GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

> **Paper 0457/01**
>
> **Individual Research**

Key Messages

- Candidates should produce two Individual Research reports with a research question as the title for each report.

- Sub-headings within the report, linked to the assessment criteria, should be used to help candidates structure their reports.

- For each candidate in the sample, Centres need to submit the Individual Research reports and a completed Individual Candidate Record Card (ICRC). This should contain notes linked to the assessment criteria to justify the marks awarded.

- Centres also need to include the Internal Assessment Mark Sheet (MS1) and the Coursework Assessment Summary Form (CASF) both of which should contain the marks awarded for all candidates entered for the component.

General Comments

The majority of candidates used appropriate research questions to focus their reports. It was clear that some Centres allowed candidates to choose their own questions, whilst others were more prescriptive. Please note that whilst candidates may choose the same topic for their Individual Research as their peers, their question should be different. Questions also need to allow candidates to conduct and present research from different perspectives; global, national/local and personal. Teachers can guide candidates with the formulation of their questions and should ensure that questions have a manageable scope. Questions about the impact of issues usually work better than those asking, 'to what extent?'

Many Centres submitted work covering a range of topics suggesting that candidates were given freedom of choice over which they chose for their Individual Research reports. Sometimes this worked well. At other times, candidates chose topics leading to more of a narrative response or an opinion piece. Candidates should be advised to choose global topics of relevance to them and their lives and phrase their question so that they can explore the issues from different perspectives; for example, 'What is the impact of substandard housing on health?'

Some candidates exceeded the word limit of 1500 – 2000 words as specified in the syllabus. Centres are asked to advise candidates to submit their work as word documents so this can be checked and they should monitor this situation and advise candidates accordingly. Candidates should also only include pictures and diagrams if they refer to them in the body of their work.

Centres will appreciate that the work produced must reflect the assessment criteria and should be in continuous prose. It must also be clear, through comments on the ICRC, how the marks have been awarded.

Comments on Specific Questions

Teacher assessment

Most assessors demonstrated a good understanding of the assessment criteria, although some were quite generous in their marking of this component and need to look more carefully at the requirements for Band 4 for each of the four criteria. Where an Individual Research report meets the assessment criteria fully, marks within Band 4 were appropriate, and Assessors should not shy away from awarding full marks where the evidence for this is provided. Where there is limited information for one of the criteria, candidates should be

awarded marks in Band 1. Assessors should decide on the most appropriate Band for each criterion and then decide whether the work meets the Band fully in which case the top mark should be awarded, or whether there is something missing and the work only meets the Band partially, in which case lower marks within that Band should be awarded.

Gather information representing different perspectives

The majority of candidates were able to gather and present more than a limited range of information linked to the topic area to answer their research question and this usually came from a range of sources, which were usually well referenced. Some candidates, however, ignored their question, and therefore produced little in the way of relevant information. Hence teachers need to guide candidates on their question and help them with planning at the outset. Candidates can have general guidance as a class once first drafts have been written but teachers should avoid specific, individual feedback to candidates from this stage onwards.

Centres should advise candidates that instead of giving information about other countries, they should be giving the perspectives of individuals or groups within those countries towards the issues raised. It is not enough for candidates to simply name countries, there should also be an indication of what these countries, groups and individuals think about the issue under investigation. The global perspective was possibly the weakest perspective this session and candidates need guidance on how to research and illustrate global perspectives on an issue. All work must be in the candidate's own words or quoted directly using quotation marks, and referenced fully. In addition, all sources must be acknowledged. For marks in Band 4, a broad range of relevant information should be presented and a range of highly appropriate sources used. Wikipedia is not considered highly appropriate so please advise candidates to avoid relying on this as a source.

Analyse issues within the report

Many reports demonstrated clear and thorough analysis, although some candidates seemed unsure how to analyse the causes and effects of issues. Candidates need further guidance in this and could start by identifying causes and effects and exploring how other authors analyse them. Many candidates simply listed causes and effects with little explanation. Current situations were generally analysed more effectively. Successful reports usually cover fewer issues in depth rather than simply presenting a lot of unrelated issues. Some reports were very factual, offering a narrative history and therefore tending toward description rather than analysis.

Identify and evaluate possible scenarios and formulate possible courses of action

This remains the most challenging criteria for candidates. Candidates were sometimes unsure about possible scenarios and how they should be generated and many reports did not leave enough word count to do this section justice. There are four criteria with equal weighting and this should be reflected in a candidate's work. Candidates need guidance in linking their possible scenarios (consequences) to their issues. Often possible scenarios and courses of action were generated without reference to the evidence. Some scenarios were fairly simple and there was an overall lack of creative thinking about possible scenarios and courses of action. Where candidates had thought about possible scenarios, they generally did not consider the likelihood of these scenarios. Courses of action were generally not developed.

Develop evidence-based personal response demonstrating self-awareness

Most candidates successfully used the evidence from the rest of their report to justify their response. Candidates often made reference to their life at home, in school or where they lived in relation to the question posed, possible scenarios and courses of action. Good reports usually identified things they had not realised before they commenced their research or described something that they will be do differently as a result of their research. The most successful reports explained how the candidate's thinking and behaviour had changed as a result of something they had found out whilst doing their research. Other candidates discussed what they had learnt from their research but did not link it to the evidence presented in their report.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

> **Paper 0457/02**
>
> **Group Project**

Key Messages

- The most effective project outcomes are those which involve some type of action such as the staging of an event; the production of an item or items; or concrete action or actions taken to address a local issue. Candidates need to consider carefully what their project is intended to achieve (i.e. their aim) and how this aim might best be achieved (i.e. their project outcome).
- Detailed project plans should be created at the outset of the project, in advance of research activities. They should not be written retrospectively as a record of event or series of minutes of meetings.
- It is not advisable to restrict cross-cultural collaboration to fellow group members or School friends who come from different countries, as this often does not provide a rich enough source for meaningful comment on what has been learned from cross-cultural collaboration in the individual evaluation of contribution and learning.
- In their group projects, candidates do not need to explore personal, local/national and global perspectives. Awareness of different perspectives should be reflected in meaningful cross-cultural collaboration. In addition, group projects need not involve consideration of future scenarios and courses of action.
- It is recommended that candidates sub-divide their individual evaluations into three distinct sections: evaluation of project plan and process; evaluation of project outcome (in respect of project aim) and evaluation of individual contribution and learning, including learning from cross-cultural collaboration.
- In addition to the candidates' marks, Individual candidate Record Cards must also include some brief comments under each of the assessment criteria explaining where credit has been given/how marks have been awarded.

General Comments

Once again, this examination session saw a wide range of topics and issues selected as the basis for group projects. There was a clear increase in the number of candidate groups choosing both active and creative project outcomes to achieve their project aims. Among these were the following: peer pressure and young people and the views on peer pressure held by different cultural groups (video as the outcome); the impact of stereotyping on young people (collage of captioned photographs as the outcome); raising awareness about the importance of organic burial plots (web blog as the outcome); the promotion of animal rights (organising a marathon for people and their pets as the outcome), and raising awareness about the effects of poverty and inequality through education and interactive technology (design and development of a website with an interactive quiz).

In the most successful projects, outcomes were well-supported by both Internet research and cross-cultural collaboration and provided a rich source for candidates to draw on in their individual evaluations. Less successful projects were often characterised by an absence of real and meaningful cross-cultural collaboration, with groups relying largely on secondary Internet research for information to inform the project outcome, which was often a piece of academic writing, in other words, a group research essay. As has been mentioned in many previous reports, case studies and general reports presenting research findings are not appropriate outcomes for the project component.

Comments on candidate response to assessment criteria

Production of a project plan

(Group assessment)

Project Plans continue to be one of candidates' strongest areas. This is largely because more candidates seem to be paying close attention to the wording of the description for the top band of marks for this assessment criterion. This descriptor makes very clear which elements candidates need to provide details of in their plans in order to gain marks in the top band and in following the wording closely, many candidates are achieving full marks for this criterion. Retrospective plans which are often based on minutes of meetings should be avoided because they make it very difficult to judge how realistic planned timeframes are. A detailed plan should be produced by the group at the outset of the project, before any further activities take place. It is perfectly acceptable for plans may be modified during the course of the project as this would be a sensible course of action if the plan is not working well, or unforeseen circumstances have arisen. Indeed, such modification could be an additional source to draw on in individual evaluations of the plan and process.

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

(Group assessment)

There seems to be a misconception that candidates need to carry out research at the local, national and global level for their group project, as well as engage in cross-cultural collaboration. **This is not the case**. Representation of different viewpoints and perspectives in the group project is focused on the requirement that candidates engage with people from a different culture either in their home country or overseas. Candidates should not sacrifice depth for breadth in their projects by trying cover local, national and global research, as well as trying to collaborate cross-culturally. On a similar note, candidates are required to consider future scenarios and suggest possible courses of action to deal with those scenarios in their individual research essays for Component 1 of the syllabus. They should **not** introduce scenarios and courses of action into their group projects.

The purpose of cross-cultural collaboration is to allow candidates to view a situation or issue from the perspective, or point of view, of people living in a different culture, by carrying out first hand research through their collaboration. They then use their findings to help them develop or produce the outcome by which they intend to achieve their project's aim. Therefore, candidates need to be very clear at the outset what the aim of their project is (e.g. raising awareness about an issue facing a different cultural group at home or overseas to encourage donations; addressing a local problem to improve the living conditions of a different cultural group at home or overseas etc.). They then need to decide on an outcome through which they can best achieve that aim (e.g. producing a video clip highlighting the plight of the group with the view to encouraging donations of food or clothing). After carrying out their research, candidates would need to carefully select which key findings are to be reflected/included in the outcome to have maximum impact in terms of achieving their aim and provide sound evidence of cross-cultural collaboration for assessment purposes.

Candidates should also be advised to ensure that, if their project outcome is a webpage, a video clip on YouTube, or something similar, they include a working link to it in their project write-up, otherwise it cannot be accessed by the external Moderator.

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 may be included on the Individual candidate Record Cards.

Evaluation of project plan and process

(Individual assessment)

There were some very strong evaluations of project plan and process. Generally, strong evaluations were characterised by in-depth critical consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of **both** the project plan (e.g. effectiveness in the allocation of roles; the planning of the activities and time-frames etc.) **and** the process of carrying out the project (e.g. the research, the production of the outcome; the degree of teamwork

and time management etc.). Some candidates adopted a very structured approach and further sub-divided their response into: strengths of plan; weaknesses of plan; suggestions for improvement and: strengths in process; weaknesses in process; suggestions for improvement. While such an approach might not be suitable for all candidates, it can help some candidates by providing a framework which allows all of the different elements within this assessment criterion to be addressed. Evaluations which simply describe what was done, by whom and how generally lacked the depth to access marks in the upper bands of the mark scheme.

Evaluation of project outcome

(Individual assessment)

Project outcome evaluations have shown signs of improvement this session. More candidates seem to have given some consideration as to how they might objectively measure how far their group's outcome had achieved the project aim and where it had fallen short. This measure sometimes took the form of a pre and post activity survey or interview. Some candidates devised quizzes to test what had been learnt, while others measured the success of donation drives by discussing what had been collected and its distribution. Individual group members were then able to discuss the implications of these in terms of how far their project had achieved its aim. Weaker evaluations were once again characterised by their tendency to be overly descriptive; lacking in depth and making little in the way of consistent reference to the aim of the project.

In cases where the outcome of the project was a research report; a case study; a letter to a politician or a debate, candidates did struggle to make an in-depth evaluation of what the strengths of their outcome were in terms of achieving the project aims and what its weaknesses were.

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

(Individual assessment)

The key point in terms of evaluating individual contribution and learning is that responses should be balanced. For instance, while all candidates detailed their own contribution to the project, some focused entirely on positive contribution, with little or no consideration given to any personal weakness or where personal performance could have been improved. Other candidates commented at length on their personal shortcomings, but did not then balance this with some reflection on their strengths as a team member. Candidates should be reminded that they also need to consider both the benefits and challenges of working as a group, as opposed to working alone. Very strong evaluations were often characterised by the quality of reflection on cross-cultural collaboration. This was generally because the cross-cultural collaboration the group had engaged in was meaningful and highly relevant to the project, thus providing individual group members with a rich source from which they could draw their comments on the learning experience. Where candidates had relied solely on the international nature of their School/group setting for their cross-cultural collaboration, they often struggled to produce a thoughtful evaluation.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

| Paper 0457/31 |
| Written Paper |

Key Messages

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

- performed well in the analysis and interpretation of information and evidence
- were able to use reasons and evidence effectively to support their judgements and claims
- need to develop evaluation skills more fully
- should have more experience in the critical comparison of arguments
- should use evidence to justify their opinions.

General Comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from a range of perspectives. In November 2015 the paper was based upon two different pieces of source material related to issues affecting the world's oceans.

The paper is designed to test candidates' skills of critical thinking and research, including the ability to:
- identify and analyse key issues
- distinguish between fact, opinion, prediction and value judgement
- identify and evaluate possible future scenarios and courses of action
- take into account different perspectives on issues
- make judgements based on evidence and on personal perspectives
- suggest a line of enquiry, outlining a possible approach to a research project
- evaluate sources, claims and the effectiveness of arguments
- develop a line of reasoning to support a judgement, decision or course of action.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good; candidates and Centres are to be congratulated on their achievements. Many candidates clearly enjoy thinking about global issues, appreciate the complexity of social, economic and technological change, and want to respond positively to the challenges posed by globalisation. They are clearly developing a critical awareness of global issues.

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 responded enthusiastically to the source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on global issues, particularly in relation to the world's oceans. Candidates had clearly undertaken stimulating and well-designed courses that were effective in developing the skills to be assessed.

In general, the questions were answered well and there were some excellent responses to all of the questions. In particular, most candidates were able to demonstrate high levels of ability when interpreting and analysing information from within the sources. Similarly, candidates were able to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry to support decision making and test claims about involvement in social action to support fish stocks. However the ability to evaluate argument (reasoning and evidence) continues to be challenging for some candidates.

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 few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- avoid simple assertion, opinion and anecdotal evidence when responding to questions
- explain their answers fully by giving a range of reasons and evidence for their point of view
- evaluate reasoning and evidence by referring to both strengths and weaknesses
- apply key concepts in critical thinking and research, for example validity, bias, reliability and expertise.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1a

Candidates were asked to identify two ways that the oceans affect their lives from Source 1. Candidates usually identified the following:

- emotions
- leisure
- livelihood
- food
- climate
- if it rains
- absorbs CO2

Candidates were only awarded marks for identifying ways that were contained within Source 1. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified two ways and were awarded maximum marks.

Question 1b

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, which effect of the ocean on their lives was the most important. They were expected to give several reasons and/or some evidence for their opinion. Candidates usually gave the following types of reasons to justify their choice:

- possible further consequences or effects
- benefits to self and others
- degree of impact/seriousness for individuals/countries/world
- how many people/groups/countries are affected
- how widespread the effect is
- how easy to pass on
- wider effects on the natural world
- impact on human ways of life and culture.

The strongest responses provided several clear reasons why one effect was more important than others; this often involved comparing the significance of different consequences. Weaker responses often simply stated the consequence without explanation.

Most candidates answered this question very well.

Question 1c

Candidates were asked to explain one way in which the actions of individuals affect ocean life. Most candidates explored:

- benefits and consequences of the action for oceans and the environment globally
- benefits and consequences for individuals, countries and the world
- benefits and consequences for human welfare – food, medicines, etc.
- issues of value and beliefs about the oceans/environment and the role of humans
- impact on ocean life and sea creatures
- morality – issues of right and wrong from different cultures
- responses to government, United Nations and other NGO aims and goals for the environment and the oceans.

The most successful responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanations. Other responses tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about the oceans in general.

Question 1d

Candidates were asked to explain one possible course of action an individual might take to reduce the effect they have on ocean life. Most candidates tended to discuss:

- reducing use of plastic/use reusable shopping bags, water bottles and utensils
- making informed (sea) food choices
- never pour chemicals, oil, or paint etc. into the drains or toilets
- choosing green (detergents, household cleaners etc.)
- eating fish from sustainable sources.

The most successful responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanations. Other responses tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about the oceans in general.

Question 2a

Candidates were expected to consider the types of information, sources of evidence and methods that could be used to test the claim that reducing the threat to the oceans is a priority for all countries.

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

The most successful responses tended to suggest information, evidence and sources of information that were clearly related to the issue. Other responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example, about ocean threats in general rather than priorities.

The following types of information, evidence and methods were most commonly suggested:

- Types of Information
  - compare statistics/factual information on public attitudes towards the oceans
  - 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
  - experts in the field
  - research reports
  - pressure groups, charities and non-government organizations
  - media and worldwide web

- Methods
  - review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents
  - research into public opinion
  - review of government statistics
  - interview relevant experts and environmentalists
  - internet search

The most successful responses 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. Other responses tended to be partial, generalised or lack clarity.

A few candidates simply described their own opinion about the oceans and did not answer the question directly.

Question 2b

Candidates were asked to suggest and explain one piece of information they might need to help organise a fish camp.

The strongest answers provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestion; weaker responses often simply stated an opinion but did not explain it.

Most candidates identified the following types of information:

- what type of support is given (funding; training; guidance; experts)
- whether fish camps are already organised in the local area
- the type of activities organized
- how long fish camps generally last
- when fish camps generally take place
- timing in the year.

Question 3a

Candidates were asked to consider how likely is it that "over-fishing will destroy the oceans by 2050".

Most candidates answered this question well. They tended to discuss the following issues about the argument in the source:

- use of evidence to support the claim
- the impact of current problems or trends affecting the oceans e.g. global warming and pollution
- the uncertainty of predictions
- the impact of environmental action
- intervening variables affecting trends
- over-exaggeration of the claim

The strongest answers provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their judgement about the claim; weaker responses often simply stated an opinion but did not explain it fully.

Question 3b

Candidates were expected to identify a fact from Source 2, and explain their selection, saying why it was a fact.

A fact is something which can be checked or proved; something that is true and which can be verified from experience and observation; a piece of information.

The following are the main examples of facts identified by candidates from Source 2:

- over 90 percent of people in Hawaii regularly eat seafood
- the Fish Trust provides support to fish camps
- Hawaii's coral reefs are valued at $10 billion
- ocean-dependent businesses generate $4.8 billion annually
- waters are threatened by coastal development, pollution, and destructive fishing.

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified a fact and most were able to explain their choice effectively to reveal an understanding of the nature of facts.

Question 3c

Candidates were asked to evaluate the reasoning in Source 2 and assess if the source was successful in persuading people that fish camps could help to reduce the threats to the oceans.

Candidates tended to discuss the following types of issue:

- quality of the argument
  - clarity
  - tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise
  - language
  - balance
- 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 and consequences of their ideas
- acceptability of the values to others
  - how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view

The most successful responses contained well-supported judgements about the argument with a clear assessment of the value of the reasoning in the statement; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument 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 about the potential effectiveness of fish camps. The source was also discussed explicitly, often with some relevant quotation in the response.

In less successful responses the discussion was unlikely to be supported and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues rather than reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response. The source was 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 help prepare for this type of question.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to consider if the threat to the oceans is most likely to be reduced by global, local or individual action.

Candidates were expected to use the material found in the sources, but go beyond simply repeating or recycling this material without further development. Other material may also be used but it was not necessary to gain full marks.

The arguments used by candidates to consider the effectiveness of the actions to reduce ocean threats tended to include:

- reference to scale of impact on individual/group/governmental/global behaviour and actions
- how long it takes to make a difference
- the effects of cultural differences and beliefs
- 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
- potential conflict
- difficulties in coordinating globally and across different countries with independence
- cost and access to resources to implement change
- governmental responses and action
- examples and evidence from personal experience

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the effectiveness of different actions to reduce ocean threats; 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 issues or threats to the oceans 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 or potential actions in response to an issue. In so doing candidates need to analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence for the perspective or action. Candidates also need to be able to describe and explain the reasons and evidence that have helped to shape their own points of view on global issues.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

> **Paper 0457/32**
>
> **Written Paper**

Key Messages

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

- performed well in the analysis and interpretation of information and evidence
- were able to use reasons and evidence effectively to support their judgements and claims
- need to develop evaluation skills more fully
- should have more experience in the critical comparison of arguments
- should use evidence to justify their opinions.

General Comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from a range of perspectives. In November 2015 the paper was based upon different pieces of source material related to issues relating to law and order.

The paper is designed to test candidates' skills of critical thinking and research, including the ability to:
- identify and analyse key issues
- distinguish between fact, opinion, prediction and value judgement
- identify and evaluate possible future scenarios and courses of action
- take into account different perspectives on issues
- make judgements based on evidence and on personal perspectives
- suggest a line of enquiry, outlining a possible approach to a research project
- evaluate sources, claims and the effectiveness of arguments
- develop a line of reasoning to support a judgement, decision or course of action.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good; candidates and Centres are to be congratulated on their achievements. Many candidates clearly enjoy thinking about global issues, appreciate the complexity of social, economic and technological change, and want to respond positively to the challenges posed by globalisation. They are clearly developing a critical awareness of global issues.

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 responded enthusiastically to the source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on global issues, particularly in relation to law and order. Candidates had clearly undertaken stimulating and well-designed courses that were effective in developing the skills to be assessed.

In general, the questions were answered well and there were some excellent responses to all of the questions. In particular, most candidates were able to demonstrate high levels of ability when interpreting and analysing information from within the sources. Similarly, candidates were able to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry to support decision making and test whether a new law has been successful. However, the ability to evaluate argument (reasoning and evidence) continues to be challenging for some candidates.

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 few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- avoid simple assertion, opinion and anecdotal evidence when responding to questions
- explain their answers fully by giving a range of reasons and evidence for their point of view
- evaluate reasoning and evidence by referring to both strengths and weaknesses
- apply key concepts in critical thinking and research, for example validity, bias, reliability and expertise.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1a

Candidates were asked to identify which country had a policy on birth rates from Source 1. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified China.

Question 1b

Candidates were asked to explain why the policy on birth rates might have been introduced in China. Most candidates discussed the following reasons:

- intended consequences – reduction in population/control of population
- increasing cycle of too many people creating lack of resources
- China already has a very large/highest population
- to reduce rapid growth in population
- to reduce problems of over-population e.g. economic difficulties

The strongest answers explained several clear reasons. Other responses often simply stated one reason. Most candidates answered this question very well.

Question 1c

Candidates were asked to identify the country where there is a law about running out of fuel from Source 1. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified Germany.

Question 1d

Candidates were asked to explain why the policy on fuel might have been introduced in Germany. Most candidates discussed the following reasons:

- to avoid possible consequences, e.g. accidents, congestion
- how many people/groups are affected
- how widespread/serious the problem was.

The strongest responses explained several clear reasons. Other responses simply stated one reason. Most candidates answered this question very well.

Question 1e

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, why it is necessary for countries to have laws. They were expected to give several reasons and/or some evidence for their opinion.

Candidates usually gave the following types of reasons to justify their choice:

- to stop people doing whatever they pleased at the expense of others
- to prevent disorder
- to protect weaker sections of society, e.g. women, children
- to create a fair and just society
- to keep the peace
- to provide stability
- to help the economy/business/tourism.

The most successful responses provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Other responses tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about the law in general.

Question 2a

Candidates were asked to suggest and explain one piece of information they might need in order to make a decision about whether the law on controlling pets (in the source) needs to be reviewed.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestion; other responses simply stated an opinion but did not explain it fully.

Most candidates identified the following types of information:

- the extent of the damage reported
- the extent to which the claim about the pets is true or exaggerated
- the extent to which the pets are capable of killing other animals
- the number of pets involved
- the amount of birds and small animals killed over a specific time frame
- the wildlife/plants that are affected
- the number of stray pets.

Question 2b

Candidates were asked how they would judge whether a new law to improve the control of pets had been successful or not.

Candidates tended to identify the following ways:

- produce a survey/questionnaire to ask members of the neighbourhood (pet owners/complainants) if there have been any improvements
- monitor the amount of native birds in the area to see if there are more surviving
- monitor the growth of plants/any damage to see if there is less damage
- record the number of stray animals in the area to see if this is reduced
- if findings show that more wildlife is surviving
- if fewer stray animals were recorded
- if there were less dead birds
- if pets were more under control
- if there were fewer reports of out of control pets/stray animals by local people.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestions, clearly related to the issue of pet control; other responses often simply stated a method but did not explain it fully.

Question 3a

Candidates were asked to explain if the statement in the question was an opinion, fact or both.

A fact is something which can be checked or proved; something that is true and which can be verified from experience and observation; a piece of information. An opinion is what some people may think or believe but there is little or no evidence to support the point of view or perspective.

The majority of candidates correctly identified that the statement was both a fact and an opinion; the majority were also able to explain their answer to reveal understanding of the nature of facts and opinions. Some candidates only identified one aspect.

Question 3b

Candidates were expected to identify a prediction from the source, and explain their selection, saying why it was a prediction.

A prediction is usually seen as a claim about the future, often based on trends or circumstances.

The following examples of a prediction could be found in the source:

- getting arrested would prevent me from having a career
- my parents would have been angry if I had been arrested.

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

Question 3c

Candidates were asked to evaluate the reasoning in the source and assess how well the author of the newspaper article explained young people's decisions to take part in the August riots in London?

Candidates tended to discuss the following types of issue:

- quality of the argument
  - clarity
  - tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise
  - language
  - balance
- 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 and consequences of their ideas
- acceptability of the values to others
- how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view

The strongest responses contained well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the value of the argument in the statements; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument 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 about the effectiveness of the argument. The source was also discussed explicitly, often with some relevant quotation in the response.

In other responses the discussion was unlikely to be supported and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues rather than reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was 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 help prepare for this type of question.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked their opinion about whether the majority of young people wanted to obey the law.

Candidates were expected to use the material found in the sources, but go beyond simply repeating or recycling this material without further development. Other material may also be used but it was not necessary to gain full marks.

The arguments used by candidates to consider the issue tended to include:

- the effects of upbringing on attitudes and behaviour regarding the law

- the effects of cultural differences and beliefs on attitudes and behavior regarding the law
- the influence of individuals and groups e.g. peer group or family
- the consequences of law breaking
- the impact of age and stage of development on attitudes and behavior
- impact of education on attitudes and behaviour
- potential conflict
- local and national responses and action
- impact of the media and popular culture on attitudes to the law.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the issue; this included coherent, structured argument and evaluation of different perspectives. 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 law-breaking 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 or potential actions in response to an issue. In so doing candidates need to analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence for the perspective or action. Candidates also need to be able to describe and explain the reasons and evidence that have helped to shape their own points of view on global issues.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Key Messages

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

- performed well in the analysis and interpretation of information and evidence
- were able to use reasons and evidence effectively to support their judgements and claims
- need to develop evaluation skills more fully
- should have more experience in the critical comparison of arguments
- should use evidence to justify their opinions.

General Comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources provided. The sources present global issues from a range of perspectives. In November 2015 the paper was based upon different pieces of source material related to issues relating to culture and globalisation.

The paper is designed to test candidates' skills of critical thinking and research, including the ability to:
- identify and analyse key issues
- distinguish between fact, opinion, prediction and value judgement
- identify and evaluate possible future scenarios and courses of action
- take into account different perspectives on issues
- make judgements based on evidence and on personal perspectives
- suggest a line of enquiry, outlining a possible approach to a research project
- evaluate sources, claims and the effectiveness of arguments
- develop a line of reasoning to support a judgement, decision or course of action.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good; candidates and Centres are to be congratulated on their achievements. Many candidates clearly enjoy thinking about global issues, appreciate the complexity of social, economic and technological change, and want to respond positively to the challenges posed by globalisation. They are clearly developing a critical awareness of global issues.

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 responded enthusiastically to the source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on global issues, particularly in relation to culture and globalisation. Candidates had clearly undertaken stimulating and well-designed courses that were effective in developing the skills to be assessed.

In general, the questions were answered well and there were some excellent responses to all of the questions. In particular, most candidates were able to demonstrate high levels of ability when interpreting and analysing information from within the sources. Similarly, candidates were able to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry to support decision making. However, the ability to evaluate argument (reasoning and evidence) continues to be challenging for some candidates.

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 few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- avoid simple assertion, opinion and anecdotal evidence when responding to questions
- explain their answers fully by giving a range of reasons and evidence for their point of view
- evaluate reasoning and evidence by referring to both strengths and weaknesses
- apply key concepts in critical thinking and research, for example validity, bias, reliability and expertise.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1a

Candidates were asked to identify and explain, in their opinion, the most important aspect of culture from Source 1.

Candidates tended to identify the following aspects of culture from Source 1 for discussion:

- art and music
- food
- clothing
- language
- traditions
- religion.

Candidates were likely to give the following reasons to justify their choice:

- possible benefits of the aspect of culture to individuals, the country and world
- possible consequences of losing the aspect of culture
- degree of impact for individual/groups of the aspect of culture on the people's way of life
- historic associations and heritage
- personal experience and taste.

Candidates were only rewarded for identifying aspects of culture found in Source 1.

Most candidates were able to identify an aspect of culture and justify their opinion with one or two simply described reasons. A few provided full, credible explanations in a clear and organised way.

Question 1b

Candidates were asked to identify and explain, from Source 2, one possible advantage of globalisation.

Candidates tended to identify the following advantages from the poem:

- sharing new technology
- being connected through technology/internet
- world without walls/barriers
- food to take away
- all wearing the same; sharing fashions and culture.

Candidates were likely to give the following reasons for their opinion:

- benefits from sharing new technologies
- positive consequences generally, especially of communication with other people over distance and borders
- how many people/groups/countries are affected and can share benefits, including knowledge and new ideas
- how widely the advantage may be shared
- the degree to which the advantage improved people's life chances and lifestyle.

The strongest responses explained several clear reasons fully and with some structure. Other responses stated only one reason quite simply though most candidates answered this question very well.

Question 1c

Candidates were asked to identify and explain one possible disadvantage of globalisation from Source 2.

Candidates tended to identify the following disadvantages from the poem:

- impact of technology
- being connected
- traditions disappearing
- take away food
- local currency dying
- all wearing the same
- loss of culture
- all the same
- loss of/no traditions
- loss of language
- sweatshops
- cheap labour
- pollution.

Candidates were likely to give the following type of explanations or reasons for their opinion:

- possible consequences and implications
- how many people/groups are affected
- how widespread the issue is
- how easy/difficult to solve.

The strongest answers explained several clear reasons fully and with some structure. Weaker responses often stated only one reason quite simply. Most candidates answered this question very well.

Question 2a

Candidates were asked to suggest and explain one piece of information Nadia might need to know, about an overseas university, in order to make a decision about which university to attend.

Candidates tended to identify the following types of information:

- where she might live
- what language the lectures will be in
- whether she will get accommodation on campus or how far away
- how long the course is
- whether the holidays are long enough for her to travel home
- what degree she would achieve
- career opportunities.

The strongest answers provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestion; other responses often simply stated an opinion but did not explain it fully.

Question 2b

Candidates were asked to explain the possible benefits of attending a university overseas based on the sources.

Candidates tended to identify and explain the following benefits:

- getting new experiences
- making friends with others from different countries and cultures
- dealing with new challenges e.g. language barrier, food, customs
- experience of different cultures and ways of life
- gaining access to higher quality education

- improved employment and career opportunities.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestions, clearly related to the issue of attending an overseas university; other responses often simply stated a benefit but did not explain it fully.

Question 3a

Candidates were asked to assess the reasonableness of an opinion expressed in the source material about marriage ceremonies.

Candidates tended to consider the following issues:

- there should be some compromise between all of the families
- there could be elements of each type of wedding from the different cultures
- the influence of those who might be paying
- respect for other cultures
- giving the couple some influence over their wedding
- the need for generosity in relationships and sharing ideas positively
- the status of the bride as an 'only daughter'
- the influence of cultural and family tradition.

The strongest responses provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation or their views, often exploring several different aspects of the issue, as listed above. Other responses tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about marriage in general.

Question 3b

Candidates were asked to compare the argument in two statements about globalisation and culture. Candidates were expected to make a supported judgement about the effectiveness of the reasoning and evidence. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to evaluate the reasons and evidence used to support an argument.

Candidates tended to discuss the following types of issue:

- quality of the argument
  - clarity
  - tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise
  - language
  - balance
- 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 and consequences of their ideas
- acceptability of the values to others
  - how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view

The strongest responses contained well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the value of the argument in the statements; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument 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 about the effectiveness of the argument. The source was also discussed explicitly, often with some relevant quotation in the response.

In other responses 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 help prepare for this type of question.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked their opinion about whether it is possible to keep national cultures alive in a globalised world.

Candidates were expected to use the material found in the sources, but go beyond simply repeating or recycling this material without further development. Other material may also be used but it was not necessary to gain full marks.

Issues that candidates tended to explore were:

- impact of the internet
- influence of social media
- effect of travel and tourism
- loss of cultural diversity
- sharing of culture to increase creativity
- cultural mixing and hybrids
- preserving local cultures through education
- movements to retain traditions and heritage.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the issue; this included coherent, structured argument and evaluation of different perspectives. 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 globalisation 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 or potential actions in response to an issue. In so doing candidates need to analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence for the perspective or action. Candidates also need to be able to describe and explain the reasons and evidence that have helped to shape their own points of view on global issues.