

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/12
Written Examination

Key messages

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

- demonstrated very good skills of interpretation and analysis
- need to develop skills of evaluation to higher levels
- should 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 2018, the examination was based upon source material related to the topic of Law and Criminality. The specific issue explored was about taking action to reduce crime.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Many candidates are clearly developing an excellent understanding of different perspectives on global issues and an ability to use reasoning and evidence to support an opinion or claim. Candidates are also able to analyse evidence in a variety of different forms. However, some 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 with the issue enthusiastically. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in relation to methods of reducing crime at an individual and national level.

Examination technique was usually good. The majority of candidates completed the questions within the time allocated. There were few 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 by giving examples to justify opinion rather than simple assertion or description
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking, including expertise, knowledge claims, bias, tone and vested interest.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Nearly all candidates identified the country with the highest prison population from Source 1 as the USA, and therefore gained the maximum of 1 mark for this question.
- (b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two causes of crime from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of 2 marks for this question.

- (c) Most candidates responded well to this question and clearly suggested a cause of crime that, in their opinion, was the most significant. Most candidates chose to discuss poverty, the influence of drugs and alcohol, and ignorance of the law. 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 cause was more important than others and gave some evidence to support their judgements. Less successful responses often simply stated the cause without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion without evidence or careful reasoning. Some candidates compared the significance of different causes, but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

- (d) Many candidates responded well to this question and could identify both a local and national consequences of crime, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concepts of 'local' and 'national' consequences.

Most candidates identified a local consequence of crime as people living in fear, loss of property and a need to protect children and vulnerable people. Some candidates explored harm to the local community and environment.

Similarly, most candidates identified a national consequence of crime as less tax paid to government, harm to the national economy and fewer resources for social services like education and health. Some candidates explored the cost of the criminal justice system and prisons.

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 crime in general without reference to 'local' or 'national'. The least successful 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 claim that, 'Parents can prevent crime by teaching children to obey the law'.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- clear reasoning which was easy to follow
- some research evidence was used
- several different types of evidence were used
- the evidence used was generally relevant
- the evidence was used forcefully in a strongly worded argument
- expert testimony from Professor Strong.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- the research evidence was only partly identified – the source and authorship was not always clear
- potential newspaper bias
- author unknown
- level of expertise of the author is not clear – may have poor knowledge claims
- little clear, specific statistical/numerical evidence
- the evidence was not easy to verify/check from the information provided
- the personal testimony/anecdote/values of the author may not apply to other places/countries, etc.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their opinions; weaker responses were often simply stated or asserted as 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) 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, 'Children commit less crime if they are praised and rewarded for good behaviour'. These methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe observation of families or a comparison of different approaches to child rearing involving differing degrees of praise and reward. Surveys of local people about childcare and crime, mainly using questionnaires and interviews, were also proposed by a significant number of candidates. Other methods included consultation with experts, social services and teachers. 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 regular opportunity to design research strategies to test claims as a regular part of their courses.

Question 3

- (a) Most candidates correctly identified a fact from the source and explained that facts are statements which are true and can be verified.

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

- (b) Most candidates correctly identified an opinion from the source and explained that opinions are statements that may not be verified and represent a subjective point of view or belief.

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

- (c) 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.

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

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

- (d) Most candidates compared Jacko's and Ria's statements explicitly and discussed issues relating to evidence, language, knowledge claims and expertise. Some candidates also successfully 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, which included a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences and values for both statements. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion. The statements by Ria and Jacko were also quoted explicitly by the most successful candidates and material from the statements was used directly as evidence to support the candidate's opinion.

Lower level responses were unlikely to be supported by evidence and tended to be mainly opinion-based 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 in the lowest level responses

Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to evaluate sources during their courses. This should involve 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 the best way to reduce crime is to reduce the gap between rich and poor. 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 about the impact of poverty and wealth inequality on levels of crime, as well as other methods for reducing crime. Alternative ways to reduce crime were often compared.

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.

Lower level responses 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 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 perspectives or actions.

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 develop 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 drawn from one of the eight topics listed in the syllabus and carry out research on a question based around this issue. This research should explore a range of information sources from different perspectives (global and national/local). Candidates must also analyse the causes and consequences of the issue and compare these to identify which is the most significant. Candidates must then propose a course of action to help improve or resolve their chosen issue, drawing on the analysis. Candidates also need to evaluate some of the sources of information they have used and reflect on how their personal perspective has been impacted by their research on the issue. They should also cite and reference the sources of information they have used in their report.

In this first session of the new syllabus, candidates produced interesting work on a wide range of different issues. The comments in this report are organised around the assessment criteria used to externally mark the component.

Comments on specific assessment criteria

Assessment Objective 1: Research, Analysis and Evaluation

Information from different perspectives

The most successful reports focused on a particular issue within the chosen topic and selected and presented information that genuinely represented different perspectives (different global or national/local viewpoints) on the issue. These perspectives were mostly drawn from secondary research though some candidates presented information from a local perspective drawn from primary research.

The very best reports presented a clear global perspective on the issue drawn from their research. This was usually in the form of a clear, well-researched viewpoint from a group, organisation or institution with influence that spreads beyond any one country. Examples included viewpoints from specific governmental bodies or charities such as the World Wild Fund for Nature (WWF). Further evidence was then given to confirm this global perspective. One successful example for a global perspective stated:

'According to the World Health Organisation, climate change is likely to have a major impact on available water resources by changing rainfall patterns and increasing the frequency of droughts around the world, including in China.'

Less successful responses often presented information about the issue/topic drawn from different places, but this information was not clearly from different perspectives.

Candidates need to show that they can research a range of information relevant to their question ensuring that different perspectives are expressed and developed. For example, to express a clear national perspective, one candidate wrote:

'I discovered that many Indians are conservative and believe that men can give back more to the family than women, that is, carry the family name and generate income whilst women are there only for household purposes.'

Analysis and comparison of causes and consequences

The most successful reports clearly focused on an issue and this focus allowed a clear analysis of the causes and consequences of the issue. For example, when exploring the issue of the negative impact of social media on family life, one candidate explained:

'India is known to be having the 2nd highest number of phones around the world. This is due to the call and text rates becoming as cheap as 2.5 cents, which is affordable for most people including teenagers.'

The most successful reports also compared the causes/consequences in order to identify the most significant causes and consequences of their chosen global issue.

In less successful reports, the issue under investigation was often unclear and therefore candidates were unable to explain and compare the causes and consequences of the issue under discussion. In other cases the candidates tried to address too many issues to be able to analyse them all in adequate depth within the specified 2000-word word count.

Some reports successfully identified causes and consequences of the issue in question but did not make comparisons. Candidates should be encouraged to give reasons why one cause/consequence is more significant than another. For example, this comparison by one candidate was well thought-out:

'In their natural habitat in the wild, an average dolphin's lifespan is around 40–50 years. Whereas in captivity, due to the fact that they receive a limited amount of food, get stressed from tourists and visitors, and are sometimes hurt while training, the average lifespan is only around 5–10 years. This shows that dolphins are less likely to become another extinct species if they are left in their natural habitat rather than kept in captivity purely to entertain humans.'

Course(s) of Action

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

'As well as replanting programs to promote reforestation, we need to spread awareness to others about deforestation and the reasons for deforestation and the damage it is causing. We can do this by talking to our friends and family and asking them to pass on this information to their friends. We can stop using so much paper and not print anything we don't need to so that further deforestation might become unnecessary if this was global action. We can also talk to younger members of the school community and raise their awareness about deforestation so they too think more about the products they use.'

In the most successful reports, the proposed course of action was related directly to the analysis of the causes or consequences of the issue. That is to say, the candidates drew on their analysis of the causes of the issue to propose a way to resolve it, or their analysis of the most significant consequences in order to propose a way to avoid these consequences.

While most candidates were able to offer some suggestions for courses of actions, many candidates proposed a number of brief and undeveloped suggestions which were unrelated to their analysis of the issue.

Evaluation of sources

Successful reports explicitly evaluated some of the sources of information used, using evaluative terms they have become familiar with while studying Global Perspectives such as 'bias', 'vested interest', 'valid', 'reliability', 'fact', 'opinion', 'prediction' and 'value judgment'. The most successful reports developed their

evaluative points; for example, explaining why the source may be biased. Some reports also evaluated how the source impacts on the overall argument in the report. For example:

'I've used information from 'Towards Food Sovereignty', which is reliable because the author has written many academic papers about localising food productivity and is therefore a reliable authority on the subject. His claims are credible as they are agreed upon by other sources I looked at so there is sufficient evidence to support my argument that local food production systems are a way of feeding a growing population. The drawbacks of this source are that it was published in 2009. However, it can be used because the situation described has not changed much. In fact, it is even more relevant.'

Assessment Objective 2: Reflection

Justification of personal perspective

The most successful reflection came from candidates who were able to reflect on how their personal perspective on the issue has changed or developed as a result of their research and the perspectives they have explored. Some candidates talked generally about how their view on the issue had changed, without directly linking this to the research they have conducted. The least successful reports simply offered a personal opinion on the issue. For example with simple statements such as: *'I think something has to be done about it.'*

Candidates should be encouraged to answer their question in a way which explicitly justifies and delves into their personal perspective.

Assessment Objective 3: Communication

Structure of the report

On the whole, reports were well-structured and easy to follow. Most candidates used sub-headings to structure their report; however in less successful responses the sub headings sometimes had little connection to the discussion contained under them. For example, many reports included the headings national perspective and local perspective but did not give these perspectives in the text which followed.

In the most successful reports, each section followed effectively from the last, with headings used to signpost key aspects of the report.

Some candidates presented their research in report style, with lists and bullet points which sometimes restricted the depth of analysis.

Clarity of arguments, perspectives and evidence

In the most successful reports, arguments, perspectives and evidence were clear and easy to follow. This criterion does not assess grammar, spelling, or written English, but rather how candidates are able to communicate the ideas, viewpoints, and research they have conducted. Where arguments were confused or difficult to follow, marks at the lower end of the mark range were awarded.

Citation and referencing

In the most successful reports, each source consulted was referenced, including author, date, title of publication, and if an online source, with the website address and date accessed. In-text or footnote citations were also used for direct quotations and where the ideas of others had been paraphrased.

In less successful reports, citations were incomplete and candidates failed to attribute where their evidence or quotations were from. Reference lists were sometimes attempted, but included just a list of web addresses.

The reference list does not need to be included in the word count.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/03
Team Project

Key messages

- Moderation can only take into consideration a single outcome and explanation and therefore candidates should not submit additional evidence of work; for example, planning documents, supplementary outcomes, etc.
- All members of a team must be awarded the same marks for the Team Element (Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration)
- Candidates should have some evidence of the success of their Outcome in meeting their aim before they begin work on their Reflective Paper.
- Candidates should be encouraged to keep an on-going reflective log to record examples of their work processes, suggestions for improvement, strengths and weaknesses of their performance as a team member and benefits and challenges of teamwork that they experience. These can then be used as examples in their Reflective Paper.

General comments

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 issue of improved waste management, while others looked at promoting good nutrition among impoverished local communities by introducing home gardens. Under the topic of disease and health, some teams focused on promoting the use of traditional cultural remedies while others looked at combatting the effects of poor diet among specific communities. Under the topic of sport and recreation, some teams chose to focus on improving access to sporting facilities to a local group of students, while others looked at using an element of the arts as therapy in schools. Outcomes were varied and included promotional videos, poems, songs, fundraising events and posters.

Comments on specific topics

Group Elements

AO3 Communication: Outcome and Explanation

Central to the Team Project should be the team's interest in an issue. The team should research different cultural perspectives about this issue and draw on this research to set a project aim. The team should then undertake a course of action to meet this aim and this should be evidenced in the Outcome. The Explanation should give the aim of the project, a description of the Outcome, and explain how Outcome was influenced by the different cultural perspectives researched by the team members. The Outcome should draw on the research that the team have conducted into different cultural perspectives but should not be about the gathering of the evidence; for example, interviews to gather views/perspectives are not an Outcome in themselves. The Outcome should be evaluated in a way that candidates can use evidence to show how far it was successful/not successful in meeting the aim.

Different cultural perspectives need to be communicated in the Outcome and an discussion of how different cultural perspectives influenced the development of the Outcome needs to be given in the Explanation. For example, if the group was interested in the issue of accessibility to drinking water, they could conduct research into water availability in different countries or regions of a particular country. This research may, for example, identify that access to fresh drinking water is not uniform and is hindered by over-use by some groups of people. The candidates could set an aim to teach children how to reduce water consumption. The Outcome could be a video that is shown to groups of local children.

The video could include examples of views on the topic from people from different groups in the country, or the team presenting views that they had learned about through desk-based secondary research. If these views were given before showing ways to reduce water consumption, then this would fulfil the requirement and different perspectives would be clearly evidenced.

Alternatively, on the topic of Poverty and Inequality, candidates might investigate the meaning of poverty in different cultures. In this case, they might consider the perspectives of: The United Nations, children at their school, a local shopkeeper and residents in different areas, such as a rural population. The aim of this might be to raise awareness about poverty locally and the outcome might be a school-wide advertising campaign reminding students of the importance of not wasting resources.

AO3 Collaboration: Teamwork

Assessment of performance in this criterion is based on evidence gathered during teacher observations of teamwork in progress. All members of a team must be awarded the same mark for this criterion. Teachers should consider how well the team as a whole work together to share resources and ideas, solve problems; how well they communicate as a team and how committed they are to teamwork throughout the process of completing the Team Project. Teachers do not have to submit evidence that they gather during observation.

Personal Element

AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation

AO1 requires evaluation of how successfully the Outcome achieved the aim. Successful reports often used an objective measure as evidence that the aim had been met – for example, a survey of learners before and after an awareness-raising session. The most successful reports then developed this into suggestions of ways the Outcome could be improved to better meet the aim.

In **AO1**, work process analysis is about the individual, NOT about the group. It covers time management and the effectiveness of personal research methods used and conclusions drawn. In the most successful reports, strengths and limitations were explained using developed examples. Successful suggestions for improvement often developed from limitations identified. For example, 'I was researching water and I made use of a few websites. However, later I found that there were specialist journals on environmental issues, and I would have been better looking there for relevant information.'

The most successful Reflective Papers included suggestions for improvements to both the Outcome and the candidates own work process and these suggestions were fully developed and explained.

AO2 Reflection

AO2 The focus here should not be on criticisms of the work of their team but rather reflection on the overall benefits and challenges of working in a team, giving examples of these benefits and challenges that they experienced. For example, they may recognise that sharing work out with a group means more can be achieved in a shorter space of time but also that this means you are now reliant on other people to complete their assigned work and managing and coordinating this can be challenging. In the most successful reports, reflections such as these were supported with clear examples from their projects.

In **AO2** strengths and weaknesses of own performance as a team member is about things the individual did that either moved the team forward or that may have held the team back. In the most successful Reflective Papers, candidates explicitly reflected upon how their actions affected the team. For example: 'I was not able to play my part in research fully because I was engaged in extra-curricular activities and this prevented us, as a team, from starting to develop the questionnaire that we needed'. Candidates must be aware that they should reflect on the strengths of their own performance as a team member, not just the limitations.

AO2 The most successful candidates considered how their learning about perspectives of people from other cultures made them think about the topic or issue differently or changed what they do or how they behave.

AO2 There are two aspects to the reflection on overall personal learning: reflection on skills that were developed (particularly those relating to teamwork), and reflection on learning about the issue. The most successful candidates reflected on the practical or emotional skills they acquired or developed through the process of completing the Team Project and gave explicit examples how this has happened. They also reflected on their learning about the issue in general.

AO3 Communication

AO3 this criterion requires the Reflective Paper to flow meaningfully with signposting to clarify the flow of ideas. In the most successful reports it was clear which paragraphs were about own work processes and which were about strengths and limitations of working as a team member.

AO3 It is expected that each member of the team will have been involved in personal research contributing to the overall project. In the most successful reports, candidates' personal research findings were made clear in the Reflective Paper. Where this research involves secondary sources these sources must be cited and referenced. This should be in a consistent format, including author, date, title, url, date accessed, etc.

Teacher Assessment

Teachers should add comments to the Individual Candidate Record Cards (ICRCs) but are not required to annotate the work or include additional school-produced assessment documents. Teachers should use the wording from the level descriptors in their supporting comments for the ICRCs.