

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/01
Individual Research

Key Messages

- Candidates should produce two essays for their Individual Research (IR) reports. Each essay should have a question as a title and sub-headings linked to the assessment criteria to help candidates structure the report. Reports must be written in a candidate's own words. Each report should have a reference list at the end of it.
- Multimedia should be avoided for this component in favour of a word document so that word counts can be checked and allowing candidates to fulfil the assessment criteria more easily.
- The questions for each IR should be written in the space provided on the Individual Candidate Record Cards (ICRC) so that it is clear which piece has received which marks. Candidates must choose two different topics, one for each report.
- Assessors should write brief comments in the spaces provided on the ICRC. This commentary should be linked to the assessment criteria and indicate why the particular mark was awarded.
- For each candidate in the sample, Centres need to submit the work (both IRs) and the completed ICRC with annotations. The Centre needs to also include the MS1 for the component and the completed Coursework Assessment Summary Form (CASF) for **all** candidates entered for the component not just that sample.
- The total marks on the ICRCs, the MS1 and the CASF should be the same. If internal moderation takes place the final mark submitted need to be made clear on all three forms.
- Centres must submit the work of the candidate on the lowest non-zero mark and of the candidate on the highest mark and a range in between these.

General comments

Candidates are producing interesting IR reports covering a variety of topics. Popular topics this examination series included: law and criminality, conflict and peace, climate change and disease and health. These topics generally lent themselves well to the IR, although candidates find it difficult to do justice to the personal response mark if they cannot really identify with the topic. This was sometimes evident with the topic of law and criminality.

In some instances candidates from the same centre were producing work on the same topic, which did not always lead to the best work, as some candidates were clearly not interested in the topic given or could not find relevant information. Better IRs indicated candidates' interest in the topic, and it was clear that a free choice of topic had been given, and that candidates had formulated their own questions. Most candidates this series used questions to focus their research and their reports, but some headings were still too broad; with candidates then struggling to find a focus or struggling to focus on one country.

Unfortunately, it is still evident that some candidates are exceeding the word count of 1500 – 2000 words as specified in the syllabus. Centres are asked to advise candidates to produce their work as word documents so this can be checked. Centres should monitor this situation and advise candidates accordingly. Where work is considerably less than the word count, candidates are unlikely to do justice to the full mark scheme and assessors need to recognise this. It is unlikely that work will score in Band 4 for criteria if the word count is significantly short of the recommended amount. Where the word count is exceeded, candidates give themselves an unfair advantage and this should be addressed by the centre.

Centres will appreciate that the work produced must reflect the assessment criteria and should be written in continuous prose. Some candidates are still providing primary evidence in the form of questionnaires, which is not needed. For this component candidates produce and submit two pieces of work only. There should also be a completed Individual Candidate Record Card for each candidate, a Coursework Summary Assessment Form and MS1 containing the marks for each candidate entered for this component.

Centres should ensure that each IR report is clearly labelled with the title of the piece in the form of a question which is the same as the title on the ICRC. Most centres are now submitting ICRCs with marks and the titles of the reports in the appropriate place and more are now providing useful comments related to the assessment criteria to reflect the marks awarded. This is to be encouraged.

Comments on specific questions

Teacher assessment

Many centres are clear about what is expected for candidates to be awarded marks in different bands and can identify pieces of work that fall into Band 2 or Band 3. Centres should ensure that there is sufficient evidence to award a mark for a specific criterion. Where an IR report met the assessment criteria fully, marks within Band 4 were awarded, and where there was limited information for one of the criteria, candidates were given marks in Band 1, although it was very rare for a candidate who has produced a report to be given no marks for any of the criteria, as there was usually something of value to be credited. Candidates should be advised that they must submit work they have written and that they are not allowed to copy and paste or lift work directly from websites. If work is used from a website, it should be placed in quotation marks, be short and used to back up a point and referenced in a list at the end of the report. If malpractice within a centre is suspected, candidates should be given the chance to produce another report for submission. Plagiarised work should **not** be submitted.

Gather information representing different perspectives

The majority of candidates were able to gather and present a range of information linked to the topic area using a range of sources. However, many are still writing what they have found out about a country, rather than looking at the issues from different perspectives. Candidates are advised to explore what different countries, groups and individuals think about the issues under investigation.

Analyse issues within the report

The skill of analysis continues to improve, with causes, effects and current situations generally considered in some detail. Candidates should be advised not to put information into tables as analysis becomes difficult and tables are included within the word count. More successful reports continue to cover fewer issues in depth rather than simply presenting a lot of unrelated issues. Centres need to remind candidates that to analyse an issue, candidates should consider the conditions related to the question being discussed and the possible causes and effects of these conditions, as well as the current situations. Some candidates are unsure what is meant by analysis and this is a skill that needs further development.

Identify and evaluate possible scenarios and formulate possible courses of action

This criterion still causes a variety of issues. Some centres misunderstand what is meant by possible scenarios and should explain to candidates that scenarios arise from answering the question, 'What if...?' This can be in relation to whether something continues or not and should be linked to the issue under discussion not made up; so becoming superficial to the rest of the work done. For example, what might happen to the country's economy if everyone stopped smoking? Where candidates had thought about possible scenarios, they sometimes considered the likelihood of these scenarios, and were awarded marks for evaluation. This is getting better, but is still not a regular feature of the work moderated. Simply putting that, 'yes, this is likelihood,' without explanation will not get candidates marks in Band 3 or above.

It is important to point out that proposals developed in a logical way will score better marks than those listed randomly at the end of a study because the candidate has run out of time or words or has not structured their study in such a way as to allow for possible courses of action to be formulated and developed. Courses of action should be in response to the possible scenarios and their likelihood and it is preferable that they are not already happening. Credit can be given for courses of action that are happening, although it is unlikely that top marks for this criterion will be awarded if this is the case.

Develop evidence-based personal response demonstrating self-awareness

Some centres continue to submit the self-evaluation form, which is no longer a requirement. The evidence for this part of the assessment should be embedded within the report, or included at the end, as was generally the practice. In this way candidates were able to fully engage with the question posed and the perspectives gathered, and there was meaningful personal involvement linked to the information gathered. Candidates successfully fulfilled this criterion if they could discuss what they had learnt from undertaking the research for the study, pointing to the evidence to support this, and considering how what they had learnt had changed their thinking (or not) about the issue and what they might or are doing/plan to do as a result. Personal responses should be linked to the research undertaken and not just vague statements about learning of a topic area.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02

Group Project

Key Messages

- Teachers are asked to ensure that the correct work is submitted in accordance with the guidance document – *Submitting Global Perspectives work to Cambridge*.
- Each group must submit the specific project plan they drew up at the start of the project, a write-up of their project and evidence of the project outcome itself, e.g. photographs, video clips, links to web pages, information leaflets etc.
- The write-up should explain what the outcome of the project was and how it was developed, including details of the cross-cultural collaboration and how this informed and/or supported the outcome.
- Group project outcomes must be specific and active, i.e. a project outcome is something that is actually produced, designed, carried out etc. General essays/reports that simply present information gathered by the group about the topic are not appropriate outcomes as they do not allow candidates to do themselves justice under the assessment criteria for the group project.
- Cross-cultural collaboration should be undertaken meaningfully. Candidates need to consider what information they need to gather in order to help them produce/develop their outcome and then consider who best to approach in order to gain that information.
- Individual evaluations need to be divided into three distinct sections: evaluation of project plan and process; evaluation of how far the outcome has achieved the aims set out in the project plan and evaluation of individual contribution to the project - what has been learned both from working as a group and collaborating cross-culturally. Evaluations need to show evidence of in-depth critical consideration if candidates are to score well.
- While some general guiding questions can help candidates respond fully in their individual evaluations, the use of very specific templates should be avoided as these tend to restrict the candidates' responses.
- Teacher assessors need to ensure that they provide some supporting comments to indicate how/where credit has been given on the Individual Candidate Record Cards (ICRC).

General Comments

This examination saw a wide variety of topics investigated by project groups. These included: modern-day slavery and the use of sweatshop labour; inequality in the treatment of indigenous peoples; the impact of exam-oriented curricula; the welfare of retired racehorses and animal cruelty; gay rights and the impact of human demand for food on other species. Project outcomes were also varied and included: promotional or informative videos, webpages, fundraising/awareness events, and various design proposals. In a number of cases, outcomes were highly appropriate and well-supported by cross-cultural research.

Comments on candidate response to assessment criteria

Production of a project plan

[Group assessment]

Generally, project plans were well done. Rationale and aims were clearly articulated and appropriate outcomes identified. Details of activities were provided, along with timeframes. It was clear that many groups had given careful thought as to how roles and responsibilities should be assigned in line with group members' strengths. Project outcomes need to be specific, active and actually carried out or produced. General research essays or case studies on the topic under investigation are passive and are not appropriate as project outcomes. Groups should avoid identifying more than one or two project outcomes. If several outcomes are intended, it can result in time management issues for the group and a problem for individual group members in terms of what they are able to cover within the word limit in their individual evaluation of the success or failure of the outcome in achieving the project's aims.

Representation of different viewpoints and perspectives (including cross-cultural)

[Group assessment]

There has been a progressive improvement in groups' use of different viewpoints and perspectives gathered through their research to support their project outcome. The strongest work showed clear evidence that careful thought had been given at the outset of the project to the nature of information required and the most effective means of obtaining, then using, that information. For some groups, it was the case that the most useful cross-cultural collaboration was with people overseas. Equally, several of the most successful projects drew on cross-cultural collaboration with people of a different culture within groups' own countries. Candidates should be advised that on its own, general internet research on the situation under investigation in different countries does not count as cross-cultural collaboration. In addition, while interviews with peers from other countries in the same school can provide a useful supplementary source of information, it should not replace cross-cultural collaboration with other, external parties.

Constructive participation in group work/activities

[Individual assessment]

Assessment of performance in this criterion must be based on concrete evidence recorded during teacher observations of group work in progress. Brief supporting comments must be included on the ICRC.

Evaluation of project plan and process

[Individual assessment]

Strong evaluations were characterised by their in-depth critical consideration of both the strengths and weaknesses of the project plan and the process of carrying out the project, including the research process and activities undertaken in developing/producing the outcome. This strong, critical consideration was then followed by carefully thought-out suggestions for improvement. Weaker evaluations were characterised by candidates' tendency to describe how things were done, rather than to evaluate. There was also a tendency to focus mainly on issues such as time management and inequitable work load. While there is nothing wrong with giving some consideration to these issues, if they become the sole focus of the evaluation, there is a danger that the evaluation may result in a lack of depth. In the different sections of their evaluations, candidates need to be advised about what constitutes evaluation of project plan and what constitutes evaluation of project process.

Evaluation of project outcome

[Individual assessment]

Generally, evaluations of project outcomes have shown steady improvement. More evaluations were consistently linked to the aims of the project. In the strongest evaluations, it was clear that the candidates had given a good deal of thought as to how they might effectively measure the success or otherwise of the outcome in achieving the project aims. Weaker evaluations tended to be descriptive in nature and lacking in depth, with little reference to the project aims. Some candidates struggled with the word limit because their group had several outcomes and it was difficult to cover all these in any depth within the word limit. Groups should be advised to take this into consideration when planning the intended outcome of the project.

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

[Individual assessment]

There were some strong evaluations of individual contribution. These tended to show a balanced and in-depth consideration of the positive aspects on candidates' contributions, as well as areas where their contribution could have been improved. Such evaluations also showed careful thought about the benefits of group work, as well as the challenges that had been faced. Very strong evaluations were generally characterised by the quality of their reflection on cross-cultural collaboration. This was generally because the cross-cultural collaboration the group had engaged in was meaningful and highly relevant, thus providing individual group members with a rich source from which they could draw their comments on the learning experience. In weaker evaluations, candidates struggled to find a great deal to say about their learning from the cross-cultural collaborative experience, either because the group had relied entirely on their peers in the school setting for their collaboration, or because their collaboration consisted solely of survey questionnaires sent randomly to overseas recipients. Candidates need to be advised that cross-cultural collaboration should play a key role in developing their project outcome and should not be considered as simply an 'add-on'.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/31

Written Paper

Key Messages

The key messages from this examination series are that:

- candidates are able to interpret information and evidence very well
- evaluation skills continue to improve but need to be developed further
- candidates are becoming more confident in describing their own perspectives and opinions
- the skill of using reasons and evidence to support and justify personal perspectives needs to be developed further.

General Comments

The Written Paper is based upon source material related to a global issue; this series the issue was related to health inequality. Within this context, the paper was designed to test candidates' ability to:

- identify and explore different perspectives on global issues
- analyse and interpret information and evidence
- identify gaps in evidence and suggest new lines of enquiry
- develop reasoning and provide evidence to justify a point of view
- evaluate evidence and arguments.

The quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be very good and improve; candidates and Centres are to be congratulated on their achievements. Many candidates are aware of different perspectives and understand the complexity of global issues. Candidates are also developing a critical awareness of globalisation and change. Similarly, many candidates are also learning to reflect upon their own perspectives and to consider the implications of global issues for their personal beliefs, values and lifestyle. Candidates have clearly undertaken stimulating, well designed courses that developed the skills to be tested.

From the evidence of candidate responses, the source material and questions were understood and accessible. The vast majority of candidates were able to respond to the questions appropriately and demonstrate positive achievement. The paper also differentiated successfully.

Candidates responded enthusiastically to the source material, especially in the more extended response questions. Candidates understood that there were a variety of different, competing perspectives on global in relation to issues surrounding health inequality. Candidates are becoming more confident in using their own experience and contemporary examples in their responses.

In general, the questions were answered competently and there were some excellent responses. In particular, most candidates were able to demonstrate high levels of achievement when analysing information and evidence from within the sources. Similarly candidates were able to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry and research to support decision making about issues. However the ability to evaluate other perspectives, evidence and reasoning continues to be more challenging for some candidates. In addition, candidates need to use reasons and evidence more extensively to support their own perspectives. Some candidates tended to describe and assert their views rather than explain and justify.

Examination technique was generally very good. Candidates seemed to have sufficient time for the tasks. The vast majority completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very few rubric errors. To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- give a range of reasons and several different types of evidence to support an opinion or argument

- avoid simple assertion, opinion and anecdotal evidence
- explain their answers fully by giving a range of reasons to support their point of view
- evaluate reasoning and evidence by referring to both strengths and weaknesses
- develop the analysis and evaluation of sources on a regular basis, especially through the comparison of different sources and arguments representing different perspectives on an issue of global significance
- explain the meaning of key concepts in critical thinking and research
- have regular opportunity to present and justify their personal perspectives on issues.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

(a) Candidates were asked to identify two reasons for poor health in developing countries from the source material. Candidates usually identified the following:

- poverty
- poor diet
- lack of knowledge about health
- not enough medical care
- governments can not afford more clinics and hospitals
- healthcare can not reach remote areas
- vaccinations are expensive
- people do not understand the benefits of vaccinations
- dirty water
- lack of sewage facilities.

Candidates were only awarded marks for reasons that were linked to the source. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified two reasons and were awarded maximum marks.

(b) Candidates were asked to explain why vaccination campaigns were not always successful, using the source material and their own background knowledge. They were expected to give several reasons or some evidence for their opinion. Candidates usually gave the following reasons to justify their choice:

- vaccinations are expensive so many people cannot afford them
- people do not understand the benefits of vaccinations
- cultural bias against vaccinations
- people may be wary of possible side effects
- vaccinations do not always work
- widespread illness may be difficult to reach in remote areas – groups/countries/globally.

The strongest responses provided several clearly reasoned explanations clearly referring to vaccination campaigns and their success rates. Weaker responses tended to describe causes of poor health in general or lacked clarity.

Most candidates answered this question very well.

(c) Candidates were asked to explain why poor healthcare in developing countries is an important national issue. They were expected to give several reasons and some evidence for their opinion. Candidates usually gave the following reasons to justify their choice:

- benefits/consequences of poor healthcare locally and nationally
- benefits/consequences of poor healthcare for individuals applied to a national context
- benefits/consequences of poor healthcare job for global society applied to a national context
- issues of equal opportunities/fairness – issue of unequal access to resources
- need for access to healthcare as a human right for all
- in response to government, United Nations and other NGO humanitarian aims and goals e.g. millenium goals
- interdependence – we are all affected
- impact of poor healthcare on work and economic development
- impact of poor healthcare on education.

The strongest responses provided a clearly reasoned explanation of the way poor healthcare might have important consequences at a national level, often in a global context. Issues of culture, value and belief were also discussed by some, for example in relation to the fairness of the unequal distribution of healthcare resources. Weaker responses tended to list the impact of poor healthcare in general and did not explicitly relate these to a national context. Weaker responses were often partial, lacked clarity and generalised.

Most candidates answered this question very well.

Question 2

(a) Candidates were expected to evaluate how well the writer supported their opinion about the need for more resources for healthcare from the government by considering the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence in the source.

(b) Candidates were most likely to discuss the following evaluative points:

- Strengths
 - factual evidence is used
 - several different types of evidence are used – opinion, factual, anecdotal, personal experience
 - evidence is generally relevant
 - evidence is related clearly and explicitly to the argument
 - evidence is used forcefully in a strongly worded argument
- Weaknesses
 - research evidence is not cited – the source and authorship are not clear
 - level of expertise of the writer/journalist is not clear – may have poor knowledge claims
 - there is no evidence of a statistical nature
 - arguments are asserted at times
 - evidence may be out of date
 - too much reliance on opinion
 - evidence is not easy to verify/check

The strongest responses were clearly focused on the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence in the source. These responses were balanced with a discussion of both strengths and weaknesses and a convincing overall assessment or conclusion reached. Weaker responses tended to have limited discussion and assert an opinion without reason or explanation. These responses tended to be generalised, tangential and lack clarity.

The majority of candidates were able to identify at least one or two strengths and weaknesses of the statement as evidence. Candidates should be encouraged to discuss both strengths and weaknesses when evaluating a source. Candidates might also consider how to improve the evidence and give some examples to demonstrate understanding.

(b) Candidates were expected to consider the types of information, sources of evidence and methods that could be used to test the claim that better pay and promotion for local doctors would make them continue to work in developing countries.

This question was designed to test candidates' ability to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry about global issues.

The strongest responses tended to suggest information, evidence and sources that were clearly related to the issue. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about health in general.

The most common responses suggested the following types of information, evidence and methods:

- Types of Information

- compare statistics/factual information on expenditure for health and doctors in individual countries and globally
- interview or questionnaire data
- expert testimony
- material from international NGOs, governments and pressure groups
- Sources of Information
 - national and local governments and their departments
 - international organizations e.g. United Nations; UNESCO
 - health provision experts
 - research reports
 - pressure groups, charities and non-government organizations
 - media and worldwide web
- Methods
 - review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents
 - research into government budgets for health
 - review of government statistics on expenditure on doctors and health
 - interview relevant experts and doctors
 - Internet search

Responses at the higher levels of response fully described information, evidence and sources that were clearly relevant to the issue supported by clear, reasoned and developed explanation of how the information may be used to help test the claim. Responses at the lower levels tended to be partial, generalised or lack clarity.

Question 3

- (a) Candidates were expected to identify an opinion in Rafaela's statement, and explain their selection, saying why it was an opinion.

The following opinions may be found in Rafaela's statement:

- some of the newer international charities, like the Bill Gates Foundation, are excellent
- they (the Bill Gates foundation) employ good quality people
- they have made real progress in distributing medicines

An opinion is usually defined as a personal view, attitude, perspective or belief which is not based on evidence and is not proven.

The strongest responses gave clear explanation of why the statement is an opinion showing good understanding of the nature of opinions. Weaker responses tended to identify an opinion from the statement successfully but did not clearly explain the reason why it was an opinion.

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified an opinion; the majority were able to explain their choice effectively to reveal understanding of the nature of opinions.

- (b) Candidates were expected to identify a prediction in Zhen's statement, and explain their selection, saying why it was a prediction.

The following predictions could be found in Zhen's statement:

- if we do not educate local people about personal healthcare they are more likely to become ill
- health will become worse

A prediction is usually defined as an assertion or statement about what might happen at some point in the future; something that is forecast in advance.

The strongest responses gave clear explanation of why the statement is a prediction showing good understanding of the nature of predictions. Weaker responses tended to identify a prediction from the statement successfully but did not clearly explain the reason why it was a prediction.

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified a prediction; the majority were able to explain their choice effectively to reveal understanding of the nature of predictions.

- (c) Candidates were asked to compare and evaluate the reasoning in Rafaela and Zhen's statements about poverty and healthcare. Candidates were expected to make a supported judgement with reasoned explanation about the effectiveness of the reasoning. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to evaluate the reasons and evidence used to support an argument. In responding candidates were encouraged to support their answers with the words and phrases in the statements and consider:

- the strength of their knowledge claims
- how reasonable their opinions are
- the reliability and validity of their evidence
- whether candidates accept their values and why.

Candidates tended to consider the following types of issue:

- quality of the argument
 - clarity
 - tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise
 - language
 - balance
 - counterarguments
 - how convincing the reasons were
- quality of the evidence
 - relevance
 - sufficiency – range/type/depth/detail
 - source
 - date – how recent
 - factual, opinion, value, anecdote
 - testimony – from experience and expert
- knowledge claims
- sources of bias
- likelihood of claims
- consequences of their ideas
- acceptability of the values to others.

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the reasoning with clear assessment of the value of the argument in the statements. This included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the reasoning worked with a focus on evaluation of issues, reasons, evidence, a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences and values. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion about 'whose reasoning worked better'. 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 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 little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response. The statements were rarely used directly or quoted in these responses.

Candidates found this question quite challenging. Centres are encouraged to give candidates opportunities to evaluate reasons and evidence in argument for a range of purposes during their courses in order to prepare for this type of question. Some key concepts in the evaluation of evidence and argument to consider would be:

- validity
- reliability
- bias
- authority
- expertise
- source of evidence
- sufficiency of evidence
- relevance of evidence
- facts

- opinion
- assertion
- values
- beliefs
- quality of reasoning/argument
- use and tone of language.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to assess the effectiveness of improving healthcare in reducing poverty. They may have considered the issue at global, national, local and individual levels. A judgement about whether improved healthcare can reduce poverty should have been made by the candidate. The candidates should have used the material found in the sources to support their arguments, but should also have gone beyond simply repeating or recycling without adaptation. Other material may have been introduced but it was not necessary to gain full marks.

Candidates tended to consider the impact of healthcare improvements on poverty, for example:

- increased access to education
- increased access to work and employability
- more productive work force created
- more economic growth.

Some candidates also considered and compared alternative ways to reduce poverty, for example:

- government action to create economic growth
- more jobs
- higher incomes
- more education.

The arguments used to consider different methods/levels of action tended to include:

- reference to scale of impact – how many people are helped
- how long it takes to make a difference
- the effects of cultural differences and beliefs on attitudes to health and poverty
- barriers to change
- the power of collective action
- the difficulties of changing individual behaviour
- the influence of individuals and groups acting locally
- the role of vested interests and power differences
- potential conflict of interest and alternative uses of resources
- cost and access to resources to implement change.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the effectiveness of specific healthcare improvements on reducing poverty. Their responses included coherent, structured argument and evaluation. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and focus on health in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted.

In preparation for this type of question, Centres are encouraged to give candidates regular opportunity to write extended essays in which they contrast and compare different perspectives on an issue. In so doing candidates need to analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence for each of the perspectives being explored. 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. Opportunity to create arguments in support of a claim or an opinion using material drawn from sources would also be of value.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/32

Written Paper

Key Messages

The key messages from this examination series are that:

- candidates are able to interpret information and evidence very well
- evaluation skills continue to improve but need to be developed further
- candidates are becoming more confident in describing their own perspectives and opinions
- the skill of using reasons and evidence to support and justify personal perspectives needs to be developed further.

General Comments

The Written Paper is based upon source material related to a global issue; this series the issue was related to health inequality. Within this context, the paper was designed to test candidates' ability to:

- identify and explore different perspectives on global issues
- analyse and interpret information and evidence
- identify gaps in evidence and suggest new lines of enquiry
- develop reasoning and provide evidence to justify a point of view
- evaluate evidence and arguments.

The quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be very good and improve; candidates and Centres are to be congratulated on their achievements. Many candidates are aware of different perspectives and understand the complexity of global issues. Candidates are also developing a critical awareness of globalisation and change. Similarly, many candidates are also learning to reflect upon their own perspectives and to consider the implications of global issues for their personal beliefs, values and lifestyle. Candidates have clearly undertaken stimulating, well designed courses that developed the skills to be tested.

From the evidence of candidate responses, the source material and questions were understood and accessible. The vast majority of candidates were able to respond to the questions appropriately and demonstrate positive achievement. The paper also differentiated successfully.

Candidates responded enthusiastically to the source material, especially in the more extended response questions. Candidates understood that there were a variety of different, competing perspectives on global in relation to issues surrounding health inequality. Candidates are becoming more confident in using their own experience and contemporary examples in their responses.

In general, the questions were answered competently and there were some excellent responses. In particular, most candidates were able to demonstrate high levels of achievement when analysing information and evidence from within the sources. Similarly candidates were able to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry and research to support decision making about issues. However the ability to evaluate other perspectives, evidence and reasoning continues to be more challenging for some candidates. In addition, candidates need to use reasons and evidence more extensively to support their own perspectives. Some candidates tended to describe and assert their views rather than explain and justify.

Examination technique was generally very good. Candidates seemed to have sufficient time for the tasks. The vast majority completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very few rubric errors. To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- give a range of reasons and several different types of evidence to support an opinion or argument

- avoid simple assertion, opinion and anecdotal evidence
- explain their answers fully by giving a range of reasons to support their point of view
- evaluate reasoning and evidence by referring to both strengths and weaknesses
- develop the analysis and evaluation of sources on a regular basis, especially through the comparison of different sources and arguments representing different perspectives on an issue of global significance
- explain the meaning of key concepts in critical thinking and research
- have regular opportunity to present and justify their personal perspectives on issues.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

(a) Candidates were asked to identify two reasons for poor health in developing countries from the source material. Candidates usually identified the following:

- poverty
- poor diet
- lack of knowledge about health
- not enough medical care
- governments can not afford more clinics and hospitals
- healthcare can not reach remote areas
- vaccinations are expensive
- people do not understand the benefits of vaccinations
- dirty water
- lack of sewage facilities.

Candidates were only awarded marks for reasons that were linked to the source. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified two reasons and were awarded maximum marks.

(b) Candidates were asked to explain why vaccination campaigns were not always successful, using the source material and their own background knowledge. They were expected to give several reasons or some evidence for their opinion. Candidates usually gave the following reasons to justify their choice:

- vaccinations are expensive so many people cannot afford them
- people do not understand the benefits of vaccinations
- cultural bias against vaccinations
- people may be wary of possible side effects
- vaccinations do not always work
- widespread illness may be difficult to reach in remote areas – groups/countries/globally.

The strongest responses provided several clearly reasoned explanations clearly referring to vaccination campaigns and their success rates. Weaker responses tended to describe causes of poor health in general or lacked clarity.

Most candidates answered this question very well.

(c) Candidates were asked to explain why poor healthcare in developing countries is an important national issue. They were expected to give several reasons and some evidence for their opinion. Candidates usually gave the following reasons to justify their choice:

- benefits/consequences of poor healthcare locally and nationally
- benefits/consequences of poor healthcare for individuals applied to a national context
- benefits/consequences of poor healthcare job for global society applied to a national context
- issues of equal opportunities/fairness – issue of unequal access to resources
- need for access to healthcare as a human right for all
- in response to government, United Nations and other NGO humanitarian aims and goals e.g. millenium goals
- interdependence – we are all affected
- impact of poor healthcare on work and economic development
- impact of poor healthcare on education.

The strongest responses provided a clearly reasoned explanation of the way poor healthcare might have important consequences at a national level, often in a global context. Issues of culture, value and belief were also discussed by some, for example in relation to the fairness of the unequal distribution of healthcare resources. Weaker responses tended to list the impact of poor healthcare in general and did not explicitly relate these to a national context. Weaker responses were often partial, lacked clarity and generalised.

Most candidates answered this question very well.

Question 2

(a) Candidates were expected to evaluate how well the writer supported their opinion about the need for more resources for healthcare from the government by considering the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence in the source.

(b) Candidates were most likely to discuss the following evaluative points:

- Strengths
 - factual evidence is used
 - several different types of evidence are used – opinion, factual, anecdotal, personal experience
 - evidence is generally relevant
 - evidence is related clearly and explicitly to the argument
 - evidence is used forcefully in a strongly worded argument
- Weaknesses
 - research evidence is not cited – the source and authorship are not clear
 - level of expertise of the writer/journalist is not clear – may have poor knowledge claims
 - there is no evidence of a statistical nature
 - arguments are asserted at times
 - evidence may be out of date
 - too much reliance on opinion
 - evidence is not easy to verify/check

The strongest responses were clearly focused on the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence in the source. These responses were balanced with a discussion of both strengths and weaknesses and a convincing overall assessment or conclusion reached. Weaker responses tended to have limited discussion and assert an opinion without reason or explanation. These responses tended to be generalised, tangential and lack clarity.

The majority of candidates were able to identify at least one or two strengths and weaknesses of the statement as evidence. Candidates should be encouraged to discuss both strengths and weaknesses when evaluating a source. Candidates might also consider how to improve the evidence and give some examples to demonstrate understanding.

(b) Candidates were expected to consider the types of information, sources of evidence and methods that could be used to test the claim that better pay and promotion for local doctors would make them continue to work in developing countries.

This question was designed to test candidates' ability to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry about global issues.

The strongest responses tended to suggest information, evidence and sources that were clearly related to the issue. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about health in general.

The most common responses suggested the following types of information, evidence and methods:

- Types of Information

- compare statistics/factual information on expenditure for health and doctors in individual countries and globally
- interview or questionnaire data
- expert testimony
- material from international NGOs, governments and pressure groups
- Sources of Information
 - national and local governments and their departments
 - international organizations e.g. United Nations; UNESCO
 - health provision experts
 - research reports
 - pressure groups, charities and non-government organizations
 - media and worldwide web
- Methods
 - review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents
 - research into government budgets for health
 - review of government statistics on expenditure on doctors and health
 - interview relevant experts and doctors
 - Internet search

Responses at the higher levels of response fully described information, evidence and sources that were clearly relevant to the issue supported by clear, reasoned and developed explanation of how the information may be used to help test the claim. Responses at the lower levels tended to be partial, generalised or lack clarity.

Question 3

- (a) Candidates were expected to identify an opinion in Rafaela's statement, and explain their selection, saying why it was an opinion.

The following opinions may be found in Rafaela's statement:

- some of the newer international charities, like the Bill Gates Foundation, are excellent
- they (the Bill Gates foundation) employ good quality people
- they have made real progress in distributing medicines

An opinion is usually defined as a personal view, attitude, perspective or belief which is not based on evidence and is not proven.

The strongest responses gave clear explanation of why the statement is an opinion showing good understanding of the nature of opinions. Weaker responses tended to identify an opinion from the statement successfully but did not clearly explain the reason why it was an opinion.

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified an opinion; the majority were able to explain their choice effectively to reveal understanding of the nature of opinions.

- (b) Candidates were expected to identify a prediction in Zhen's statement, and explain their selection, saying why it was a prediction.

The following predictions could be found in Zhen's statement:

- if we do not educate local people about personal healthcare they are more likely to become ill
- health will become worse

A prediction is usually defined as an assertion or statement about what might happen at some point in the future; something that is forecast in advance.

The strongest responses gave clear explanation of why the statement is a prediction showing good understanding of the nature of predictions. Weaker responses tended to identify a prediction from the statement successfully but did not clearly explain the reason why it was a prediction.

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified a prediction; the majority were able to explain their choice effectively to reveal understanding of the nature of predictions.

- (c) Candidates were asked to compare and evaluate the reasoning in Rafaela and Zhen's statements about poverty and healthcare. Candidates were expected to make a supported judgement with reasoned explanation about the effectiveness of the reasoning. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to evaluate the reasons and evidence used to support an argument. In responding candidates were encouraged to support their answers with the words and phrases in the statements and consider:

- the strength of their knowledge claims
- how reasonable their opinions are
- the reliability and validity of their evidence
- whether candidates accept their values and why.

Candidates tended to consider the following types of issue:

- quality of the argument
 - clarity
 - tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise
 - language
 - balance
 - counterarguments
 - how convincing the reasons were
- quality of the evidence
 - relevance
 - sufficiency – range/type/depth/detail
 - source
 - date – how recent
 - factual, opinion, value, anecdote
 - testimony – from experience and expert
- knowledge claims
- sources of bias
- likelihood of claims
- consequences of their ideas
- acceptability of the values to others.

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the reasoning with clear assessment of the value of the argument in the statements. This included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the reasoning worked with a focus on evaluation of issues, reasons, evidence, a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences and values. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion about 'whose reasoning worked better'. 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 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 little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response. The statements were rarely used directly or quoted in these responses.

Candidates found this question quite challenging. Centres are encouraged to give candidates opportunities to evaluate reasons and evidence in argument for a range of purposes during their courses in order to prepare for this type of question. Some key concepts in the evaluation of evidence and argument to consider would be:

- validity
- reliability
- bias
- authority
- expertise
- source of evidence
- sufficiency of evidence
- relevance of evidence
- facts

- opinion
- assertion
- values
- beliefs
- quality of reasoning/argument
- use and tone of language.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to assess the effectiveness of improving healthcare in reducing poverty. They may have considered the issue at global, national, local and individual levels. A judgement about whether improved healthcare can reduce poverty should have been made by the candidate. The candidates should have used the material found in the sources to support their arguments, but should also have gone beyond simply repeating or recycling without adaptation. Other material may have been introduced but it was not necessary to gain full marks.

Candidates tended to consider the impact of healthcare improvements on poverty, for example:

- increased access to education
- increased access to work and employability
- more productive work force created
- more economic growth.

Some candidates also considered and compared alternative ways to reduce poverty, for example:

- government action to create economic growth
- more jobs
- higher incomes
- more education.

The arguments used to consider different methods/levels of action tended to include:

- reference to scale of impact – how many people are helped
- how long it takes to make a difference
- the effects of cultural differences and beliefs on attitudes to health and poverty
- barriers to change
- the power of collective action
- the difficulties of changing individual behaviour
- the influence of individuals and groups acting locally
- the role of vested interests and power differences
- potential conflict of interest and alternative uses of resources
- cost and access to resources to implement change.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the effectiveness of specific healthcare improvements on reducing poverty. Their responses included coherent, structured argument and evaluation. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and focus on health in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted.

In preparation for this type of question, Centres are encouraged to give candidates regular opportunity to write extended essays in which they contrast and compare different perspectives on an issue. In so doing candidates need to analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence for each of the perspectives being explored. 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. Opportunity to create arguments in support of a claim or an opinion using material drawn from sources would also be of value.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/33

Written Paper

Key Messages

The key messages from this series are that:

- candidates are able to interpret information and evidence very well
- evaluation skills continue to improve but need to be developed further
- candidates are becoming more confident in describing their own perspectives and opinions
- the skill of using reasons and evidence to support and justify personal perspectives needs to be developed further.

General Comments

The Written Paper is based upon source material related to a global issue; this series the issue was related to international sport. Within this context, the paper was designed to test candidates' ability to:

- identify and explore different perspectives on global issues
- analyse and interpret information and evidence
- identify gaps in evidence and suggest new lines of enquiry
- develop reasoning and provide evidence to justify a point of view
- evaluate evidence and arguments.

The quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be very good and improve; candidates and Centres are to be congratulated on their achievements. Many candidates are aware of different perspectives and understand the complexity of global issues. Candidates are also developing a critical awareness of globalisation and change. Similarly, many candidates are also learning to reflect upon their own perspectives and to consider the implications of global issues for their personal beliefs, values and lifestyle. Candidates have clearly undertaken stimulating, well designed courses that developed the skills to be tested.

From the evidence of candidate responses, the source material and questions were understood and accessible. The vast majority of candidates were able to respond to the questions appropriately and demonstrate positive achievement. The paper also differentiated successfully.

Candidates responded enthusiastically to the source material, especially in the more extended response questions. Candidates understood that there were a variety of different, competing perspectives in relation to issues surrounding international sport. Candidates are becoming more confident in using their own experience and contemporary examples in their responses.

In general, the questions were answered competently and there were some excellent responses to all of the questions. In particular, most candidates were able to demonstrate high levels of achievement when analysing information and evidence from within the sources. Similarly candidates were able to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry and research to support decision making about issues. However the ability to evaluate other perspectives, evidence and reasoning continues to be more challenging for some candidates. In addition, candidates need to use reasons and evidence more extensively to support their own perspectives. Some candidates tended to describe and assert their views rather than explain and justify.

Examination technique was generally very good. Candidates seemed to have sufficient time for the tasks. The vast majority completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- give a range of reasons and several different types of evidence to support an opinion or argument
- avoid simple assertion, opinion and anecdotal evidence
- explain their answers fully by giving a range of reasons to support their point of view
- evaluate reasoning and evidence by referring to both strengths and weaknesses
- practice the analysis and evaluation of sources on a regular basis, especially through the comparison of different sources and arguments representing different perspectives on an issue of global significance
- explain the meaning of key concepts in critical thinking and research
- have regular opportunity to present and justify their own perspectives on issues.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a) Candidates were asked to identify which country achieved the highest number of gold medals in the London 2012 Olympics from the source material. Virtually all candidates correctly identified the country as the USA.
- (b) Candidates were asked to identify which country achieved the lowest number of silver medals in the Beijing 2008 Olympics from the source material. Virtually all candidates correctly identified the country as Germany.
- (c) Candidates were asked to identify one change in the medal tables from 2008 to 2012 within the source material.

Most candidates correctly identified a change and described this accurately; most candidates described a change in the number of medals achieved by a country between the different Olympic Games.

- (d) Candidates were asked to suggest a reason for the change identified in **Question 1c**. Most candidates were able to give a relevant reason for the change in the medal tables. Candidates tended to identify reasons related to:
- funding
 - training
 - coaching
 - advantages of home venues
 - changes in the ability and talents of the athletes and teams.

The strongest answers provided a clearly reasoned explanation for the identified change in the medal table. Weaker responses simply stated a reason and may have lacked clarity.

- (e) Candidates were asked to suggest a way to increase the number of medals a country might achieve at the Olympic Games. Most candidates were able to give a relevant suggestion. Candidates tended to identify ways to increase the number of medals related to:
- funding
 - training
 - coaching
 - increasing the pool of ability amongst athletes and teams
 - improved scouting for talent.

- (f) Candidates were asked to give a benefit of the Olympic Games suggested by the poem in source 2. Most candidates were able to give a relevant suggestion. Candidates tended to give the following benefits:
- peace
 - stopping war
 - reducing trouble and strife
 - taking part
 - not winning

- nations uniting
- enabling someone to be true to their heart/fulfill ambitions.

(g) Candidates were asked to explain the benefit of the Olympic Games given from the poem in source 2 in answer to **Question 1f**.

Stronger responses were supported by clear reasoning and explanation justifying the candidate's opinion. These responses usually contained three or four reasoned arguments to support the view expressed, clearly and explicitly related to the benefit of the Olympic Games identified.

Weaker responses tended to give asserted statements. Responses were often partial or generalised, or simply repeated source material.

Question 2

(a) Candidates were expected to suggest information they would need to know in order to make a decision about applying for a voluntary post supporting a sporting event. This question was designed to test candidates' ability to identify further lines of enquiry about global issues.

The strongest responses tended to suggest information that was clearly related to the issue. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about dress codes or pay, though the latter was not relevant as the post was voluntary.

The most common responses suggested the following types of information:

- hours to be worked
- type of accommodation
- health and safety issues
- location of the work
- how it is decided who will do what work
- skills needed
- type of work
- type of sports
- characteristics of the people that will be supported.

Responses at the higher levels fully described information that was clearly relevant to the issue supported by clear, reasoned and developed explanation of how the information may be used to help make a decision about whether or not to participate as a volunteer. Responses at the lower levels tended to be partial, generalised or lack clarity.

Candidates should be encouraged to express their answers in terms of 'what if' statements, for example, 'if this information is given ... then ... I could decide to ... because ...'

(b) Candidates were expected to suggest additional information for the same purpose as in **Question 2a**. Responses were therefore very similar to those for **Question 2a**.

Question 3

(a) Candidates were expected to identify a value judgement in Lara's blog, and explain their selection, saying why it was a value judgement.

A value judgement in the Lara's blog was:

'In some countries, people are moved from their homes ... this is not fair as they might have lived there all of their lives.'

A value judgement is usually regarded as a view or decision about the desirability of something based on beliefs. It usually considers the fairness or morality of something.

The strongest responses gave clear explanation of why the statement is a value judgement showing good understanding of the nature of value judgements. Weaker responses tended to identify a value judgement from the blog successfully but did not explain clearly the reason why it was a value judgement.

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified a value judgement; the majority were able to explain their choice effectively to reveal understanding of the nature of value judgements.

- (b)** Candidates were asked to evaluate Aina's statement about the advantages and disadvantages of the Olympic Games. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to evaluate arguments or claims.

Candidates tended to explore the following aspects of the statement:

- the balance of the statement; no disadvantages were explored
- there were few counterarguments
- only a limited range of arguments were explored; for example about media coverage of sport
- limited range of evidence
- no sources
- uses opinion rather than research evidence
- no factual or statistical evidence.

The strongest responses tended to be clearly focused upon the statement, and its possible strengths and weaknesses. These responses were balanced with a convincing overall assessment or conclusion reached. Weaker responses tended to have limited discussion and assert an opinion without reason or explanation. Responses at the lowest level tended to lack clarity, be generalised and tangential.

The majority of candidates were able to identify at least one or two strengths or weaknesses of the statement.

- (c)** Candidates were asked to evaluate Xin Lee's reasoning in support of his views about the Olympic Games. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to evaluate arguments or claims.

Candidates tended to explore the following aspects of the statement:

- quality of the argument
 - clarity
 - tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise
 - language
 - balance
- quality of the evidence
 - relevance
 - sufficiency – sample
 - source – media; radio
 - date – how recent?
 - factual, opinion, value, anecdote
 - testimony – from experience and expert
- knowledge claims
- the reasons given to support the claim.

The strongest responses tended to be clearly focused upon the statement, and its possible strengths and weaknesses. These responses were balanced with a convincing overall assessment or conclusion reached.

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the reasoning with a clear assessment of the value of the argument in the statement; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the reasoning worked with a focus on evaluation of issues, reasons and evidence, with a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences and values. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion. The statement was also explicitly quoted and used directly in the response.

At the lower levels of response the discussion was unlikely to be supported and mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. There was little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response. The statement was rarely used directly or quoted in these responses. Responses at the lowest level tended to lack clarity, be generalised and tangential.

The majority of candidates were able to identify some evaluative points. However candidates found this question quite challenging.

Candidates should be encouraged to evaluate in a balanced way and to discuss both strengths and weaknesses. Centres are encouraged to give candidates opportunities to evaluate reasons and evidence used in argument for a range of purposes during their courses in order to prepare for this type of question.

Some key concepts in the evaluation of evidence and argument that candidates should use are:

- validity
- reliability
- bias
- authority
- expertise
- source of evidence
- sufficiency of evidence
- facts
- opinion
- assertion
- values
- beliefs
- quality of reasoning/argument
- use and tone of language.

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 on an issue. In so doing candidates need to analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence for the perspective. 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.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to assess the effectiveness of sport in promoting peace and friendship. They may have considered the issue at global, local and individual levels. A judgement about whether sport can help promote peace and friendship should have been made by the candidate.

The candidates should have used the material found in the sources to support their arguments, but go beyond simply repeating or recycling without adaptation. Other material may have been introduced but it was not necessary to gain full marks.

The arguments used to consider different levels of response tended to include:

- reference to scale of impact
- how long it takes to make a difference
- the effects of cultural differences and beliefs
- competition vs cooperation
- the power of collective action
- the difficulties of changing individual/collective behaviour
- the influence of individuals and groups
- the role of vested interests and power differences
- potential conflict
- political intervention and interference
- potential opportunities for corruption
- potential opportunities for crime
- difficulties in coordinating globally and across different countries with independence
- governmental responses and action.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the effectiveness of sport to promote peace and friendship; this included coherent, structured argument and evaluation. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and focus on sport in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted.

As in question 3, 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 on an issue. In so doing candidates need to analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence for each of the perspectives being explored. 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.