mark
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

As a result, marking requires some judgement from the examiner; however this must be within the limits defined by the mark scheme and the guidance given by the Principal Examiner and team leaders.

Examiners should use the whole mark range when awarding marks; it is possible for a candidate to be awarded full marks.

3 Mark Scheme

All of the questions are based on Sources which are available to candidates as an insert to the examination paper. It is therefore very important to study this material prior to marking to become familiar with the context of the questions.

1 (a) Give two reasons why some children in developing countries do not go to school. [2]

Candidates may identify the following reasons from Source 1:

- governments don't have enough money to pay for schools
- countries are still developing
- migration/moving from the country to the city
- there are no schools in the place where they live
- children have to work or beg
- impact of HIV/AIDS

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

Further guidance – note that the only acceptable answers are located in Source 1. However candidates may use their own words to describe a reason from this list.

(b) Which of these reasons do you think is most important? Explain why. [4]

Candidates are likely to give the following type of reasons to justify their choice:

- Possible consequences
- Degree of impact/seriousness for individual
- How many people/groups/countries are affected
- Increasing cycle of poverty/disadvantage
- How widespread the problem is
- How easy to solve
- Other reasonable response

Further guidance – candidates may discuss 'reason(s)' from the Sources as listed above in the Mark Scheme for Q1 or from their background knowledge; the assessment is focussed upon their reasoning/justification of their choice.

Level 4: Strong Response [4]

Clearly reasoned explanation of why one cause is more important than another; may compare with one or more other causes; usually 2/3 developed reasons linked to not going to school i.e. some attempt to explain how the factor affects attendance at school.
e.g. HIV/AIDS is the most important cause of lack of schooling, because other causes are easier to deal with. There is no vaccination against AIDS and it can't be cured, so it is a long term problem for education. It affects millions of children and the number is still growing so more and more children can't go to school. Their parents can't work and many die, so the children can't go to school because they don't have the time or money.

Level 3: Reasonable Response [3]

Some reasoned explanation of why one cause is important; usually 1/2 reasons suggested with some link to not going to school, but may be implicit at times.
e.g. HIV/AIDS is most important because learning is difficult when you are not very well. Also many children can't go to school because they have to work or beg to survive.

Level 2: Basic Response [2]

Identifies a cause as important but reasoning is weak or not linked to going to schooling explicitly
e.g. HIV/AIDS is most important because it affects lots of people at school in developing countries.

Level 1: Limited Response [1]

Simple identification of a cause but no attempt to justify or the reasoning is not related to the issue of going to school
e.g. HIV/AIDS *OR* HIV/AIDS because it is a nasty disease that kills people.

No relevant response or creditworthy material. [0]

(c) Explain why not going to school is an important global issue. [6]

Candidates are likely to discuss the following reasons drawing upon the information in Sources 1 and 2:

- The benefits/consequences of going/not going to school for individuals – e.g. cycle of poverty/health/life chances/helps people get a job
- The benefits/consequences of going/not going to school for communities/countries – e.g. less crime and social unrest; more economic growth
- The benefits/consequences of going/not going to school for global society – e.g. interdependence and shared economic growth
- Issues of equal opportunities/fairness – helps to address or reduce inequality/poverty
- The need for access to education as a human right for all
- In response to government, United Nations and other NGO humanitarian aims and goals e.g. millenium goals
- Other reasonable responses

The following levels of response should be used to award marks.

Levels and Marks	Description of Level
Level 3: Strong Response **5–6**	Strong, supported reasoning and explanation justifying why not going to school in developing countries is an issue of global importance. 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 clearly and explicitly related to the global dimension. Lower in the band a greater proportion of arguments will be left undeveloped.

Level 2: Reasonable Response 3–4	Some reasoning and explanation justifying why not going to school in developing countries is an issue of global importance. The response is likely to contain some reasoned arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with at least 2 developed points, and some undeveloped points. Arguments may be partial and lack clarity at times. The global dimension is apparent but may be implicit at times. Lower in the band most arguments may begin to lack clarity, and/or be partial and generalised. A tendency to assert may be apparent.
Level 1: Basic Response 1–2	Basic reasoning and explanation justifying why not going to school in developing countries is an issue of global importance. The response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with only 1/2 undeveloped points. Arguments are partial and lack clarity. The global dimension is not apparent. Lower in the band the arguments are likely to be very generalised, lack relevance to the issue and/or simply recycle/copy material from the Sources without any explanation or development. The response is likely to be tangential to the question.

2 (a) **'We need more government funded schools in our developing countries.'**

How well does the writer support this opinion? You should consider the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence in the Source. **[6]**

Candidates are likely to discuss the following evaluative points:

- Strengths
    - some factual evidence is used
    - several different types of evidence are used – opinion, factual, anecdotal, etc
    - 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
    - has a balanced argument discussing action at different levels
    - other reasonable response
- Weaknesses
    - evidence is not always cited – the source and authorship are not clear at times
    - level of expertise of the writer/journalist is not clear – may have poor knowledge claims
    - there is no evidence from experience or testimony
    - arguments are asserted at times
    - loses focus on countries for individual action
    - too much reliance on opinion
    - evidence may be out of date
    - other reasonable response

The following levels of response should be used to award marks.

Level and Marks	Description of Level
L4: Strong Response **5–6**	Strong, clear evaluation about how well the writer uses the evidence in the Source to support his opinion. Evaluation is clearly focussed upon the evidence, its strengths and weaknesses, and the way it is used to support the opinion. The response is likely to contain at least 3 developed/explained evaluative points, possibly with 1/2 undeveloped points. A range (3/4) of brief but clearly appropriate undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this band. The response is balanced. A convincing overall assessment or conclusion is reached. Lower in the band a greater proportion of arguments will be left undeveloped.
L3: Reasonable Response **3–4**	Some reasonable evaluation of how well the writer uses the evidence in the Source to support his opinion. Evaluation is mainly focussed upon the evidence, its strengths and weaknesses, and the way it is used to support the opinion. The response is likely to contain at least 2 developed/explained evaluative points, usually with 1/2 undeveloped points. A range (2/3) of brief but clearly appropriate undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this band. An overall assessment or conclusion is attempted. Lower in the band most arguments may begin to lack clarity, and/or be partial and generalised. A tendency to assert may be apparent.
L2: Basic Response **1–2**	Some basic evaluation of how well the writer uses the evidence in the Source to support his opinion. Evaluation is often unsupported and asserted. The response lacks clarity at times. There is some generalisation. The response is likely to contain 1/2 undeveloped points only. An overall assessment or conclusion is very weak, asserted and unconvincing, or not attempted. Lower in the band, the response is likely to repeat/recycle the opinion or simply assert agreement/disagreement with the views expressed. The response may not contain any clear evaluative points. The response is likely to be tangential to the question.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material

(b) **'More money is spent on weapons than school books.'**

How could you test this claim? You should consider the types of information, sources of evidence and methods you might use. **[6]**

- Types of Information
  - compare statistics/information on public opinion about biodiversity – for individual countries and globally
  - interview or questionnaire data
  - expert testimony
  - material from international NGOs and environmental pressure groups
  - other relevant response

- Sources of Information
  - national and local governments and their departments
  - international organizations e.g. United Nations; UNESCO
  - environmental experts
  - research reports
  - pressure groups, charities and non government organizations
  - media and worldwide web
  - other relevant response
- Methods
  - review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents
  - interview relevant experts
  - interview members of the public
  - survey public opinion with questionnaires
  - internet search
  - other relevant response

The following levels of response should be used to award marks.

Level 3: Strong Response 5–6	Strong, supported reasoning and explanation of a range of methods to test and evaluate the claim. The response is likely to contain a range of reasoned methods to support the suggested methods, with at least 3 developed/explained points, and some undeveloped points. The response is clearly and explicitly related to the claim. Lower in the band a greater proportion of arguments will be left undeveloped.
Level 2: Reasonable Response 3–4	Some supported reasoning and explanation of some methods to test and evaluate the claim. The response is likely to contain some reasoned arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with at least 2 developed points, and some undeveloped points. Explanations may be partial and lack clarity at times. The relevance to the claim is apparent but may be implicit at times. Lower in the band explanations may begin to lack clarity, and/or be partial and generalised. A tendency to generalise may be apparent.
Level 1: Basic Response 1–2	Basic reasoning and explanation of 1/2 methods to test and evaluate the claim. The response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted suggestions, with only 1/2 undeveloped points. Explanations are partial and lack clarity. The claim being tested is mainly implicit. Lower in the band the arguments are likely to be very generalised, lack relevance to the claim and/or simply recycle/copy material from the Source without any explanation or development. The response is likely to be tangential to the question.

3 (a) Identify one fact in Source 4. Explain why you think it is a fact. [3]

A fact is something which can be checked or proved; something that is true and which can be verified from experience and observation; a piece of information

The following examples of facts may be found in Source 4:

- fewer girls than boys attend school (in most countries, especially developing)
- fewer girls than boys attend secondary school
- female literacy rates are lower than males

Level 3: Strong Response [3]

The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of facts and applies this accurately to a correct example identified from the Source.

Level 2: Reasonable Response [2]

The response demonstrates some understanding of the nature of facts and attempts to apply this to a correct example identified from the Source. The explanation lacks some clarity and accuracy.

Level 1: Basic Response [1]

The candidate identifies one fact from the Source correctly but does not explain the reason; the response demonstrates very little or no understanding of the nature of facts.

No relevant response or creditworthy material. [0]

(b) Identify one opinion in Source 4. Explain why you think it is an opinion. [3]

An opinion is a personal view or attitude or perspective; judgment or belief not founded on certainty or proof

The following examples of opinions may be found in Source 4:

- we need local projects targeted on girls and women to get to the heart of the problem
- women need to respect the culture of their countries and past traditions
- we really need is more jobs for men so that they can support their families better
- simply giving girls schooling will not really help – it may cause conflict and disrupt family life in many parts of the world
- government money should be spent on projects to increase job opportunities and improve the economy

Level 3: Strong Response [3]

The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of opinions and applies this accurately to a correct example identified from the Source.

Level 2: Reasonable Response [2]

The response demonstrates some understanding of the nature of opinions and attempts to apply this to a correct example identified from the Source. The explanation lacks some clarity and accuracy.

Level 1: Basic Response [1]

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 facts.

No relevant response or creditworthy material. [0]

(c) **In this discussion, whose reasoning works better, Vijay's or Faiza's?**

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

- **the strength of their knowledge claims**
- **how reasonable their opinions are**
- **whether you accept their values and why**
- **the reliability and validity of their evidence**
- **other relevant issues** [12]

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 – media; radio
  – date – how recent
  – factual, opinion, value, anecdote
  – testimony – from experience and expert
- knowledge claims
- 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

The following levels of response should be used to award marks.

Level and Marks	Description of Level
L5: Very Good Response **11–12**	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.
L4: Strong Response **8–10**	Strong, 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.
L3: Reasonable Response **5–7**	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.
L2: Basic Response **3–4**	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.
L1: Limited Response **1–2**	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

4   Study Sources 1–4

Which of the following ways do you think is most likely to help more children go to school in developing countries?

- **Global – through international aid and charitable organisations**
- **National – by governments increasing expenditure on building new schools**
- **Local – community projects targeting girls' education**

In your answer you should:

- **state your conclusion**
- **give reasons for your opinion**
- **use the material in the Sources and your own experience**
- **show that you have considered different perspectives**   **[18]**

Candidates are expected to compare and assess the effectiveness of different forms of action to help more children go to school in developing countries at global, local and individual levels. A judgement should be made about which types/level(s) of action are the most likely to succeed or work the most. The 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.

The arguments used to consider different levels of response are likely to include:

- reference to scale of impact
- 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

The following levels of response should be used to award marks.

Level and Marks	Description of Level
L5: Very Good Response **16–18**	Very good, well supported and logical reasoning and judgements about which type/level of action is most likely to help more children to go to school in developing countries. Coherent, structured argument and evaluation with at least two levels of action compared. The response is likely to contain a range of clearly 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 clear, balanced assessment or conclusion is reached.

L4: Strong Response **12–15**	Strong, supported reasoning and judgements about which type/level of action is most likely to help more children to go to school in developing countries. Some clear argument and evaluation with at least two levels of action compared. The response is likely to contain a range of reasoned arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with at least 2 developed points, and some undeveloped points. The response is balanced. A balanced assessment or conclusion is reached. Lower in the band a greater proportion of arguments will be left undeveloped and there will be uneven treatment of different levels of action.
L3: Reasonable Response **8–11**	Reasonable argument and judgement about which type/level of action is most likely to help more children to go to school in developing countries. The response is likely to contain some arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with at least 1 developed point, and some undeveloped points. An assessment or conclusion is attempted but may not be convincing. Lower in the band some arguments may begin to lack clarity, and/or be partial and generalised.
L2: Basic Response **4–7**	Basic argument about which type/level of action is most likely to help more children to go to school in developing countries. Arguments are unlikely to be supported and mainly asserted. There is little clarity of argument and no structure. Some attempt to make a judgement about the most likely level may be present; it may be implicit. The response is likely to contain only 1/2 undeveloped points. Lower in the band the arguments are likely to be very generalised, lack relevance to the issue and focus on issues of schooling rather than an explanation of why a level of action is more likely to help; or a list of ways to help children go to school at a level without explanation of why these actions are most likely to work.
L1: Limited Response **1–3**	Limited, if any, unsupported argument about which type/level of action is most likely to help more children to go to school in developing countries. There is very little clarity in the argument. The response is likely to assert a very simple view or describe schooling issues generally. The response may not contain any relevant points about action to help children go to school in developing countries.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material