



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
International General Certificate of Secondary Education

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

0457/03

Paper 3

For Examination from 2012

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

1 hour 15 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK: 60

This document consists of **8** printed pages.



1 (a) Give three ways in which the internet could reduce poverty. [3]

Internet systems make welfare systems more efficient (so there is more money to help the people who need it).

The internet is a useful tool (weather forecasting, etc.).

The internet puts sellers directly in contact with markets.

This all means that people should make more money.

Old technology is getting cheaper, so it will soon be free to poor people.

In the future, educational material will be free too, like Wikipedia.

But people in poor countries will be happy to use free materials.

So people in less developed countries will soon receive a good education via online learning.

People will be able to work for any company in the world using the internet, wherever they live.

So companies will use cheaper workers in poorer countries, and these countries will get richer.

Any three. One mark each.

Accept reasonable summary or paraphrase. Accept reasonable suggestions from candidates which did not appear in the stimulus passage.

(b) Give three reasons why the internet is unlikely to reduce poverty. [3]

The internet (hardware, software, access) costs money that people don't have.

People spend their time on the internet messaging, etc. (accept gossiping / not working).

Online gossip can't make people richer.

Some people are spending a big proportion (15%) of their income on communications.

Any three. One mark each.

Accept reasonable summary or paraphrase. Accept reasonable suggestions from candidates which did not appear in the stimulus passage.

- (c) **yachi38 asks einar_norseman whether poor people are ‘people who have nothing or just people who don’t have enough.’ Explain how this difference affects the discussion about whether the internet can reduce poverty. [6]**

It makes a difference because people who have nothing and can’t afford to eat probably can’t afford internet access, so einar_norseman might be right that the internet won’t reduce poverty. But for people who are poor but not so poor they have nothing, the internet might be affordable and help them to earn more money, so it might help to reduce poverty for these people.

Mark according to levels of response

0 marks – no creditworthy material.

Level 1 (1–2 marks): Basic Response

Comment which relates to the definition of poor people and might imply why this makes a difference.

e.g. not all poor people have nothing.

Level 2 (3–4 marks): Reasonable Response

Attempt to explain why the definition makes a difference, with some reference to the debate about internet access OR a better explanation which does not make direct reference to the internet.

e.g. People with nothing really can’t afford the internet. People with not enough might be able to afford it.

Level 3 (5–6 marks): Strong Response

Convincing explanation of why a definition of poor people makes a difference to the debate about the internet.

e.g. If poor people are only people who have nothing, einar_norseman is right, the internet is too expensive to help them. But if poor people just don’t have enough, the internet might help them to get more. So einar_norseman would be wrong.

Exemplar candidates answers to Q1 (c)

Basic Response

It makes a difference because people who have nothing means that they can’t even afford their basic needs for example food, water, clothes etc. And people who don’t have enough means that they lack of something, they have it but not enough. For example clean water, they haven’t got enough clean water, they just have some sometimes.

Reasonable Response

If we are talking about people with nothing then to be honest they probably are more worried about getting food on the table. However, if it is people without much money then they would probably love to have a computer with internet.

Strong Response

Because if poor people means people who don’t have enough, it means that they have something and they can sacrifice that something to have access to the internet and then the internet may help them to make money. But if it is that poor people are people that have nothing then they cannot even have the possibility to use the internet so there is no way that the internet can help these kind of people.

- 2 (a) **How useful is dembe's example about people in Madagascar in deciding whether the internet will help reduce poverty? Explain your answer and suggest what else you would need to know.** [6]

It is not very useful because it does not give us any information about what the people are using the internet for, whether it helps them to make any more money, or whether the time they spend travelling would be better spent working. But it is useful to the extent that it demonstrates that there is a demand for the internet, and perhaps a need for better internet access. We would need to know what people are using the internet for, and how many people would use it / be able to pay for it if provision were better.

Mark according to levels of response.

0 marks – no creditworthy response

Level 1 (1–2 marks): Basic Response

Comment relating to Dembe's example which might imply whether it is useful or not, possibly accompanied by an unfocused suggestion of what else we would need to know.

Level 2 (3–4 marks): Reasonable Response

Attempt to explain why Dembe's example is (not) very useful in deciding what to think with some suggestion of what else we would need to know to make this judgements.

Level 3 (5–6 marks): Strong Response

Convincing explanation why Dembe's example is (not) very useful in deciding what to think, with at least one strong suggestion of what else we would need to know to make this judgement.

- (b) **India is trying to reduce poverty by ensuring that one young person in each village is able to use the internet. Give two pieces of information you would need to help you decide whether this is working and explain how each would help you decide.** [6]

Mark according to levels of response:

0 marks – no creditworthy material.

Level 1 (1–2 marks): Basic Response

Answer which might suggest (vaguely or obliquely) what information would be useful but these suggestions are unfocused or are unlikely to be helpful in making a decision about whether the internet is likely to reduce poverty).

Level 2 (3–4 marks): Reasonable Response

Answer suggests what information would be useful with some focus on how it might help make a decision about whether or not the internet is likely to reduce poverty.

Level 3: (5–6 marks): Strong Response

Considered answer which suggests precisely relevant information useful in helping to make a decision about whether or not the internet is likely to reduce poverty.

Exemplar candidate answers to Qs 2 (a) and (b).

Basic Response

- (a) *Dembe said that some people need to travel to get to the place with internet access, I think it's really useful because it's not convenient for the people, so that that government can help maybe to build libraries so that people can use there.*
- (b) *How many people are in each village, ask them if they are free to use.*

Reasonable Response

- (a) *People need to travel for hours for access to internet, which means they may not use it because for the inconvenience. This means the internet access is useless for some people. I need to know how are the people populated and try to suggest placing computers in the area which is most densely populated to reduce travel time of some people. Increasing the number of computers is also effective but may cost more.*
- (b) *How is the government planning to let the young person use the internet, and how should this reduce poverty. If the government do not have a plan, they are likely to fail because the young people from different villages may spend time playing instead of being productive.*

Strong Response

- (a) *Dembe's example suggest that internet is not easily available in poorer countries therefore may not be very beneficial to the poor. However, it also suggest that people make use of the internet if they are travelling long distances to use it. it doesn't however say whether it is the poor who travel these long distances and whether they use it at all. Therefore Dembe's example is not very useful.*
- (b) *You would need to know, firstly and most importantly, whether there is one young person in each village, who is able to read and write. Furthermore you would then need to know the approximate cost of enabling internet access and electricity for each village, and whether India has the economy to pay for this, as the costs would surely be enormous.*

3 Whose argument is most convincing – that of kwame77 or dave_sunlord's?

In your answer you should

- consider the claims they make;
- consider possible consequences;
- use examples of words and phrases from their web visitors' comments to support your point of view. [18]

Mark according to levels of response

Level 0: no creditworthy material.

Level 1 (1–6 marks): Basic Response

Opinion about which is more convincing followed by paraphrase of or (dis)agreement with the text OR undeveloped comparison which may hint at an evaluative point OR stock, pre-learned phrases which are not well applied to these particular arguments.

e.g. kwame77 is more convincing because he gives reasons why the internet can help people out of poverty. dave_sunlord isn't convincing because the internet is never going to be free.

Level 2 (7–12 marks): Reasonable Response

Conclusion about which argument is more convincing supported by justified agreement or disagreement with the argument and/or some evaluative comment relating to the quality of these particular arguments which might offer some support to a conclusion about which is most convincing.

e.g. kwame77 is more convincing because he gives good reasons why the internet can help people. It is likely that a consequence of using the weather forecast is that you will plan better, perhaps avoid wind damage. dave_sunlord is not convincing because he talks about extreme consequences.

Level 3 (13–18 marks): Strong Response

A structured response which uses evaluation of the quality of these particular arguments to support a conclusion about how convincing they are.

e.g. kwame77 is more convincing because his claims are reasonable and it makes sense to say that investing in a tool can help improve productivity. His claim that craftswomen in Nairobi can sell directly to people in New York really does mean that they can make more money – without the internet people in New York wouldn't even know about the people in Nairobi. dave_sunlord is not at all convincing because his claims are exaggerated and he talks about extreme consequences. Just because old technology is getting cheaper doesn't mean it will soon be free.

Exemplar candidate part answers to Q3.**Basic Response**

I think kwame 77 is more convincing because he said about how internet can help the different people in different ways. Web visitor think that it will help to improve the economy of the place. Although dave_sunlord's is also very convincing, but I think kwame 77's is more powerful and he said it will help the people in the country. [This was a complete answer.]

Reasonable Response

I think dave_sunlord's comment is more convincing. Kwame 77 claims farmers can see the weather forecast, but it can be done with the radio. Craftwomen can not really sell to New York because they need to mail it which may not be safe ... On the other hand, dave_sunlord's comment ... provided real evidence of free and paid educational materials, suggested realistic ways of reducing poverty. [This is part of the answer.]

Strong Response

I think kwame 77's argument is more convincing as kwame 77 considers what could happen if all went to plan rather than insisting it will dave_sunlord claims that 'internet will end poverty' as if it is the only thing needed to end poverty; that internet by itself will end poverty is very unlikely. dave_sunlord seems to argue that poor people will use anything free, even if it is unreliable, and that this will help education seems contradictory ... kwame 77's opinion that by putting people halfway across the world from each other in direct contact more business can be done seems correct, but he does not ensure his claim that, 'this all means that people should make more money.' Both have flaws but kwame 77 is more realistic. [This is part of the answer.]

4 Do you think that poor countries with limited resources should invest a lot of money in the internet?

In your answer you should:

- **give reasons for your opinion;**
- **show that you have considered different points of view;**
- **explain why you disagreed with some of these points of view. [18]**

Mark according to levels of response:

Level 0: no creditworthy material.

Level 1 (1–6 marks): Basic Response

May be undeveloped and / or inconclusive. Tends to use statement and exaggeration rather than reasoning, and there is very little support for a conclusion / opinion if given. Mentions alternative perspectives only vaguely or in a confused way. May simply repeat much of the stimulus material without adaptation.

Level 2 (7–12 marks): Reasonable Response

Provides reasoning which gives some logical support to the clearly stated conclusion / opinion. There may be occasional exaggeration. Attempts to consider alternative opinions (which may not be fully relevant) and explain why these were not accepted (although this may be a simple disagreement or only a partial answer).

Level 3 (13–18 marks): Strong Response

Clear and structured. Provides reasoning giving strong logical support to the candidate's conclusion / opinion, which may be nuanced and/or suggest middle ground between different options. Considers relevant alternative points of view and explains why these were not accepted in a way which really answers points raised.

Exemplar candidates part answers to Q4

Basic Response

Yes I do think that poor countries with limited resources should invest a lot of their money in the internet because the internet would basically help people get money. ... but sometime the internet can ruin your whole life. It can turn your life upside down if you do not use it in the right way. [This is part of the answer.]

Reasonable Response

I think that investing in internet technology for all the country could be really useful ... but in my point of view, I think what comes first is the health and good education of the country which is also requiring huge help from the government in most countries so I agree with 'how can internet technology help people who cannot afford to buy food or shelter or health care' said by einar_norseman. In my opinion, countries should start from this point by helping develop health and education ... as kwame 77 said, 'the internet can possibly reduce poverty' but he is not sure, so it is best not to put everything into it. [This is part of the answer.]

Strong Response

Poor countries should not invest heavily in technology because the money could be put to better use, such as education. Giving computers to poor people will only burden them more because they will have to pay monthly for a connection. Although a country will need internet access, I believe this should be done through mobile internet cafes to cater for those who need it ... The populations' health needs can not be sacrificed to the needs of a few who want internet access. [This is part of the answer.]