GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

> **Paper 0457/11**
> **Written Examination**

Key messages

The key messages from this series are that candidates:

- demonstrated good skills of interpretation and analysis
- need to explain research designs
- should use material from sources as evidence to justify their opinions
- need to fully explain the potential impact and consequences of different actions.

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 2019, this examination was based upon source material related to the topic of Fuel and Energy. The impact of fuel and energy supply on air quality and pollution was the issue explored.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Many candidates clearly respect and appreciate different perspectives on global issues and use reasons and evidence to support their own opinions. Candidates were able to analyse sources and data in different ways. However, some candidates need to develop evaluation skills to higher levels and apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of sources.

In addition, candidates should explain their research designs and choice of research methods in greater detail, explicitly relating their research strategy to the claim to be tested. Candidates should explain how the research method will gather evidence that will enable them to test the claim or answer a research question.

Most candidates showed real interest in the topic and discussed the issue outlined in the sources with enthusiasm. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to reduce air pollution. However, candidates should explain and assess the potential impact and consequences of proposals in more detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgement within the conclusion.

Examination technique was usually very good. Nearly all candidates completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very few rubric errors. However, some candidates would benefit from structured practice in responding to the types of task encountered in this component. Candidates should also explain their answers fully.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn from the sources including through quotation and citation of sources
- provide reasons and evidence to justify opinion
- fully explain research strategies
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, bias, tone, language, prediction, opinion, fact, value judgement and vested interest
- evaluate alternative actions in greater detail, explaining and assessing potential impact and consequences more fully.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a)   Nearly all candidates correctly identified the percentage of the world's population living in places with high levels of air pollution as 92 per cent and therefore gained the maximum of 1 mark.

(b)   Almost all candidates were able to identify two ways to reduce air pollution and therefore gained the maximum of 2 marks. Most candidates identified use of cleaner forms of energy and better choices of transport.

(c)   Most candidates responded very well to this question, identifying and justifying which method of reducing air pollution in their opinion would have most impact. Most candidates chose to discuss use of cleaner forms of energy and better choices of transport.

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

- the number of people affected
- the range of impact e.g. number of countries/businesses/organisations affected
- the depth of impact e.g. how much difference will be made
- the speed of impact e.g. how soon the impact would occur
- costs
- impact of pollution on other aspects of social and economic life.

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 'virtuous circle'.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why one method was likely to have more impact than others and gave some evidence to support their judgements. Less successful responses often simply stated the action/method without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion without evidence or careful reasoning. Some candidates compared the significance of different reasons/causes, but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

(d)   Many candidates responded well to this question and could explain why air pollution is an important local issue, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concept of 'local'.

The reasons given by candidates related mainly to those given within the sources, including the impact of air pollution on health, work, the economy and the environment. There was some attempt to explain why these impacts were important.

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 air pollution in general without reference to the local dimension of the task.

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'local' context. This type of answer only reached the lower levels of response within the mark scheme.

Question 2

(a)   Most candidates were able to evaluate 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 at the beginning
- emphasis on the health of children
- appeals to emotion
- suggestion that work and businesses will suffer because of the smog

- quotes from a scientific magazine
- uses a named scientist in support of the argument
- presents information from the news.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- little factual evidence
- no television programme cited
- a named scientist is used but no other details are given regarding the project
- no reference to the name of the reports about health.

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

Some less successful 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.

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the quality of the reasons and evidence in the source and justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means quoting from or summarising 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, 'There has been a reduction in the use of fossil fuels locally in the last year'. The methods of testing the claim suggested were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys and questionnaires with people about the issue; for example from different businesses and organisations in the local area. Surveys of local people about use of fuel and energy were also suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts, local government 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*; less successful responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence but did not explain them 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 or answer research questions as a regular part of their courses.

Question 3

(a)   Most candidates correctly identified a fact from Source 4.

(b)   Most candidates correctly identified a prediction from Tadean's statement.

(c)   Many candidates correctly identified bias in Abdu's statement, revealing an understanding that bias is a predisposition for or against something; an attitude of strong like or dislike; an unbalanced approach not prepared to consider counterarguments or other points of view

Candidates most frequently identified the following examples of bias from the source:

- Abdu has a breathing problem which may have been caused by air pollution and is likely to get worse if there is more pollution from a power station.
- Abdu is likely to have to move to a house in a new location if there is another power station built and he cannot afford this.

- Abdu believes that the value of his house is likely to be affected by the proposed power station.

Candidates also discussed the following aspects of the statement that suggest possible bias:

- Lack of balance.
- Very little evidence.
- Only disadvantages of power stations highlighted.
- Emotive language – 'It would be noisy and ugly'.
- Focus only on local evidence/arguments and personal perspectives/interests.

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

Some candidates seemed to have little understanding of 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 judgement, vested interest, 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.

Teachers should give candidates frequent opportunity to evaluate sources. 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 assess and recommend different proposed actions designed to reduce air pollution in a local city over five years. 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 each proposed action. Some candidates chose to compare all options, which was a more challenging, but at times very effective, way to structure the argument.

However, some candidates tended to describe their opinions in a generalised and asserted way, comparing each action without exploring the potential impact on air pollution in cities.

Most candidates recommended the course of action of educating people about fossil fuels.

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

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lacked relevance to the issue and simply described their own opinion about the option or air pollution in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and

asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to reduce pollution rather than explain why one method/action was likely to have greater impact and should therefore be recommended.

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.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/12
Written Examination

Key messages

The key messages from this series are that candidates:

- demonstrated good skills of interpretation and analysis
- need to explain research designs
- should use material from sources as evidence to justify their opinions
- need to fully explain the potential impact and consequences of different actions.

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 2019, this examination was based upon source material related to the topic of Education for All. The development of basic literacy skills was the issue explored.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good. Many candidates clearly respect and appreciate different perspectives on global issues and use reasons and evidence to support their own opinions. Candidates were able to analyse sources and data presented in different ways. However, some candidates need to develop evaluation skills to higher levels and apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of sources.

In addition, candidates should explain their research designs and choice of research methods in greater detail, explicitly relating their research strategy to the claim to be tested. Candidates should explain how the research method will gather evidence that will enable them to test the claim or solve the research question.

Most candidates showed real interest in the topic and discussed the issue outlined in the sources with enthusiasm. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to improve the quality of education in a local school. However, candidates should explain and assess the potential impact and consequences of proposals in more detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgement within the conclusion.

Examination technique was usually very good. The majority of candidates completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very few rubric errors. However, some candidates would benefit from structured practice in responding to the types of task encountered in this component. Candidates should also explain their answers fully.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn from the sources including through quotation and citation of sources
- provide reasons and evidence to justify opinion
- fully explain research strategies
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, bias, tone, language, prediction, opinion, fact, value judgement and vested interest
- evaluate alternative actions in greater detail, explaining and assessing potential impact and consequences more fully.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a)   Nearly all candidates correctly identified the number of children worldwide who do not have basic literacy skills as 250 million and therefore gained the maximum of 1 mark.

(b)   Almost all candidates were able to identify two benefits of literacy, and therefore gained the maximum of 2 marks. Most candidates identified improved learning, better understanding of the world, reducing poverty and access to employment.

(c)   Most candidates responded very well to this question, identifying and justifying which benefit of literacy in their opinion was most important or would have most impact. Most candidates chose to discuss improved learning, better understanding of the world, reducing poverty and access to 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. number of countries/businesses/organisations affected
- the depth of impact e.g. how much difference will be made
- the speed of impact e.g. how soon the impact would occur
- costs
- impact of literacy on other aspects of social, political and economic life.

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 'virtuous circle'.

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

(d)   Many candidates responded well to this question and could explain why literacy is an important issue for governments.

The reasons given by candidates related mainly to those given within the sources, including the impact of literacy on health, education, work, poverty, the economy and technological change/innovation. There was some attempt to explain why these impacts were important.

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 air pollution in general, without reference to the local dimension of the task.

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to governments. This type of response only reached the lower levels of response within the mark scheme.

Question 2

(a)   Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'there are many benefits of learning outside of the classroom'.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- states the view at the beginning
- has relevant experience and potentially some expertise
- refers to scientific magazines and teachers as evidence
- gives an example of an activity outside of the classroom to support argument
- looks at the global picture

- uses an appeal to emotion.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- does not give the title of the role in education or the village school – expertise cannot be tested
- much assertion
- magazines are not cited
- arrogant tone
- little evidence about the improvement of communication.

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

Some less successful 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.

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the quality of the reasons and evidence in the source and justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means quoting from or summarising 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, 'Most teachers do not take their candidates outside the classroom'. The methods of testing the claim suggested were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example from different schools and organisations in different areas. Surveys of local people about education and schools were also suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts, local government and head teachers. 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*; less successful responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence but did not explain them 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 or answer research questions as a regular part of their courses.

Question 3

(a) Most candidates correctly identified a prediction from Tuaco's statement.

(b) Most candidates correctly identified a fact from Source 4.

(c) Many candidates correctly identified a value judgment in Abina's statement, revealing an understanding that a value judgment is a view or decision about what is right, wrong or important, based upon a particular set of standards, principles, or values.

Candidates most frequently identified one of the following examples of value judgements from Abina's statement:

- it is important to communicate with your family
- … is important for our heritage.

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

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

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates about value judgments and provide experience of using the term in the analysis of sources, alongside other critical thinking concepts like bias, vested interest, 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 assess and recommend different proposed actions designed to improve the quality of education in a local school. 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 each proposed action. Some candidates chose to compare all options, which was a more challenging, but at times very effective, way to structure the argument.

However, some candidates tended to describe their opinions in a generalised and asserted way, describing benefits for a person's life chances and lifestyle without exploring the potential impact of the action on the intended outcome – on the quality of education in a school.

Most candidates recommended improving the development of literacy skills.

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 improving the quality of education in a local school 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 or education/literacy in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to improve schools rather than explaining why one method/action was likely to have greater impact and should therefore be recommended.

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.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/13
Written Examination

Key messages

The key messages from this series are that candidates:

- demonstrated good skills of interpretation and analysis
- need to explain research designs
- should use material from sources as evidence to justify their opinions
- need to fully explain the potential impact and consequences of different actions.

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 2019, this examination was based upon source material related to the topic of Employment. The relationship between employment and age was the issue explored.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good. Many candidates clearly respect and appreciate different perspectives on global issues and use reasons and evidence to support their own opinions. Candidates were able to analyse sources and data presented in different ways. However, some candidates need to develop evaluation skills to higher levels and apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of sources.

In addition, candidates should explain their research designs and choice of research methods in greater detail, explicitly relating their research strategy to the claim to be tested. Candidates should explain how the research method will gather evidence that will enable them to test the claim or solve the research question.

Most candidates showed real interest in the topic and discussed the issue outlined in the sources with enthusiasm. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in employment rights and age. However, candidates should explain and assess the potential impact and consequences of proposals in more detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgement within the conclusion.

Examination technique was usually very good. Most candidates completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very few rubric errors. However, some candidates would benefit from structured practice in responding to the types of task encountered in the this component. Candidates should also explain their answers fully.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn from the sources including through quotation and citation of sources
- provide reasons and evidence to justify opinion
- fully explain research strategies
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, bias, tone, language, prediction, opinion, fact, value judgement and vested interest
- evaluate alternative actions in greater detail, explaining and assessing potential impact and consequences more fully.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a)   Nearly all candidates correctly identified the area of the world with the highest percentage of workers in vulnerable employment as South East Asia and therefore gained the maximum of 1 mark.

(b)   Almost all candidates were able to identify two benefits of good working conditions and therefore gained the maximum of 2 marks. Most candidates identified personal development opportunities, improved social relations and improved health.

(c)   Most candidates responded very well to this question, identifying and justifying which benefit of good working conditions in their opinion was most important or would have most impact. Most candidates chose to discuss personal development opportunities, protection from danger at work, improved social relations and improved health.

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

- the number of people affected
- the range of impact e.g. number of countries/businesses/organisations affected
- the depth of impact e.g. how much difference will be made
- the speed of impact e.g. how soon the impact would occur
- costs
- impact of working conditions on other aspects of social and economic life.

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 'virtuous circle'.

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

(d)   Many candidates responded well to this question and could explain why working conditions are an important issue for governments.

The reasons given by candidates related mainly to those given within the sources, including the impact of working conditions on health, employment, productivity, the economy and opportunities for government to provide quality social services from enhanced taxation. There was some attempt to explain why these impacts were important.

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 working conditions/employment in general without reference to the governmental dimension of the task.

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences of good/poor working conditions taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to governments. This type of response only reached the lower levels of response within the mark scheme.

Question 2

(a)   Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'Older people should continue to work'.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- works with older people so understands relevant issues – ability to know
- uses facts and predictions as evidence

**Cambridge Assessment
International Education**

© 2019

- talks about experience as evidence
- professor has expertise and his views are valuable evidence
- reassures younger people.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- does not explore different types of experience
- does not back up suggestions
- uses predictions – not strong evidence as intervening factors may change trends
- some assertion
- little citation and does not give source of evidence.

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

Some less successful 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.

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the quality of the reasons and evidence in the source and justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means quoting from or summarising 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, 'Older people do not use social media as much as younger people'. The methods of testing the claim suggested were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example from different agencies, businesses and organisations working with different age groups. Surveys of local people about employment and age were also suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts, local government, employers and managers/directors. 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*; less successful responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence but did not explain them 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 or answer research questions as a regular part of their courses.

Question 3

(a) Most candidates correctly identified an opinion from Source 4.

(b) Most candidates correctly identified a prediction from Susanna's statement.

(c) Many candidates correctly identified bias in Susanna's statement, revealing an understanding that bias is a predisposition for or against something; an attitude of strong like or dislike; an unbalanced approach not prepared to consider counterarguments or other points of view

Candidates most frequently identified the following examples of bias from the source:

- Susanna may be biased against older people working as she feels that it will make it harder for her to find work next year.

Candidates also discussed the following aspects of the statement that suggest possible bias:

- Lack of balance.
- Very little evidence.
- Only disadvantages of power stations highlighted.
- Emotive language – 'It would be noisy and ugly'.
- Focus only on local evidence/arguments and personal perspectives/interests.

The most effective responses tended to quote from the source and clearly describe evidence from the source to support their 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 judgement, vested interest, fact, opinion and prediction.

(d)   Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, Susanna's and Ryan's, 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 assess the claim that people should be allowed to work at any age. 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 this proposal. However, some candidates tended to describe their opinions in a generalised and asserted way, describing benefits/problems of working at a young or old age without reaching a clear conclusion about the issue.

Most candidates recommended allowing older people to continue to work but suggested that children of school age should not be allowed to work.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well-supported, logical reasoning and presented evidence about the issue. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses linked the argument back to the issue of age and employment.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about age and employment 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 action.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

| Paper 0457/02 |
| Individual Report |

Key messages

- Teachers and candidates must be aware of and fully understand the **assessment criteria**.
- Candidates are most successful when they focus on **one issue** and formulate a question on this issue.
- The candidate's response must focus on **different perspectives** on their chosen issue.

General comments

For this component, candidates select one of the eight topics in the syllabus. They identify a global issue within their topic area and formulate a question about the chosen issue. They research and present different perspectives (global and national/local) on their issue, with relevant supporting information. They analyse the causes and consequences of their issue. They compare causes and consequences. They propose and develop a course of action to help resolve their chosen issue. They evaluate the sources of information they have used to support their argument. Finally, they reflect on their personal perspective and how this has been impacted by their research and the perspectives explored. They cite and reference the sources of information they use in their report. They present their report in essay form (continuous prose), in a Word document and should write between 1500 and 2000 words.

Comments on specific assessment criteria

Assessment Objective 1: Research, Analysis and Evaluation:

Information from different perspectives

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.

Weaker work responds to more general questions often starting with 'To what extent…' or 'How' which tend to encourage a more descriptive answer with no central issue. Philosophical questions such as *Why is Family important?* are so general and vague that it is difficult for the candidate to find relevant material or to demonstrate the required skills in answering it.

The strongest work shows a clear understanding of perspectives.

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

Some weaker work did not present different perspectives on the issue, but instead presented information about different places, viewpoints and opinions. In these cases, no supporting evidence was given for the viewpoints or opinions and they were asserted with little or no explanation.

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. In some cases, the candidate presented causes or consequences labelled as issues 1 and 2.

Analysis and comparison of causes and consequences

Most candidates were able to present and explain the causes and consequences of their chosen issue.

Where candidates had not identified issues, or where they wrote descriptive essays, they lost out on this criterion.

Stronger candidates were able to compare different causes of 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.

An example of part of a strong comparison of causes seen this session:

The candidate identifies and explains some of the global causes of child marriage:

…Although poverty is a notable cause of child marriage, it is often in combination with other factors. Gender expectations are another component of child marriage. Early marriage stems from social norms that reflect the gender inequality of girls (UNICEF: Annual Report, 2014). For example, many countries across South Asia highly regard a girl's modesty and respectability. In fear of their daughter straying from these norms, families marry their daughters young…

Then compares the global causes to the causes in Australia:

In Australia, the causes are somewhat different to the global drivers. The Salvation Army highlighted (2016) that migration benefits, social control, customary/religious practices, financial benefits, gender/sexual orientation and lack of understanding of Australia's laws and interpretations of rights and choices, were the motivating factors for child marriage in Australia…. **(the candidate goes on to explain)**

Weaker candidates struggled to compare causes and consequences explicitly, though some identified the main or most important cause or consequence.

Course(s) of Action

The strongest work had one developed and focused 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.

In some cases, candidates successfully outlined a course of action already in place in another part of the world and suggested how it could be adapted to be carried out in their own country, again giving details of who could do it and how it could be implemented and what the impact might be.

The weakest work provided *self-help* style bullet lists of advice – often limited, with no details of how they could be done or by whom, or what their impact would be.

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. Examples of some evaluative comments seen this session:

Since it is a global news webpage the idea of it is to raise awareness…. it is updated and takes into consideration the fact of quoting what people said, which is useful because it evidences and clarifies its content. This source is useful for my project since it is not one sided because it covers different global points of views…. I used these sources because they all have recent information, well backed-up and their intentions are raising awareness through different ways. In the case of the source which provided both graphs, they are useful for getting a screenshot about the global data.

My second source I'm evaluating is a website, www.nzherald.co.nz (2017). This source was about eating disorders and what potentially causes/affects them. A strength of this source was that they interviewed a qualified doctor, Doctor Roger Mysliwiec. The information can be trusted because it comes from a qualified doctor who provided facts for the article. A slight weakness could be that the doctor may base some of his evidence around personal opinion and may not reflect cultural diversity.

The third source I'm evaluating is a website, www.theconversation.com (2017). This website was about obesity rates around the world and what is causing obesity. One strength of this source is that it has information from all around the globe, not just one place reducing the chance of bias. A weakness of this source is that it does not provide an author. This means the information might not be reliable and we can not check the background of the author credentials.

Some weaker work mentioned evaluative criteria such as expertise or bias but did not explain these or link them to the issue or consider their impact on the research findings or conclusions.

Weak work presented a section labelled 'Evaluation of Sources' but actually only described the sources in general terms and did not evaluate them – or evaluated their own research rather than their sources.

Many candidates did not attempt to evaluate any of their sources at all.

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.

Weaker work explained what the candidate thought and why and mentioned their research but did not explain how the research had impacted their own conclusions or their perspective.

Weak work stated the candidate's opinion without any explanation or justification. The weakest work did not reflect at all, or mention the candidate's own opinion, perspective or attitude to the question they asked.

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.

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

Weaker work did not focus on one issue or the required perspectives. 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 the argument from an introduction, through all the required criteria, to a reflective conclusion.

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 work showed little evidence of any research; with the candidate's opinions and views presented in a philosophical argument rather than a structured essay on their research.

Clarity of arguments, perspectives and evidence

For this criterion, candidates must present all required elements. The argument, evidence and perspectives, causes and consequences, reflection and evaluation must all be explicit and clearly presented.

The strongest work clearly identifies the criteria and makes them easy to follow by presenting them in separate paragraphs, or by using sub-headings. It is clear that the candidate understands what they are doing and presents the required elements explicitly.

Weaker work misses out some criteria (such as evaluation or reflection) or is disorganised so that it is difficult to work out what each paragraph is about.

The weakest work shows little if any awareness of the requirements for this component. Candidates present information in a generalised way without explicitly presenting any of the criteria. In this work they may simply discuss their question without presenting any perspectives, causes and consequences, there may be 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 found out, either from research or fieldwork and did not process or discuss it at all.

Citation and referencing

The main concern in terms of referencing in this component is attribution of sources.

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 plagiarism.

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

In-text attribution: 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, (though for ease of reading and control of word count, numbers or brackets may be more manageable).

References: Their references should include author, date and title of publication for books or magazines, and online materials should include at least the full URL and date of access.

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

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.
- There is a Guidance Document which summarises the process for the Team Project on the School Support Hub, listed under teaching and learning.

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 wastage in school food and developed activities showing how waste could be reduced, using school surveys to communicate their messages. 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 mindfulness and organised yoga sessions in school and in the community. 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 videos, school seminars, leaflets, yoga sessions, 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 or subject in order to inform or 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. Some of the most successful projects explicitly plan ways to assess how far their Outcome met their aim; for example, a survey of audience members to see how much they have learned from a presentation.

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 food waste in school. The team carried out research to identify how much food was wasted through different activities and by different cultural groups locally, including their own school. During their research, they identified schools as a group that wasted more food locally than most. The team's aim then became to reduce the amount of food wasted in the school. To support them in achieving this, they surveyed school pupils to find out their thoughts. To achieve this aim, the team then produced an Outcome in the form of posters and a video of local perspectives on the subject and of the school population to share with various members of the school staff. They then conducted a seminar to see how learners and teachers could suggest change in the school systems. 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 the impact of their work, of how far the Outcome had achieved the project aim. For instance, for a project on the issue of mindfulness, a survey was conducted to assess the extent to which posters and yoga sessions had changed student behaviour. They had a percentage success rate and feedback about why others had made no 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 of the weaknesses that had been 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 sites 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, such as a section of the video that had less evidence to support its claims. 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. Some candidates began by knowing that they worked best alone, only to find that it was more effective to have different ideas to listen to. 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, 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. There were candidates who produced effective reflections. As a weakness, a candidate reflected that: 'I am not a confident speaker, so I let the others do all the group leading in seminar sessions and this meant that I missed out of an opportunity that I may not get again'. 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 edit the content'.

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. Some centres have indicated that they are giving classes time to write sections of the Reflective Paper as they progress through Team Project e.g. to evaluate the Outcome soon after the event at which it was shared.

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 food waste a candidate had learned that actions in cities and towns affect water availability across the whole country, giving them a need to take the message home.

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 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

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 these final marks are submitted, so that marks on the ICRCs, the CASF and those submitted to Cambridge International all match.