

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

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

Key messages

The key messages from this examination series are that candidates:

- were able to identify information relevant to an issue
- were able to analyse sources to identify reasons and evidence
- need further guidance on evaluating and explaining the strengths and weaknesses of sources
- need practise on using evidence and reasons to create an argument to support a claim

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 2023, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Education for All. The impact of technology on education and schooling was the issue explored.

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

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

Candidates generally recognised that opinions should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of opinion is generally not sufficient in responses to most questions in the written exam. Whilst most candidates are using material from the sources to support their arguments, for example through summary or quotation, some would benefit from guidance on how to plan and organise an argument to support a claim or opinion. Evidence and reasons should be clearly and explicitly related to the claim and used to justify the claim clearly and with structure. Careful planning of lines of argument and essay structure would help in this process.

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

In addition, candidates should explain research designs and choice of research methods, 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 issues with enthusiasm. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to increase access to education. However, candidates should explain and assess the potential impact and consequences of the proposals in detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgement within the conclusion.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

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

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified the percentage of countries that closed schools due to the coronavirus pandemic as 27 per cent, from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.
- (b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two benefits of schooling, from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks. Most candidates identified gaining qualifications, developing talents and interests, and success in later life.
- (c) Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying, and justifying which benefit of schooling was the most important, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss gaining qualifications or developing talents and interests.

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

- the number of people affected
- the effect of schooling on life chances and the future prosperity of people
- employment opportunities
- to help communities and countries to develop economically and socially
- developing skills and qualifications to support success in life

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

- (d) Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why access to education is an important issue for governments, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concept of 'government' within a national context.

The reasons given by candidates related mainly to those given within the Sources, including the impact of education on human rights, employment, economic development, crime, and health. There was some attempt to explain why these impacts were important to the government at a national level.

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 the government in the question.

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'government' context. 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, 'new technology will improve access to education'.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- gives information about his experience, which is relevant
- the author has ability to know
- refers to his position as a politician

- describes benefits of school and technology
- refers to an expert in the field – Professor Malik.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- the politician may be biased and have a vested interest
- no sources of statistical data or factual evidence
- emotive references to family safety
- much assertion
- no citation and referencing
- does not discuss counterarguments
- does not consider costs of technology.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their opinions, usually discussing a range of distinct evaluative points. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion about the source rather than examining strengths and weaknesses systematically.

Some weaker responses simply 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 clear and explicit reference to the arguments and evidence in the Source to justify their opinion, thereby using the material in the source as evidence. This means quoting from or summarising relevant parts 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, 'new technology will improve access to education.' The methods of testing the claim suggested were clearly explained and carefully 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 the local area. Surveys of local people about technology in education 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. Headteachers, teachers and candidates were often mentioned.

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 or listed several methods or sources of evidence but did not explain them fully or make any 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 Ajay's statement and could explain why the statement was a prediction. A prediction is a statement suggesting something is likely to happen in the future. Most candidates were able to justify and explain their judgement convincingly.
- (b) (i) Most candidates correctly identified an opinion from Salena's statement and explained that opinions are statements which are subjective points of view or beliefs which cannot be verified, and may not be shared by others.
- (ii) Most candidates were able to relate the identified opinion to Salena's argument that attending school is better than learning from home. However, this question was challenging for some

candidates who did not evaluate the use of the opinion as reasoning or evidence within the argument.

The most effective responses explained how the opinion related to the argument and explained a strength and/or a weakness of the fact within this argument.

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

- (c) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, Ajay's and Salena'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.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to assess and recommend different proposed actions designed to improve access to education in a country. 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 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 access to education.

Most candidates recommended building more 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 explicitly and frequently linked the argument back to the issue of improving access to education.

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 in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to increase access to education rather than explaining why one method/action was likely to have greater impact and should therefore be recommended.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

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

Key messages

The key messages from this examination series are that candidates:

- were able to identify information relevant to an issue
- were able to analyse sources to identify reasons and evidence
- need further guidance on evaluating and explaining the strengths and weaknesses of sources
- need practise on using evidence and reasons to create an argument to support a claim

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 2023, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Demographic Change. The impact of migration on living in cities was the issue explored.

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

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

Candidates generally recognised that opinions should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of opinion is generally not sufficient in responses to most questions in the written exam. Whilst most candidates are using material from the sources to support their arguments, for example through summary or quotation, some would benefit from guidance on how to plan and organise an argument to support a claim or opinion. Evidence and reasons should be clearly and explicitly related to the claim and used to justify the claim clearly and with some structure. Careful planning of lines of argument and essay structure would help in this process.

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

In addition, candidates should explain research designs and choice of research methods, 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 issues with enthusiasm. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to improve the lives of migrants in cities. However, candidates should explain and assess the potential impact and consequences of the proposals in detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgement within the conclusion.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

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

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified that there will be 43 megacities in the world by 2030, according to Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.
- (b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two benefits of living in a city, from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks. Most candidates identified better healthcare, education and employment opportunities.
- (c) Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying, and justifying which benefit of living in a city was the most significant, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss better employment opportunities or education.

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

- the number of people affected
- the effect of schooling on life chances and the future prosperity of people
- the benefits of better employment opportunities
- multiple positive consequences creating a 'spiral of virtue'
- access to goods and services

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

- (d) Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why increased migration to cities is an important national issue, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concept of national.

The reasons given by candidates related mainly to those given within the Sources, including the impact of migration to cities on employment, economic development, crime, education, housing and health. There was some attempt to explain why these impacts were important to the country or government at a national level.

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 the government in the question.

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'government' context. 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, 'the growth of cities is damaging the environment'.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- gives information about his experience, which is relevant
- the author has ability to know
- refers to his position as a local government environment department manager
- some reference to data and statistical evidence



- describes many relevant examples of damage to the environment in cities
- refers to an expert scientist in the field – Dr Perez
- uses a photograph as evidence to illustrate the issue.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- the author may be biased and have a vested interest
- little reference to sources of statistical data or factual evidence
- emotive tone with rhetorical questions
- much assertion
- no citation and referencing
- does not discuss counterarguments
- does not consider costs of technology.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their opinions, usually discussing a range of distinct evaluative points. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion about the source rather than examining strengths and weaknesses systematically.

Some weaker responses simply 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 clear and explicit reference to the arguments and evidence in the Source to justify their opinion, thereby using the material in the source as evidence. This means quoting from or summarising relevant parts 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, ‘cities have become more polluted.’ The methods of testing the claim suggested were clearly explained and carefully related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys, and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example from different cities and organisations in the country and overseas. Surveys of local people about urban pollution 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. Migrants, local government, and community leaders were often mentioned. The impact of pollution on air quality and health were also suggested.

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 or listed several methods or sources of evidence but did not explain them fully or make any 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 Elena’s statement and could explain why the statement was a fact. A fact is a statement which is true or accurate; can be verified; is objective and proven by research; or similar.

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

- (b) Most candidates were able to identify aspects of bias in Juan’s statement. These candidates showed understanding of bias as a tendency or prejudice for or against something, or an

unbalanced approach to an issue, and being not prepared to consider counter arguments or other points of view.

Most candidates explained that Juan's experience of cities from his grandparents may influence his viewpoint about living in cities, shape his perspective on employment opportunities and encourage him not to consider other perspectives.

Candidates also raised other issues with Juan's statement that might be evidence of bias, including:

- unbalanced argument – very little consideration of other perspectives or counterarguments
- use of exaggerated language and phrases e.g., 'It is a pity ...'
- only referring to positive aspects of cities
- not much evidence
- mainly opinion

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

- (c) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, Elena's and Juan'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.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to assess and recommend different proposed actions designed to improve the lives of migrants in cities. 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 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 access to education.

Most candidates recommended encouraging businesses in cities to employ migrants.

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 explicitly and frequently linked the argument back to the issue of improving the lives of migrants in cities.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the option or migration or life in cities in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to improve city life for migrants rather than explaining why one method/action was likely to have greater impact and should therefore be recommended.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

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

Key messages

The key messages from this examination series are that candidates:

- were able to identify information relevant to an issue
- were able to analyse sources to identify reasons and evidence
- need further guidance on evaluating and explaining the strengths and weaknesses of sources
- need practise on using evidence and reasons to create an argument to support a claim

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 2023, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Law and Criminality. The growth of cybercrime was the issue explored.

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

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

Candidates generally recognised that opinions should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of opinion is generally not sufficient in responses to most questions in the written exam. Whilst most candidates are using material from the sources to support their arguments, for example through summary or quotation, some would benefit from guidance on how to plan and organise an argument to support a claim or opinion. Evidence and reasons should be clearly and explicitly related to the claim and used to justify the claim clearly and with some structure. Careful planning of lines of argument and essay structure would help in this process.

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

In addition, candidates should explain research designs and choice of research methods, 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 of cybercrime and discussed the growing phenomenon with enthusiasm. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to reduce the impact of cybercrime. However, candidates should explain and assess the potential impact and consequences of the proposals in detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgement within the conclusion.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- relate source material explicitly to the perspective or issue being explored

- explain the significance of strengths and weaknesses in the evaluation of arguments
- plan and organise reasons and evidence with a clear structure when supporting an argument or opinion.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified that the trend in the number of organisations affected by cybercrime is increasing, according to Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.
- (b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two types of cybercrime, from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks. Most candidates identified stealing private information, identity theft and spreading computer viruses.
- (c) Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying, and justifying which type of cybercrime was the most significant, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss identity theft and stealing private information.

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

- the number of people affected
- the effect of cybercrime on life chances and the future prosperity of people
- the impact of cybercrime on well-being and health
- the likelihood of being affected
- multiple negative consequences
- difficulties in preventing cybercrime

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

- (d) Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why cybercrime is an important personal issue, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concept of personal i.e. affecting the individual and their immediate relationships with others.

The reasons given by candidates related mainly to those given within the Sources, including the impact of loss of money, data, and personal information. Disruption, inconvenience, and harm generally were often highlighted, including reputational and to relationships, including in employment. There was some attempt to explain why these impacts were important at an individual level.

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 cybercrime in general without reference to the personal element of the question.

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences taken directly from the sources without any explanation. 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, 'cybercrime is the most important challenge for organisations today.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- some reference to research evidence
- describes many relevant examples

- refers to an expert scientist in the field – Professor Ayers
- clear structure
- reasonable tone and measured language.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- the author may be biased and have a vested interest in selling newspapers
- little reference to sources of statistical data or factual evidence
- some assertion
- little citation and referencing
- does not discuss counterarguments
- unbalanced.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their opinions, usually discussing a range of distinct evaluative points. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion about the source rather than examining strengths and weaknesses systematically.

Some weaker responses simply 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 clear and explicit reference to the arguments and evidence in the Source to justify their opinion, thereby using the material in the source as evidence. This means quoting from or summarising relevant parts 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, ‘the amount of cybercrime is increasing rapidly.’ The methods of testing the claim suggested were clearly explained and carefully related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys, and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example from different cities, businesses and organisations in the country and overseas. Surveys of local people about cybercrime 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 police, IT security experts, local government, and community leaders were often mentioned.

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 or listed several methods or sources of evidence but did not explain them fully or make any 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 Isla’s statement and could explain why the statement was an opinion. An opinion is an individual’s point of view or belief which is not necessarily shared by others/supported by evidence; or similar.
- (b) Most candidates correctly identified a value judgement from Freya’s statement and could explain why the statement was a value judgement. A value judgement is a view or decision about what is right, wrong, or important, based on a particular set of standards, principles, or values; or similar.
- (c) Most candidates were able to identify aspects of bias in Freya’s statement. These candidates showed understanding of bias as a tendency or prejudice for or against something, or an



unbalanced approach to an issue, and being not prepared to consider counter arguments or other points of view.

Most candidates explained that Freya's experience as a psychologist might shape her perspective on human behaviour and crime and encourage her not to consider other perspectives. In addition, Freya has written a book, and she may be presenting a particular point of view to help sell her book. She has a vested interest.

Candidates also raised other issues with Freya's statement that might be evidence of bias, including:

- unbalanced argument – little consideration of other perspectives or counterarguments
- use of exaggerated language and phrases e.g. 'the internet never forgets'
- not much evidence and little citation/referencing
- mainly opinion and personal experience used as evidence

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

- (d) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, Isla's and Freya'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.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to assess and recommend different proposed actions designed to reduce the impact of cybercrime in their country. 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 an 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 cybercrime.

Most candidates recommended introducing lessons on internet safety 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 explicitly and frequently linked the argument back to the issue of reducing the impact of cybercrime.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the option or cybercrime in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply described different ways to reduce cybercrime rather than explaining why one method/action was likely to have greater impact and should therefore be recommended.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

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

Key messages

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

General comments

Successful work for this component was well-structured and logical, and explicitly presented several different well-supported perspectives, including **at least one global and one national perspective** on the issue identified in their question. It showed clear evidence of research, with accurate citation of sources used. Successful candidates analysed and explained the causes and consequences of the issue.

Successful candidates provided full details of a proposed course of action, including details of how the course of action would be implemented and the possible impact on the issue.

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

Some weaker work did not provide a question or a topic. Some work showed evidence of copy and paste of whole passages from their sources.

Comments on Specific Assessment Criteria

Assessment Objective 1: Research, Analysis and Evaluation

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

Direct, issue-based questions that could be answered either Yes or No, allow candidates to be clear about their topic and issue, to focus on that throughout and to identify different views.

Successful questions this session included:

- *Should criminals be sentenced to the death penalty?*
- *Do social media companies exert an excess of power over young people?*
- *Should governments impose an extra tax on meat products?*
- *Should governments impose vaccination in order to guarantee public health?*
- *Should we ban zoos?*
- *Should developing countries be subject to the same CO₂ emission targets as developed countries?*

Unfortunately, we still saw work presented without a central global issue or a clear research question.

There was a significant minority of candidates who did not address an issue in their response. The majority of these gave a purely narrative account of, e.g. family dynamics or religious beliefs, but did not then go on to explain why that might be a problem.

A few candidates provided an appropriate research question on a global issue, but their reports did not then address the issue highlighted.

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

Information from different perspectives:

The strongest work shows a clear understanding of perspectives.

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

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

Successful work included paraphrased and/or direct quotes showing a clear global perspective:

A candidate wrote on the question: 'Should developing countries be subject to the same CO2 emission targets as developed countries?'

'There is a clear pressure to achieve the desired targets with maximum efficiency.... For example the Paris Agreement requires ... The global ambition reflected in such targets and requirements from the United Nations reveals a global perspective that climate change is a pressing issue that requires hard-line targets. As Francesco LaCamera, director-general for IRENA puts it, "We need to be clear, we cannot envisage a different path between the developing and the developed world... this has to be a common effort," (Silverstein, 2021)'

This contextualises the perspective, provides support and evidence and includes a direct quote giving a global perspective on the issue and is related directly to the research question.

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.

A candidate wrote on the question: 'Is women's empowerment as a solution to poverty in underdeveloped countries?'

'According to the UNDP Regional Director for Asia and the Pacific, Kanni Wignaraja, "There will be no sustainable recovery without the active participation of Afghan women in the economy and in public life, which includes delivering on humanitarian and livelihoods-saving projects" (3). She argues that the only way for Afghanistan to escape economic collapse is to allow the full continuity of female education and keep work opportunities open for them.'

Some work included a section labelled Global perspective in which views from different countries were presented, however no global view was presented, and the different national views were not drawn together to form a global view.

Some weak work did not present any perspectives or opinions apart from the candidate's own views and these were sometimes unsupported, meaning that the report read as an unresearched opinion piece.

Some **weaker work did not present different perspectives** on the issue, but instead presented information about different places. This was sometimes labelled as Global / National Perspective though there were no perspectives presented. In these cases, candidates described actions taken by a government, for example, or provided relevant statistics without explaining what anyone thought or felt about the issue. Others presented their own viewpoints and opinions, with no supporting information or evidence.

Analysis and comparison of causes and consequences:

Most candidates explained the consequences of their chosen issue. Where their issue was clear, some were able to discuss causes of the issue. Where candidates had not identified a global issue, or where they wrote descriptive essays, they found it difficult to identify or explain any causes or consequences.

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

Course(s) of Action:

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

For example on the issue of whether veganism can truly mitigate climate change, the candidate wrote:

'I think veganism should be promoted and encouraged. Countries should instil more policies to lower the production and consumption of animal products, such as laws that require every menu to contain at least one plant-based item and implement taxes on meat products or offer subsidies for plant-based products to make them more affordable. Countries should adopt rules inspired by Portugal and Germany's vegan regulations, to popularise veganism and make it more accessible.... Schools should also start initiatives like "Meatless Mondays", offer plant-based menu options, host sampling events to introduce veganism and empower student clubs to organise campaigns and events to turn more vegan-friendly. Furthermore, governments should encourage campaigns like the Israeli "Green Label" program to help consumers identify plant-based products. Governments also need to introduce new opportunities for people working in the agriculture industry such as mushroom and hemp-crop farming. While it would be naïve to say that the whole world will turn vegan in the near future, efforts can always be made to introduce the vegan palette and lifestyle.... Just like the shift to green energy, green food systems and production methods could be introduced to sustainably accommodate vegans, and hence, mitigate climate change.'

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

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

Evaluation of sources:

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

'Concerning my sources, I started with the video conference 'AI Dilemma' by the Centre for Humane Technology, which is a non-profit organisation, making them free of vested interest. The same stands for bias, as the founders are ex-employees of big tech companies, giving them both sides of the equations, concerning knowledge and experience. Furthermore, their expertise, alongside that Apple and the UN took their courses, greatly adds to their reliability. The presentation being updated every day due to the constant novelty in AI, also confirms the data's accuracy. However, I rejected one of their statistics, as after cross-referencing, the survey revealed that the question had a response rate of only 4%; making it too low to accurately represent the researchers' viewpoint (22). Leading me to reflect upon my school survey and its relatively low response rate, which could, despite its richness of information, not be representative of WISS's perspective....'

There should be comment on what the evaluation means for the candidate's research or perspective:

Note: In order to fully achieve this criterion, the candidate must provide at least 3 **different** points of evaluation on **more than one** source used.

A common confusion about what is required is shown when candidates provide a generalised evaluation of their research, without any detailed or specific evaluation of individual sources:

'The information collected differs in its reliance. Most of the sources used are recent, increasing their reliability; however, others are outdated or lack specific publication dates. Some sources hold a potential bias, for example websites and organizations against the continuation of social media, like Brilliant, BBC Lifestyle and LinkedIn, are more likely to provide information favouring a specific perspective. Furthermore, some websites need more authenticity as they need to have validated authors and could be untrustworthy. This includes University Communications and Marketing, Maryville University, Simplilearn and Mayo Clinic.'

This attempt is generalised, some statements are made without any identification of the sources referred to and the evaluative comments are unexplained. For example, there is no identification of a recent source and no explanation of why it matters that a source is recent. The second point made about bias is neither explained nor justified. So we do not know why the candidate thinks Brilliant, BBC Lifestyle and LinkedIn should be against the continuation of social media or why they would be more likely to favour a specific perspective, or what the perspective they favour is. It is not clear what validated authors are and why Maryville University, for example might lack authenticity and /or be untrustworthy.

In the weakest work on evaluation, candidates simply stated what they had learnt from their sources but did not provide any evaluation of the quality or credibility of their sources.

A disappointing majority of candidates did not attempt to evaluate any of their sources at all. As Evaluation carries 1/6 of the total marks for the component, this has a considerable impact on their performance. All candidates should understand how to evaluate the credibility of their sources in order to assess the reliability of the information and evidence they take from them.

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.

'Prior to my research, I believed that developing countries should not be subject to the same carbon emission targets as developed countries because it is ineffective to sacrifice economic growth in order to achieve these unfair and unrealistic targets. After my research process, I believe that developing nations should be subject to the same targets. However we must achieve our carbon emission targets with acknowledgement of the challenges countries like India face. Ultimately developed nations should provide assistance by implementing strategies similar to my suggested courses of action. This will minimise negative impacts to developing countries but maximise the efficiency of reducing carbon emissions to save and sustain the planet.'

Some strong candidates reflected throughout and then drew their reflections together at the end coming to a logical and supported conclusion.

Weaker work simply provided a general conclusion, with no personal reflection on findings, perspectives, or the issue. The weakest work ended without answering the question or providing a personal perspective or conclusion or answered a different question.

Assessment Objective 3: Communication

Structure of the report:

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

The strongest work was easy to follow and provided a clear structured argument with an introduction, addressing all the required criteria and ending with a reflective conclusion. It used the full available word count. This work started by introducing and explaining the issue and focussed on the issue and question

throughout. The candidate kept control of their argument and did not lose contact with their question, the central issue, or their research findings.

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

The weakest work often provided a series of headings with some facts and figures on the topic area, with no clear flow of any argument and sometimes with no reflection or conclusion. Some work showed little evidence of any research; the candidate simply wrote a general philosophical argument. This was particularly common in essays on Belief Systems and the Family, where candidates had a point of view and wrote only about that.

A surprising number of candidates presented extremely short essays. Candidates cannot hope to cover all the required criteria in any depth in such short essays.

Clarity of arguments, perspectives, and evidence:

The **strongest work** clearly identifies the required criteria and presents 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.

The **weakest work** shows little awareness of the requirements for this component. 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 present information they have gained from primary and secondary research and do not process or discuss it at all.

Citation and referencing:

All candidates should understand the need for **complete in-text attribution**. They should be aware that if they present material as their own when they have found it in other sources, this is considered to be plagiarism. Where they quote directly from sources, this should be in the form of short quotes, clearly attributed, and most of the material in their work should be their own. Please note that when candidates quote sources found within material from other sources, they do need to reference the quoted sources as well. There is no one fixed method of citation or referencing for this component. **Any clear and consistent method is acceptable.**

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

References: References for books or magazines should include author, date, and title of publication. References for online materials should include **at least** the full URL (leading to the document, not just to a website) **and date of access (retrieval date)**. The full reference list/footnotes/endnotes should be clearly linked to the in-text attribution. Candidates should use one clear, consistent, and logical method (one set of numbers, or alphabetical order). References should be clearly organised and easy to find.

Note: Primary research: Some candidates carry out primary research, particularly to explore different perspectives. Where they do so, they should mention this in text; so that it is clear where/how the information has been gained. They may wish to put a note at the end of their reference list or in a footnote, to give details such as date of interview. If candidates wish to include evidence of their primary research, such as statistics, they can append this to the reference list. (This should not be included as part of the essay, unless it is to be read and counted in the words allowed for the essay).

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

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

Key messages

- Teams submit an Explanation and an Outcome. Individuals submit a Reflective Paper.
- The Explanation must detail the perspectives/aspects of the issue that will be researched, the team's aim, the activity that will take place, how the activity will be evidenced and how the team will gather information to help them to evaluate their achievement.
- The Outcome must be the means by which the Team met their aim or the evidence of their activity.
- The Reflective Paper requires candidates to present their own research findings and cite their sources.
- Candidates must evaluate the Outcome as a means of meeting their aim, their own work processes towards the completion of the project and reflect on teamwork, their role in the team and their learning.
- Reflective Papers should evaluate the aspects of the team project (see below for details) and should not tell the story of the project or repeat the Explanation.
- All members of a team must be awarded the same mark for the team elements (Explanation and Outcome, and Collaboration)

General comments

Team Projects

The most successful projects involved a focus on an issue of local concern. Candidates chose a variety of issues on which to focus their projects. Some teams focused on education e.g. raising awareness about the problem of homework. Other teams focused on raising awareness about health issues e.g. how stress and depression in teenagers can be reduced and or on climate issues e.g. the problem of waste and how schools can engage with it.

Outcomes were varied and included school year assemblies, leaflets, fundraising events and posters. Some who had made websites realised too late that these did not make it easy to gather evidence for evaluating the success in meeting their aim. It was clear that most candidates had freedom when deciding on an aim and when designing an Outcome. Locally important issues made research and activities easier to organise, and easier to give everyone in the team a specific role and responsibility.

Less successful projects tended to give general information about a topic or an issue, without explicitly referring to different cultural perspectives (perspectives of different groups of people: young/older), or perspectives in different parts of the world on the issue. The evaluations of these team projects sometimes made it clear that learners had had limited involvement in the choice of topic, Outcome or team members.

Reflective Papers

The most successful Reflective Papers were well organised according to the criteria found in the mark scheme: How far did the Outcome meet the team's aim? How effective were my working processes? How could the Outcome and my work processes have been improved? How effective was our team in completing the project? How well did I work as a team member? What have I learned about the issue, other people's perspectives on it, and my skills in project/teamwork? What were my research findings, in summary?

The most successful evaluations consistently used evidence/examples from the team project to explain strengths/benefits and weaknesses/challenges. Candidates should keep an ongoing reflective log of their own ways of working and their work as a part of the team as these details are needed to evidence their evaluations and reflections. They should note both what was a strength/benefit and what was a challenge/weakness, and what impact this had on the project/the Outcome.



Comments on specific questions

Team Elements: Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration

AO3 Communication: Outcome and Explanation

The Explanation is a planning document. It informs the reader about the Team's aims, plans for research into the issue and perspectives on it, and plans for an activity. It gives decisions about an Outcome that will be developed to inform others, and details of how the team will measure its success. If the aim is to raise awareness, it is clear about the audience for their event. The Explanation should not contain team members' research findings.

The Outcome gives evidence of the activity that has been developed to help the team to meet their aim. The Outcome is necessary to show that the project was completed, thus enabling the Reflective Paper to contain evidence. The Outcome must be fit for purpose. If it meant to raise awareness of an issue, then a presentation or a poster is appropriate. The Outcome should not be seen as the most important part of Team Project. It should not be a series of interviews joined together, as this is research.

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 consider 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 the teacher's observation of teamwork and questioning of team members individually and collectively. There should be no explanation on ICRC forms of how this mark was arrived at.

Individual element: The Reflective Paper

AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation

Evaluating the Outcome:

Candidates must ask themselves how far the Outcome helped them to achieve their aim. They must then use evidence to show how far the Outcome was successful in meeting their aim, and how far it failed to help them. The evidence that they have can be from a variety of sources. If the team is raising awareness about an issue:

- 1 Candidates can have a set of questions to ask their audience before the action and the same set asked after the action. These can then be compared to show which parts of their aim had been met and which had not. Candidates can then ask how their Outcome could be improved to minimise these weaknesses.
- 2 Candidates can ask verbal questions to their audience about what has been learned about the issue, and what could have been improved. They can compile the team's findings and show which parts of their Outcome were successful in meeting their aim, and where it had missed its mark.

Suggestions made about improving the Outcome should come from a weakness that was found in the analysis of the data.

An example of an evaluation where strengths and limitations of the Outcome are explained, and its impact on the team's aim is considered:

'Our Outcome was a PowerPoint Presentation to our year group. We asked them what they had learned and what they thought about our presentation as they left our workshop. Most said that they had learned something about food waste in school and that they would share the booklet with their parents to help limit food waste at home. As our aim was about reducing food waste in school, this was a better result than we could have hoped for. However, some said that there were just too many facts on the presentation for it to be learned, and that we did not allow enough time for questions and discussions. We learned that what our audience learned was more important than sharing everything we had researched, and that giving them time to make sense of it was as important as what we said. Next time we will make fewer slides and ask for more feedback and engagement.'

Evaluating my own Work Processes:

Taking part in the team action and carrying out their own research gives candidates the clearest opportunities for evaluating their work processes. Candidates must ask themselves how far their own work processes helped in achieving the Outcome or the team's aim, and how far they held them back. The evidence they have can come from comments made by others e.g. teachers or teammates, or it can be from reflection.

Suggestions made about improving their own work processes should come from a weakness that was found in the analysis of the information.

An example of an evaluation where strengths and limitations of own work processes are explained, and their impact on the team's aim/the Outcome is considered:

'My research task was to find out about green ways of generating electricity. I was really pleased at my ability to pursue my task, finding many ways that I did not know about. I was particularly pleased to find out about Germany's biomass generator as the case study had really different pictures to brighten up our presentation. However, I became sulky when I found out that only some of my findings would be used in the presentation as our aim was raising awareness about the least environmentally costly ways governments had found to keep us warm in cold weather. I must remember in future that I am part of a team and need to feel proud about my contribution to the Outcome that led to us meeting our aim.'

AO2 Reflection

Reflecting on Teamwork:

The question candidates must ask is: How effectively did our team work to produce our Outcome or meet our aim? They must then use evidence to explain both the benefits and challenges of teamwork, reflecting on the impact on the team's aim or the Outcome. Evidence could come from the log they have kept on what went well and what proved to be a challenge, or it could come from team discussions, reflecting on how decisions were made, how much in line with each other they were, how effectively they planned. In the latter case, their interpretation and writing must be their own, as this is an individual piece of work.

An example of a reflection on teamwork where benefits and challenges are explained, and their impact on the project considered:

'We were lucky as a team that we had a variety of skills among team members. We all had to do some research, and we shared out the topics fairly even though some of us were more used to researching than others. But we had a team member who had used film making equipment before and that saved us a lot of time and effort, and we had one who was part of the public speaking club in school, so she was a good presenter. The challenge in our teamwork was that some of us felt left out. While my job was to make a story board of our information ready for filming, and I knew that this was important, it still meant that I could see little of my work in the finished product as they ignored the story board when it was looking to be making too long a film. They missed out case study details that would have helped our audience to understand better why teens' mental health is made worse by the burden of homework. Communication broke down somewhere as time pressures increased.'

Reflecting on being a team member:

Candidates should ask themselves how well they supported the team, and how far they were supported by the team.

The strengths of being a team member include giving support to the team. This can come from:

- listening to others, and helping develop others' ideas, as well as from contributing their own ideas
- supporting team members who are struggling with an aspect of their teamwork, or asking for help from others
- meeting deadlines so that the Outcome was ready to be tried out before a presentation event
- passing information to others about a part of your work that is just not possible to achieve.

Weaknesses in team members can include:

- taking control of the project and making an Outcome yourself

- ignoring the schedule of events and taking your time doing your task, holding up the finished product
- not offering ideas or helping to clarify the ideas of others
- not turning up to take your part in an event.

An example of a reflection on own role in the team where strengths and weaknesses are explained and their impact on the project considered:

'I was made team leader because I am clever and everyone thought I could guide our team to success. I did my best by keeping good notes of meetings and making sure everyone's ideas were collected when we met. However, I am very busy with sport, and I did not put this project first in my mind. I delayed our meetings when they clashed with a match, and the result was that team members lost interest in their tasks. Our research fell behind and, as a result, our presentation was poor and had little of interest in it.'

Learning about the issue and perspectives:

Candidates should consider what they have learned from the research of team members as well as their own research. They should ask themselves what they have learned about the issue and about what others' perspectives on it are.

An example showing effective learning from team research:

'My primary research into the effects of homework on the mental health of school learners showed that my year group feels that they have so much homework that they do not have time to make good use of social media. They go to bed so tired they often cannot sleep. My team started this project because we wanted policies for homework to be changed. However, my team found that what we have to do is far less than in other countries, where children much younger than us have the amount of homework we do and have to go to music lessons and language classes after school as well. Also, our parents felt that they were encouraging us to do well in our exams so that we could do well in the future and were not being harsh on us at all. It is clear that education is linked to future success, and maybe we had not thought about the perspectives of others enough.'

Learning about skills:

Candidates should reflect on what they have learned about working in a team, or about working on a project. The skills they identify may not be new skills, but skills developed further or put to different use.

An example may be:

'I have always been very quiet, preferring to work on my own. I do not offer answers in class and I dread working in pairs. However, this project attracted my attention. I could have just collected books for our local school from home and talked to no-one. But instead, I went to neighbours' homes and asked them for books, explaining what we were doing as our team project. I found that people were interested in what I had to say. I have gained confidence in my own communication skills in this way, and I was even willing to speak at our presentation.'

AO3 Communication

This assessment objective requires reflective reports to flow meaningfully with signposting and linking to make clear the aspects of the criteria being evaluated or reflected upon, their benefits/strengths and challenges/weaknesses/limitations. 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.

Many candidates benefit from using a template with headings or questions to guide their report. This has no impact on marks available.

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 summarised in the Reflective Paper.