

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

<p>Paper 0457/01 Individual Research</p>
--

Key messages

- The use of sub-headings linked to the assessment criteria helped candidates structure their work and fulfil the assessment criteria.
- A complete reference list should be given at the end of the report, and this should include the author, date and title of the publication, the website address and the date accessed. Citations in the body of the text should be used for any direct quotations.
- Reports should be a maximum of 2000 words in length.
- The requirements for the syllabus and component will change in 2018. Centres should ensure that they are familiar with the changes. From 2018 onwards, each candidate will produce one Individual Report which will be externally marked by Cambridge. Full details can be found on the Teacher Support website.

General comments

Most centres demonstrated a reasonable understanding of the requirements for the assessment of this component. However, a small number of centres continue to confuse the requirements of this component with those for the Group Project. Teachers should make use of the documentation available to support this component, including the guidance in the syllabus document and the 'Submitting Cambridge Global Perspectives work' administrative guide (both available from www.cambridgeinternational.org).

Most candidates used questions to focus their research and their reports. Where candidates did not, the reports were often less focused. Centres should advise candidates that they need a question as the title of their report, which candidates should then answer in their report. Their conclusion should directly answer their question. Teachers can help candidates formulate their questions and give general verbal feedback once first drafts have been reviewed. A research question is compulsory from 2018.

This series, most centres covered a range of topics, suggesting that candidates had been given freedom to choose the topics for their Individual Research reports. Sometimes this worked well, but at other times it was clear that candidates were lacking in guidance as to what to produce to answer the question posed. Please note that in 2018, candidates must choose an issue from a list of eight topics for this component. Their question (focused on a global issue) must stem from one of these topics and they should be able to give their personal perspective once they have researched their issue from different perspectives. They must also be able to answer their question and fulfil all the assessment criteria, which includes source evaluation.

From 2018, candidates should produce their work as word processed documents so that word counts can be verified. Candidates should also only include pictures and diagrams if they refer to them in the body of their work and they support a point the candidate is making. Appendices are not permitted from 2018. Candidates should be advised to submit this component in essay format.

Comments on specific criteria

Teacher assessment

On the whole, the internal assessment of this component was appropriate, with a substantial number of centres marking in accordance with the assessment criteria. It was helpful to have comments included on the Individual Candidate Record Card (ICRC) to justify the mark given, and often they related directly to the assessment criteria. This will not be an issue in 2018, as all work will be marked by Cambridge International and centres should ensure that all work is labelled with the candidate's full name and candidate number. If teachers suspect that any work has been plagiarised they should follow the guidance in the *Cambridge Handbook*, available at www.cambridgeinternational.org.

Where an Individual Research report meets the assessment criteria in a band fully, marks at the top of that band were awarded. To fully achieve the criteria for Band 4, there must be thorough analysis of the issues and the possible scenarios identified relate to this analysis. In the most successful reports, the issues were also explored from different perspectives (global, local/national and personal) and possible scenarios were evaluated before courses of action were proposed. Courses of action were developed, and not simply identified, in order to fully meet the criteria for Band 4. For the personal response mark, it was not enough that candidates gave their opinion: they should have explained their response with reference to the research they conducted and the different perspectives they explored. Assessors generally decided on the most appropriate band for each criterion and then decided whether the work met the band fully, in which case the top mark in the band was awarded, or whether there was something missing and the work only met the band partially, in which case lower marks within that band were awarded.

Gather information representing different perspectives

The majority of candidates were able to gather and present some information linked to the topic area in order to answer their research question. This usually came from a range of sources, and in the most successful reports, these sources were well-referenced. The most successful reports also clearly explored different perspectives on the issue(s), outlining evidence of different views and opinions on the issue(s), broadly related to a place, country, organisation or institution. Less successful reports often simply gave information relating to the issue (though not specifically views or opinions on the issue) from different countries. Only the very best candidates were able to successfully explore global perspectives on an issue. A global perspective may come from a specific country, organisation, institution, or even an individual, but it will have influence that spreads beyond any one country. The very best reports not only explained and gave evidence for global perspectives, but also some justification for why they are global.

All work must be in the candidate's own words. If quotations are included they should be shown as quotations with the source directly cited. Teachers should advise candidates to use quotes sparingly and only to support points that have been made in the candidates own words. It was often found that candidates need help to write a complete reference list, including the author, date and title of the publication on the website and the date the candidate accessed it, rather than just giving the web link URL. For marks in Band 4, a broad range of relevant information was presented and a range of highly appropriate sources were used.

Analyse issues within the report

This session saw a wide range of levels of analysis, from simply listing causes, effects and current situations, to exploring these in more depth. The most successful reports tended to cover fewer issues but explored them in more depth. Less successful reports tended to outline lots of unrelated issues. The key to this criterion is that candidates formulate a focused question (with guidance from their Teacher) which leads the candidate to explore one or two issues in depth; the reasons for the issue/causes of the issue and the consequences/effects of the issue. Explanation will always attract more marks than identification and candidates need to be aware of this and use words like 'because', 'due to', 'as such', 'therefore' to develop their points. In 2018, candidates will be expected to compare causes and consequences of their identified issue.

Identify and evaluate possible scenarios and formulate possible courses of action

Many candidates still find this criterion challenging and possible scenarios were on the whole fairly simple, with candidates unsure about how they should be generated. This may be because candidates are being asked to think beyond the research they have conducted and they are less confident of their own ability to create/develop possible scenarios and courses of action. The scenarios presented generally already existed

and there remains an overall lack of creative thinking about possible scenarios. Even among those who were able to develop possible future scenarios, only the very best reports considered how likely the scenarios were and why. Courses of action generally need to be further developed, including how they might work to resolve, prevent or reduce the issue under discussion.

Develop evidence-based personal response demonstrating self-awareness

Often this was left until the end and lacked evidence from the rest of the report. Some candidates made reference to their life at home, in school or where they lived in relation to the question they posed. They identified and explained, referring directly to the evidence in the report, how their thinking on the topic has changed or developed as a result of conducting the research and things they will be doing differently as a result of their research. Some reports very successfully provided a personal response throughout the report, offering a considered personal response directly after presenting the evidence. Less successful reports were more likely to add a paragraph at the end which often offered a simple statement of opinion.

From 2018, candidates must reflect on the topic of the research and explain how their personal perspective has changed or developed as a result of the research they have conducted and what they have learned while completing the research.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02
Group Project

Key messages

- In planning their projects, candidates should identify a single project aim, such as raising awareness about an issue, or addressing a problem and then identify an appropriate active outcome to achieve that aim.
- Outcomes may take the form of posters, information leaflets, video clips, fundraising events, designs or models etc. and evidence of the outcome should be submitted. Extended text based responses are not appropriate as outcomes and must not be accepted.
- Individual evaluations need to address all the various elements contained within the mark band descriptors for each of the assessment criteria. From 2018, 60 marks out of a total of 70 will be awarded on the basis of candidates' individual reflection and evaluation in their reflective paper. It is therefore most important that candidates understand the difference between critical evaluation and description. It is also important that candidates are fully familiar with the wording of the descriptors in the top performance band in order to focus their responses appropriately and maximise scoring opportunities.
- The requirements for this syllabus and component change in 2018. There are summary notes about these changes on the final page of this report and teachers are strongly advised to visit the Teacher Support website to learn more about the changes and access sample materials.

General comments

There was a wide range in topic choices in this examination session. These included: helping refugees integrate into the community; exploitation in the labour market; prevention of water pollution; effects of social media and alleviating traffic congestion. Project outcomes included lessons aimed at younger students; school presentations; websites, videos and fund raising events. It was often the case that when candidates identified an issue of particular importance in their local neighbourhood and used their project as an opportunity to address the issue, it made the whole experience more meaningful to them. This generally resulted in more thoughtful and critical individual evaluations.

Comments on specific criteria

Production of a project plan

[Group assessment]

Project plans were generally of a high standard. This was because the candidates had paid attention to the wording of the performance descriptors in the top mark band and provided all the elements required to gain maximum marks for this assessment criterion. Weak plans were generally sketchy in terms of providing a clear cut aim and a specific project outcome and lacked full details of planned activities. Teachers should advise candidates that they should identify a single aim and produce a single outcome to achieve that aim.

Representation of different perspectives including cross-cultural

[Group assessment]

There was evidence of some interesting and meaningful cross-cultural collaboration being used to inform and support the development of project outcomes. The most meaningful collaboration generally involved candidates interacting with people of different cultures living and working in their own communities, often by carrying out interviews or observations. Candidates also used secondary internet research to support their outcomes. Some candidates were over-ambitious in attempting to produce several outcomes. This was inadvisable because they tended to find that they were short of time as deadlines approached and were unable to do proper justice to any of the outcomes. Some candidates' work showed little evidence of any

research being used to develop the outcome. Other candidates made the mistake of making their research an outcome in itself and produced what was essentially a group essay. This was not appropriate for the project component and disadvantaged the candidates when it came to their individual evaluations of the project outcome.

Constructive participation in group work/activities

[Individual assessment]

Assessment of performance in this criterion was based on evidence gathered during teacher observations of group work in progress.

Evaluation of project plan and process

[Individual assessment]

Strong individual evaluations showed evidence of careful critical thought. Candidates considered the strengths and weaknesses of both the project plan and the strengths and weaknesses of the processes involved in carrying out the project, as well as providing well-thought out suggestions as to how both could have been improved. Weaker evaluations did not score well because they focused on describing what the group had done without considering strengths and weaknesses of approach. Some candidates were unsure about what is meant by the project process. The process of carrying out the project comprises elements such as the information gathering process; research methodology and analysis of findings; the execution of other activities relating to the production of the outcome; time management etc. Candidates often find it easier to fully address all the different elements within each of the assessment criteria if they structure their work with sub-headings that are closely aligned to the wording of the descriptions within the mark bands. These sub-headings can be removed before the work is submitted for assessment so that the word count is not exceeded.

Evaluation of project outcome

[Individual assessment]

Some candidates struggled to score well on this criterion, usually because they did not make clear and consistent reference to the project aim when making their evaluation. Simply describing what was good and what was weak about their outcome without considering what the original aim of the project was did not allow them to access marks at the upper end of the mark scheme. Candidates who scored well generally did so because they first revisited the group's original project aim and then considered how far the group's outcome had succeeded in achieving the aim and where it had fallen short. In order to do this successfully, they had clearly spent some time considering how best they might measure its success or otherwise. This was often done through pre and post activity surveys and interviews or by observing the impact their activities had had on their local community.

Evaluation of individual contribution (including what was learnt from cross-cultural collaboration)

[Individual assessment]

The quality of evaluations of individual contribution and learning varied considerably. While most candidates did identify and comment on the different activities they had personally been responsible for, in the strongest evaluations, candidates did not just consider activities, but also considered the role they had played in the group, in particular where they had been involved in a leadership or supportive role. They also considered how they could have improved their contribution. These evaluations often showed a good deal of thought and honesty. Candidates also needed to consider both the benefits and challenges of working in a group setting. This element of the assessment criterion was often forgotten. Stronger responses to this element considered the candidate's own working style and preferences, often acknowledging the benefits of sharing workload and ideas, while also acknowledging the difficulty, at times, of relying on others. When considering what has been learned about different cultural perspectives, candidates should be advised to not only consider what they have found out from their research (either primary or secondary) into another culture or other cultures, but also what impact this has had on their own attitudes or behaviour.

Teacher Assessment

Teachers are reminded that in addition to awarding marks for each of the assessment criteria, they are also required to include brief supporting comments on each candidate's individual candidate record card for each of the assessment criteria to indicate how marks have been awarded and where credit has been given. These comments should be anchored in the wording of the assessment criteria.

Important notes on the 2018 Syllabus (for implementation from March 2018)

There are a number of important changes to the existing project component of the 0457 syllabus in the revised version to be implemented in **March 2018**. In the revised syllabus, this component will become component **3** and will be called the **Team Project**. The maximum mark will be **70**, rather than the current 60.

Candidates taking the revised syllabus should be made clearly aware of the following changes to the requirements for the project component:

Group

- 1 There are 8 specified topics on which the team project may be based. Any projects on topics outside of these 8 must be awarded zero marks.
- 2 Teachers will be required to award a group mark (with the same mark awarded to each team member) on the basis of the group's teamwork and commitment during the process of carrying out the project.
- 3 Teams will no longer submit a project plan for assessment. The team's collaborative submission will comprise 2 elements: a project outcome and an accompanying explanation (max 300 words).
- 4 Direct cross-cultural collaboration will no longer be a compulsory element of the project. However, as part of their research, candidates will still be required to explore different cultural perspectives on the issue they have chosen to investigate and teams will need to take this into consideration when planning their projects. Research into different cultural perspectives may still encompass some degree of primary research, if the team so chooses, as well as secondary research via the internet and/or other sources of information. The different cultural perspectives explored should be reflected in the outcome itself and the explanation.
- 5 The project outcome is what the team produces collaboratively to achieve the project aim and it must involve the team addressing an issue; for example, raising public awareness about an issue; or solving a problem etc. The outcome could take a variety of forms, such as: a poster; information leaflet or brochure; a song; a video, or a series of photographs possibly depicting an event such as a fundraiser, lessons; or cartoons with captions; a model or design; a webpage etc. An essay such a group research report or case study must not be accepted as an outcome.
- 6 The explanation (200–300 words) accompanying the outcome should include the following information: the project aim; a brief description of the outcome and an explanation of how the team's exploration of different cultural perspectives has informed or supports the outcome. If the explanation exceeds the word limit, teachers must not give credit beyond the first 300 words.

Individual

- 1 Individual marks will no longer be awarded for individuals' participation in group work and activities.
- 2 Individual work will be made up of a single Reflective Paper (750–1000 words) in which candidates will individually reflect on:
 - their **personal research** findings and their own **work processes**
 - the **effectiveness** of the **project outcome** in **achieving the project aim**
 - what they have learned about **different cultural perspectives** of the issue
 - what they have learned about **teamwork overall** and their **own performance as a team member**
 - what they have learned **overall** from carrying out the project

If the Reflective Paper exceeds the word limit, teachers must **not** give credit beyond the first **1000** words.

Teachers are strongly advised to thoroughly familiarise themselves with the revised requirements of the 2018 syllabus well before candidates embark on the project component. The Teacher Support website and the Teachers' Guide for this qualification provide some examples of possible Team Project responses for teacher guidance. In assessing this component in 2018, teachers should, as previously, be closely guided by the wording of the performance descriptors within each of the mark bands.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/31
Written Paper

Key messages

The key messages from this series of examination papers are that candidates:

- demonstrated very good levels of ability in skill of analysis
- need to develop skill of evaluation of argument and evidence more fully
- should use material from sources as evidence to justify their opinions.

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 2017, the paper was based upon source material related to sport in the community.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Many candidates clearly have an excellent understanding of globalisation, related issues and an ability to use evidence to support an opinion or claim. Candidates are also able to analyse evidence in a variety of different forms. However, some need to develop evaluative skills to higher levels.

Candidates responded very well to the source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in relation to the need for increased participation in sport in general.

Examination technique was generally very good. The vast majority completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were hardly any rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn from the Sources including through quotation and direct reference or citation
- provide explanation rather than simple assertion or description, where appropriate
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, bias, tone, and use of evidence.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Nearly all candidates identified two positive effects of sport from the Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks for this question. Candidates were only awarded marks for identifying positive effects of sport that were contained within Source 1.
- (b) Almost all candidates were able to suggest a negative effect of sport that was the most serious. Most candidates chose to discuss injury or bullying. Many candidates showed awareness of the link between cause and effect in this context, as well as the 'snowball' effect of one consequence leading to another. A number attributed the negative effect to the absence of facilities or too much competition. Some discussed a possible 'vicious circle'.

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

- (c) As in previous years, some candidates found this question quite challenging. Most candidates explained the benefits of sport and good facilities in general rather than addressing the 'local' dimension of the question. Most candidates explored the benefits of providing sport facilities in relation to health, entertainment, crime reduction and relationships. Some related sport facilities to improving educational and employment opportunities.

The most successful responses provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Less successful responses tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about the importance of sport in general without reference to 'facilities' or 'local'. Some very low scoring answers simply listed a range of benefits of sport taken directly from the sources without any development or explanation.

Question 2

- (a) Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, 'Sport can improve lives.' These methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe surveys of local people to compare the views of those who did and did not participate regularly in sport, mainly using questionnaires and interviews. Some candidates suggested observation and 'inspection' of local sporting provision and facilities. Other methods included consultation with experts, local authorities and medical doctors. Nearly all candidates suggested secondary research using sources from the internet.

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

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

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

- (b) Many candidates presented a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of ways to persuade people to become more involved in sporting activity. This included consideration of who needed to be persuaded, the justification for involvement, often in terms of benefits, and the methods to be used, for example via advertising, social media and television.

There were some excellent responses to this question which explained why particular groups were targeted for the promotion of sport, the methods proposed and the content of the campaign. Justification of the strategy was key to achieving at high levels.

Less successful responses tended to list a few suggestions without explanation or linking to the perspective being promoted. Some candidates simply listed the benefits of sport without addressing the 'persuasion' dimension to the question.

Question 3

- (a) Most candidates correctly suggested that the statement was an example of an opinion as it could not be verified and was the view of only one person. A common error was to suggest that it was a fact as it was likely to be true.

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

- (b) Many candidates correctly identified a value judgement from Source 3 and were able to explain the selection as an example of a view or belief about what is important, moral or ethical.

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

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

- (c) Most candidates compared both statements and discussed issues relating to evidence, language, knowledge claims and expertise. Some candidates explored the arguments and values.

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 explicitly quoted and used directly in the response.

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 expected to consider the opinion that all young people should be made to do sport at school and justify their own views using material drawn from the sources and their own experience and evidence.

The arguments used by candidates mainly related to health, relationships and the potential for bullying, as well as 'freedom of choice' and the value of compulsion in school activities. There were many thoughtful discussions of the purpose of the school curriculum and the role of schools in preparation for life. Some discussed alternative opportunities within the community and in adulthood, for example through sports clubs.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about priorities. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and describe personal opinion. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed the benefits of sport.

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. Candidates also need to be able to describe and explain the reasons and evidence that have helped to shape their own points of view on global issues.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/32
Written Paper

Key messages

The key messages from this series of examination papers are that candidates:

- demonstrated very good levels of ability in skills of analysis
- need to develop skills of evaluation of argument and evidence more fully
- should use material from sources as evidence to justify their opinions.

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 2017, the paper was based upon source material related to global warming.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good. Many candidates clearly have an excellent understanding of globalisation, related issues and an ability to use evidence to support an opinion or claim. Candidates are also able to analyse evidence in a variety of different forms. However, some need to develop evaluative skills to higher levels.

Candidates responded positively to the source material, especially in the extended response questions, and engaged with the issue enthusiastically. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in relation to the need to take action to reduce global warming at an individual and national level.

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

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn from the sources including through quotation and direct reference or citation
- provide explanation rather than simple assertion or description, where appropriate
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, bias, tone, and use of evidence

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Nearly all candidates identified two causes of global warming from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks for this question. Candidates were only awarded marks for identifying causes of global warming that were contained within Source 1.
- (b) Almost all candidates were able to suggest a consequence of global warming that was the most serious. Most candidates chose to discuss extreme weather, rising sea levels, crop failure and extinction of species. Many candidates showed awareness of the link between cause and effect in this context, as well as the 'snowball' effect of one consequence leading to another. Some discussed a possible 'vicious circle'.

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

- (c) Many candidates responded well to this question. Most candidates explained the problems of global warming and addressed the 'local' dimension to the question. Most candidates explored global warming in relation to impact on the environment, biodiversity, economy and local amenities like housing. Some explored the responsibility of local people to take action to reduce global warming, especially through lifestyle and consumer choices.

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 global warming in general without reference to 'local'. Some candidates simply listed a range of problems or issues taken directly from the sources without any development or explanation.

Question 2

- (a) Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, 'Businesses are more concerned with profit than the environment.' These methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe surveys of local people about local businesses and their response to environmental issues, mainly using questionnaires and interviews. Some candidates suggested observation and 'inspection' of businesses, analysing data on environmental policies as well as expenditure and profits. Other methods included consultation with experts, local authorities and environmentalists. Nearly all candidates suggested secondary research using sources from the internet.

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

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

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

- (b) Many candidates presented a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of ways to persuade people in the local area to take action to reduce global warming. This included consideration of who needed to be persuaded, the justification for involvement, often in terms of benefits, and the methods to be used, for example via advertising, social media and TV.

There were some excellent responses to this question which explained why particular groups were targeted, the methods proposed and the content of the campaign. This often involved educating young people through schools with the younger generation then persuading older people to participate. Justification of the strategy was key to achieving at high levels.

Less successful responses tended to list a few suggestions without explanation or linking to the perspective being promoted. Some candidates simply listed ways to reduce global warming without addressing the 'persuasion' dimension to the question.

Question 3

- (a) Most candidates correctly identified a fact from the source and explained that it was a fact as the statement could be verified or was true.

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

- (b) Most candidates found this question straightforward and gained a high level of marks. Candidates explained the reasons why the statement was both a prediction and an opinion, relating the explanation to claims about the future that could not be verified.

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates about key critical thinking concepts like value judgements, bias, vested interest, fact, opinion and prediction and give opportunity for them to use the concepts frequently in the analysis of sources and arguments.

- (c) Most candidates compared both statements and discussed issues relating to evidence, language, knowledge claims and expertise. Some candidates explored the arguments and values.

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 explicitly quoted and used directly in the response.

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 expected to discuss who is responsible for reducing global warming, governments or individuals, and justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

The arguments used by candidates mainly related to levels of power, range of impact, responsibility, influence and ability to force change through laws. There were many thoughtful discussions of the responsibility and ability of individuals to make a significant and lasting difference to global warming through lifestyle changes in comparison to governments with resources, power and influence. Some discussed the merits of individual and collective action in general in responding to global issues.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well-supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about responsibilities. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and describe personal opinion. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to reduce global warming.

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. Candidates also need to be able to describe and explain the reasons and evidence that have helped to shape their own points of view on global issues.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/33
Written Paper

Key messages

The key messages from this series of examination papers are that candidates:

- demonstrated very good levels of ability in skills of analysis
- need to develop skills of evaluation of argument and evidence more fully
- should use material from sources as evidence to justify their opinions

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 2017, the paper was based upon source material related to animal rights.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Many candidates clearly have an excellent understanding of global issues and an ability to use evidence to support an opinion or claim. Candidates are also able to analyse evidence in a variety of different forms. However, some need to develop evaluative skills to higher levels.

Candidates responded positively to the source material, especially in the extended response questions, and engaged with the issue enthusiastically. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in relation to responsibility for the protection of animal rights.

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

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn from the sources including through quotation and direct reference or citation
- provide explanation rather than simple assertion or description, where appropriate
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, bias, tone, and use of evidence.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) (i) Nearly all candidates correctly identified the worldwide trend in the number of people keeping animals as pets as rising.
- (ii) Nearly all candidates correctly identified one of the groups predicted to be the main owners of pets within the next five years as the elderly or single people.
- (b) Almost all candidates were able to explain which use of animals by humans was the most important, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss use of animals for food or medical research. Many candidates showed awareness of the importance of animals as a resource and the impact that a loss of the resource might have on humans and animals themselves. Some candidates discussed the environmental aspects of the issue with real insight.

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

- (c) Many candidates responded well to this question. Most candidates clearly explained their opinion about the use of animals for entertainment and justified their views, often referring to issues of cruelty, animal rights and access to natural habitats and ways of life. The benefits of human-animal relationships were also explored with sensitivity, especially for companionship.

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 animals in general without reference to the ethical dimension or 'entertainment'. Some candidates simply listed issues for animals taken directly from the sources without any development or explanation.

Question 2

- (a) Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, 'The wolf and the Iberian lynx are two species which have been saved from dying out.' These methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe surveys of local people about local wildlife, mainly using questionnaires and interviews. Some candidates suggested observation and expeditions to gather and analyse data on animal populations. Other methods included consultation with experts, local authorities and environmentalists. Nearly all candidates suggested secondary research using sources from the internet.

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

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

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

- (b) Many candidates presented a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of ways to persuade people in the local area to treat animals humanely. This included consideration of who needed to be persuaded, the justification for involvement, often in terms of benefits to humans and animals, and the methods to be used, for example via advertising, social media and television.

There were some excellent responses to this question which explained why particular groups were targeted, justified the methods proposed and clearly described the content of the campaign. This often involved educating the younger generation or targeting institutions with a history of inappropriate animal use. Justification of the strategy was key to achieving at high levels.

Less successful responses tended to list a few suggestions without explanation or linking to the perspective being promoted. Some candidates simply explained their views on animal cruelty.

Question 3

- (a) Many candidates performed well on this questions, explaining the reasons why the statement was both a prediction and an opinion, relating the explanation to claims about the future that could not be verified.

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates about key critical thinking concepts like value judgements, bias, vested interest, fact, opinion and prediction and give opportunity for them to use the concepts frequently in the analysis of sources and arguments.

- (b) Many candidates correctly identified a value judgement from the source and were able to explain the selection as an example of a view or belief about what is important, moral or ethical.

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

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

- (c) Most candidates compared both statements and discussed issues relating to evidence, language, knowledge claims and expertise. Some candidates explored the arguments and values.

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 explicitly quoted and used directly in the response.

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 expected to discuss who is responsible for protecting animals, governments or individuals, and justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

The arguments used by candidates mainly related to levels of power, range of impact, responsibility, influence and ability to force change through laws. There were many thoughtful discussions of the responsibility and ability of individuals to make a significant and lasting difference to animal rights and protection in comparison to governments with resources, power and influence. Some discussed the merits of individual and collective action in general in responding to global issues.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well-supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about responsibilities. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and describe personal opinion. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed problems in the treatment of animals and asserted that 'things should change' because they were wrong.

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. Candidates also need to be able to describe and explain the reasons and evidence that have helped to shape their own points of view on global issues.