



---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES**

**0457/33**

Paper 3 Written Paper

**May/June 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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

This document consists of **18** printed pages.

## General Marking Guidance

Marking is **positive**: marks must not be deducted for errors or inaccuracies.

Scripts must be **annotated** to show how and where marks have been awarded.

Crossed out work should be marked wherever possible unless the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response or its inclusion would infringe the rubric.

Poor spelling, handwriting or grammar should not be penalised as long as the answer makes sense, unless the mark scheme states otherwise.

In addition, for scoris-marked papers:

Ensure that you have completed the training for on-screen marking before you complete your practice and standardisation scripts.

A blank space, dash, question mark, or a response that bears no relation to the question constitutes a 'no response' rather than a zero.

Answers that are not written on the answer lines, or in the correct answer space, should still be marked.

If there are blank pages, these must be checked and annotated "BP" if the candidate has not written anything on them. Use the tick etc, as normal, if the candidate has written something worthy of credit. Use the cross, etc, if the candidate written something which is not worthy of credit.

Some candidates use additional sheets of paper and you must check these sheets in the same way as blank pages. You will be prompted whenever a candidate has done this.

**Note**

The mark scheme cannot cover all points that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases candidates may think of very strong answers which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should be credited according to their quality. If examiners are in any doubt about an answer they should contact their team leader or principal examiner. For answers marked by levels of response:

- a. Mark grids describe the top of each level.
- b. **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer.
- c. **To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Award mark</b>
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
1(a)(i)	<p>Candidates may identify the following number of mobile telephones:</p> <p>7 billion</p> <p>1 mark for the correct answer</p>	1	<p><b>Further Guidance</b></p> <p>The only acceptable answer is located in Source 1.</p>
1(a)(ii)	<p>Candidates may identify the following type of countries:</p> <p>developing countries</p> <p>1 mark for the correct answer</p>	1	<p><b>Further Guidance</b></p> <p>The only acceptable answer is located in Source 1.</p>
1(b)	<p>Indicative Content</p> <p>The following benefits of mobile phones and the internet for communication may be identified from the source:</p> <p>communicate without landlines when away from buildings and / or moving around</p> <p>communicating is much cheaper</p> <p>talk to relatives easily</p> <p>make friends in foreign countries</p> <p>shop and buy things from across the world</p> <p>businesses can trade overseas</p> <p>people can share ideas and work together more easily even when working in different countries.</p> <p>keep in contact with friends and family.</p>	4	<p><b>Further Guidance</b></p> <p>Candidates should discuss ‘benefits’ from the sources as listed; however, the assessment is focussed upon their reasoning / justification and so other benefits should be credited.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
	<p>Candidates are likely to give the following reasons to justify their choice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possible further consequences or effects</li> <li>Degree of impact / seriousness for individuals / countries / world</li> <li>How many people / groups / countries are affected</li> <li>Increasing ease and frequency of communication</li> <li>How widespread the advantage is</li> <li>Effects on political life and social stability</li> <li>Other reasonable response</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 4 (4 marks) Strong response</b> Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation; may compare different benefits; usually two (or more) developed arguments or a range of undeveloped reasons, clearly linked to the issue.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (3 marks) Reasonable response</b> Some reasoned explanation of why one benefit is most significant; 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><b>Level 2 (2 marks) Basic response</b> Identifies a benefit as significant but argument is weak or not linked to the issue explicitly.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response</b> Simple identification of a benefit but no attempt to justify or the reasoning is not related to the issue.</p> <p>Source material copied or recycled without development / explanation.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
1(c)	<p>Indicative Content</p> <p>Candidates are likely to discuss the following reasons drawing upon the information in the sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The benefits / consequences for individuals, countries and the world</li> <li>The benefits / consequences for economic growth – communication and language issues</li> <li>The benefits / consequences for human welfare – security, health, safety; relationships; etc</li> <li>Issues of value and beliefs about open communication and possible surveillance / privacy issues</li> <li>Human rights</li> <li>Morality – issues of right and wrong from different cultures</li> <li>In response to government, United Nations and other NGO aims and goals for development</li> <li>Potential conflict issues</li> <li>Other reasonable responses</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Strong response</b> Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of impact; usually two (or more) developed arguments clearly linked to the issue; or three (or more) undeveloped reasons. The global dimension is explicit.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response</b> Some reasoned explanation of impact; 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. The global dimension is mainly implicit.</p>	6	

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
	<p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Basic response</b> Basic reasoning and explanation; the response is likely to contain simple, undeveloped and asserted points. Arguments are partial, generalised and lack clarity. The global dimension may not be apparent. Source material copied or recycled without development / explanation.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant or creditworthy material</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
2(a)	<p>Indicative Content</p> <p>Candidates are likely to discuss the following evaluative points:</p> <p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some factual evidence is used</li> <li>several different types of evidence are used – opinion, fact, statistics, values</li> <li>the evidence is generally relevant</li> <li>the evidence is related clearly and explicitly to the argument</li> <li>the evidence is used forcefully in a strongly worded argument</li> <li>research evidence is cited</li> <li>personal experience used</li> <li>other reasonable response</li> </ul> <p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>research evidence is partially cited – the source and authorship are not clear</li> <li>level of expertise of the author is not clear – may have poor knowledge claims</li> <li>method of research is alleged / unclear</li> <li>there is only a little clear, specific statistical / numerical evidence</li> </ul>	<b>6</b>	<p><b>Further Guidance</b></p> <p>The candidate does not need to discuss both strengths and weaknesses to reach Level 3.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
	<p>the evidence is not easy to verify / check from the information provided  too much reliance on opinion and personal anecdote  evidence may be out of date  personal testimony / anecdote / values may not apply to other places /  countries etc  other reasonable responses</p> <p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Good response</b>  Clearly reasoned, credible and structured evaluation; usually two (or more)  developed points clearly linked to the issue, usually with some other  undeveloped points; or a wide range (four or more) of undeveloped points.  Evaluation is clearly focussed on the evidence, its strengths and / or  weaknesses, and the way it is used to support the view.  A convincing overall assessment or conclusion is reached.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response</b>  Reasonable evaluation mainly focused on the evidence, its strengths and / or  weaknesses, and the way it is used to support the view. The response may  contain one (or more) developed point(s), with some other undeveloped  points. Some (two or more) undeveloped points may be sufficient.</p> <p>An overall assessment or conclusion is attempted.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response</b>  Limited evaluation which is often unsupported and asserted. The response is  clear in part but is incomplete and generalised. It contains one undeveloped  point only. Answers at this level may repeat source material with little  understanding.</p> <p>An overall assessment or conclusion is weak or not attempted.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b>  No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>		



Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
2(b)	<p>Indicative Content</p> <p>Possible Types of Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>compare statistics / information on texting – for individuals, countries and globally</li> <li>interview or questionnaire data</li> <li>expert testimony</li> <li>material from international NGOs and pressure groups</li> <li>other relevant response</li> </ul> <p>Possible Sources of Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>national and local governments and their departments</li> <li>international organizations e.g. United Nations; UNESCO</li> <li>research experts</li> <li>research reports</li> <li>pressure groups, charities and non-government organizations</li> <li>media and worldwide web</li> <li>other relevant response</li> </ul> <p>Possible Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>review of secondary sources / literature / research / documents</li> <li>interviews</li> <li>interview relevant experts</li> <li>internet search</li> <li>questionnaires</li> <li>surveys</li> <li>other relevant response</li> </ul>	<b>6</b>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
	<p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Strong response</b> 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. The response is clearly and explicitly related to testing the claim.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response</b> 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. The response is implicitly related to testing the claim.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Basic response</b> 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><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
3(a)	<p>Indicative Content</p> <p>A fact is information or data that can be verified or proven to be true</p> <p>The following examples of facts may be found in Source 4:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">My mum says that mobile telephones are wonderful She (mum) doesn't worry about me so much The internet makes communicating much cheaper. Expert psychologists estimate that only 45 per cent of communication is through spoken language. Eye contact and gestures help us to understand what someone is trying to say. Research at the university shows that bullying is now easier Photographs and emoticons help others understand what I am trying to say</p> <p><b>Level 3 (3 marks) Strong response</b> The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of facts and applies this accurately to a correct example identified from the source.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark) Basic response</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant or creditworthy material.</p>	<b>3</b>	<p><b>Further Guidance</b></p> <p>If the example is incorrect the candidate must score 0 even if the reasoning suggests some understanding of the nature of facts.</p> <p>The example must be drawn from Source 4.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
3(b)	<p>Indicative Content</p> <p>A prediction is generally defined as a statement suggesting something which is likely to happen in the future.</p> <p>The following examples of predictions may be found in Source 4:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">These benefits mean that the use of mobile telephones will grow. Learning how to communicate with others will become more difficult in the future (because of mobile telephones).</p> <p><b>Level 3 (3 marks) Strong response</b> The response demonstrates clear understanding of the nature of prediction and applies this accurately to a correct example identified from the source.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response</b> The response demonstrates some understanding of the nature of prediction and attempts to apply this to a correct example identified from the source. The explanation lacks some clarity and accuracy.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark) Basic response</b> 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.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>	<b>3</b>	<p><b>Further Guidance</b></p> <p>If the example is incorrect the candidate must score 0 even if the reasoning suggests some understanding of the nature of prediction.</p> <p>The example must be drawn from Source 4.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
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> <p>quality of the argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– clarity</li> <li>– tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise</li> <li>– language</li> <li>– balance</li> </ul> <p>quality of the evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– relevance</li> <li>– sufficiency – sample</li> <li>– source</li> <li>– date – how recent</li> <li>– factual, opinion, value, anecdote</li> <li>– testimony – from experience and expert</li> </ul> <p>knowledge claims</p> <p>ability to see</p> <p>sources of bias</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– gender</li> <li>– political</li> <li>– personal values</li> <li>– experience</li> </ul> <p>likelihood of solutions working and consequences of their ideas</p> <p>acceptability of their values to others</p> <p>how likely other people are to agree with their perspective / view</p>	12	

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
	<p><b>Level 5 (11–12 marks) Very good response</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>A clear judgement is reached.</p> <p><b>Level 4 (8–10 marks) Strong response</b></p> <p>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.</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><b>Level 3 (5–7 marks) Reasonable response</b></p> <p>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	Notes
	<p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response</b></p> <p>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><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b></p> <p>No relevant response or creditworthy material</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
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. the impact of mobile telephones and social media on communication.</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"> <li>reference to scale of impact on individual / group / governmental behaviour / actions</li> <li>how long it takes to make a difference</li> <li>the effects of cultural differences and beliefs</li> <li>barriers to change</li> <li>the power of collective action</li> <li>the difficulties of changing individual behaviour</li> <li>the influence of individuals and groups acting locally</li> <li>the role of vested interests and power differences</li> <li>potential conflict</li> <li>difficulties in coordinating globally and across different countries with independence</li> <li>cost and access to resources to implement change</li> <li>governmental responses and action</li> <li>other reasonable response</li> </ul>	18	<p><b>Further Guidance</b></p> <p>The second set of bullet points in the question are to guide candidates and do not have to be specifically addressed to gain full marks.</p> <p>Candidates may discuss either mobile telephones or social media or both and be rewarded fully.</p>



Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
	<p><b>Level 5 (16–18 marks) Very good response</b> Clear, well supported and structured reasoning about the recommended judgement / course of action. Different arguments and perspectives are clearly considered.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A clear judgement is reached.</p> <p><b>Level 4 (12–15 marks) Strong response</b> Clear, supported reasoning with some structure about the recommended judgement / course of action. Different arguments and perspectives are considered.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>A judgement is reached.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (8–11 marks) Reasonable response</b> Some supported reasoning about the recommended judgement / course of action. 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.</p> <p>An attempt is made to give an overall judgement.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Notes
	<p><b>Level 2 (4–7 marks) Basic response</b> Basic reasoning about the recommended judgement / course of action. 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.</p> <p>A basic judgement may be attempted.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–3 marks) Limited response</b> Limited and unsupported reasoning about the topic in general. Different arguments may be included.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>		