



GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

0457/33

Paper 3 Written Paper

October/November 2017

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 60

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

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

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

This document consists of **14** printed pages.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1a(i)	<p>Candidates identify the trend IN PEOPLE owning pets worldwide from Source 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the number is increasing/rising/going up or similar <p>1 mark for the correct answer</p>	1	<p>1 The only acceptable answers are located in Source 1. Candidates may use their own words but the answers must be in that order.</p> <p>2 Only award worldwide trend in people, not type of pets or trend in the US.</p>
1a(ii)	<p>Candidate identifies the main group of owners from Source 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • either single people or the elderly <p>1 mark for a correct answer</p>	1	<p>The only acceptable answers are located in Source 1. Candidates may use their own words but the answers must be in that order.</p>
1(b)	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates are likely to discuss the following uses of animals, drawing upon the information in Source 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food • Clothing • Medical research • Beauty products • Entertainment <p>Candidates are likely to give the following reasons to justify their choice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible further consequences or effects • Degree of impact/seriousness for individuals/groups • How many people/groups/countries are affected • Increasing cycle of advantage/disadvantage • Other reasonable response 	4	<p>Candidates must discuss one of the uses from Source 2 as listed; the assessment is focussed upon their reasoning/justification.</p>

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

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(c)	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates are likely to discuss the following reasons drawing upon the information in Sources 1 and 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether using animals for entertainment is right or wrong and reason for their choice • Issues of value and beliefs about animal welfare • Other reasonable responses <p>The following levels of response should be used to award marks:</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Strong response Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation; usually two (or more) developed arguments clearly linked to the issue; or three (or more) undeveloped reasons.</p> <p>The ethical/moral dimension is explicit.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response Some reasoned explanation; usually one (or more) developed argument(s) with some link to the issue, but may be implicit at times; or two (or more) undeveloped reasons.</p> <p>The ethical/moral dimension is partly explicit.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Basic response Basic reasoning and explanation; the response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted points. Arguments are partial, generalised and lack clarity.</p> <p>The ethical/moral dimension may be implicit or not be apparent.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No relevant or creditworthy material</p>	6	

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

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2(a)	<p>The following levels of response should be used to award marks.</p> <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Strong response Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of ways to test the claim. The response is likely to contain two (or more) developed points, and may contain some undeveloped points.</p> <p>The response is clearly and explicitly related to testing the claim.</p> <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response Reasoned and mainly credible explanation of ways to test the claim. The response is likely to contain one (or more) developed point(s), and/or a range of undeveloped points.</p> <p>The response is implicitly related to testing the claim.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Basic response Basic explanation of ways to test the claim. The response is likely to contain one or two simple, undeveloped and asserted points.</p> <p>There is little relevance in the response to testing the claim – the methods, sources and types of information are generally not appropriate for the claim being tested.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>		

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

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(a)	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>It's a prediction as 'will' is used and it's an opinion as she doesn't verify what she says with any evidence or proof. It might be a fact if she gave evidence or a source where she got her information from.</p> <p>The following levels of response should be used to award marks.</p> <p>Level 3 (3 marks) Strong response The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of this part of an argument.</p> <p>Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response The response demonstrates some understanding of the nature of this part of an argument. The explanation lacks some clarity and accuracy.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Basic response The candidate identifies the part of the argument but does not explain the nature of the part; the response demonstrates very little or no understanding.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>	3	<p>1 Award 1 mark for any of prediction, opinion or both.</p> <p>2 Award L2 for a partial explanation of their judgement with some understanding.</p> <p>3 Award L3 for clear explanation and understanding of their judgement.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(b)	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>A value judgement is a view or belief about what is important or right/wrong.</p> <p>The following examples of value judgements may be found in Source 3: ‘It is wrong for human beings to use animals for food, clothing, experiments or anything else.’ ‘It is equally wrong for humans to ignore the consequences to animals of their actions.’</p> <p>The following levels of response should be used to award marks.</p> <p>Level 3 (3 marks) Strong response The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of value judgements and applies this accurately to a correct example identified from the source.</p> <p>Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response The response demonstrates some understanding of the nature of value judgements and attempts to apply this to a correct example identified from the source. The explanation lacks some clarity and accuracy.</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) Basic response The candidate identifies one value judgement from the source correctly but does not explain the reason; the response demonstrates very little or no understanding of the nature of values.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>	3	<p>1 If the example is incorrect the candidate must score 0 even if the reasoning suggests some understanding of the nature of value judgements.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3(c)	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates are expected to evaluate the reasoning in the two statements and compare their effectiveness. They should make a supported judgement with some explanation about which person has the most effective reasoning.</p> <p>Candidates may consider the following types of issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of the argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – clarity – tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise – language – balance • Quality of the evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – relevance – sufficiency – sample – source – media; radio – date – how recent – factual, opinion, value, anecdote – testimony – from experience and expert • Knowledge claims • Ability to see • Sources of bias <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – gender – political – personal values – experience • Likelihood of solutions working and consequences of their ideas • Acceptability of their values to others <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view 	12	1 If only one statement is discussed explicitly, then maximum of Level 3.

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

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Basic response Basic points about which reasoning works better. There may be only one argument considered in any detail, with little attempt at comparison. Judgements and evaluative points are likely to be partially supported and lack clarity/relevance at times.</p> <p>The response is likely to contain two (or more) undeveloped points.</p> <p>A basic judgement may be reached.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response Limited and unsupported points about which reasoning works better. The response is likely to consider the arguments briefly and/or tangentially. There is little clarity. Answers at this level may repeat source material with little understanding or simply agree/disagree with the arguments presented. The response may not contain any clear evaluative points.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates are expected to argue using reasons and evidence to justify their opinion and judgement about the issue i.e. whether it is the responsibility of governments or individuals to protect animals.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to use and develop the material found in the sources, but should go beyond simply repeating or recycling without adaptation. Other material may be introduced but it is not necessary to gain full marks.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to consider the following arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reference to scale of impact on individual/group/governmental behaviour/actions • 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 <p>The following levels of response should be used to award marks:</p> <p>Level 5 (16–18 marks) Very good response Clear, well supported and structured reasoning about the issue. Different arguments and perspectives are clearly considered. The response is likely to contain a range of clearly reasoned points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with three (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points. A clear judgement is reached.</p>	12	Candidates may focus on the issue of individual vs. government responsibility and/or the need to protect animals. Both are acceptable.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>Level 4 (12–15 marks) Strong response Clear, supported reasoning with some structure about the issue. Different arguments and perspectives are considered. The response is likely to contain some reasoned points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with two (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points. A judgement is reached.</p> <p>Level 3 (8–11 marks) Reasonable response Some supported reasoning about the issue. Different arguments and perspectives are included. The response is likely to contain points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with one (or more) developed point(s), and some undeveloped points. An attempt is made to give an overall judgement.</p> <p>Level 2 (4–7 marks) Basic response Basic reasoning about the issue. Different arguments are included; perspectives, if present, are unclear. The response is likely to rely on assertion rather than evidence and contain some undeveloped points. A basic judgement may be attempted.</p> <p>Level 1 (1–3 marks) Limited response Limited and unsupported reasoning about the issue in general. Different arguments may be included.</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>		