

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

<p>Paper 0457/11 Written Paper 11</p>

Key messages

The key messages from this examination series are that candidates were able to:

- demonstrated very good skills of identifying information relevant to an issue
- analysed sources to identify reasons and evidence
- need further guidance on evaluating and explaining the strengths and weaknesses of sources
- would benefit from further practise in using evidence and reasons to create an argument to support a claim.

General comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based upon a range of sources linked to a global topic and issue. The sources present information and different perspectives on the global issue, which is broadly related to the topics in the Syllabus. In June 2023, the paper was based upon four sources. These sources were related to the topic of fuel and energy. The issue was global access to electricity.

Candidates understood the source material very well. They were able to identify and analyse the main types of statement, evidence, and reasoning within sources, describing them clearly and accurately. Different perspectives were well understood and explained.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be good and improve. Many candidates are developing an excellent understanding of global issues. They are aware of causes, consequences, and possible actions in response to problems. They can explain their own perspectives and compare these with the viewpoints of other people and groups.

Whilst most candidates are using material from the sources to support their arguments, for example through summary or quotation, some would benefit from guidance on how to plan and organise an argument to support a claim or opinion. Evidence and reasons should be clearly and explicitly related to the claim and used to justify the claim clearly and logically. Careful planning of lines of argument and essay structure would help in this process.

Candidates were usually able to identify potential strengths and weaknesses of sources and argument. However, these were often simply described rather than explained. When evaluating a source, candidates should explain the significance or impact of the identified strength or weakness on the argument.

Examination technique was generally very good. Responses to questions were sufficiently detailed. Most candidates had enough time for the tasks, though there was some evidence of the need for candidates to spend more time planning their responses. There were very few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- plan and organise reasons and evidence with a clear structure
- relate source material explicitly to the perspective or issue being explored
- explain the significance of strengths and weaknesses in the evaluation of arguments.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) From Source 1, almost all candidates correctly identified that the trend in the number of people in the world without access to electricity was decreasing. Learners demonstrated an excellent ability to identify and select information from the source.
- (b) From Source 2, almost all candidates correctly identified two consequences of energy poverty. The consequences of energy policy most frequently identified were:
- cooking with fire causing air pollution and disease
 - teaching and learning activities being limited.

Candidates demonstrated an excellent ability to identify and select information from the source.

- (c) Most candidates were able to explain and support their choice of a significant consequence of energy poverty. This was usually justified by several clearly described reasons and some evidence drawn from the sources. The discussion usually involved consideration of the impact of energy poverty on economic development, trade, life chances, well-being, the family, and the scope of the impact.

Most candidates demonstrated good ability to support their judgement by explaining the consequence and giving reasons for its significance.

- (d) Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why energy poverty is an important personal issue. The explanations mainly related to the impact of energy poverty on individuals in their everyday lives, including for families and communities, especially for health, food, access to technology, and education. These candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the concept of 'personal'.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some limited, weak explanation, or asserted opinion about energy or poverty in general, without reference to the personal dimension of the question.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and identify some strengths and weaknesses.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- uses relevant evidence and argument
- gives examples to support argument
- evidence from experts cited – Oxfam
- uses rhetorical questions
- clear, well-structured use of language
- uses some statistical evidence
- clear values and ethical stance.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- not much evidence
- biased tone – some exaggeration
- few counter arguments
- author unknown
- much opinion
- expertise of author not known
- only relevant to the US – difficult to generalise from limited sampling.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of their evaluative points, usually discussing four or more distinct aspects of the source. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion about the issue.

Some weaker responses analysed and described the reasons and evidence within the source but did not evaluate or explain why the identified reason or type of evidence was a strength or weakness. For example, *'A weakness is that the writer uses some exaggeration.'* This statement does not explain why exaggeration may not be strong evidence. A better response would be, *'A weakness is that the writer relies upon exaggeration. This type of evidence is not strong because it is not supported with evidence and is not accurate. Therefore, we do not know if the statement is true. It has weak validity and lacks credibility.'*

Candidates should also be encouraged to justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means being willing to quote from or summarise elements of the source.

- (b) Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources of information and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, 'Rich industrialised nations emit the most greenhouse gases.' The methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys, and questionnaires with people about the issue, often in different places and cultures. Other methods included consultation with experts, engineers, businesses, and government officials.

Nearly all candidates suggested secondary research using sources from the internet. Many described the type of source that was likely to be reliable and free from bias or vested interest, for example from governments, NGOs, and United Nations organisations.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestions clearly and explicitly related to the claim being tested; weaker responses often simply stated a method or source of evidence but did not explain it fully or make the link to the claim being tested.

Some candidates listed a range of methods and sources but did not relate them to the claim; these responses only reached the lower levels of response. Similarly, candidates that very briefly described many methods or types of evidence did not tend to gain many marks. Candidates that carefully explained three or four methods in detail, giving reasons for their choice of methods and sources of evidence, related to the claim to be tested, tended to reach the higher levels of response.

A few candidates responded to the question by describing their opinion on the issue rather than describing how it could be researched. These responses gained very few, if any, marks.

Candidates should be given regular opportunity to design research strategies to test claims as a regular part of their courses.

Question 3

- (a) Most candidates correctly identified an opinion from Hua's statement in the source.

Opinions are statements which are subjective points of view or beliefs which cannot be verified, and may not be shared by others.

Most candidates were able to justify and explain their selection convincingly.

- (b) (i) The vast majority of candidates were able to identify one example of a fact from Jin's statement.

A fact is a statement that is true, correct, accurate or can be proven/verified.

The facts most frequently identified were:



- A charity in India recently installed microgrids to power more than 150 villages serving 230,000 people.
- Micro-grids can deliver electricity to people in remote areas.

(b)(ii) Most candidates were able to relate the identified fact to Jin's argument that energy poverty is best solved at the local level. However, this question was challenging for some candidates who did not evaluate the use of the fact as reasoning or evidence within the argument.

The most effective responses explained how the fact related to the argument and explained a strength and/or a weakness of the fact within this argument. For example, a good response was, *'strong support as this fact is based on research that makes the evidence accurate and likely to be valid; this gives confidence to the reader about Jin's claim.'* Another good response was, *'This fact gives limited support because it is based on only one piece of research that may not have the same results as other research. It is not representative and based on enough evidence to be confident that the data is correct and accurate.'*

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates about facts and their use in argument as evidence and provide experience of using the term in the analysis and evaluation of sources, alongside other critical thinking concepts like value judgement, bias, opinion, vested interest and prediction.

(c) In this question, candidates were asked to compare and evaluate the strength and weaknesses of two arguments about a global issue. The two arguments related to differences in perspective on the how to reduce energy poverty.

Responses at the higher levels contained well supported judgements about both Hua's and Jin's arguments, including a clear conclusion about which person offered the most convincing argument. These responses included a credible, structured evaluation of the argument used to support the claim in the statement, including the reasons and evidence.

The most effective responses considered a range of different evaluative points about aspects of the evidence, reasons, language, knowledge claims, and values, for both arguments. These responses were balanced with a clear conclusion. The evaluative points were also clearly and frequently supported with evidence drawn from the source material, including quotations and summaries.

At the lower levels of response, candidates often limited their evaluative comment to one of the arguments or failed to reach a clear conclusion about which argument was the strongest. Another weakness included commenting upon the arguments without using the material in the source as evidence to support their evaluation. These responses tended to assert evaluative points rather than explain and use evidence from the arguments to support their views. Some weaker responses lacked structure and had little clarity of argument.

Many responses included a description of different parts of the statements and highlighted those aspects that might be a strength or weakness. However, the reason for these aspects of the statement being a strength or weakness was not given. This meant that the evaluative point was not developed or explained and was simply asserted.

An example of a weaker or asserted evaluative point is, *'Hua's argument was based on just one piece of evidence from a newspaper report which is not good evidence.'* This response does not explain why using only one piece of evidence from a newspaper is a weakness. An example of a strong, developed evaluative point is, *'Hua's argument was based on just one piece of evidence from a newspaper report. This is a weakness because it is a small sample and may not be representative of other people or the newspaper itself. This evidence may be subjective and biased because the newspaper wants to sell copies and may exaggerate and sensationalise to attract attention. Therefore, the evidence may not be accurate or true. His argument is not very convincing.'*

This response is clearly developed and explains the weakness in the argument because of the small sample of one piece of research and its origin from a newspaper that does not provide enough evidence to give confidence in the argument.

Some candidates found this question quite challenging. To prepare candidates for this type of question, candidates should be given frequent opportunities to evaluate sources on global issues

from a variety of perspectives. This should involve a consideration of the reasons and evidence used to support an argument or perspective in sources of different length and complexity. Candidates should also be encouraged to quote and refer directly to material within sources to support evaluative points.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to recommend an action to a government to reduce energy poverty. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence. Most candidates recommended investing in microgrids or national projects to improve the national grid. Most candidates revealed a good understanding of the link between action and intended impact.

There were many thoughtful discussions of the three options. Most candidates chose one action and explained why this was selected. Some candidates chose to compare two or three actions, which was more challenging, but at times an effective way to structure the argument. Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses frequently linked the argument back to the issue of reducing energy poverty.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about urban transport problems in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to reduce energy poverty.

In preparation for this type of question, centres are encouraged to give candidates regular opportunity to write extended essays in which they contrast and compare different perspectives or potential actions in response to an issue. In so doing candidates need to analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence for the perspective or action, as well as the impact of different actions.

Drama games, simulation, debating, group discussion, designing presentations, role play, peer, and self-assessment, are useful strategies in the development of the skills of argument. Regular opportunity to practice using reasons and evidence from a few simple sources to construct arguments to support conflicting claims or opposing viewpoints is also valuable. Scaffolded and structured exercises using mind maps and tables, outlining a structure for the argument before composing and writing the essay, are also helpful. These techniques support planning and the development of skills in the construction of arguments and lines of reasoning. It is also helpful for candidates to analyse and deconstruct examples of strong arguments and weak arguments, so that they understand the principles behind the planning and writing of an argument.



GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

<p>Paper 0457/12 Written Examination</p>
--

Key messages

The key messages from this examination series are that candidates:

- demonstrated very good skills of identifying information relevant to an issue
- analysed sources to identify reasons and evidence
- need further guidance on evaluating and explaining the strengths and weaknesses of sources
- would benefit from further practise in using evidence and reasons to create an argument to support a claim.

General comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based upon a range of sources linked to a global topic and issue. The sources present information and different perspectives on the global issue, which is broadly related to the topics in the Syllabus. In June 2023, the paper was based upon four sources. These sources were related to the topic of Demographic Change. The issue was related to the global rise of single-person households.

Candidates understood the source material very well. They were able to identify and analyse the main types of statement, evidence, and reasoning within sources, describing them clearly and accurately. Different perspectives were well understood and explained.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be good and improve. Many candidates are developing an excellent understanding of global issues. They are aware of causes, consequences, and possible actions in response to problems. They can explain their own perspectives and compare these with the viewpoints of other people and groups.

Whilst most candidates are using material from the sources to support their arguments, for example through summary or quotation, some would benefit from guidance on how to plan and organise an argument to support a claim or opinion. Evidence and reasons should be clearly and explicitly related to the claim and used to justify the claim clearly and logically. Careful planning of lines of argument and essay structure would help in this process.

Candidates were usually able to identify potential strengths and weaknesses of sources and argument. However, these were often simply described rather than explained. When evaluating a source, candidates should explain the significance or impact of the identified strength or weakness on the argument.

Examination technique was generally very good. Responses to questions were sufficiently detailed. Most candidates had enough time for the tasks, though there was some evidence of the need for candidates to spend more time planning their responses. There were very few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- plan and organise reasons and evidence with a clear structure
- relate source material explicitly to the perspective or issue being explored
- explain the significance of strengths and weaknesses in the evaluation of arguments.



Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) From Source 1, almost all candidates correctly identified a country where a high proportion of the population live in single-person households. Learners identified either Norway or Sweden. Candidates demonstrated an excellent ability to identify and select information from the source.

- (b) From Source 2, almost all candidates correctly identified two reasons for the growth in single-person households. The reasons most frequently identified were:

- increased access to higher education and university
- living alone is less expensive with cheaper housing in cities
- greater gender equality and female employment

Candidates demonstrated an excellent ability to identify and select information from the source.

- (c) Most candidates were able to explain and support their choice of a reason for the growth in single person households that was the most significant, in their opinion. This was usually justified by several clearly described reasons and some evidence drawn from the sources. The discussion usually involved consideration of the impact of the cause on the growth of this type of household.

Most candidates demonstrated good ability to support their judgement by explaining the cause and giving reasons for its significance.

- (d) Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why the growth of single-person households is an important national issue. The explanations mainly related to the impact of living in a single-person household on the community and country, especially for health, safety, and well-being nationally, the provision of social services, access to suitable accommodation and housing, and economic development. These candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the concept of 'national'.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some limited, weak explanation, or asserted opinion about single-person households in general, without reference to the national dimension of the question.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and identify some strengths and weaknesses.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- based on sociological expertise
- provides detailed information
- range of evidence provided
- based on Some weaker responses analysed and research evidence
- statistical evidence offered

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- author unknown as not fully cited/referenced
- expertise of author not known
- some assertion without evidence
- not relevant to all countries and situations
- few examples
- not much evidence

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of their evaluative points, usually discussing four or more distinct aspects of the source. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion about the issue.

Some weaker responses described the reasons and evidence within the source but did not evaluate or explain why the identified reason or type of evidence was a strength or weakness. For example, *'A weakness is that the writer is not known or cited.'* This statement does not explain why lack of citation may weaken evidence. A better response would be, *'A weakness is that the writer is unknown and is not cited. This type of evidence is not strong because the evidence cannot be found and verified. It cannot be tested to see if it is accurate. Therefore, we do not know if the statement is true. It has weak reliability and is not convincing.'*

Candidates should also be encouraged to justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means being willing to quote from or summarise elements of the source.

- (b) Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources of information and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, 'More people are choosing not to have children than in the past'. The methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys, and questionnaires with people about the issue, often in different places and cultures. Other methods included consultation with experts, doctors, midwives, and government officials.

Nearly all candidates suggested secondary research using sources from the internet. Many described the type of source that was likely to be reliable and free from bias or vested interest, for example from governments, NGOs, and United Nations organisations.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestions clearly and explicitly related to the claim being tested; weaker responses often simply stated a method or source of evidence but did not explain it fully or make the link to the claim being tested.

Some candidates listed a range of methods and sources but did not relate them to the claim; these responses only reached the lower levels of response. Similarly, candidates that very briefly described many methods or types of evidence did not tend to gain many marks. Candidates that carefully explained three or four methods in detail, giving reasons for their choice of methods and sources of evidence, related to the claim to be tested, tended to reach the higher levels of response.

A few candidates responded to the question by describing their opinion on the issue rather than describing how it could be researched. These responses gained very few, if any, marks.

Candidates should be given regular opportunity to design research strategies to test claims as a regular part of their courses.

Question 3

- (a) Most candidates correctly identified a value judgement from Arthit's statement.

A value judgement is a view or decision about what is right, wrong, or important, based on a set of standards, principles, or values.

The value judgements most frequently identified were:

- it is not right to expect the government to look after you
- families should care for each other

Most candidates were able to justify and explain their selection convincingly.

- (b)(i)** The vast majority of candidates were able to identify one example of a fact from Malee's statement.

A fact is a statement that is true, correct, accurate or can be proven/verified.

The facts most frequently identified were:

- research studies by psychologists in 2019 in the United States show that living alone does not cause loneliness
- Malee is buying an affordable apartment designed for single people.
- you can speak to your family on social media

- (b)(ii)** Most candidates were able to relate the identified fact to Malee's argument that living alone has many benefits. However, this question was challenging for some candidates who did not evaluate the use of the fact as reasoning or evidence within the argument.

The most effective responses explained how the fact related to the argument and explained a strength and/or a weakness of the fact within this argument. For example, a good response was: *'strong support as this fact is based on research that makes the evidence accurate and likely to be valid; this gives confidence to the reader about Malee's claim.'* Another good response was: *'This fact gives limited support because it is based on only one piece of research that may not have the same results as other research. It is not representative and based on enough evidence to be confident that the data is correct and accurate.'*

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates about facts and their use in argument as evidence and provide experience of using the term in the analysis and evaluation of sources, alongside other critical thinking concepts like value judgement, bias, opinion, vested interest and prediction.

- (c)** In this question, candidates were asked to compare and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of two arguments about a global issue. The two arguments related to differences in perspective on the how to reduce energy poverty.

Responses at the higher levels contained well supported judgements about both Arthit's and Malee's arguments, including a clear conclusion about which person offered the most convincing argument. These responses included a credible, structured evaluation of the argument used to support the claim in the statement, including the reasons and evidence.

The most effective responses considered a range of different evaluative points about aspects of the evidence, reasons, language, knowledge claims, and values, for both arguments. These responses were balanced with a clear conclusion. The evaluative points were also clearly and frequently supported with evidence drawn from the source material, including quotations and summaries.

At the lower levels of response, candidates often limited their evaluative comment to one of the arguments or failed to reach a clear conclusion about which argument was the strongest. Another weakness included commenting upon the arguments without using the material in the source as evidence to support their evaluation. These responses tended to assert evaluative points rather than explain and use evidence from the arguments to support their views. Some weaker responses lacked structure and had little clarity of argument.

Many responses included a description of different parts of the statements and highlighted those aspects that might be a strength or weakness. However, the reason for these aspects of the statement being a strength or weakness was not given. This meant that the evaluative point was not developed or explained and was simply asserted.

An example of a weaker or asserted evaluative point is: *'Malee's argument was based on the experience of just two people which is not good evidence.'* This response does not explain why using only the experience of two people is a weakness. An example of a strong, developed evaluative point is: *'Malee's argument was based on just two people's experience of living alone. This is a weakness because it is a small sample and may not be representative of other people. This evidence may be subjective and biased because the people want to justify their own ideas and choices. Therefore, the evidence may not be accurate or true. His argument is not very convincing.'*

This response is clearly developed and explains the weakness in the argument because of the small sample that does not provide enough evidence to give confidence in the argument.

Some candidates found this question quite challenging. To prepare candidates for this type of question, candidates should be given frequent opportunities to evaluate sources on global issues from a variety of perspectives. This should involve a consideration of the reasons and evidence used to support an argument or perspective in sources of different length and complexity. Candidates should also be encouraged to quote and refer directly to material within sources to support evaluative points.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to consider the statement, 'Living on your own is better than living within a family.'

The arguments used by candidates mainly related to:

- reference to impact of living alone on relationships generally
- importance of personal choice in lifestyle
- health and well-being implications
- employment and career implications
- ethical or moral issues
- reference to different consequences and implications for individuals/different age and gender groups/government
- the influence of individuals and groups on other people
- potential conflicts of interest within the wider family
- vulnerability to crime and harm

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the issue, providing a balanced assessment of living in both types of household. These responses frequently referred to the advantages and disadvantages of living alone or with other people. These responses frequently related their argument and evidence directly and explicitly to the issue in the question.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and describe general opinions about living alone or in a family or simply list advantages and disadvantages of each. The issue in the statement was only implicit. Arguments tended to be mainly unsupported and asserted. These responses only used some material drawn from one or two of the sources in the Insert or failed to use any of the material and evidence in any of the sources.

It is important that candidates plan and organise their responses so that the argument in the essay has a clear, logical structure. This should typically include an introduction, discussion of the first perspective, discussion of the second or alternative perspectives, and a conclusion that clearly answers the question. The significance or relationship of evidence and reasons in the argument to the conclusion should be stated explicitly and frequently. The reasons and evidence should explicitly lead to the intended conclusion.

In preparation for this type of question, centres are encouraged to give candidates regular opportunity to write essays in which they contrast and compare different perspectives in response to a global issue. In so doing, candidates need to analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence for the perspectives or possible actions.

Drama games, simulation, debating, group discussion, designing presentations, role play, peer, and self-assessment, are useful strategies in the development of the skills of argument. Regular opportunity to practise using reasons and evidence from a few simple sources to construct arguments to support conflicting claims or opposing viewpoints is also valuable. Scaffolded and structured exercises using 'mind-maps' and tables, outlining a structure for the argument before composing and writing the essay, are also helpful. These techniques support planning and the development of skills in the construction of arguments and lines of reasoning. It is also helpful for candidates to analyse and deconstruct examples of strong arguments and weak arguments, so that they understand the principles behind the planning and writing of an argument.



GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

<p>Paper 0457/13 Written Examination</p>
--

Key messages

The key messages from this examination series are that candidates:

- demonstrated very good skills of identifying information relevant to an issue
- analysed sources to identify reasons and evidence
- need further guidance on evaluating and explaining the strengths and weaknesses of sources
- would benefit from further practise in using evidence and reasons to create an argument to support a claim.

General comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based upon a range of sources linked to a global topic and issue. The sources present information and different perspectives on the global issue, which is broadly related to the topics in the Syllabus. In June 2023, the paper was based upon four sources. These sources were related to the topic of Transport. The issue was related to encouraging walking as a sustainable form of transport.

Candidates understood the source material very well. They were able to identify and analyse the main types of statement, evidence, and reasoning within sources, describing them clearly and accurately. Different perspectives were well understood and explained.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be good and improve. Many candidates are developing an excellent understanding of global issues. They are aware of causes, consequences, and possible actions in response to problems. They can explain their own perspectives and compare these with the viewpoints of other people and groups.

Whilst most candidates are using material from the sources to support their arguments, for example through summary or quotation, some candidates would benefit from guidance on how to plan and organise an argument to support a claim or opinion. Evidence and reasons should be clearly and explicitly related to the claim and used to justify the claim clearly and logically. Careful planning of lines of argument and essay structure would help in this process.

Candidates were usually able to identify potential strengths and weaknesses of sources and argument. However, these were often simply described rather than explained. When evaluating a source, candidates should explain the significance or impact of the identified strength or weakness on the argument.

Examination technique was generally very good. Responses to questions were sufficiently detailed. Most candidates had enough time for the tasks, though there was some evidence of the need for candidates to spend more time planning their responses. There were very few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- plan and organise reasons and evidence with a clear structure
- relate source material explicitly to the perspective or issue being explored
- explain the significance of strengths and weaknesses in the evaluation of arguments.

Comments on specific questions



Question 1

- (a) From Source 1, almost all candidates correctly identified one form of transport. Learners identified one of:

- Road
- Rail
- Water
- Air
- Walking

Candidates demonstrated an excellent ability to identify and select information from the source.

- (b) From Source 2, almost all candidates correctly identified two benefits of walking. The reasons most frequently identified were:

- Cheap and affordable transport for everyone
- Reduces noise pollution and reduces greenhouse gas emissions
- Creates a more safe and pleasant environment.

Candidates demonstrated an excellent ability to identify and select information from the source.

- (c) Most candidates were able to explain and support their choice of a benefit of walking that was the most important, in their opinion. This was usually justified by several clearly described reasons and some evidence drawn from the sources. The discussion usually involved consideration of the impact of the benefit on the growth of walking for the individual or community, especially related to health and environmental issues. Most candidates demonstrated good ability to support their judgement by explaining the cause and giving reasons for its significance.

- (d) Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain one local and one global consequence of encouraging people to walk more. The explanations mainly related to the impact of walking on the community and world, especially for health, safety, and well-being, the provision of social services, economic development, and environmental improvements, including climate change. These candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the concepts of 'local' and 'global'.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some limited, weak explanation, or asserted opinion about walking in general, without reference to the local and global dimensions of the question.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and identify some strengths and weaknesses.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- relevant evidence and argument
- examples used to support argument
- evidence from experts cited – World Bank; UN
- clear, well-structured use of language

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- not much evidence
- few counter arguments
- author unknown as not fully cited/referenced
- expertise of author not known
- some assertion and prediction – weak evidence

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of their evaluative points, usually discussing four or more distinct aspects of the source. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion about the issue.

Some weaker responses analysed and described the reasons and evidence within the source but did not evaluate or explain why the identified reason or type of evidence was a strength or weakness. For example: *'A weakness is that the writer is not known or fully cited.'* This statement does not explain why lack of citation may weaken evidence. A better response would be: *'A weakness is that the writer is unknown and is not fully cited. This type of evidence is not strong because the evidence cannot be found and verified. It cannot be tested to see if it is accurate. Therefore, we do not know if the statement is true. It has weak reliability and is not convincing.'*

Candidates should also be encouraged to justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means being willing to quote from or summarise elements of the source.

- (b) Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources of information and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, 'Air pollution is the greatest environmental risk to human health.'

The methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys, and questionnaires with people about the issue, often in different places and cultures. Other methods included consultation with experts, scientists, doctors, and government officials.

Nearly all candidates suggested secondary research using sources from the internet. Many described the type of source that was likely to be reliable and free from bias or vested interest, for example from governments, NGOs, and United Nations organisations.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestions clearly and explicitly related to the claim being tested; weaker responses often simply stated a method or source of evidence but did not explain it fully or make the link to the claim being tested.

Some candidates listed a range of methods and sources but did not relate them to the claim; these responses only reached the lower levels of response. Similarly, candidates that very briefly described many methods or types of evidence did not tend to gain many marks. Candidates that carefully explained three or four methods in detail, giving reasons for their choice of methods and sources of evidence, related to the claim to be tested, tended to reach the higher levels of response.

A few candidates responded to the question by describing their opinion on the issue rather than describing how it could be researched. These responses gained very few, if any, marks.

Candidates should be given regular opportunity to design research strategies to test claims as a regular part of their courses.

Question 3

- (a) (i) Most candidates correctly identified an example of vested interest within Aput's statement and explained that a vested interest is a special concern about something due to personal gain or advantage, which could be economic, social, political, or other.

The examples of vested interest most frequently identified were:

- Aput is the manager of a large company selling cars
- Aput may gain financially if he sells more cars
- Aput promotes cars as he works in the car industry

Most candidates were able to justify and explain their selection convincingly.

- (a) (ii) Most candidates were able to relate the identified vested interest to Aput's argument that cars have many benefits. However, this question was challenging for some candidates who did not evaluate vested interest in reasoning or evidence within the argument.

The most effective responses explained how the vested interest related to the argument and explained its impact on the argument, strengthening or weakening. For example, a good response was: *'vested interest weakens the argument as vested interest makes the evidence biased and therefore not balanced; this gives little confidence to the reader as the claim may not be true and simply based on self-interest.'*

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates about vested interest in argument as evidence and provide experience of using the term in the analysis and evaluation of sources, alongside other critical thinking concepts like value judgement, bias, opinion, fact, and prediction.

- (b) The vast majority of candidates were able to identify one example of a fact from Yura's statement.

A fact is a statement that is true, correct, accurate or can be proven/verified.

The facts most frequently identified were:

- Walking is healthy for your body.
- Research by a university shows that clean, well-lit city centres, with direct walkways and paths that link residential, commercial, educational and recreational areas really improve the well-being and mental health of residents.
- Walking networks help people to meet others/create closer relationships in the community.

Most candidates were able to explain why the chosen example was a fact, revealing clear understanding of the concept.

- (c) In this question, candidates were asked to compare and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of two arguments about a global issue. The two arguments related to differences in perspective on the benefits of walking in comparison to other forms of transport.

Responses at the higher levels contained well supported judgements about both Aput's and Yura's arguments, including a clear conclusion about which person offered the most convincing argument. These responses included a credible, structured evaluation of the argument used to support the claim in the statement, including the reasons and evidence.

The most effective responses considered a range of different evaluative points about aspects of the evidence, reasons, language, knowledge claims, and values, for both arguments. These responses were balanced with a clear conclusion. The evaluative points were also clearly and frequently supported with evidence drawn from the source material, including quotations and summaries.

At the lower levels of response, candidates often limited their evaluative comment to one of the arguments or failed to reach a clear conclusion about which argument was the strongest. Another weakness included commenting upon the arguments without using the material in the source as evidence to support their evaluation. These responses tended to assert evaluative points rather than explain and use evidence from the arguments to support their views. Some weaker responses lacked structure and had little clarity of argument.

Many responses included a description of different parts of the statements and highlighted those aspects that might be a strength or weakness. However, the reason for these aspects of the statement being a strength or weakness was not given. This meant that the evaluative point was not developed or explained and was simply asserted.

An example of a weaker or asserted evaluative point is: *'Yura's argument was based on research which is good evidence.'* This response does not explain why using research is a strength or good evidence. An example of a strong, developed evaluative point is: *'Yuras argument was based on two pieces of research. This is a strength because research gathers evidence carefully and it is reviewed by other people to check its accuracy. It is therefore reliable and convincing as it is likely to be representative of opinion on the issue.'* This response is clearly developed and explains the

strength in the argument because of the research that provides enough evidence to give confidence in the argument.

Some candidates found this question quite challenging. To prepare candidates for this type of question, candidates should be given frequent opportunities to evaluate sources on global issues from a variety of perspectives. This should involve a consideration of the reasons and evidence used to support an argument or perspective in sources of different length and complexity. Candidates should also be encouraged to quote and refer directly to material within sources to support evaluative points.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to recommend an action to a government to encourage walking as a form of transport in cities. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence. Most candidates recommended creating more walkways and paths in cities. Most candidates revealed a good understanding of the link between action and intended impact.

There were many thoughtful discussions of the three options. Most candidates chose one action and explained why this was selected. Some candidates chose to compare two or three actions, which was more challenging, but at times an effective way to structure the argument. Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses frequently linked the argument back to the issue of encouraging walking.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about walking in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to increase walking.

In preparation for this type of question, centres are encouraged to give candidates regular opportunity to write extended essays in which they contrast and compare different perspectives or potential actions in response to an issue. In so doing candidates need to analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence for the perspective or action, as well as the impact of different actions.

Drama games, simulation, debating, group discussion, designing presentations, role play, peer, and self-assessment, are useful strategies in the development of the skills of argument. Regular opportunity to practise using reasons and evidence from a few simple sources to construct arguments to support conflicting claims or opposing viewpoints is also valuable. Scaffolded and structured exercises using mind maps and tables, outlining a structure for the argument before composing and writing the essay, are also helpful. These techniques support planning and the development of skills in the construction of arguments and lines of reasoning. It is also helpful for candidates to analyse and deconstruct examples of strong arguments and weak arguments, so that they understand the principles behind the planning and writing of an argument.



GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

<p>Paper 0457/02 Individual Report</p>
--

Key Messages

- Candidates should formulate a question that focusses on **one global issue**.
- The candidate's response must focus on **different perspectives** on their chosen issue.
- Candidates should analyse the **causes and consequences** of their chosen issue.
- Candidates should **evaluate** the individual **sources** they use.
- Candidates should clearly **cite** all their sources.
- The Individual Report should be an **independent** piece of coursework.

General Comment

Successful work for this component is well-structured and logical, and explicitly presents several different well-supported perspectives, including **at least one global and one national perspective** on the issue identified in their question. It shows clear evidence of research, with accurate citation of sources used.

Successful candidates analyse and explain the causes and consequences of the issue identified in their question. They explicitly compare the different causes and/or consequences of their chosen issue. This could be, for example, a range of causes compared to identify the main cause or a comparison of causes in different countries. They explain their comparison. Successful candidates provide full details of their proposed course of action, including details of how the course of action would be implemented and the possible impact on the issue.

Stronger candidates reflect on their own perspective and how this has been impacted by their findings and by others' perspectives. They answer their question and remain focussed throughout on the central issue.

Some candidates included a section of reflection on what they might do differently in future. Please note that this not required. Candidates are advised to spend more time developing other criteria.

Comments on Specific Assessment Criteria

Assessment Objective 1: Research, Analysis and Evaluation

The strongest work responds to a **clear question** about a **single global issue**. This enables candidates to present clear global perspectives, national perspectives, and their own perspective on this issue.

Direct, issue-based questions allow candidates to be clear about their topic and issue, to focus on that throughout and to identify different views.

Successful questions this session included:

- *Are human activities the main cause of water pollution?*
- *Should the Film and TV Entertainment Industry be allowed to use animals for Entertainment?*
- *Should governments use digital surveillance technology on their citizens?*
- *Is the use of coal justified, considering its contribution to climate change?*
- *Are electric vehicles a sustainable form of transport?*
- *Can refugees positively impact their host communities?*
- *Is a lack of policing the main cause for cybercrime on the Dark Web?*
- *Does sustainable agriculture help mitigate deforestation?*
- *Should girl-child marriage be banned by law?*



Most candidates provided a research question and attempted to answer it. Unfortunately, we still saw work without a clear research question.

Some candidates did not identify an issue in their question and wrote about 2 or 3 issues in their response. Many of these could usefully have been included as consequences of a central issue.

There was a significant minority of candidates who did not address an issue at all in their response. The majority of these gave a description of e.g. the uses of chemotherapy, but did not explain why that might be a problem.

A few candidates provided an appropriate research question on a global issue, but their reports did not address the issue highlighted. In some cases, the report appeared to be focussed on a different topic.

There were a number of reports without any research question and some with no title or topic. This has a clear impact on their success, as the mark scheme is based on the premise that the candidate has researched an issue and is answering a research question by exploring different perspectives and coming up with their own response as a result of all the research done.

Information from different perspectives:

The strongest work shows a clear understanding of perspectives.

Note: For Global Perspectives, a perspective is always based on a **view, opinion, or attitude**: on what people think or feel about the issue. It is not enough to present general information, facts and figures on a topic from different parts of the world.

For this component, **a global perspective is a supported view about a global issue** raised in the question. It should be clear whose perspective this is – a quote from the relevant person or organisation should be attributed to them, or the candidate should draw together supporting information and attitudes to tell us which group of people has this perspective. In all cases, information should be presented to explain the perspective and support it.

Successful work included paraphrased and/or direct quotes showing a clear global perspective. A global perspective should be clearly identified as such and include an opinion:

Global Perspective: *The United Nations (UN) recognises girl-child marriage as an issue to be addressed. They believe that girl-child marriage is a 'violation of girls' rights' denying girls from making their own life choices (United Nations, 2016) Dr Osotimehin, the UN Population Fund (UNFPA) executive director, stated 'Choosing when and whom to marry is one of life's most important decisions. Child marriage denies millions of girls this choice each year' (UNICEF, 2016)*

Similarly, **a national perspective** is a national viewpoint on the issue presented, or an opinion/feeling about/attitude to the national situation. Again, it should be clear whose perspective is being presented, either by paraphrasing or quoting the person/s or organisation/s with clear attribution. There should be evidence of the perspective and supporting information to explain it:

National Perspective: *Brazil strongly believes that agricultural sustainability diffuses environmental issues like deforestation. According to Andre Nassar, a representative of Brazil's Ministry of Agriculture, this is because sustainable agriculture 'increases productivity and uses fewer fossil fuels thus decreasing emissions associated with deforestation.'*

National Perspective: *The Filipino government believes that girl-child marriage should be banned. On January 8, 2022, President Rodrigo Duterte signed a law illegalizing 'child marriage'. The law states: 'The state... views child marriage as a practice constituting child abuse because it debases, degrades, and demeans the intrinsic worth and dignity of children' (Presse, 2022). To elaborate, the Philippine president believes that child marriage is harmful because it... exploits children's vulnerability... is a form of abuse and should be prohibited. (Presse, (2022).*

National Perspective: *The US government believes that girl-child marriage should be respected. Zollinger, a US politician, stated: 'child marriage is a contract between people that shouldn't require government permission' (Clark, 2019). From his viewpoint, child marriage is a family decision that others should not intervene in, including the government. Christy Zito, another US politician, supported his viewpoint. She felt*

that prohibiting it would erode families' sanctity by severing relationships and original cultures. Thus, the US government opposes a ban on child marriage.

Some work included a section labelled 'Global perspectives' in which views from different countries were presented. However, no global view was presented, and the different national views were not drawn together to form a global view. This work can only be credited as 'National perspectives'.

Some **weaker work did not present different perspectives** on the issue, but instead presented information about different places. This was sometimes labelled as 'Global' or 'National Perspectives' though there were no perspectives presented. In these cases, candidates described actions taken by a government, for example, or provided relevant statistics without telling us what anyone thought or felt about the issue. Others did not present any perspectives or opinions apart from the candidate's own views and these were sometimes unsupported, with no relevant information or evidence, meaning that the report read as an unresearched opinion piece.

Some **weak work** presented a **general topic with 2 or 3 sub-topics** (often labelled Issue 1, Issue 2, Issue 3). This work did not present perspectives explicitly and (because it was dealing with multiple topics) did not deal with the required criteria in any depth or detail.

Analysis and comparison of causes and consequences:

Most candidates explained the consequences of their chosen issue. Where their issue was clear, they were able to discuss causes of the issue, explaining in some detail:

Analysis of causes: The topic of domestic violence is a complicated subject that can be linked back to a variety of causes. Some individuals argue that external elements like alcohol and stress are involved. Others argue that perpetrators' actions are unrelated to external factors.

According to statistics from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (1995) '30 to 40 per cent of men and 27 to 34 per cent of women who perpetrated violence against their partners were drinking at the time of the event'. Alcohol elevates the possibility of losing control of one's behaviour which could raise the chances that someone who is already violent acts on their thoughts and urges (Schumacher, 2022). Stress, particularly socioeconomic stress, which is associated with poverty, unemployment, and a lack of social resources, contributes to the rise in domestic violence. According to the National Network to End Domestic Violence (2020), couples under financial stress are three times more likely to engage in violence than couples without financial stress. In the same way that alcohol can make people aggressive, stress can do the same. It builds up repressed emotions which result in violence when they get released (Dimoff, 2020).

Where candidates had not identified a global issue, or where they wrote descriptive essays, they found it difficult to identify or explain any causes or consequences.

Stronger work compared different causes of (or reasons for) their central issue. They explained which were the more important, or main causes and/or they explained how and why there were different causes in different countries or regions. They also compared the consequences (sometimes labelled impacts or effects) explaining which consequences were the most serious, and/or why there were different consequences for different groups of people, or different places or different situations.

Developed comparison of consequences is given below:

I believe that deforestation is the most significant consequence of not shifting to sustainable agriculture, as it is the starting point for various other negative externalities. Statistics by WWF show that deforestation emits seven times more carbon dioxide than all other human activities combined and that almost 1.5 of the rural population depends on forests; it is also a cause of land degradation itself. It is not a sustainable long-term solution to feeding the world due to the environmental costs that follow conventional agriculture.

Course(s) of Action:

The strongest work had a developed and focussed course of action. The candidate explained the course of action: its implementation (e.g. who would do it and details of how it would be done) and gave a clear explanation of the likely impact of the course of action.

Note: it is acceptable for candidates to consider courses of action that have been successful elsewhere and apply them to their own country:

I believe that the best course of action to be taken against water pollution due to human activities is the implementation of severe laws and regulations by the government.

Examples of some of these laws could be imposing harsh rules on industries to reduce the number of pollutants they release into waterways by closely monitoring and setting limits to the amount of chemicals they discharge into waterways. If these regulations are not heeded, there should be severe consequences like hefty fines or suspension of their licences. Additionally, citizens should be prohibited from dumping domestic waste and chemicals directly into water sources. If these laws are not heeded, heavy penalties should be enforced on businesses and individuals found violating them.

In Kenya the Ministry of Water, Sanitation and Irrigation will be tasked with this responsibility and it will work closely with other government departments such as National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) to enforce these laws and ensure compliance with them. This is highly likely to succeed in Kenya since a previous ban on plastic bags and their usage was introduced in 2018 and according to NEMA (2023) the success rate of the ban was 80 per cent with help from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry in Kenya.

Weaker work described solutions already in place but did not develop these to explain how these solutions might be applied to their specific issue or in other countries. Some candidates either explained how the course of action might be implemented **or** what its impact might be – but not both. Others provided a detailed course of action that was not clearly linked to the issue they were considering.

The weakest work provided a list of actions that might be taken, but with no further details.

Some candidates did not identify an issue – they presented general information about a topic. Without a problem, they could not suggest a course of action to address it.

Evaluation of sources:

The **strongest work** showed clear evaluation of sources used. Candidates evaluated the sources using different criteria and with an explanation of the impact of the quality of sources on the candidate's thinking, or work.

The evaluations made should be explained:

... The researchers published the paper on The Royal Society web page and the research was supported by a scientific report released by the Princeton Press. The report was written to discuss the causes and consequences of animal extinction. While the source is weakened marginally by the fact that there is no information on the authors themselves, the fact that the further reading section shows other works by the authors boosts their credibility. Additionally, the fact that it is a scientific report means it would have been peer reviewed and is therefore credible. The projections give insight into further consequences of biodiversity loss by providing information on the global impact of the loss of seed-dispersing vertebrates, aiding my arguments in this report.

Note: In order to fully achieve this criterion, the candidate must provide at least 3 **different** points of evaluation on **more than one** source used. Some candidates provide a generalised evaluation of their research, without any evaluation of individual sources. This is not what is required:

I used many different sources and there were many advantages and disadvantages of the sources. All of them were very helpful but I did use some more than others and some were questionable since it wasn't written by professionals. Some websites had some great info but were biased so had to use unbiased info and use other sources next to it and basically combine them. Some other websites used statistics and political perspectives all of them were relatively very long and I didn't have much time to read. I read a section that I was looking for and then went onto the next one.

This example seems to indicate that the candidate is not fully aware of what is required. Their comments may be correct, but they are descriptive rather than evaluative; general and unexplained; and not specific to one source. It is not clear, for example, which sources were biased and which unbiased, how the candidate knows this and why it might matter.



A number of candidates did not attempt to evaluate any of their sources at all, or merely listed what information they had found in each source.

Assessment Objective 2: Reflection:

The **strongest work** had a clear section of reflection on the candidate's own perspective, on their research findings and on the perspectives they had explored. The candidate clearly explained how their own perspective had developed, been changed, or impacted by others' perspectives and by the information they had gained about the issue. It included a clear conclusion/answer to their question based on research findings and other perspectives. Some strong candidates reflected throughout and then drew their reflections together at the end coming to a logical and supported conclusion.

Before my research, I believed that euthanasia should be allowed everywhere. I didn't see any controversy and hardship in the process. My thinking was mostly based on feelings and opinions influenced by a situation with my great grandma. She wanted euthanasia when getting an incurable illness... but the Swedish law did not allow it. However, after doing research, my perspective on this issue has changed. Today I realise that euthanasia is a complex subject. Even though there are arguments against euthanasia, such as religion, and philosophical beliefs on unethical practices, good access to palliative care, risks of others taking advantage, manipulation of a will and lastly the risk of distrust between family, medicine, and patients; I still hold on to the vision that euthanasia should be made legal, but in strict secure conditions. In the end, euthanasia comes down to a personal request that can only be made by the individual themselves. Therefore, I regard euthanasia as a human right... Nonetheless, the process has to be implemented with care and caution.

Weaker work simply provided a general conclusion, with no personal reflection on findings, perspectives, or the issue. Some of the weakest work lost contact with the question and the issue and simply summed up a descriptive essay.

The **weakest work** ended without answering the question or providing a personal perspective or conclusion.

Assessment Objective 3: Communication

Structure of the report:

Candidates are required to write their report in essay form. Their argument should be planned and logical and follow a clear structure to answer their question. They should include all required criteria. They can write between 1500 and 2000 words, and they are advised to use the full word count.

Some of the work seen this session was well-structured and the **strongest work** was cohesive and logical.

The **strongest work** was easy to follow and provided a clear structured argument with an introduction outlining the global issue, addressing all the required criteria and ending with a reflective conclusion. It used the full available word count. This work started with different perspectives on the issue and kept those focussed throughout. The candidate kept control of their argument and did not lose contact with their question, the central issue, or their research findings.

As in previous sessions, **weaker work** lacked focus. It tended to select several separate issues and present general information about those, making it difficult to follow any central argument. It sometimes included information that was not relevant to the question. It tended to move around from one topic to another instead of developing a central argument.

The **weakest work** often provided a series of headings with some facts and figures on the topic area, with no clear flow of any argument and sometimes with no reflection or conclusion. Some appeared to have copied and pasted sections from different sources, with no apparent connection between the different paragraphs or with the question or issue.

Some work showed little evidence of any research; the candidate simply wrote a general philosophical argument, or opinion piece. This was particularly common in essays on Belief Systems and the Family, where candidates started with their own point of view and, as in past sessions, wrote only about that.

Clarity of arguments, perspectives, and evidence:

The **strongest work** clearly identified the required skills and presented the criteria for this component in separate paragraphs, or by using sub-headings. It is clear that the candidate understood what they were doing and presented the required elements explicitly.

The **weakest work** showed little awareness of the requirements for this component. In this work they may have simply discussed their question without presenting any perspectives, causes and consequences. There may have been no clear issue and so no course of action with no reflection on their research findings or evaluation of sources.

Some candidates simply presented information they had gained from primary and secondary research and do not process or discuss it at all.

Citation and referencing:

More candidates than in the past showed evidence of copy and paste of whole passages from their sources, or possible use of spinners and thesaurus apps. All candidates should understand the need for **complete in-text attribution**. They should be aware that if they present material as their own when they have found it in other sources, this is considered to be plagiarism. Where they quote directly from sources, this should be in the form of **short quotes**, clearly attributed, and most of the material in their work should be their own. Some work showed unacceptable involvement and comment from teachers.

There is no one fixed method of citation or referencing for this component. **Any clear and consistent method is acceptable.**

In-text citation: Candidates may use bracketed citations, or numbering, or in-text referencing, to indicate where they have used sources. They must include complete references somewhere in their work, either footnotes, endnotes, or in-text references. (For ease of reading and control of word count, numbers or brackets are more manageable).

References: References for books or magazines should include author, date, and title of publication. References for online materials should include **at least** the full URL (leading to the document, not just to a website) **and date of access (retrieval date)**. If candidates wish to include evidence of their primary research, such as statistics, they can append this to the reference list. This should not be included as part of the essay, unless it is to be read and counted in the words allowed for the essay.

The full reference list/footnotes/endnotes should be clearly linked to the in-text attribution. Candidates should use one clear, consistent, and logical method (one set of numbers, or alphabetical order). References should be clearly organised and easy to find.

Note: when candidates quote sources found within material from other sources, they do need to reference the quoted sources as well. It should be possible for the reader to find a reference for every person or organisation quoted in the essay.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

<p>Paper 0457/03 Team Project</p>

Key messages

- All members of a team must be awarded the same mark for the team elements (Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration).
- Teams need an aim that can be met.
- Candidates should choose an issue to focus on and carry out research into different cultural perspectives on the issue.
- The Outcome should demonstrate the means by which the Team met their aim.
- The Reflective Paper requires candidates to present their own research findings and cite their sources.
- Candidates should keep an ongoing reflective log of their own ways of working and their work as a part of the team.
- Candidates should use examples from their team project when they are explaining their reflections on the strengths and weaknesses/benefits and challenges of the different aspects of the marking criteria.
- Teachers should steer candidates away from topics/issues that could be sensitive locally.
- Schools should note that there is a Guidance Document for the Team Project on the School Support Hub, listed under 'Planning and preparation' (ref: The Cambridge Assessment International Education School Support Hub).

General comments

Team Projects:

The most successful projects focused on an issue of local concern and worked to change the behaviour or perception of others in relation to the issue. Candidates chose a variety of issues on which to focus their projects. Under the topic of *water, food and agriculture*, some candidates focused on the problem of waste in school meals, opening up a debate as to how this could be avoided. Under the topic of *disease and health*, some teams focused on raising awareness about the need for teenagers to be active in order to limit mental health issues, for example by running exercise classes, while others looked at how school culture supports sustainable development goals, producing a leaflet for the school community.

Outcomes were varied and included school seminars, leaflets, fundraising events and posters. As was to be expected, there were teams who were unable to carry out their plans as fully as they wished. Those who handled this most successfully used the process of adapting their plans as part of their evaluation.

Less successful projects tended to give general information about a topic or an issue, without explicitly referring to different cultural perspectives, or perspectives in different parts of the world on the issue. The evaluations of these team projects sometimes made it clear that learners had little choice in the focus of their topic or their team members.

Comments on specific questions

Team Elements: *Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration*

AO3 Communication: Outcome and Explanation

In the most successful projects, there is coherence between the Explanation and the Outcome. The Explanation is a planning document: it communicates the team's aims, research plans and activity, and then details plans for an Outcome as well as indicating how the team will measure its success. The Explanation should not contain team members' research findings.



The Outcome considers perspectives and offers comment on the activity that has led to the aim being met. The Outcome is necessary to enable the Reflective Paper to demonstrate evidence. The Outcome should not be seen as the most important part of Team project, nor should it contain a series of interviews joined together as they should form part of the research.

Example:

The following is from a team's Explanation: 'Topic: Water, food, and agriculture Issue: Is clean water available to everyone?'

Introduction:

The principal intent of our project is to spread cognizance concerning the scarcity of clean water throughout Pakistan. We had to conduct primary and secondary research to ensure and affirm our perspectives regarding this issue of water sanitation, especially in rural areas. Our research on the internet showed that at least 2 billion people use a drinking water source contaminated with feces.¹ In Pakistan, over 21 million people still have no choice but to drink dirty water,² It is also estimated that 30 percent of all diseases are caused due to poor water quality.³ We discovered by interviewing a doctor that millions of people in Pakistan die from contaminated water.⁴

Cross-cultural perspective:

We interviewed several individuals in order to get their perspectives. The privileged interviewees stated that they obtained their water from clean sources such as tankers and pipelines⁵, whereas the underprivileged interviewees elaborated that they did not get clean water due to which problems were created, such as diseases⁶. Through this, we discovered the centre of motive: to supply water to people in need.

Project explanation:

'Our team carried out the campaign through which we created awareness amongst people about the lack of clean water in underprivileged areas. We raised a considerable sum of money by carrying out a donation drive, which was sufficient to construct a hand pump. Therefore, we gave back to our community through its construction. Our progress can be viewed through this video on YouTube.'

Comment:

The aim is clear: to raise awareness. The means of doing so is clear: a campaign. The research to be undertaken is clear, and headline findings that explain the reason for going forward with the project are clear. The citations should accompany the research findings in individual Reflective Papers. Given here, they cannot be attached to an individual and so cannot contribute towards individual marks.

The detail in the Explanation makes description of the project at the beginning of the Reflective Paper a waste of valuable words.

¹World health organisation 2021 <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/drinking-water#:~:text=Key%20facts,water%20source%20contaminated%20with%20faeces> Accessed on 1st November 2022

² Water aid organisation Pakistan <https://www.wateraid.org/where-we-work/pakistan> Accessed on 1st November 2022

³ Dawn News 2021 <https://www.dawn.com/news/1598924> Accessed on 1st November 2022

⁴ Abdullah, Dawood, Kabeer, Myra, and Vania Interview 2022 Doctor Saba, 2022. (Interview), (Access date: 9th October)

⁵ Abdullah, Dawood, Kabeer, Myra, and Vania Interview 2022 Sir Noor Ali, 2022. (Interview), (Access date: 26th October). Miss Shabana, 2022. (Interview), (Access date: 22nd October)

⁶ Abdullah, Dawood, Kabeer, Myra, and Vania Interview 2022 Mr. Akhtar Masih, 2022. (Interview), (Access date: 17th October). Miss Pushpa Vishram, 2022. (Interview), (Access date: 12th October)

The only unclear aspect is the place of the fundraising for a handpump. Was this additional to the plans? Was it a way of demonstrating the team's achievement?

AO3 Collaboration

Teachers must award a mark for how well the team have worked together to complete the project. All members of the team must be given the **same** mark and teachers should take into account how well team members have worked together over the course of the project, including how well they have communicated with each other, solved problems, resolved conflict and divided work fairly between the team. This mark should be informed by teacher observation of teamwork and questioning of team members individually and collectively. There should be no explanation on ICRC forms of how this mark was arrived at.

Personal Element: Reflective Paper

AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation

The most successful candidates provided direct evidence of the impact of their work, demonstrating how far the Outcome had achieved the project aim. For instance, in the project on attitudes to teenage mental Health, a survey was conducted to assess the extent to which the presentation had improved understanding. They had a percentage success rate. Analysis led to them being able to discuss their effectiveness in different parts of their year group. Where the aim is to raise awareness about an issue, a survey of the target audience before and after the awareness-raising session was often used successfully to show how far the Outcome was successful in achieving the aim. The very best responses also then made suggestions of ways in which the Outcome could be improved, drawing on the weaknesses identified.

Less successful responses often simply described the Outcome and the process by which it was produced. Where there was evaluation, these responses explained only weaknesses or strengths. Suggestions for improvement were not linked to any of the weaknesses that had been identified.

An example of an evaluation of an Outcome:

'We were able to successfully spread awareness regarding the water sanitation issue as we successfully carried out our campaign and were able to raise enough funds for the construction of the hand pump, which was the outcome of our project, which can supply clean water and fulfill the necessities of the people in need.'

Comment:

One question is answered- the fundraising and provision of a hand pump is the evidence of a successful awareness-raising campaign. There is no reflection about what the weaknesses were in the campaign, e.g. evidence about questions that the team were asked and could not answer, or groups of people that the team was unable to engage with. In turn, this made it impossible for the team to reflect effectively on how they could have improved their project.

Guidance: Ask learners to answer: How far was our project successful? They should present strengths and weaknesses of the Outcome, supported by evidence.

Evaluating Work Processes: Only the very best responses were successful in evaluating their own work processes. Successful responses evaluated their time management; for example, giving reasons why they failed to keep to their research schedule. Other successful responses evaluated their research technique; how they went about the task and what they wished they had done. Both of these included examples to illustrate and develop their points.

The most successful **suggestions for improvement** for both the Outcome and own work processes drew on evaluation of weaknesses in these areas, as in this example where the candidate wrote: *'From this I have learned to plan when my research needs to be complete for it to be useful in our event'*. For reflection to be insightful/in depth it must consider the impact on the project's aims or the Outcome, as it does here.

More commonly, candidates were unclear on the difference between 'strengths/limitations of own work processes' and 'strengths/weaknesses of own performance as a team member'. They should consider the latter with the questions: How well did I support the team in its work towards the Outcome? And: 'How well was I supported by the team? This would lead to discussion of help and support that they gave others, and occasions where they themselves needed help or support.

Guidance: Rather than give candidates headings from the assessment criteria, give them questions that encourage evaluation. For example: 'How well did your Outcome meet your aim?', 'Which elements of the Outcome were more or less successful?', 'How could you improve the Outcome to better meet the aim?', 'How did your work processes/time management affect the project?', 'How effective was your research in satisfying the aims of the Outcome?', 'How would you improve your work processes if you had to complete the project again?'

AO2 Reflection

This assessment objective requires candidates to reflect on the overall benefits and challenges of working in a group situation, as opposed to working alone. They need to provide specific examples drawn from their experience to illustrate their reflections. In the best responses, candidates commented that sharing work allowed the team to achieve more in a shorter space of time, or that it provided a greater pool of skills to draw on (giving examples from their project). Challenges of working in a team that were commonly mentioned include difficulties of communicating with other team members, organising meetings, dividing work equally and keeping all members on task. Some candidates initially believed that they worked best alone, only to find that it was more effective to have different ideas to listen to. Others were looking forward to working with friends, only to find that either they wasted time or that they would have preferred to do the work alone as they were not satisfied with what their team-mates did. In the very best responses, candidates demonstrated insightful evaluation in their explanation of how these benefits and challenges impacted upon their project.

Less successful responses simply listed who did what in the team, or, often, which team members failed to do tasks that were assigned to them.

Reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of own performance as a team member is concerned with those things the individual does that either move the team forward or hold it back. It is about the individual's impact on the team as a whole. Paragraphs that show what they did to support the team, and how they needed support from the team, and how either of these impacted on the team's performance overall would indicate a mark at Level 4.

Less successful work focused only on identifying a role in the team, such as what work had been done, or what prevented work from being completed.

Guidance: Candidates could be given a reflective log to record examples while they are completing the project or be asked to take notes. This could include examples of when working as a team helped them to achieve something positive; when working as a team was difficult, and why; when they did something positive to help the team achieve their goal; when their performance had a negative effect on the team. Some centres have indicated that they are giving classes time to write sections of the Reflective Paper as they progress through the Team Project e.g. to evaluate the Outcome soon after the event.

There are three elements to reflecting on overall personal learning. Candidates should consider what they have learned about the issue or topic, and about perspectives on it, as well as what personal or practical skills they have developed through completing the project.

Example: *'This project challenged how I view eating disorders (EDs), a personal struggle. I got desensitised to the harms they have after first-hand experience. However, after writing the roleplay, I realised how similar they are to drug addiction. The link between the two was a crucial realisation for me as I'd dismiss my ED since starving yourself to lose weight is normalised and even encouraged for teenage girls.'*

I now acknowledge that addiction is the same whether it's to starve yourself or to do drugs: in both, you damage your body which is irreversible in the majority of cases, and you end up isolating yourself which makes you struggle through life. Conclusively, it made me realise the severity of my problem and consequently, the importance of taking care of myself.'

Learning about skills: *'Overall, the Team project required me to be heard clearly. It sharpened my public speaking skills and boosted my confidence through conducting workshops.'*

AO3 Communication

This assessment objective requires reflective reports to flow meaningfully with signposting and appropriate linking used to make sense of the flow of ideas. For instance, it should not be difficult to follow which paragraphs are about own work processes and which are about strengths and limitations of working as a team member.

It is expected that each member of the team will have been involved in some personal research towards the work overall. These individual personal research findings need to be clearly presented. Where this individual research has involved secondary research, candidates must include citation and referencing. This referencing should be included in the Reflective Paper and detail the author, date, title, URL and date accessed for all sources used, in a consistent format.

Example summary of research findings and citations: *‘Initially, I thought immature people did drugs to deal with boredom, causing damage to their bodies for short-term pleasure. This is a common reason to get into drugs in Pakistan⁽⁴⁾ while Iceland nearly eradicated its drug problem through its preventative model which includes having more leisure activities available.⁽⁵⁾ Additionally through my research I found out accessibility of drugs is a unique problem to Pakistan because of its border with Afghanistan, a major opium producer.⁽⁶⁾*

Citations were provided.

Teacher Assessment

In schools where there are several teaching groups led by different teachers, it is helpful if the teachers share an understanding of the mark scheme applied to Team Project before teaching begins. Learners benefit from understanding the mark scheme as well.

The Individual candidate record cards (ICRC) must be completed by teachers. Teachers are requested to comment on the ICRC. Teachers are reminded that they must include comments on the ICRC to support/explain the marks awarded and they should use the wording from the assessment criteria level descriptors when formulating these supporting comments. Changes made through internal moderation should be explained through the wording on the ICRC. Any internal moderation should be completed before final marks are submitted, so that marks on the ICRCs, the CASF and the MS1 all match each other.

