

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

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

Key messages

The key messages from this examination series are that candidates:

- demonstrated excellent skills of interpretation and analysis
- should develop skills of evaluation to higher levels
- need to use material from sources as evidence to justify their opinions.

General comments

The Written Examination consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In March 2019, the examination was based upon source material related to the topic of migration. The impact of migration on local communities was the main issue explored.

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

Candidates responded very well to the source material, especially in the extended response questions, and engaged actively with the issue. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in relation to government responses to migration.

Examination technique was usually very good. Candidates had sufficient time for the tasks. The majority completed the questions within the time allocated. There were very few rubric errors and candidates responded to the questions carefully and thoughtfully.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn directly from the sources
- use quotations and material from the sources
- provide explanation to justify opinion rather than simple assertion or description
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, bias, tone, and vested interest.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) (i) Nearly all candidates could explain the nature of migration using Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of 1 mark for this question. Migration was defined as the movement of people from one country to live in another country.
- (b) (i) Almost all candidates were able to identify one cause of migration from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of 1 mark for this question.
- (ii) Almost all candidates were able to identify a consequence of migration from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of 1 mark for this question.

- (c) Most candidates responded very well to this question and identified a consequence of migration that, in their opinion, was the most significant. Most candidates chose to discuss the movement of skilled workers, reduction in wages, economic growth and loss of young people from the donor country. Many candidates showed awareness of the link between cause and effect in this context, as well as the ‘snowball’ effect of a consequence or cause leading to another. Some discussed a possible ‘vicious circle’.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why one consequence was more significant 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.

- (d) Many candidates responded well to this question and could explain why migration is of significance to countries and governments at a national level.

Most candidates related their answers to the impact on the host country; however, some candidates explored both host and donor countries. Most explanations focused on the impact on economic growth, the distribution of different age groups within countries and provision of public services.

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 migration in general without reference to ‘countries’. Unfortunately, some candidates simply listed a range of consequences taken directly from the sources without any development or explanation.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, ‘We must help refugees’.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- uses many examples
- strong tone of language – passionate
- clear argument and easy to follow
- uses a source as evidence
- counterarguments used
- empathy shown.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- few facts and statistics were used to support the claim
- source not referenced
- potential newspaper bias
- author unknown – difficult to verify knowledge claims
- emotive tone.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their opinions; weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion.

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the argument in the Source and justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means being willing to quote from or summarise elements of the source.

- (b) Many candidates seemed to find this question quite challenging.

Candidates who performed well described several methods, sources of information and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, ‘Migrants help the economy of a country to grow stronger’. These methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe the analysis of statistical evidence about levels of migration and economic growth to explore potential correlations. Surveys of local people about the impact of migration on the local economy, mainly using questionnaires and interviews, were also proposed by a significant number of candidates. Other methods included consultation with experts, economists and pressure groups. 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 opinion on the issue rather than describing how it could be researched. These responses gained very few, if any, marks.

Candidates should be given opportunities to design research strategies to test claims as a significant feature of their courses.

Question 3

- (a) Most candidates correctly identified an opinion from the source. An opinion is a statement which cannot be verified and which is a subjective point of view or personal belief not necessarily shared by others.
- (b) Most candidates correctly identified a prediction from the source. A predication is a statement or claim about the future.
- (c) Many candidates correctly identified a vested interest from the source and were able to explain that vested interests are a strong personal opinion in which the person has some sort of benefit, private gain or advantage

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

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

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

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

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

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

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to assess the view that, 'governments should allow people to migrate between countries if they want to.' 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 and lengthy discussions of the impact of migration on donor and host countries, especially in relation to economic consequences and cultural exchange.

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. Alternative perspectives or counter arguments were explored.

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

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 proposed perspective(s) or action(s).

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

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

Key messages

- It is essential that both teachers and candidates are familiar with and fully understand the assessment criteria.
- The choice of question must provide opportunities for candidates to research global and national/local perspectives on a global issue from the eight topics stated in the syllabus for this component.
- Candidates were most successful when they focused on one issue and this was clearly expressed in their question.

General comments

For this component, candidates identify a global issue from one of the 8 topics in the syllabus and formulate a question, which they should answer. They present different perspectives (global and national/local) on their issue, with relevant supporting information. They analyse the causes and consequences of the chosen issue. They compare causes and consequences – identifying and explaining why they are different in different places and/or which is the most significant/serious etc. and why. They then propose and develop a course of action to help resolve their chosen issue. They evaluate the sources of information they have researched and used to support their argument and, finally, they reflect on their personal perspective and how this has been impacted by their research and the perspectives explored. They should also cite and reference the sources of information they use in their report. They should present their report in essay form (continuous prose), in an MS Word document and should write between 1500 and 2000 words.

Comments on specific assessment criteria

Assessment objective 1: research, analysis and evaluation

Information from different perspectives

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

Weaker work responded to more general questions often starting with 'To what extent...' or 'How' which tended to encourage a more descriptive answer with no central issue.

The strongest work showed a clear understanding of perspectives.

A global perspective should show a viewpoint, an opinion, a feeling about, or an attitude to the global situation or issue raised in the question. It should be clear whose perspective this is and information should be presented to explain the perspective and support it. Similarly, a national perspective should show 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 and there should be evidence of the perspective and supporting information to explain it. The global perspective may agree with the national perspective or there may be opposing perspectives, global or national or both.

Some candidates found it a challenge to present the different perspectives on their issue, giving instead information about different places.

Some weak work did not focus on a central issue, but a general topic and chose 2 or 3 sub-topics (often labelled Issue 1, Issue 2, Issue 3). This work did not present perspectives on any issue and, because it was dealing with multiple topics, did not deal with required criteria in any depth or detail.

Analysis and comparison of causes and consequences

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

Where candidates had not identified issues or where they wrote descriptive essays, they did lose out on this criterion because they tended to look only at possible future developments.

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

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

Course(s) of action

The strongest work had one developed and focused course of action. The candidate explained how the course of action could be carried out: its implementation, who would do it, details of how it would be done and a clear explanation of the likely impact of the course of action.

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

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

Evaluation of sources

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

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

Even weaker work presented a section labelled 'Evaluation of Sources' but actually only described the sources in general terms and did not evaluate them.

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

Assessment objective 2: reflection

The strongest work had a clear section of reflection on the candidate's own perspective, on their research findings and on the perspectives they had explored. The candidate clearly explained how their own perspective had developed, been changed or impacted by others' perspectives and by the information they had gained about the issue. It included a clear conclusion/answer to their question based on research findings and other perspectives.

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

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

Assessment objective 3: communication

Structure of the report

Candidates are required to write their report in essay form. Their argument should be planned and logical and follow a clear structure. They should include all required criteria.

The strongest work was easy to follow, and the argument flowed. It used the full available word count and did not include extraneous material or pictures. The candidate had clearly planned before beginning the writing so that they kept control of their argument and did not lose contact with their question, the central issue or their research findings. This work started with the various perspectives on the issue and kept those focused throughout. It progressed from an introduction, through all the required criteria to a reflective conclusion.

Weaker work did not focus on one issue or the required perspectives. It tended to select several sub-topics and present general information about those topics, making it difficult to follow the candidate's argument. It sometimes included irrelevant headings (such as scenarios) or information that did not have real relevance to the question. It tended to move around from one topic to another instead of developing the argument from an introduction, through all the required criteria, to a reflective conclusion.

The weakest work often provided a series of headings with some facts and figures on the topic area, with no clear flow of any argument and sometimes with no reflection or conclusion.

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

Clarity of arguments, perspectives and evidence

For this criterion, candidates must present all the separate elements clearly. A reader must be able to identify and understand the arguments, evidence and perspectives and all the elements must be easy to understand.

The strongest work clearly identified the criteria and made them easy to follow by separating them into paragraphs, or by using sub-headings. All criteria were included and it was made clear that the candidate understood what they were doing and that the criteria must be explicitly addressed.

Weaker work missed out some criteria, such as Evaluation or Reflection, or was unclear, so that it was difficult to work out what each paragraph is about.

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.

There is no one fixed method of citation or referencing for this component. Any clear and consistent method is acceptable. The main concern is attribution of sources.

Candidates may use bracketed citations, or numbering, or in-text referencing to indicate where they have used sources.

They must have complete references somewhere in their work, either footnotes, end-notes or in-text references, (though for ease of reading and control of word count, numbers or brackets may be more manageable).

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

The full reference list/footnotes/endnotes should be clearly linked in one clear, consistent and logical way to the in-text attribution.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/03
Team Project

Key messages

- All members of a team must be awarded the same mark for the team elements (Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration).
- Candidates should choose an issue from the topics available for Team Project, carry out research into different cultural perspectives on the issue, and then use their findings to decide on an aim and an Outcome to achieve the aim. Some of the most successful projects set an aim to raise awareness about different cultural perspectives on a particular issue.
- Projects with one aim and one Outcome were usually more successful than those with multiple aims/Outcomes.
- The Reflective Paper requires candidates to present their own research findings which means that although the team may work collectively for much of the time, it is expected that each individual team member will each carry out some individual research into the issue, citing their own sources.
- Candidates should keep an ongoing reflective log of their own ways of working and their work as a part of the team.
- The most successful reports not only reflect on and evaluate what well / less well but also explain the impact of these things on the project as a whole.
- Teachers should steer candidates away from topics/issues that could be sensitive locally.

General comments

The most successful projects involved raising awareness of different cultural perspectives on an issue of local concern and changing the behaviour or perception of others in relation to the issue. Candidates chose a variety of issues on which to focus their projects. Under the topic of *water, food and agriculture*, some candidates focused on the problem of water shortage and developed activities showing how water use can be reduced safely or how local farmers could benefit from school research into crop growing techniques. Under the topic of *disease and health*, some teams focused on raising awareness about the increase in support available to those with a mental illness. Under the topic of *sport and recreation*, some teams focused on bringing sporting activities to a local group of children, while others looked at developing and promoting exercise programmes to encourage students to exercise more regularly. *Poverty and Inequality* saw some teams investigate the benefits of vocational learning.

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

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

Team Elements: Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration

AO3 Communication: Outcome and Explanation

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

In less successful projects, the Outcome was often not an action taken to achieve the aim but instead an information gathering activity (e.g. a video of interviews being undertaken) or a description of other activities relating to the project process (e.g. a video of candidates talking about what they have done). In other

projects, the Outcome was an action taken to achieve an aim, but did not include different cultural perspectives on the issue (e.g. an information leaflet simply giving facts about the issue in order to raise awareness).

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

Example: The following example is drawn from the work of a team who chose the topic of *water, food and agriculture* for their project, which focused on the issue of reducing water usage. The Team entered into a research project using different ways of irrigating crops and looking at their resulting crops. The team's aim then became to reduce the amount of water wasted. To achieve this aim, the team produced an Outcome in the form of posters for use in meetings with farmers, with reminders about how much water is used every in each type of irrigation system. They conducted a survey to see how many farmers had changed their behaviour as a result. This is an example of a project that addresses a specific local problem and tries to solve it.

AO3 Collaboration

Teachers must award a mark for how well the team have worked together to complete the project. All members of the team must be given the same mark and teachers should take into account how well team members have worked together over the course of the project, including how well they have communicated with each other, solved problems, resolved conflict and divided work fairly between the team. This mark should be informed by teacher observation of teamwork and questioning of team members individually and collectively.

Personal Element: Reflective Paper

AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation

The most successful candidates provided direct evidence of how far the Outcome had achieved the project aim. For instance, in the case of the example given above, a survey was conducted to assess the extent to which posters had changed behaviour. They had a percentage success rate and feedback about why others had made no or fewer changes to their practice. Where the aim is to raise awareness about an issue, a survey of the target audience before and after the awareness-raising session was often used successfully to show how far the Outcome was successful in achieving the aim. The very best responses also then made suggestions of ways in which the Outcome could be improved, drawing on the weaknesses identified.

Less successful responses often simply described the Outcome and the process by which it was produced. Where there was evaluation, these responses explained only weaknesses or strengths. Examples used were often about which team member took what actions, rather than details of the Outcome that were felt to support the team in meeting its aims and aspects that did not. Suggestions for improvement were not linked to any weakness identified.

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

More commonly, candidates were unclear on the difference between 'strengths/limitations of own work processes' and 'strengths/weaknesses of own performance as a team member'. Other candidates who were able to discriminate between the two areas did not do this in a balanced way, focusing on just strengths or just weaknesses of their work processes.

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

AO2 Reflection

This assessment objective requires candidates to reflect on the overall benefits and challenges of working in a group situation, as opposed to working alone and they need to provide specific examples drawn from their experience to illustrate their reflections. In the best responses, candidates commented that sharing work allowed the team to achieve more in a shorter space of time; or that it provided a greater pool of skills to draw on (giving examples from their project). Challenges of working in a team that were commonly mentioned include difficulties of communicating with other team members, organising meetings, dividing work equally and keeping all members on task. In the very best responses, candidates explained how these benefits and challenges impacted upon their project.

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

Reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of own performance as a team member is concerned with those things the individual does that either move the team forward or hold it back. It is about the individual's impact on the team as a whole. There were candidates who produced effective reflections. As a weakness, a candidate reflected that: 'I am a very shy person and not a confident speaker, so I let the others do all the interviewing and this meant it took much longer than it should have, leaving us short of time to develop our Outcome'. Giving balance, another candidate reflected that: 'I am really interested in making videos and am familiar with many different types of software, so I was able to use my expertise to make the video quite quickly, which gave each of us more time to work on our Reflective Papers'.

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

Guidance: Give candidates a reflective log to record examples while they are completing the project. This could include examples of when working as a team helped them to achieve something positive; when working as a team was difficult, and why; when they did something positive to help the team achieve their goal; when their performance had a negative effect on the team.

In reflecting on what they have learned about different cultural perspectives, candidates should not just consider what they have learned, but should think about whether and how their learning has made them think differently about those cultures or has changed what they do or how they behave. In other words, what impact this learning has had on them. For instance, from the research into water shortages a candidate had learned that actions in rural areas affect water availability across the whole country, giving them a determination to spread the learning from their research with the working community.

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

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

AO3 Communication

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

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

Where this individual research has involved secondary research, candidates must include citation and referencing. This referencing should be included in the Reflective Paper and detail the author, date, title, URL and date accessed for all sources used, in a consistent format.

Teacher Assessment

The Individual Candidate Record Cards (ICRC) must be completed by teachers. Teachers are requested to comment on the ICRC only. Teachers are reminded that they must include comments on the ICRC to support/explain the marks awarded and they should use the wording from the assessment criteria level descriptors when formulating these supporting comments. Changes made through internal moderation should be explained through the wording and marks on the ICRC. Any internal moderation should be completed before these final marks are submitted.