MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2014 series

0457 GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

0457/31	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 October/November 2014 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

1   (a) **Give <u>two</u> reasons for poor health in developing countries according to Sources 1 and 2.**   **[2]**

Candidates may identify the following reasons from Sources 1 and 2:

* poverty
* poor diet
* lack of knowledge about health *(do not credit 'lack of knowledge' alone without clear reference to health)*
* not enough medical care
* governments cannot afford more clinics and hospitals
* healthcare cannot reach remote areas
* vaccinations are expensive
* people do not understand the benefits of vaccinations
* dirty water
* lack of sewage facilities

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

Further guidance – note that the only acceptable answers are located in Sources 1 and 2. However candidates may use their own words to describe a reason from this list.

(b) Explain why vaccination campaigns are not always successful. **[4]**

Indicative Content

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

- vaccinations are expensive so many people cannot afford them *(be careful when crediting 'too expensive' alone because the expense would only impact on the success of the campaign if people could not afford them. 'Too expensive' would need to be explained in light of the impact on vaccination campaigns to be fully credited)*
- people do not understand the benefits of vaccinations
- cultural bias against vaccinations
- people may be wary of possible side effects
- vaccinations do not always work
- widespread illness may be difficult to reach in remote areas – groups/countries/globally
- How much it affects local, national and international communities – the problem is too big
- Other reasonable response

Further guidance – candidates may discuss 'reasons(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.

Level 4: Strong Response **[4]**
Clearly reasoned explanation of why vaccination campaigns are not always successful; usually 3 reasons.

E.g. If the disease is very widespread it is difficult to reach everyone and so the disease can still spread to others and the campaign won't work because new people will catch it; also governments cannot afford to vaccinate everyone as they are so expensive and so the disease will be able to affect those people not given the injection so the disease continues to have an effect.

Level 3: Reasonable Response **[3]**
Some reasoned explanation of why vaccination campaigns are not always successful; usually 2 reasons suggested.

E.g. If the disease is very widespread it is difficult to reach everyone and provide vaccinations so the disease can still spread to others.

Level 2: Basic Response **[2]**
Identifies reason(s) but argument is weak or not linked to success of vaccination campaigns explicitly.

E.g. If the disease is very widespread it is difficult to reach everyone.

Level 1: Limited Response **[1]**
Simple identification of a reason but no attempt to link to vaccination campaigns; asserted only and not explained.

E.g. they are expensive

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

(c) Explain why poor healthcare in developing countries is an important national issue.

[6]

Indicative Content

Candidates are likely to discuss the following reasons drawing upon the information in Sources 1 and 2:
- The benefits/consequences of poor healthcare locally and *nationally* – see Source 2
- The benefits/consequences of poor healthcare for individuals applied to a *national context* – see Source 2
- The benefits/consequences of poor healthcare job for global society applied to a *national context* – see Source 2
- Issues of equal opportunities/fairness – issue of unequal access to resources
- The need for access to healthcare as a human right for all
- In response to government, United Nations and other NGO humanitarian aims and goals e.g. millennium 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**	Clearly reasoned explanation justifying why poor healthcare is an issue of national importance. 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 clearly and explicitly related to the national 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 poor healthcare is an issue of national importance. The response is likely to contain some reasoned arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with at least 1 developed point, and some undeveloped points. Arguments may be partial and lack clarity at times. The national 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**	Assertion as to why poor healthcare is an issue of national 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 national 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 (a) 'In my opinion we need more resources from the government to treat people properly.'

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
- some factual evidence is used
- several different types of evidence are used – opinion, factual, testimony of experience
- 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 doctor is not clear – may have poor knowledge claims
- evidence from expertise is alleged/unclear
- there is no clear, specific statistical/numerical evidence
- the evidence is not easy to verify/check from the information provided
- too much reliance on opinion
- evidence may be out of date
- personal testimony/anecdote may not apply to other places/countries etc.
- other reasonable response

Responses focusing on only strengths **or** weaknesses may still reach the highest mark depending on the quality of the evaluation.

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. The response is likely to contain at least 2 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. 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 evaluation of how well the writer uses the evidence in the Source to support their opinion. The response is likely to contain at least 1 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.
L1: Basic Response **1–2**	Some basic evaluation of how well the writer uses the evidence in the Source to support their 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) **What other information would you need to decide whether better pay and promotion for local doctors will make them continue to work in developing countries?** **[6]**

Indicative Content

Possible Types of Information
- compare statistics/information on emigration of doctors from different countries with different levels of pay
- compare statistics/information on job satisfaction of doctors and level of pay/promotion
- questionnaire and interview data from doctors
- expert testimony from doctors and professional associations
- other relevant response

Possible Sources of Information
- national and local governments and their departments
- international health organizations e.g. United Nations; WHO
- medical experts
- research reports
- individual doctors – case studies and personal testimony
- pressure groups, charities and non-government organizations working in the health sector
- media and worldwide web
- other relevant response

Possible Methods
- review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents
- interview doctors
- interview relevant experts
- internet search
- case studies
- 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 information 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 2 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 information 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 developed point, 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 information to test and evaluate the claim. The response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted suggestion(s), with only 1/2 undeveloped points. Explanations are partial and lack clarity. 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 (a) Study Source 4. Identify <u>one</u> opinion from Rafaela. Explain why you think this is an opinion. [3]

Indicative Content

An opinion is a personal view or attitude or perspective; judgment or belief not founded on certainty or proof *(only one aspect is required)*.

The following examples of opinions may be found in Rafaela's statement:

- some of the newer international charities, like the Bill Gates Foundation, are excellent
- they (the Bill Gates foundation) employ good quality people
- they have made real progress in distributing medicines
- they move fast in new ways

Level 3: Strong Response [3]

Reasoned thoughtful response which demonstrates understanding of the nature of opinions and applies this accurately to a correct example identified from the Source.

Level 2: Reasonable Response [2]

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]

Response 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 opinions.

No relevant response or creditworthy material [0]

Further guidance – If the example identified is wrong but the explanation is clearly correct Level 1 should be awarded.

(b) Study Source 4. Identify <u>one</u> prediction from Zhen. Explain why you think this is a prediction. [3]

Indicative Content

A prediction is an assertion or statement about what might happen at some point in the future; something that is forecast in advance.

The following examples of predictions may be found in Zhen's statement:

- if we don't educate local people about personal healthcare they are more likely to become ill
- health will become worse

Level 3: Strong Response [3]

Reasoned thoughtful response which demonstrates understanding of the nature of predictions and applies this accurately to a correct example identified from the Source.

Level 2: Reasonable Response [2]

Response demonstrates some understanding of the nature of predictions 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 prediction from the Source correctly but does not explain the reason; the response demonstrates very little or no understanding of the nature of predictions.

No relevant response or creditworthy material. [0]

Further guidance – If the example identified is wrong but the explanation is clearly correct Level 1 should be awarded.

(c) **Whose reasoning works better, Rafaela's or Zhen'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	Strong 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 addresses both statements explicitly. A clear assessment or conclusion is reached.
L4: Strong Response 8–10	Reasonable judgements about which reasoning works better. Some evaluation of how well the reasoning works for both statements with an attempt at 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 addresses both statements explicitly. 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 at least one of the 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

Further guidance – Responses which do not mention both contributors cannot be placed above L3.

4   **Do you think that poverty in developing countries can be reduced by improving healthcare?**

In your answer you should:

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

Indicative Content

Candidates are expected to assess the effectiveness of improved healthcare to reduce poverty. A judgement should be made about this way to reduce poverty. 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 may consider the impact of healthcare improvements on poverty, for example:

- increased access to education
- increased access to work and employability
- more productive work force created
- more economic growth
- other reasonable argument

Candidates may also consider and compare alternative ways to reduce poverty, for example:

- government action to create economic growth
- more jobs
- higher incomes
- more education
- personal, local/national and global levels of action
- other reasonable suggestion

The arguments used to consider different methods/levels of action are likely to include:

- reference to scale of impact – how many people are helped
- 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 the impact of healthcare on poverty. Coherent, structured argument and evaluation. 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. More than one perspective is considered explicitly. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion is reached.
L4: Strong Response 12–15	Strong, supported reasoning and judgements about the impact of healthcare on poverty. Some clear argument and evaluation. 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 perspectives.
L3: Reasonable Response 8–11	Reasonable argument and judgement about the impact of healthcare on poverty. 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 the impact of healthcare on poverty. Arguments are unlikely to be supported and mainly asserted. There is little clarity of argument and no structure. Some attempt to make a judgement 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 health and/or poverty in general; or a list of ways to improve healthcare.
L1: Limited Response 1–3	Limited, if any, unsupported argument about the impact of healthcare on poverty. There is very little clarity in the argument. The response is likely to assert a very simple view or describe poverty or health issues generally.
0	No relevant or creditworthy material