



# Cambridge IGCSE™

---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES**

**0457/11**

Paper 1 Written Examination

**October/November 2021**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 70

---

**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 2021 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **19** printed pages.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

**Social Science-Specific Marking Principles  
(for point-based marking)****1 Components using point-based marking:**

- Point marking is often used to reward knowledge, understanding and application of skills. We give credit where the candidate's answer shows relevant knowledge, understanding and application of skills in answering the question. We do not give credit where the answer shows confusion.

From this it follows that we:

- a DO credit answers which are worded differently from the mark scheme if they clearly convey the same meaning (unless the mark scheme requires a specific term)
- b DO credit alternative answers/examples which are not written in the mark scheme if they are correct
- c DO credit answers where candidates give more than one correct answer in one prompt/numbered/scaffolded space where extended writing is required rather than list-type answers. For example, questions that require  $n$  reasons (e.g. State two reasons ...).
- d DO NOT credit answers simply for using a 'key term' unless that is all that is required. (Check for evidence it is understood and not used wrongly.)
- e DO NOT credit answers which are obviously self-contradicting or trying to cover all possibilities
- f DO NOT give further credit for what is effectively repetition of a correct point already credited unless the language itself is being tested. This applies equally to 'mirror statements' (i.e. polluted/not polluted).
- g DO NOT require spellings to be correct, unless this is part of the test. However spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. Corrasion/Corrosion)

**2 Presentation of mark scheme:**

- Slashes (/) or the word 'or' separate alternative ways of making the same point.
- Semi colons (;) bullet points (•) or figures in brackets (1) separate different points.
- Content in the answer column in brackets is for examiner information/context to clarify the marking but is not required to earn the mark (except Accounting syllabuses where they indicate negative numbers).

**3 Calculation questions:**

- The mark scheme will show the steps in the most likely correct method(s), the mark for each step, the correct answer(s) and the mark for each answer
- If working/explanation is considered essential for full credit, this will be indicated in the question paper and in the mark scheme. In all other instances, the correct answer to a calculation should be given full credit, even if no supporting working is shown.
- Where the candidate uses a valid method which is not covered by the mark scheme, award equivalent marks for reaching equivalent stages.
- Where an answer makes use of a candidate's own incorrect figure from previous working, the 'own figure rule' applies: full marks will be given if a correct and complete method is used. Further guidance will be included in the mark scheme where necessary and any exceptions to this general principle will be noted.

**4 Annotation:**

- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
- For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
- Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

**Introduction**

Most questions are marked holistically using levels of response mark schemes. The marks awarded for an answer are usually based on a judgement of the overall quality of the response, rather than on awarding marks for specific points and accumulating a total mark by adding points.

Inevitably, the mark scheme cannot cover all responses that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases, candidates may make very strong responses which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should nevertheless be credited according to their quality.

**Levels of response**

For answers marked by levels of response, the following is intended to describe the quality of the response required (level of skill that should be demonstrated) for the award of marks at different points in the mark range for the question.

In the levels of response mark scheme positive achievement is being rewarded. For answers marked by levels of response:

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

Descriptor	Award mark
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level
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)
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level

**Mark scheme**

All of the questions are based on sources which are available to candidates as an Insert to the examination paper. It is therefore very important to study this material prior to marking to become familiar with the context of the questions.








**Annotations**

All scripts and all responses must be annotated to show how and where marks have been awarded. The practice scripts indicate the amount of annotation expected.

For scripts marked on RM Assessor, a selection of the following on-screen annotations are available.

The number of ticks used does not need to tally with the mark achieved. Every question must be annotated in some way. The mark scheme indicates the most likely annotation to be used with each question.

Annotation should be within the candidate's text or the right-hand margin of the response as it appears in the marking screen.

<b>Annotation</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
	Correct, creditworthy point
<b>Eval</b>	Evaluation
	Development **
	Benefit of doubt given
	Incorrect point
	Unclear/confused point
<b>JU</b>	Justification
	Omission mark, more required
<b>I</b>	Interpretation
Vertical wavy line	Irrelevant
	Highlighter
<b>REP</b>	Repetition
<b>NAQ</b>	Not Answered Question

**\*\* IMPORTANT NOTE**

A developed point is one which is explained, or supported with evidence, usually drawn from the sources or the candidate's experience. For example:

**Example 1**

1a. Undeveloped point - A strength of Hani's argument is the use of personal experience from her background on the farm.

1b. Developed point - A strength of Hani's argument is the use of personal experience from her background on the farm. Personal experience helps provide evidence which is first-hand and is likely to be accurate. It can be trusted.

1c. Undeveloped point - A weakness of the argument is the use of personal testimony from experience.







1d. Developed point - A weakness of the argument is the use of personal testimony from experience. This experience may not apply to many other people and could be biased. It is not strong evidence.




**Example 2**

2a. Undeveloped point – Increasing taxation on the long-distance transportation of food will reduce pollution by encouraging people to buy locally.





2b. Developed point - Increasing taxation on the long-distance transportation of food will reduce pollution by encouraging people to buy locally because foreign food will become more expensive and people will only be able to afford local food.





2c. Developed point - Increasing taxation on the long-distance transportation of food will reduce pollution by encouraging people to buy locally. This is supported in Source 4 when Hani says that food that has travelled a long way costs a lot of money and causes pollution.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>Main Annotations</b>   </p> <p>Candidates should identify the following from Source 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2400 km – <i>the units must be present to award a mark</i></li> </ul> <p>1 mark should be awarded for identifying the above.</p> <p><i>Further guidance – the only acceptable answer is listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.</i></p>	<b>1</b>
1(b)	<p><b>Main Annotations</b>   </p> <p>Candidates may identify the following problems from source 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More fossil fuels used.</li> <li>• Increased congestion.</li> <li>• Food is less fresh when eaten.</li> <li>• More pollution.</li> <li>• More packaging required.</li> <li>• Higher carbon dioxide emissions.</li> <li>• Less business for local farmers.</li> </ul> <p>1 mark should be awarded for each correctly identified problem up to a maximum of 2 marks.</p> <p><i>Further guidance – the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.</i></p>	<b>2</b>






Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	<p data-bbox="304 282 555 315"><b>Main Annotations</b></p> <p data-bbox="592 259 791 304">  </p> <p data-bbox="304 349 539 383">Indicative content</p> <p data-bbox="304 416 1023 450">Candidates may identify one of the following problems:</p> <ul data-bbox="304 454 799 696" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More fossil fuels used.</li> <li>• Increased congestion.</li> <li>• Food is less fresh when eaten.</li> <li>• More pollution.</li> <li>• More packaging required.</li> <li>• Higher carbon dioxide emissions.</li> <li>• Less business for local farmers.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 730 1283 797">Candidates may give the following reasons, any of which could be used, to justify their choice:</p> <ul data-bbox="304 801 852 1010" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has greatest impact.</li> <li>• Affects most people.</li> <li>• Ethically or morally most justifiable.</li> <li>• Has multiple negative consequences.</li> <li>• Creates spiral of harm.</li> <li>• Other reasonable response.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 1043 1289 1178"><i>Further guidance – candidates are most likely to discuss problems from the source as listed above. However, the assessment is focused mainly upon their reasoning / justification and therefore additional problems should be credited.</i></p> <p data-bbox="304 1211 1155 1245">The following levels of response should be used to award marks:</p> <p data-bbox="304 1279 772 1312"><b>Level 3 (3 marks) Good response</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1317 922 1350">Clear explanation explicitly linked to a problem.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1384 863 1417"><b>Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1422 1299 1480">Some explanation. The explanation and link to the problem may be implicit / unclear at times.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1514 783 1547"><b>Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1552 1262 1619">A reason is identified; there may be some limited explanation, though not necessary for award at this level.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1653 549 1686"><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1691 911 1724">No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>	3







Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	<p data-bbox="304 286 555 315"><b>Main Annotations</b></p> <p data-bbox="587 264 842 309">   </p> <p data-bbox="304 353 539 383">Indicative content</p> <p data-bbox="304 421 1169 450">Candidates are likely to identify the following <b>local</b> consequences:</p> <ul data-bbox="304 461 890 701" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increases congestion on local roads.</li> <li>• Food is less fresh when eaten.</li> <li>• More pollution in local area.</li> <li>• Packaging may cause litter in local area.</li> <li>• Less business for local farmers.</li> <li>• More choice of food in shops.</li> <li>• Benefits to local economy.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 734 1182 763">Candidates are likely to identify the following <b>global</b> consequences</p> <ul data-bbox="304 775 799 909" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More fossil fuels used.</li> <li>• More pollution.</li> <li>• Higher carbon dioxide emissions.</li> <li>• Benefits global economy.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 947 1278 1043">3 marks are available for the explanation of each consequence. A total of 6 marks (3 marks + 3 marks) are therefore available for the questions as a whole.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1081 1153 1111">The following levels of response should be used to award marks:</p> <p data-bbox="304 1149 770 1178"><b>Level 3 (3 marks) Good response</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1189 1230 1245">A clear and full explanation of the consequence explicitly related to the context – local/global.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1283 858 1312"><b>Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1323 1262 1379">A basic or partial explanation of the consequence generally related to the context – local/global. Occasionally may be unclear.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1417 783 1447"><b>Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1458 1326 1514">An identification of a consequence with limited or no explanation related to the context – local/global. Explanation, if present, may be difficult to follow.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1552 547 1581"><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1592 911 1621">No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>	6






Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p data-bbox="304 286 555 315"><b>Main Annotations</b></p> <p data-bbox="595 264 855 309">     </p> <p data-bbox="304 353 539 383">Indicative content</p> <p data-bbox="304 421 1257 488">Candidates are likely to discuss the following evaluative points relating to Source 3</p> <p data-bbox="304 521 456 551"><b>Strengths:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="304 562 855 801" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personal views.</li> <li>• Use of newspaper.</li> <li>• Refers to 'personal choice'.</li> <li>• Uses evidence from a friend's factory.</li> <li>• Uses evidence from advertisements.</li> <li>• Refers to a professor</li> <li>• Other reasonable response</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 835 496 864"><b>Weaknesses:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="304 875 994 1048" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General comments at the beginning.</li> <li>• No reference to other ways we pollute the world.</li> <li>• Use of questioning.</li> <li>• No examples of other countries or their food.</li> <li>• Other reasonable response</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 1081 1153 1111">The following levels of response should be used to award marks:</p> <p data-bbox="304 1149 804 1178"><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Good response</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1189 1294 1279">Clearly explained and credible evaluation of the argument/evidence; usually two (or more) developed points clearly linked to the issue, with some other undeveloped points; or a wide range (four or more) of undeveloped points.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1317 1302 1384">Evaluation is clearly focused on the reasoning and/or evidence, its strengths and weaknesses and the way it is used to support the claim.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1417 1326 1507">Material from the sources is used as evidence to support the evaluation; some reference to the evidence and/or arguments in the source e.g. quotation/summary of ideas.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1552 895 1581"><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1592 1318 1715">Some evaluation of the argument/evidence, its strengths and/or weaknesses, and the way it is used to support the claim. The response usually contains one (or more) developed point(s), with some other undeveloped points. Some (two or more) undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this level.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1753 1326 1843">Some material from the sources may be used as evidence to support the evaluation. The response may occasionally lack some clarity and by difficult to follow.</p>	6







Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response</b> Limited evaluation of the argument/evidence which is often unsupported and asserted. The response may be tangential, partial, generalised and lack clarity. It usually contains one or two undeveloped points only. It usually contains one undeveloped point only. Answers at this level may repeat source material with little understanding.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p data-bbox="304 286 555 315"><b>Main Annotations</b></p> <p data-bbox="592 264 916 309">      </p> <p data-bbox="304 353 539 383">Indicative content</p> <p data-bbox="304 421 1302 488">Candidates are likely to discuss the following ways to test the claim stated in Source 3.</p> <p data-bbox="304 521 730 551"><b>Possible types of information:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="304 562 1118 730" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compare statistics/information on pollution from transport.</li> <li>• Data from industries and governments.</li> <li>• Individual testimony or personal experience.</li> <li>• Material from environmental and transport groups.</li> <li>• Other relevant response.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 768 767 797"><b>Possible sources of information:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="304 808 1123 1043" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• National and local governments and their departments.</li> <li>• International organisations, e.g. United nations; UNESCO.</li> <li>• Experts in food and diet.</li> <li>• Research reports.</li> <li>• Pressure groups, charities and NGOs.</li> <li>• Media and the internet.</li> <li>• Other relevant response.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 1081 571 1111"><b>Possible methods:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="304 1122 1155 1323" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents.</li> <li>• Interview relevant experts.</li> <li>• Internet search.</li> <li>• Questionnaires.</li> <li>• Surveys.</li> <li>• Other relevant response.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 1361 1155 1391">The following levels of response should be used to award marks:</p> <p data-bbox="304 1429 874 1458"><b>Level 4 (7–8 marks) Very good response</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1469 1289 1559">Clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of a range of ways to test the claim. The response usually contains three (or more) developed points and may contain some undeveloped points.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1597 1150 1626">The response is clearly and explicitly related to testing the claim.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1664 807 1693"><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks) Good response</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1704 1289 1794">Reasoned and mainly credible explanation of ways to test the claim. The response usually contains two (or more) developed points and may contain some undeveloped points.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1832 995 1861">The response is explicitly related to testing the claim.</p>	8

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks) Reasonable response</b> Some reasoning and explanation of ways to test the claim. The response usually contains one (or more) developed point(s), and/or a range of undeveloped points. The response may lack clarity.</p> <p>The response is implicitly related to testing the claim.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks) Limited response</b> Limited explanation of ways to test the claim. The response contains one or two simple, undeveloped and asserted points.</p> <p>There is little relevance in the response to testing the claim or 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> <p><i>Further Guidance - responses that do not link explicitly to the issue/context and are simply a list of research methods/sources/types of information should not score higher than Level 2</i></p>	





Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p><b>Main Annotations</b>    </p> <p>Indicative Content</p> <p>A prediction is a statement that makes a claim about the future.</p> <p>The following examples of predictions may be found in Source 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will get here more quickly.</li> <li>• This will increase his profits.</li> <li>• The food will be more damaging to the local area.</li> <li>• This will be much better for the environment.</li> </ul> <p>Award 1 mark for correctly identifying a prediction from the list above.</p> <p>Award an additional 1 mark for a response that demonstrates a clear understanding of a prediction. This mark may only be awarded if the identification of a prediction is correct.</p> <p><i>Further guidance – note that the only acceptable answers are listed above. However, candidates may use their own words.</i></p>	<b>2</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p data-bbox="304 282 555 315"><b>Main Annotations</b></p> <p data-bbox="592 259 932 309">      </p> <p data-bbox="304 349 544 383">Indicative Content</p> <p data-bbox="304 421 1310 517">Bias is a tendency or prejudice for or against something; an attitude of strong like or dislike; an unbalanced approach not prepared to consider counter-arguments or other points of view.</p> <p data-bbox="304 555 1289 618">Candidates are likely to identify the following possible reasons for bias from Hani's background/experience:</p> <ul data-bbox="304 622 1145 757" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Her family lives on a farm.</li> <li>• Her father is a farmer and may be put out of business by big supermarkets.</li> <li>• She is a representative on the school committee.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 795 1267 857">Candidates are likely to identify the following evidence of bias from Hani's statement:</p> <ul data-bbox="304 862 1286 1037" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of balance for example no focus on positives of transporting food.</li> <li>• Emotive language.</li> <li>• Lack of evidence to support opinion.</li> <li>• Focused only on personal/local experience.</li> <li>• Mainly opinion</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 1075 1150 1108">The following levels of response should be used to award marks:</p> <p data-bbox="304 1144 770 1178"><b>Level 3 (3 marks) Good response</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1178 1278 1240">A clear and full explanation of why the statement may be biased supported with evidence from the statement.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1276 858 1310"><b>Level 2 (2 marks) Reasonable response</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1310 1171 1341">A basic or partial explanation of why the statement may be biased.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1377 783 1411"><b>Level 1 (1 mark) Limited response</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1411 1066 1442">A limited explanation of why the statement may be biased.</p> <p data-bbox="304 1478 544 1512"><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1512 911 1543">No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>	3

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	<p data-bbox="304 282 555 315"><b>Main Annotations</b></p> <p data-bbox="571 264 979 309">       </p> <p data-bbox="304 353 539 387">Indicative content</p> <p data-bbox="304 421 1294 555">Candidates are expected to evaluate the arguments presented in Source 4 and compare their effectiveness. They should make a supported judgement with some explanation about which person has the most convincing argument.</p> <p data-bbox="304 589 1043 622">Candidates may support their judgement by considering:</p> <p data-bbox="304 656 624 689"><b>Strength of reasoning:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="304 696 480 831" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• logic</li> <li>• structure</li> <li>• balance</li> <li>• claims</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 864 544 898"><b>Use of language:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="304 904 847 972" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• tone – emotive, exaggerated, precise</li> <li>• clarity</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 1005 448 1039"><b>Evidence:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="304 1046 1150 1285" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• range of information and depth</li> <li>• relevance</li> <li>• sufficiency – sample</li> <li>• source – media; internet</li> <li>• date – how recent</li> <li>• different types of information – fact, opinion, value, anecdote</li> <li>• testimony – from experience and expert</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 1319 528 1352"><b>Sources of bias</b></p> <ul data-bbox="304 1359 571 1494" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• local interest</li> <li>• economic</li> <li>• personal values</li> <li>• experience</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 1527 927 1561"><b>Likely consequences of the ideas presented</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1594 831 1628"><b>Acceptability of their values to others</b></p> <ul data-bbox="304 1635 1182 1668" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="304 1702 1150 1736">The following levels of response should be used to award marks:</p> <p data-bbox="304 1769 903 1803"><b>Level 5 (13–15 marks) Very good response</b></p> <p data-bbox="304 1809 1254 1899">Clear, credible and well supported points about which argument is more convincing. Coherent, structured evaluation of both arguments with clear comparison.</p>	15



Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	<p>The response usually contains three (or more) developed evaluative points, and may include some undeveloped points.</p> <p>Material from the sources is used as evidence to support the evaluation; clear reference to the evidence and/or arguments in the source e.g. quotation/summary of ideas.</p> <p>A clear judgement is reached.</p> <p><b>Level 4 (10–12 marks) Good response</b> Clear, supported points about which argument is more convincing. Evaluation of both arguments, with comparison.</p> <p>The response usually contains 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.</p> <p>Material from the sources is used as evidence to support the evaluation; some reference to the evidence and/or arguments in the source e.g. quotation/summary of ideas.</p> <p>A judgment is reached.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (7–9 marks) Reasonable response</b> Reasonable points about which argument is more convincing. Some evaluation of both arguments, with an attempt at comparison or a very good evaluation of only one argument. Judgements and evaluative points are partially supported or asserted.</p> <p>The response usually contains one (or more) developed evaluative points, possibly with some undeveloped points; three (or more) undeveloped points may be sufficient to enter this band at the lower level.</p> <p>Some material from the sources may be used as evidence to support the evaluation. The response may occasionally lack some clarity and be difficult to follow.</p> <p>An attempt is made to give an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (4–6) Basic response</b> Basic points about which argument is more convincing. There may be only one argument considered in any detail, with little attempt at comparison. Judgements and evaluative points are partially supported and lack clarity/relevance at times.</p> <p>The response usually contains two (or more) undeveloped points.</p> <p>A basic judgement may be reached.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	<p><b>Level 1 (1–3 marks) Limited response</b> Limited and unsupported points about which argument is more convincing. The response considers 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.</p> <p>The response may not contain any clear evaluative points.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p> <p><i>Further Guidance</i> <i>Responses that give a very good evaluation of only one argument may achieve Level 3 but no higher.</i></p>	
4	<p><b>Main Annotations</b> J    </p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Candidates are expected to make a choice about the best course of action, i.e. how best to reduce pollution from transporting food over long distances.</p> <p>Candidates may use and develop the material found in Sources 1 to 4 but should go beyond simply repeating or recycling without adaptation. Other material may be introduced but is not necessary to gain full marks.</p> <p>Candidates may consider some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to scale of impact on transportation</li> <li>• Reference to different consequences and implications for individuals/groups/government.</li> <li>• How long it might take to make a difference.</li> <li>• Barriers to change.</li> <li>• The power of collective action, e.g. cooperation between countries over knowledge of pollution issues.</li> <li>• The influence of individuals and groups on decision making.</li> <li>• The role of vested interests and power differences.</li> <li>• Potential conflicts of interest.</li> <li>• Difficulties in planning and coordinating improvements.</li> <li>• Cost and access to resources to implement change.</li> <li>• Other reasonable response.</li> </ul> <p>The following levels of response should be used to award marks:</p> <p><b>Level 5 (20–24 marks) Very good response</b> Clear, well supported reasoning about the proposed course of action. Different arguments and perspectives are clearly considered.</p> <p>The response contains a wide range of clearly reasoned points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, usually with four (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points.</p> <p>The response is very well-structured and a clear judgement is reached.</p>	<b>24</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p><b>Level 4 (15–19 marks) Good response</b> Clear, supported reasoning about the proposed course of action. Different arguments and perspectives are considered.</p> <p>The response contains a range of reasoned points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, usually with three (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points.</p> <p>The response is generally well-structured and a judgement is reached.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (10–14 marks) Reasonable response</b> Some supported reasoning about the proposed course of action. Different arguments and perspectives are included.</p> <p>The response contains some points and/or evidence to support the views expressed, usually with two (or more) developed points, and some undeveloped points.</p> <p>The response is structured but at times difficult to follow and an attempt is made to give an overall judgement.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (5–9 marks) Basic response</b> Basic reasoning about the proposed course of action. Different arguments are included; perspectives, if present, are unclear.</p> <p>The response relies on assertion rather than evidence and explanation and usually contains one (or more) developed point(s) or a range of undeveloped points.</p> <p>The response lacks structure and is difficult to follow though a basic judgement may be attempted.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1–4 marks) Limited response</b> Limited and unsupported reasoning about the topic in general. Tangential. Generalised. Different arguments may be included.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant response or creditworthy material.</p>	