

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/11
Written Examination

Key messages

The key messages are that:

- candidates demonstrated good skills of interpretation and analysis
- evaluation skills need to be developed further
- material from sources should be used as evidence to justify opinions
- candidates should assess the potential impact and consequences of actions in greater detail.

General comments

The Written Examination consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In November 2018, the examination was based upon source material related to the topic of education for all. The need to improve the quality of education internationally was the specific issue explored.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Many candidates are developing understanding of different perspectives on global issues and an ability to use reasoning and evidence to support an opinion or claim. Candidates are also able to analyse evidence in a variety of different forms. However, some candidates need to develop evaluation skills to higher levels and apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of sources.

Candidates responded very well to the source material, especially in the extended response questions, and engaged actively with the issue. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in advising governments on priorities for educational expenditure. However, candidates should explore alternative actions in greater detail, assessing potential impact and consequences before reaching a balanced and supported judgement about which to recommend.

Examination technique was usually very good. The vast majority of candidates completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn from the sources, especially through quotation, direct reference and citation
- provide explanation to justify opinion rather than making assertions or providing descriptions
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, bias, tone, and vested interest
- evaluate alternative actions by assessing potential impact and consequences.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified that 57 million or 9 per cent of children worldwide had no access to primary education in 2015.

- (b) From Source 2, almost all candidates were able to identify two ways that parents could help prepare children for education. Most candidates identified reading stories, encouraging talk and playing games.
- (c) Most candidates responded well to this question and clearly described and explained the importance of an effect or consequence of education. Most candidates chose to discuss the impact of education on health, lifestyle, happiness and employment.

The most common justifications given by candidates related to issues of impact, including:

- the number of people affected
- the range of impact e.g. different aspects of people's lives affected
- the depth of impact e.g. how much difference might be made
- the timescale for making a difference
- costs.

Many candidates showed awareness of the link between cause and effect in this context, as well as the 'snowball' effect of a consequence or cause leading to another. Some discussed a possible 'vicious circle' relating to poverty and crime.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why one effect was more important than others and gave some evidence to support their judgements. Weaker responses often simply stated the effect without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion without evidence or careful reasoning. Some candidates compared the significance of different effects, but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

- (d) Many candidates responded well to this question and could explain why the provision of good education is an important national issue, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concept of 'national'.

The national issues or consequences of good education most frequently discussed by candidates were:

- provision of more productive employees
- improved economic growth
- filling important roles that a country needs; for example, doctors and teachers
- higher rates of literacy
- children becoming more informed and active citizens.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about education in general without reference to 'national' issues, benefits or problems. Some candidates simply listed a range of issues taken directly from the sources without any development or explanation.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'education is of great importance to our children'.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- clear reasoning which was easy to follow
- persuasive
- uses relevant examples
- the argument is strongly worded
- appeals to emotions
- author has some experience in education.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- very little evidence or research to support argument

- potential bias and selectivity as the source was a political speech
- author unknown – difficult to verify knowledge claims or expertise
- level of expertise of the author is not clear – may have poor knowledge claims
- very little clear, specific statistical/numerical evidence.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their opinions, usually discussing four or more distinct evaluative points. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion.

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 source was part of a speech.'* This statement does not explain why the speech in the source may not be strong evidence. A better response would be, *'A weakness is that the source was taken from a speech because politicians often sensationalise to gain attention and votes. This type of evidence is not strong because it is likely to be biased and selective.'*

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the argument in the Source and 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, 'If we spend more money on education, our children will get better qualifications.' These 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, for example teachers, parents and past candidates in different places and cultures. Surveys of local people about educational expenditure were also suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts and educational workers. 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.

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 prediction from the source and explained that predictions are statements that are claims about the future.

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

- (b)** Nearly all candidates correctly identified an opinion from the source and explained that opinions are statements which are subjective points of view or beliefs which cannot be verified and are not necessarily shared by others.

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

- (c)** Most candidates correctly identified an example of a value judgement, revealing an understanding that a value judgement is a view or decision about what is right, wrong or important, based upon a set of standards, principles, or values.

The most effective responses tended to quote from the source and clearly describe evidence from the source to support their interpretation and judgment.

This question was challenging for some candidates who did not understand the concept of value judgement and were not able to use the idea in the analysis of source material.

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

- (d) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, and discussed issues relating to evidence, language, knowledge claims and expertise. Some candidates also addressed the reasons and values within each statement.

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the value of each statement; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a focus on reasons and evidence, with a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences and values for both statements. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion. The statements were also quoted explicitly with material from the statements used directly in the response as evidence to support the candidate's opinion.

At the lower levels of response, the discussion was unlikely to be supported and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues rather than reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was very little or no overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to evaluate sources during their courses. This should involve a consideration of the reasons and evidence used to support the argument or perspective in the source.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to compare, assess and recommend actions for improving education in schools by governments. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

There were many thoughtful discussions of all three options. Some candidates chose to compare all options, which was a more challenging but at times very effective way to structure the argument. Other candidates only recommended and discussed one option in detail. This was also an effective strategy for responding to the task.

However, some candidates tended to describe their opinions in a generalised and asserted way, describing the possible actions without exploring the consequences and impact on the issue of how to improve education in schools.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well-supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the issue. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses linked the argument back to the issue of how to improve education in schools explicitly and frequently.

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

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 the consequences and impact of different actions.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/12
Written Examination

Key messages

The key messages are that:

- candidates demonstrated good skills of interpretation and analysis
- evaluation skills need to be developed further
- material from sources should be used as evidence to justify opinions
- candidates should assess the potential impact and consequences of actions in greater detail.

General comments

The Written Examination consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In November 2018, the paper was based upon source material related to the topic of fuel and energy. The provision of clean and renewable energy was the specific issue explored.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Many candidates are developing understanding of different perspectives on global issues and an ability to use reasoning and evidence to support an opinion or claim. Candidates are also able to analyse evidence in a variety of different forms. However, some candidates need to develop evaluation skills and apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of sources.

Candidates responded very well to the source material, especially in the extended response questions, and engaged actively with the issue. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in advising governments on how to persuade people to use more renewable energy. However, candidates should explore alternative actions in greater detail, assessing potential impact and consequences before reaching a balanced and supported judgement.

Examination technique was usually very good. Candidates had sufficient time for the tasks. The vast majority of candidates completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn from the sources through quotation and direct reference or citation
- provide explanation to justify opinion rather than simple assertion or description
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, bias, tone, and vested interest
- evaluate alternative actions by assessing potential impact and consequences.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified the trend in the share of worldwide energy supplied by renewable resources as rising or increasing.

- (b) From Source 2, almost all candidates were able to identify two disadvantages of using basic energy sources. Most candidates identified spoiling the environment, danger and increasing air pollution.
- (c) Most candidates responded well to this question and clearly described and explained the disadvantage of using basic energy sources which, in their opinion, had the most impact. Most candidates chose to discuss the impact of spoiling the local environment or increasing air pollution.

The most common justifications given by candidates related to issues of impact, including:

- the number of people affected
- the range of impact e.g. different aspects of people's lives or the environment affected
- the depth of impact e.g. how much impact might be made
- the timescale for an impact to be made
- economic costs.

Many candidates showed awareness of the link between cause and effect in this context, as well as the 'snowball' effect of a consequence or cause leading to another. Some discussed a possible 'vicious circle' relating to environmental degradation.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why one effect was more important than others and gave some evidence to support their judgements. Weaker responses often simply stated the effect without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion without evidence or careful reasoning. Some candidates compared the significance of different effects, but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

- (d) Many candidates responded well to this question and could explain one local and one global consequence of providing clean, modern energy to people who do not have access to it, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concepts of 'local' and 'global'.

The local consequences of providing clean modern energy to people who do not have access to it discussed most frequently by candidates were:

- increased supply of local jobs
- local forests may need to be cleared
- damage incurred in preparing new roads and buildings in the local area
- less time spent by people collecting basic fuels
- less local pollution caused by burning basic fuels.

The global consequences of providing clean modern energy to people who do not have access to it discussed most frequently by candidates were:

- increase in worldwide energy use
- increased use of fossil fuels or alternative sources of energy
- more employment opportunities in energy supply
- further deforestation.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about energy in general without reference to 'local' or 'global' issues, benefits or problems. Some candidates simply listed a range of issues or consequences taken directly from the sources without any development or explanation.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'air pollution is a problem in our town'.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- the case is stated at the beginning
- some factual evidence e.g. '15 per cent of people in town walk to work'
- several different types of evidence used – personal, research

- the evidence is generally relevant
- the evidence is used forcefully in the argument
- positive and enthusiastic use of language and tone.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- research is only partially cited
- level of expertise of author is not clear
- method of research is not clear
- too much reliance on opinion
- biased evidence due to self interest
- no date on the evidence cited.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their opinions, usually discussing four or more distinct evaluative points. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion.

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 source was taken from a blog.'* This statement by the candidate does not explain why a blog may be a weakness. A better response would be, *'A weakness is that the source was taken from a blog because people often say what they want in a blog, without evidence or accountability. This type of evidence is not strong because it is likely to be biased and selective, or just not true because it is only an opinion.'*

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the value of different parts of the argument in the source and 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, 'only 15 per cent of the people in our town walk to work.' These methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and explicitly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example teachers, parents and past candidates in different places and cultures. Surveys of local people about transport to work were also suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts and employers. 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.

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 fact from the source.
- (b)** Nearly all candidates correctly identified an opinion from the source.
- (c)** Most candidates correctly identified an example of a vested interest, revealing an understanding that a vested interest is a strong personal interest (involvement, commitment, point of view or

similar) because of potential personal advantage or gain, which could be economic, social, political, or other.

The most effective responses tended to quote from the source and clearly describe evidence from the source to support their interpretation and judgment.

This question was challenging for some candidates who did not understand the concept of vested interest and were not able to use the idea in the analysis of source material.

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates about vested interests and provide experience of using the term in the analysis of sources, alongside other critical thinking concepts like value judgements, bias, fact, opinion and prediction.

- (d)** Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, and discussed issues relating to evidence, language, knowledge claims and expertise. Some candidates also addressed the reasons and values within each statement.

Responses at the highest levels contained well-supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the value of each statement; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a focus on reasons and evidence, with a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences and values for both statements. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion. The statements were also quoted explicitly and material from the statements was used directly in the response as evidence to support the candidate's opinion.

At the lower levels of response, the discussion was unlikely to be supported and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues rather than reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was very little or no overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to evaluate sources during their courses. This should involve a consideration of the reasons and evidence used to support the argument or perspective in the source.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to compare, assess and recommend options for action by governments to persuade people to use renewable energy. Candidates were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

There were many thoughtful discussions of all three proposed options. Some candidates chose to compare all options, which was a more challenging but at times very effective way to structure the argument. Other candidates only recommended and discussed one option in detail. This was also an effective strategy for responding to the task.

However, some candidates tended to describe their opinions in a generalised and asserted way, describing the possible actions without exploring the consequences and impact on the issue of how to persuade people to use renewable energy.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well-supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the issue. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses linked the argument back to the issue of how persuade people to use renewable energy explicitly and frequently.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the option in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted.

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 the consequences and impact of different actions.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/13
Written Examination

Key messages

The key messages are that:

- candidates demonstrated good skills of interpretation and analysis
- evaluation skills need to be developed further
- material from sources should be used as evidence to justify opinions
- candidates should assess the potential impact and consequences of actions in greater detail.

General comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In November 2018, the paper was based upon source material related to the topic of migration and urbanisation. The impact of migration on urban and rural areas was the specific issue explored.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Many candidates are developing understanding of different perspectives on global issues and an ability to use reasoning and evidence to support an opinion or claim. Candidates are also able to analyse evidence in a variety of different forms. However, some candidates need to develop evaluation skills and apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of sources.

Candidates responded very well to the Source Material, especially in the extended response questions, and engaged actively with the issue. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in advising governments on how to reduce migration of people from rural to urban areas. However, candidates should explore alternative actions in greater detail, assessing potential impact and consequences before reaching a balanced and supported judgement.

Examination technique was usually very good. Candidates had sufficient time for the tasks. The vast majority of candidates completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn from the sources through quotation and direct reference or citation
- provide explanation to justify opinion rather than simple assertion or description
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, bias, tone, and vested interest
- evaluate alternative actions by assessing potential impact and consequences.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified the trend in the worldwide urban population as rising or increasing.

- (b) From Source 2, almost all candidates were able to identify two reasons why people move from rural to urban areas. Most candidates identified improving their standard of living, finding a well-paid job and better opportunities for housing, education, healthcare, and entertainment.
- (c) Most candidates responded well to this question and clearly described and explained the reason for people moving from rural to urban areas which, in their opinion, was the most significant. Most candidates chose to discuss improving their standard of living or finding a job. Some discussed improving opportunities for healthcare and education.

The most common justifications given by candidates related to issues of impact, including:

- the number of people affected
- the range of impact e.g. different aspects of people's lives affected
- the depth of impact e.g. how much impact might be made
- the timescale for an impact to be made
- economic costs.

Many candidates showed awareness of the link between cause and effect in this context, as well as the 'snowball' effect of a consequence or cause leading to another. Some discussed a possible 'vicious circle' relating to problems of rural or urban life.

The strongest answers provided several clear explanations to justify why one reason for moving was more important than others and gave some evidence to support their judgements. Weaker responses often simply stated the effect without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion without evidence or careful reasoning. Some candidates compared the significance of different reasons, but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

- (d) Many candidates responded well to this question and could explain why moving from rural to urban areas was an important local issue, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concept of 'local'.

The local consequences of people moving from rural to urban areas discussed most frequently by candidates were:

- Increasing overpopulation in the city
- pressure on resources in urban areas
- increasing crime
- spread of disease
- reduced economic base for rural areas
- causes depopulation, increased poverty and fewer facilities in rural areas.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about energy in general without reference to 'local' issues, benefits or problems. Some candidates simply listed a range of issues or reasons taken directly from the sources without any development or explanation.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'air pollution is a problem in our town'.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- states the case for the claim at the beginning
- some factual evidence
- several different types of evidence used – personal, research
- the evidence is generally relevant
- the evidence is used forcefully in the argument
- positive and measured tone and use of language.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- research is only partially cited
- level of expertise of author is not clear
- methods of research are not clear
- no date on the evidence cited
- some assertion
- arguments are sometimes vague.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their opinions, usually discussing four or more distinct evaluative points. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion.

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 source was taken from a blog.'* This statement by the candidate does not explain why a blog may be a weakness. A better response would be, *'A weakness is that the source was taken from a blog because people often say what they want in a blog, without evidence or accountability. This type of evidence is not strong because it is likely to be biased and selective, or just not true because it is only an opinion.'*

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the value of different parts of the argument in the source and 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, 'eighty percent of families in rural areas work in farming.' These methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and explicitly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example employers and local government in different places and cultures. Surveys of local people about work were also suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts and employers. 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.

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 fact from the source.
- (b)** Nearly all candidates correctly identified a prediction from the source.
- (c)** Most candidates correctly explained why Ni Lui's statement might be biased, revealing an understanding that 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.

The most effective responses tended to quote from the source and clearly describe evidence from the source to support their interpretation and judgment.

This question was challenging for some candidates who did not understand the concept of bias and were not able to use the idea in the analysis of source material.

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates about bias and provide experience of using the term in the analysis of sources, alongside other critical thinking concepts, like value judgements, vested interests, fact, opinion and prediction.

- (d) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, and discussed issues relating to evidence, language, knowledge claims and expertise. Some candidates also addressed the reasons and values within each statement.

Responses at the highest levels contained well-supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the value of each statement; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a focus on reasons and evidence, with a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences and values for both statements. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion. The statements were also quoted explicitly and material from the statements was used directly in the response as evidence to support the candidate's opinion.

At the lower levels of response, the discussion was unlikely to be supported and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues rather than reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was very little or no overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to evaluate sources during their courses. This should involve a consideration of the reasons and evidence used to support the argument or perspective in the source.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to compare, assess and recommend options for action by governments to reduce the number of people moving from rural to urban areas. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

There were many thoughtful discussions of all three proposed options. Some candidates chose to compare all options, which was a more challenging but at times very effective way to structure the argument. Other candidates only recommended and discussed one option in detail. This was also an effective strategy for responding to the task.

However, some candidates tended to describe their opinions in a generalised and asserted way, describing the possible actions without exploring the consequences and impact on the issue of how to persuade not to move from rural to urban areas.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well-supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the issue. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses linked the argument back to the issue of how persuade people to use renewable energy explicitly and frequently.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the option in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to reduce migration or improve rural and urban environments.

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 the consequences and impact of different actions.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

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

Key messages

- Teachers and candidates should have access to and understand the assessment criteria for this component. The criteria are listed and explained in the Syllabus and the Teacher Guide which can both be found on the School Support Hub.
- Candidates should choose a topic of interest to them, from the eight topics for this component – as listed in the Syllabus.
- Candidates should identify a global issue within that topic area and formulate a question about their chosen issue.
- The question must allow the candidate scope to develop global and national/local perspectives on the issue.
- Candidates should plan their reports so that they cover all the required criteria for this component. Their report should be in the form of an essay and be presented as a Word document.
- Candidates should be encouraged to use (but not exceed) the full word count (2000 words) to aid depth of analysis and evaluation.

General comments

For the Individual Report (IR), candidates choose a topic and identify a global issue; preferably one with a clear impact in their own country/local area. Candidates carry out research on their issue, identifying different perspectives/views and opinions on the issue. For the purposes of this component, an issue is a problem or a divisive topic that causes disagreement or debate. Facts and figures about different places do not constitute perspectives.

Candidates should ensure that they find a clear global perspective on the issue. Candidates analyse the causes and consequences of their chosen issue and compare these to identify and explain which are more important or serious and why. Candidates propose a course of action to address the issue (to help improve or solve the problem/resolve the disagreement) drawing on the analysis undertaken.

Candidates should evaluate individual sources of information they have used; how useful and reliable the sources are and how this has impacted their research or perspective. Candidates should also reflect on how their personal perspective has been impacted by their findings and the different perspectives they have explored. Candidates should cite any sources of information used in their essay and include a reference list at the end of their report after the word count.

In this session, candidates produced interesting work on a wide range of different issues. The comments that follow reflect the assessment criteria used in marking the IR.

Comments on specific criteria

Information from different perspectives

The most successful reports presented different perspectives (global and national/local) focused on one specific issue within a chosen topic. They developed a clear global perspective; usually a well-researched viewpoint from at least one group, organisation or institution with influence beyond any one country. They included other examples of the same viewpoint, with supporting information to develop the perspective. Examples included viewpoints from specific bodies such as the United Nations (UN). Further evidence was then given to confirm this global perspective. However, please note that some successful reports drew evidence together and presented their own global perspective. One successful example of a global

perspective starts:

With the over-packaging of products becoming commonplace, the future of the natural world is looking more bleak than ever before. The major consumerism and capitalism seen in the majority countries worldwide mean that the present global economy cares more about price than other factors, such as quality or sustainable elements.

Less successful responses often presented information about the issue/topic drawn from different countries, without considering different perspectives on it.

Candidates must ensure that different perspectives are expressed and developed. They can indicate perspectives by using language such as: 'according to', 'thinks/believes/recognises/feels that' etc.

For example, to express a clear local perspective, the same candidate wrote:

*Countless websites based in Melbourne and Victoria largely encourage the practice of recycling, informing of the latest rules and regulations. As stated by my **Local Council's recycling sector** 'The City of Boroondara recognises the importance of providing effective waste management through the provision of its waste services that improve the sustainability of the urban environment'.*

Analysis and comparison of causes and consequences

The most successful reports clearly focused on a single main issue and this focus allowed a clear analysis and comparison of the causes and consequences of this issue. Some reports successfully identified causes and consequences of the issue in question but did not make comparisons.

The questions posed had a direct impact on whether candidates were able to compare causes and/or consequences.

For example:

IS CYBERBULLYING THE GREATEST CAUSE OF ANXIETY AND DEPRESSION IN TEENAGERS AND YOUNG ADULTS?

This title allows for cause and consequence, but also for comparison. The candidate identifies the primary cause, saying:

PRIMARY CAUSE

The focal driver of anxiety and depression in teenagers and young-adults is cyberbullying....

And later, after a full explanation of the primary cause and a section explaining the Secondary Cause (IAD):

The evidence establishes that the number of cases of anxiety and depression caused by cyberbullying far outweigh those caused by IAD.

In less successful work, where the issue was unclear, candidates were unable to explain and compare its causes and consequences. Some candidates tried to address too many issues and were unable to analyse them all in adequate depth in the specified word count.

Some candidates seemed to be unsure about the difference between a cause and a consequence of an issue. Under the heading 'causes', they listed some things caused by the issue and then repeated similar impacts under Consequences. Candidates should understand that they are expected to think about what has caused or does cause the issue or make it worse and what the consequences of the issue are.

Courses of action

In successful reports, candidates proposed a single, well-developed course of action, outlining how this course of action might help to resolve the issue in practice. For example, one candidate suggested:

Governments could pass an act or redo the national budget to allow and give more funding to Schools for improved technology. They would have to put the newly acquired equipment and funding in the hands of the teacher and train the teachers to utilize the new technology effectively with educational software like Nearpod, Kahoot and ClassDojo. These programmes can be used to better parent – teacher communication

and also improve the classroom learning environment allowing for better concentration and focus from the candidates due to the absence of personal devices.

This could help the candidates directly as it would be harder for them to be affected by each other as the teacher is now conveying the information in a much more eye-catching and interactive way. Boosting candidates focus and learning while allowing a wider range of candidates with different learning styles, whether it be a visual, auditory, verbal or physical to be able to learn with equal effectiveness due to the nature of these new educational software.

Governments may be reluctant to implement this especially in areas of lower economic development as priorities like national welfare, food supply, security, healthcare or national debt may be areas of immediate importance or a demand from the people. Making it difficult to budget around these sectors while allocating enough funds to improve Schools with newer technology that can often be quite costly to fairly implement with costs ranging from \$142 to \$490 per candidate per year in certain areas. However, an act like this it would be able to revitalise a new industry for educational programmes and boost the economic growth of a country meeting, a core government objective.

In the most successful reports, candidates drew on their own analysis of the main causes or consequences of their issue to propose a course of action. Their course of action was designed to resolve the issue, or deal with the main cause, or avoid or mitigate the worst consequence.

Most candidates were able to offer some suggestions for courses of actions. The least successful work listed several relevant solutions with no explanation of how they might be carried out, by whom, or what the impact would be.

Some candidates proposed brief, undeveloped suggestions which were related to the topic area but not their question, and unrelated to their analysis of the issue. Some candidates made future predictions rather than suggested courses of action, so were unable to gain credit for their work for this criterion.

It is acceptable for candidates to outline courses of action that have been successful in other parts of the world and explain and discuss how these could be adopted and applied in their own country or local area. However, they will not be credited for simply lifting others' suggestions or describing courses of action already being carried out, without any of their own thoughts and conclusions.

Evaluation of sources

Candidates should evaluate individual sources used in their report. Their evaluation should show an understanding of the impact of weaknesses or strengths of evidence, reliability, credibility of sources and plausibility of arguments.

Successful reports explicitly evaluated some, if not all, of the individual sources of information used, using evaluative terms. The most successful reports made evaluative points throughout; explained strengths and weaknesses and summed up their overall research at the end.

For example; one candidate commented on all their sources throughout and then concluded about the impact of the quality of their evidence on their analysis:

Comments on specific sources

'The Economic Times, India, is a leading business weekly, and is thus a reliable source with recent, relevant, factual information. However, the lack of a clear proposition in the source content leads to undefined accuracy'

'A 2015 study by the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention.... As the evidence's source is a government organisation, the reliability and objectivity are high. If a larger geographical footprint was covered, it would have strengthened the reasoning.'

'According to a 2016 study by the National centre for Biotechnology Information (NCBI),..... The reasoning is strengthened by the influential nature of the source and the study's fairly up-to-date publication. Yet, lack of comparative statistics weakens it.'

'A 2016 article published by the Indian Express brought forth the case.... The source is reliable, as it is one of India's daily newspapers, and is fairly current. However, as it primarily focuses on a single anecdote, it

may be subject to bias, and lacks sample size sufficiency'

Comment on impact:

'There were gaps in my research and analysis, as I struggled to access information that was authoritative, had sufficient sample size, was credible and current. I may have needed to draw a clearer link between cyberbullying and IAD, and consider various other physical societal causes, which link to the digital realm'

Less successful responses addressed evaluation in a general way, sometimes referring vaguely to 'reliability' or 'date'. For example, *'I used reliable sources although some were out of date.'* This example does not show that the candidate understands the term 'reliability' and is not specific to one source. It does not explain why it matters that they were out of date, or what the impact of this might be.

NB. It is perfectly acceptable for candidates to evaluate all their sources at the end and together in one paragraph, drawing a conclusion about the impact of the quality of their sources. However, they should identify the individual sources by name and explain their evaluation clearly. Note that candidates are less likely to fully develop their evaluation and discuss impact when they evaluate all sources together:

'The information I used in my report comes from sources that are generally reputable and reliable such as The Atlantic, The Straits Times, The Guardian and the United Nations. Other than these, I've collected information from studies with sufficient and reasonable sample sizes such as the research done by Dove as well as the Ipsos Global Survey. Most of these sources are balanced in viewpoints and unbiased. The ones that took a stand have medical research and relevant statistics to back them up. For example, the article from The Guardian, 'Click to Agree with What? No One Reads Terms of Service, Studies Confirm', used research studies to back its argument about terms of service being ignored by most people.'

Reflection

Successful work reflected on how the candidate's own perspective on the issue had changed or developed as a result of their research and the perspectives they had explored. Some candidates talked generally about how their view on the issue had changed, without directly linking this to the research they had conducted. The least successful reports simply offered the candidate's opinion on the issue, with statements such as: *'I think something has to be done about it.'*

Candidates should be encouraged to answer their question in a way which explicitly discusses and justifies their personal perspective. For example:

'Before conducting this research, I thought that sustainable development would not bring any great impacts to society. However, my view has changed after reading a few articles and news regarding the effect of sustainable development on society. In my opinion, I think that the Clean Water Act should be deemed as a success as it has brought positive impacts socially, environmentally and to the economy. We can see that the Clean Water Act has affected the national and global economy and thus the standard of living. I have also learnt that society, the environment and the economy are actually interconnected. Improving the environment will also affect society and the economy. Therefore, I believe that when the three core elements of sustainability are applied, sustainable development can affect standard of living.'

Structure of the report

Most reports were well-structured and easy to follow.

Some successful work was structured along the lines of the criteria for the IR, so that it was easy to follow, flowed logically and covered all the criteria thoroughly.

Most candidates used sub-headings to structure their report. However, in less successful responses, the sub-headings did not reflect what followed. For example, some reports included the headings *'global perspective'* and *'national perspective'* but did not present any perspectives in the text that followed. Instead, candidates presented information, in the form of facts and figures, under these headings.

Some reports followed an illogical order with different issues presented one after the other in great depth, followed by causes and consequences and then perspectives. This meant that material and ideas tended to be repeated or unclear. The least successful work had no apparent structure.

In the most successful reports, each section followed effectively from the last, with headings clearly related to

the text and markers like, '*Firstly*', '*Secondly*', '*However*' and '*In conclusion*' used to signpost key aspects of the report.

Clarity of arguments, perspectives and evidence

This criterion is concerned with candidates' clear communication of ideas, perspectives, viewpoints, and their research findings.

In successful work, arguments, perspectives, evidence, causes and consequences were clear and easy to follow. Where arguments were confused or difficult to follow, or headings did not reflect content; marks at the lower end of the mark range were awarded.

Centres should guide candidates to plan and structure arguments to make the report a cohesive and logical whole. Candidates should also use quotes sparingly and only to support points that they make in their own words.

Citation and referencing

Candidates should understand the need to attribute all quoted material and to cite their sources. There is no prescribed method of referencing, but all sources should be referenced. It should be clear what is quoted or paraphrased and what is the candidate's own work. Candidates should use one consistent method throughout and it should be possible for the Examiner to follow up and find any sources referred to.

In the most successful reports, there is clear attribution of material used (via in-text, footnote or endnote citation) for any direct quotations and where the ideas of others have been paraphrased. All sources are referenced in a list at the end, including author, date, title of publication and, for online sources, with the website address and date accessed. It is easy to find the sources mentioned in the text or footnotes.

In less successful work, candidates attributed quoted material and information used, but there was no link between the in-text citation and the reference list. In some cases, the reference list was not organised to make finding sources easy, or quotes were numbered, but the numbers did not match the reference list.

In less successful reports, candidates failed to attribute all evidence or quotations, citations were incomplete and reference lists only contained web addresses, without access dates or any other information.

Word count

Some reports were shorter than the specified word count (1500 to 2000 words). Shorter reports lacked detailed analysis and so were unable to meet the assessment criteria. Centres should advise candidates to use the full word count. The reference list is not included in the word count.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/03
Team Project

Key messages

All members of a team must be awarded the same mark for the three team elements (Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration).

Candidates should choose an issue to focus on, carry out research into different cultural perspectives on the issue, and then use their findings to decide on an aim and an Outcome to achieve the aim.

The Reflective Paper requires candidates to present their own research findings which means that although the team may work collectively for much of the time, it is expected that each individual team member will each carry out some individual research into the issue.

Candidates should keep an ongoing reflective log of their own ways of working and their work as a part of the team.

Teachers should steer candidates away from topics/issues that could be sensitive locally.

General comments

The most successful projects involved raising awareness of different cultural perspectives on an issue of local concern and changing 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 water shortage and developed activities showing how water use can be reduced safely. Under the topic of *disease and health*, some teams focused on raising awareness about the increase in support available to those with a mental illness, while others looked at combatting obesity by producing a food guide. Under the topic of *sport and recreation*, some teams focused on bringing sporting activities to a local group of children, while others looked at developing and promoting exercise programmes to encourage students to exercise more regularly.

Outcomes were varied and included promotional videos, school presentations, handbooks, leaflets, fundraising events and posters.

Less successful projects tended to give general information about an issue, without explicitly referring to different cultural perspectives on the issue.

Team Elements: Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration

AO3 Communication: Outcome and Explanation

In the most successful projects, the Outcome clearly demonstrated an action taken by the team to achieve their aim. The Outcome also clearly communicated different cultural perspectives on the issue; that is to say, different views or opinions on the issue from people in different countries, or from different groups within one country such as young/old, urban/rural, wealthy/poor, etc.

In less successful projects, the Outcome was often not an action taken to achieve the aim but instead an information gathering activity (e.g. a video of interviews being undertaken) or a description of other activities relating to the project process (e.g. a video of candidates talking about what they have done). In other projects, the Outcome was an action taken to achieve an aim, but did not include different cultural perspectives on the issue (e.g. an information leaflet simply giving facts about the issue in order to raise awareness).

Guidance: Interviews carried out to gather views/perspectives cannot be an Outcome in themselves. The Outcome should be an action taken to achieve the aim. The process of how initial research led to identification of the aim and the development of the Outcome should be made clear in the Explanation. There should be communication of different cultural perspectives in the Outcome and some discussion of how the research into these different perspectives has informed the Outcome should be part of the Explanation.

Example: The following example is drawn from the work of a team who chose the topic of *water, food and agriculture* for their project, which focused on the issue of reducing water usage. The team carried out research to identify how much water was used through different activities and by different cultural groups locally. During their research, they identified school members as a group that used more water than most. The team's aim then became to reduce the amount of water wasted in the school. To achieve this aim, the team produced an Outcome in the form of posters for use in every school bathroom, with reminders about how much water is used every minute a shower runs, a tap runs or a toilet flushes. They conducted a survey to see how many learners and teachers had changed their behaviour as a result. This is an example of a project that addresses a specific problem and tries to solve it.

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.

Personal Element: Reflective Paper

AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation

The most successful candidates provided direct evidence of how far the Outcome had achieved the project aim. For instance, in the case of the example given above, a survey was conducted to assess the extent to which posters had changed behaviour. They had a percentage success rate and feedback about why others had made no or fewer changes to their behaviour. 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. Examples used were often about which team member took what actions, rather than details of the Outcome that were felt to support the team in meeting its aims and aspects that did not. Suggestions for improvement were not linked to any weakness identified.

Only the very best responses were successful in evaluating their own work processes. Some successful responses evaluated their time management; for example, giving reasons why they failed to keep to schedule. Other successful responses evaluated their research technique: 'I was researching into water pollution and I made use of a few general websites about the importance of water. However, later I found that there were specialist journals on environmental issues relating to water pollution, and I would have gained more relevant information if I had used these'. The most successful responses included examples to illustrate and develop their points of evaluation; for example, an illustration of something that they were unable to achieve due to their failure of time management. The most successful suggestions for improvement to both the Outcome and own work processes also drew on evaluation of weaknesses in these areas.

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'. Other candidates who were able to evaluate did not do this in a balanced way, focusing on just strengths or just weaknesses of their work processes.

Guidance: Rather than give candidates headings from the assessment criteria, give them questions that encourage evaluation. For example: 'How did your work processes affect the project?', 'How well did your Outcome meet your aim?', 'Which elements of the Outcome were less successful?', 'How could you improve the Outcome to better meet the aim', '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 and 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. In the very best responses, candidates explained how these benefits and challenges impacted upon their project.

Less successful responses simply listed who did what in the team, or, often, who 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. There were candidates who produced effective reflections. As a weakness, a candidate reflected that: 'I am a very shy person and not a confident speaker, so I let the others do all the interviewing and this meant it took much longer than it should have, leaving us short of time to develop our Outcome'. Giving balance, another candidate reflected that: 'I am really interested in making videos and am familiar with many different types of software, so I was able to use my expertise to make the video quite quickly, which gave each of us more time to work on our Reflective Papers'.

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

Guidance: Give candidates a reflective log to record examples while they are completing the project. 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.

In reflecting on what they have learned about different cultural perspectives, candidates should not just consider what they have learned, but should think about whether and how their learning has made them think differently about those cultures or has changed what they do or how they behave. In other words, what impact this learning has had on them. For instance, from the research into water shortages a candidate had learned that actions in cities and towns affect water availability across the whole country, giving them a determination to save water by turning off the tap when cleaning teeth and encouraging friends and family to do the same.

There are two elements to reflecting on overall personal learning. Candidates should consider what they have learned about the issue or topic, as well as what personal or practical skills they have developed through completing the project. For instance, having investigated the issue of food poverty in their country, a candidate might conclude that while there is sufficient food for in the country for everyone to avoid hunger, food wastage is a major issue and there are a number of ways that this could be improved. On learning of personal or practical skills, a candidate might say, 'I worked with a team that gave a presentation to a year group of 100 children and I learned to overcome my fear of public speaking because I knew the team were relying on me'; or 'I learned how to use video editing software to help my team produce an effective Outcome and I will be able to use this skill in future projects'.

Guidance: The Team Project is a piece of work that spans several weeks. It would help candidates reflect and record notes throughout the process on what they have learned about different perspectives, the topic/issue, working as a team and their own skills and abilities.

AO3 Communication

This assessment objective requires reflective reports to flow meaningfully with signposting and linking making 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 to the work overall. These personal research findings need to be clearly flagged up in the Reflective Paper. For instance, through a combination of primary and secondary research, one team member might have found out what diseases were prevalent in their local area; their causes and possible methods of prevention; while other team members looked into the situation nationally and internationally so that they could make comparisons and draw conclusions. The Outcome in this case might be a series of posters targeted at a particular audience aimed at raising awareness about a disease and stopping its spread. The candidate who had researched the situation locally would then explain what they had found out about their local situation and how this was reflected in the Outcome.

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.

Teacher Assessment

The Individual Candidate Record Cards (ICRC) must be completed by teachers. Teachers are requested to comment on the ICRC only. 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 these final marks are submitted.