MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

0457 GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

0457/33   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 May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

1   **Study Sources 1 and 2.**

   (a) Give two benefits of having a job.   **[2]**

   Candidates may identify the following benefits from Source 1:

   - reduces poverty
   - gives people a sense of well-being
   - people feel as if they are making a contribution to their family
   - people feel as if they are making a contribution to their community
   - helps to prevent protests and riots
   - helps reduce crime
   - promotes development
   - improves living standards
   - make people more productive
   - bring people together in the community

   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 benefit from this list.

(b) **Which of these benefits of having a job do you think is the most important? Explain why.** **[4]**

Indicative Content

Candidates are likely to give the following type of reasons to justify their choice:
- Possible additional positive consequences at different levels of society
- The seriousness of the problem that employment solves
- How far it contributes to the goals of local, national and international communities
- Degree of positive impact on individual, family, community, country and world
- How many people / groups / countries are affected
- Increasing virtuous circle – jobs create more jobs
- Degree of poverty / suffering alleviated
- How easy to solve
- Other reasonable response

Further guidance – candidates may discuss 'benefits(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 benefit is more important than another; may compare with one or more other benefit; usually 2/3 reasons clearly linked to benefits of having a job i.e. some attempt to explain how having a job affects a person's life positively.
e.g. Reducing poverty is the most important benefit of having a job because this helps the person and their family in lots of additional ways. For example children can then afford to go to school and get an education to help them get a job in the future. Having a good income helps people to buy food and keep healthy. This also reduces the burden on the government for healthcare so they can spend money on other things.

Level 3: Reasonable Response **[3]**
Some reasoned explanation of why one benefit is most important; usually 1/2 reasons suggested with some link to positive effects of having a job, but may be implicit at times.
e.g. Reducing poverty is most important because people will have better lives in lots of different ways because they have more money to spend, for example on food and education. This improves their lives as a whole.

Level 2: Basic Response **[2]**
Identifies a benefit as important / most important but reasoning is weak or not linked to having a job explicitly.
e.g. Having a job has the important benefit of giving them a vital human right which many people believe is important.

Level 1: Limited Response **[1]**
Simple identification of a benefit but no attempt to justify or the reasoning is not related to having a job
e.g. money OR reducing poverty because it helps people

No relevant response or creditworthy material. **[0]**

(c) Explain why unemployment is an important global issue. [6]

Indicative Content

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

- The benefits / consequences of having/not having a job for individuals – see Source
- The benefits / consequences of having/not having a job for communities/countries – see Source
- The benefits / consequences of having/not having a job for global society – see
- Issues of equal opportunities / fairness – helps to address or reduce inequality / poverty
- The need for access to a job as a human right for all
- In response to government, United Nations and other NGO humanitarian aims and goals e.g. millenium goals
- Interdependence – we are all affected
- 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 unemployment 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 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 unemployment 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 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 unemployment 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 undeveloped point. 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.

2 **Study Source 3.**

(a) **'We need more people with the skills and confidence to start small businesses to create jobs.'**

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

Indicative Content

Candidates are likely to discuss the following evaluative points:

Strengths
- factual evidence is used
- several different types of evidence are used – opinion, factual, testimony and anecdotal
- 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
- other reasonable response

Weaknesses
- research evidence is not cited – the source and authorship are not clear
- level of expertise of the writer / businessman is not clear – may have poor knowledge claims
- there is no apparent evidence from expertise or statistical / numerical
- the evidence is not easy to verify / check from the information provided
- some evidence is only anecdotal using one example
- too much reliance on opinion
- evidence may be out of date
- personal testimony / anecdote may not apply to other businesses / places / countries etc.
- other reasonable response

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

Level and Marks	Description of Level
L3: Strong Response **5–6**	Strong, clear evaluation about how well the writer uses the evidence in the Source to support the 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 evaluative points. 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.
L2: 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 evaluative points, usually with 1/2 undeveloped points. 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.
L1: 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) **'Locally created jobs encourage workers to have greater commitment and increased pride in their work.'**

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

Indicative Content

Types of Information
- compare statistics / information on attitudes of workers in different size businesses – small local and large multinational
- compare statistics / information on success of businesses locally, nationally and internationally
- questionnaire and interview data from workers in different types of business
- expert testimony from business leaders and trade unions
- other relevant response

Sources of Information
- national and local governments and their departments
- international organizations e.g. United Nations; International Labour Organisation
- business experts
- research reports
- people at work in different types of organizations – 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
- interview workers
- observe workers
- interview relevant experts
- internet search
- case studies of different work places
- 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, with at least 2/3 methods explained. 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 1/2 methods. 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 method/s to test and evaluate the claim. The response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted suggestions. 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.

3 **Study Source 4.**

(a) Identify one value judgement. Explain why you think it is a value judgement. **[3]**

Indicative Content

A value judgement is a subjective assessment based on a code of values concerning what is right and wrong; a decision based on moral principles or beliefs; an opinion based on an individual's beliefs or views of what is desirable, important or highly regarded and not upon facts which can be checked or proved.

The following examples of value judgements may be found in Source 4:

- It is right to make young people a priority
- It is only fair for those who caused the recession through bad management to pay for new jobs to be created.

Level 3: Strong Response **[3]**

The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of value judgements 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 value judgements 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 value judgement from the Source correctly but does not explain the reason; the response demonstrates very little or no understanding of the nature of value statements.

No relevant response or creditworthy material. **[0]**

(b) Identify one fact. Explain why you think it is a fact. **[3]**

Indicative Content

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:

- recession has hit young people the hardest in all parts of the world
- young people are nearly three times as likely as adults to be unemployed
- an estimated 6.4 million young people have given up hope of finding a job
- Professor Smith says that governments could pay employers' training costs

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]**

(c) In this discussion, whose reasoning works better, Joan's or Ahmed'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]

Indicative Content

Candidates are expected to evaluate the reasoning in the two statements and compare their effectiveness. They should make a supported judgement with some explanation about which person has the most effective reasoning.

Candidates may consider the following types of issue:

Quality of the argument
- clarity
- tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise
- language
- balance

Quality of the evidence
- relevance
- sufficiency – sample
- source – 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 **Which of the following ways do you think is most likely to increase employment for young people:**

- **Global – through international organisations improving world trade**
- **National – by governments spending more money on young people and employment**
- **Local – by training people to start their own businesses**

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]**

Indicative Content

Candidates are expected to compare and assess the effectiveness of different forms of action to increase employment for young people 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 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 increase employment for young people. 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 increase employment for young people. 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 increase employment for young people. 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. A range of undeveloped points could be enough to reach this level. 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 increase employment for young people. 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 unemployment in general rather than an explanation of why a level of action is more likely to help; or a list of ways to increase employment 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 increase employment for young people. There is very little clarity in the argument. The response is likely to assert a very simple view or describe unemployment/work issues generally. The response may not contain any relevant points about action to increase employment for young people.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material