GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES	**0457/31**
Paper 3 Written Paper	**October/November 2016**
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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2016 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **12** printed pages.

1 (a) Identify two positive consequences of improving transport systems from Source 1. [2]

Candidates may identify the following positive consequences from Source 1:

- enable movement around the world
- quicker to get to/from places
- easier to get abroad/move around the world
- easier to visit family and friends
- take more holidays
- places seem far away
- transport is cheaper
- transport is faster/quicker
- more employment opportunities
- move goods and services to people who need them more easily
- transport to school/work easier

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. Candidates may use their own words.

(b) **From Source 2, explain which one of the negative consequences of improving transport systems you think is the most significant.** **[4]**

Indicative Content

The following negative consequences caused by improving transport links may be identified from the source:

- environmental damage
- spread of disease
- increased risk of accidents
- more traffic
- less land

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

- Possible further consequences or effects
- Degree of impact/seriousness for individuals/countries/world
- How many people/groups/countries are affected
- Increasing cycle of decline
- How widespread the problem is
- How easy to solve
- Effects on natural world and human ways of life
- Other reasonable response

Further guidance – candidates may discuss 'consequences' from the Sources as listed above in the Mark Scheme; the majority of marks are for their reasoning/justification.

Level of Response and Marks	Description of Level
Level 4: Strong Response **4 marks**	Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of which negative consequence is the most significant; may compare different advantages; usually two (or more) developed arguments clearly linked to the issue; or a range of undeveloped reasons.
Level 3: Reasonable Response **3 marks**	Some reasoned explanation of which negative consequence is the most significant; usually at least one (or more) developed argument(s) suggested with some link to the issue, but may be implicit at times; or several undeveloped reasons.
Level 2: Basic Response **2 marks**	Identifies a consequence as significant but argument is weak or not linked to the issue explicitly.
Level 1: Limited Response **1 mark**	Simple identification of a consequence but no attempt to justify or the reasoning is not related to the issue.
0 marks	No relevant response or creditworthy material.

(c) Do you think that having cheaper and faster forms of transport is an important local issue? Explain your answer. **[6]**

Indicative Content

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

- The benefits of transport for the locality and the individual
- The consequences of not having growth in local transport systems
- The benefits of transport links for the local economy
- The benefits/consequences of transport links for individuals
- The benefits/consequences of transport links for human welfare – food, medicines, ease of access, etc.
- Issues of value and beliefs about the responsibility of governments
- 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**	Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of importance; usually two (or more) developed arguments clearly linked to the issue; or a wide range of undeveloped reasons. Lower in the band a greater proportion of arguments will be left undeveloped.
Level 2: Reasonable Response **3–4**	Some reasoned explanation of importance; usually at least one (or more) developed argument(s) with some link to the issue, but may be implicit at times; or several undeveloped reasons. Lower in the band 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; the response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted explanation, with only one undeveloped point. Arguments are partial, generalised and lack clarity. The local 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.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material

2 (a) Opinion is divided about the need for building a new airport or a third runway.

The chairperson of the local transport committee suggests collecting evidence of public opinion by asking people at the airport to complete a questionnaire.

How effective do you think this method is? Give reasons for your opinion. **[6]**

Indicative Content

Candidates are likely to discuss the following evaluative points:

Strengths
- some evidence can be provided – opinion, values
- the evidence could generally be relevant and used to inform an argument
- the evidence could be related clearly and explicitly to the argument
- the evidence will come from appropriate subjects (those that will benefit)
- other reasonable response

Weaknesses
- will only get responses from those that travel/ have money to travel/ tourists rather than local people
- method of research is time consuming and labour intensive
- there will probably be little clear, specific statistical/numerical evidence
- too much reliance on opinion
- evidence takes a long time to collect and analyse
- 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**	Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of the effectiveness of the method. The response is likely to contain two (or more) developed points, and may contain some undeveloped points. The response is clearly and explicitly related to collecting public opinion.
L2: Reasonable Response **3–4**	Reasoned and mainly credible explanation of the effectiveness of the method. The response is likely to contain one (or more) developed point(s), and/or a range of undeveloped points. The response is implicitly related to collecting public opinion.
L1: Basic Response **1–2**	Basic explanation of the effectiveness of the method. The response is likely to contain one or two simple, undeveloped and asserted points. There is little relevance in the response to collecting public opinion.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material

(b) How could you persuade people in your local area of the need to improve transport systems?

In your response, you must consider:

- **who you need to persuade and why;**
- **what you need to tell them;**
- **the method(s) you would use.** **[6]**

Indicative Content

- 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.

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

Level and Marks	Description of Level
Level 3: Strong Response **5–6**	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) bullet points, and there are 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.
Level 2: Reasonable Response **3–4**	Some supported reasoning and explanation. The response is likely to have a developed response for one (or more) bullet 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.
Level 1: Basic Response **1–2**	Basic reasoning and explanation. The response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted suggestions, with only one undeveloped point. Explanations are partial and lack clarity. There is little relevance to the issue. Lower in the band the points are likely to be very generalised, lack relevance to the issue and/or simply recycle/copy material from the Source material without any explanation or development.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material

3 (a) 'The number of passengers at the airport last year was about 60 million'

Is this statement a fact? Explain your answer.   [3]

Indicative Content

Either response is correct as long as the reasoning is reasonable.

A fact is information or data that can be verified or proven to be true, so this statement might be a fact (about 60 million) but it depends where the information given comes from. The statement alone does not contain any verification and we don't know if it's true, so it may not be a fact.

Level and Marks	Description of Level
Level 3: Strong Response 3 marks	The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of a fact.
Level 2: Reasonable Response 2 marks	The response demonstrates some understanding of the nature of a fact and gives some explanation.
Level 1: Basic Response 1 marks	Response demonstrates little understanding of the nature of a fact and may assert that the statement does/does not contain a fact.
0 marks	No relevant response or creditworthy material.

(b) 'I think fewer people will come anyway and then we will not need a new runway.'
Is this a prediction, an opinion or both? Explain your answer. **[3]**

Indicative Content

It's both, as less people will come and not needing a new runway happens *in the future* and 'I think' indicates that it's an opinion, something that someone believes but others may not share and is not necessarily verifiable/provable – *accept all three possibilities.*

Award 1 mark for the identification (prediction, or opinion, or both) and the additional 2 marks for the quality of the explanation, as per the Levels that follow.

Level and Marks	Description of Level
Level 3: Strong Response **3 marks**	The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of this part of an argument.
Level 2: Reasonable Response **2 marks**	The response demonstrates some understanding of the nature of this part of an argument. The explanation lacks some clarity and accuracy.
Level 1: Basic Response **1 marks**	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.
0 marks	No relevant response or creditworthy material.

(c) In this debate, whose reasoning works better, Sofia's or Rafi's?

In your answer you should support your point of view with words and phrases from the text 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

ability to see 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**	Clear, credible and well supported points about which reasoning works better. Coherent, structured evaluation of both arguments with clear comparison. The response is likely to contain three (or more) developed evaluative points, and may include some undeveloped points. A clear judgement is reached.
L4: Strong Response **8–10**	Clear, supported points about which reasoning works better. Evaluation of how well the reasoning works for both arguments with comparison. The response is likely to contain two (or more) developed evaluative points and may include some undeveloped points. A wide range (four or more) of undeveloped but clearly appropriate points may be sufficient to enter this band at the lower level. A judgement is reached.
L3: Reasonable Response **5–7**	Reasonable 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 or asserted. 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. An attempt is made to give an overall judgement.
L2: Basic Response **3–4**	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. The response is likely to contain two (or more) undeveloped points. A basic judgement may be reached.
L1: Limited Response **1–2**	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.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material

4 **Study Sources 1–4**

Do you think improving transport systems should be a priority for all countries?

In your answer you should:

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

Indicative Content

Candidates are expected to argue using reasons and evidence to justify their opinion and judgement about the issue.

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 are likely to consider the following arguments:

- reference to scale of impact on individual/group/governmental behaviour/actions
- how long it takes to make a difference
- barriers to change
- the power of collective action
- 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**	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 usually four (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points. A clear judgement is reached.

L4: Strong Response **12–15**	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 usually three (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points. A judgement is reached.
L3: Reasonable Response **8–11**	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 usually two (or more) developed point(s), and some undeveloped points. An attempt is made to give an overall judgement.
L2: Basic Response **4–7**	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 but contains usually one (or more) developed point(s) or a range of undeveloped points. A basic judgement may be attempted.
L1: Limited Response **1–3**	Limited and unsupported reasoning about the issue in general. Different arguments may be included.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material