GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

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

Key messages

- Candidates must produce two Individual Research reports with **one** question as a title for each report. These reports should be in an essay format with a reference list at the end of each report. This continues to be the case for 2017.

- Candidate need help structuring their reports. Sub-headings linked to the assessment criteria have been shown to help with this.

- Each Individual Report should have a full reference list at the end of it and citations should be used in the body of the work. Reports should be a maximum of 2000 words in length.

- Assessors are advised to add notes linked to the assessment criteria to the Individual Candidate Record Cards (ICRCs) as this helps with marking and moderating.

- For each candidate, Centres need to submit the work and the completed ICRC. The Centre needs to also include the Mark Sheet for the component and the Coursework Assessment Summary Form (CASF) with the marks for all candidates entered for the session on it. All files should be clearly labelled with candidate numbers as indicated in the guide to Centres.

General comments

There has been evidence of an increased awareness by Centres of the requirements for and assessment of this component this year. However, some Centres are still confusing the Individual Research report with the Group Project. Teachers should consult the necessary documentation available on the Teacher Support Site for further guidance as to what candidates should produce for each component. There is a checklist for each coursework component which highlights clearly everything that Centres should submit. Using the discussion forum within the Teacher Support Site and the Online Learning Platform can also help with support and guidance for both coursework components. Please note that there are no changes to this syllabus until first examination in 2018. If Centres are planning to enter candidates for examination in this syllabus in 2018 (first session is March) they should check the latest syllabus and supporting documentation as considerable changes have been made to both this component and the Group Project.

Most candidates are now using questions to focus their research and their reports, although some did not and this made the reports less focused. Centres should advise candidates that they need one question as the title of their report, which they then try to answer after consideration of different perspectives. Their conclusion should be an answer to their question and their personal response. Teachers can help candidates formulate their questions.

Many Centres covered a range of topics and candidates were given freedom of choice with which they chose for their Individual Research reports. Usually this worked well. At other times, candidates struggled to give a personal response to the topic, for example the topic of poverty did not really allow for the consideration of a personal perspective as many candidates have no personal experience of issues to do with this topic. Candidates would do better to choose global topics of relevance to them and their lives, for example, biodiversity and ecosystem loss and humans and other species.

Centres are asked to advise candidates to produce their work as Word documents so that word counts can be checked and teachers should monitor this situation and advise candidates accordingly. Please also ask candidates to only include pictures and diagrams if they refer to them in the body of their work. Some candidates appear to be spending a long time on the presentation of their work for which there are no marks.

Please ask candidates to avoid submitting anything other than an essay format for this component. Power Point presentations do not generally enable candidates to access Band 4 of the assessment criteria as candidates cannot and do not analyse the issues in depth.

Administration proved to be a particular challenge for some Centres this session. In a Centre with a large number of candidates, it is good practice for internal moderation to take place. However, this should not be a re-marking exercise and there should be reasons given on the ICRC for why marks have been changed. The total marks for each candidate also need to be the same on all documentation – the MS1, the CASF and the ICRC. If marks are different, this causes confusion for the Moderator and the Centre is contacted to provide further guidance. The marks submitted to Cambridge, which form the candidate's grade, are those on the MS1, so if changes have been made, it is essential that these are transferred to the MS1. Please note also that if internal moderation takes place, this should be for all candidates and not just for those in the sample.

Comments on specific questions

Teacher assessment

On the whole, marking of the Individual Research reports was better this year, with more Centres marking in accordance with the set standard. Some assessors were a bit generous in their marking, and as no evidence of how they arrived at their marks was included, it was difficult to see how some marks had been awarded. Similarly, where marking was severe, it would have been helpful to see why such marks had been awarded. It is very rare for candidates to be awarded marks in Band 1 if they have attempted to produce a research report as there is usually something of credit if candidates have been given the assessment criteria. Please note that any work that teachers suspect has been plagiarised should not be marked or submitted. Candidates might be given opportunity to do another IR but teachers should not be marking nor submitting work that they know is plagiarised. When marking the IRs, the following guidance might be useful. Where an Individual Research report meets the assessment criteria in a band fully, marks at the top of that band can be awarded, but for band 4 there should be in-depth analysis of the issues and possible scenarios should stem from analysis of these issues from different perspectives (global, national, local and personal). Possible scenarios should also be evaluated before courses of action are proposed. Courses of action need to be developed to access marks in band 4 and not simply identified. For the personal response mark, it is not enough that candidates give their opinion, they should link their response to the evidence found when researching the issues from different perspectives. 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 can be awarded.

Gather information representing different perspectives

The majority of candidates were able to gather and present some information linked to the topic area to answer their research question and this usually came from a range of sources, which were sometimes well referenced. However, most candidates tended to give information about countries rather than considering the issues from different perspectives. As well as giving examples of countries for their global perspective, candidates should also be considering the perspectives of individuals or groups related to the issue(s). It is not enough for candidates to simply name countries, there should also be an indication of what these countries, groups and individuals think/believe about the issue(s) under investigation, with evidence to support the perspectives given. All work must be in the candidate's own words or quoted directly and all sources must be acknowledged to avoid any suspicion of plagiarism. Teachers should advise candidates to use quotes sparingly and to support any quotes used with their own discussion and explanation as other people's work cannot be credited to the candidate. Candidates need help to write a complete reference list, including the author, date and title of the publication on the website and the date the candidate accessed it, rather than just giving the web link url. For marks in band 4, a broad range of relevant information should be presented and a range of highly appropriate sources used. Online encyclopaedias and blogs are generally not considered highly appropriate so please advise candidates against using these, although they can be a useful starting point to find other, more credible sources.

Analyse issues within the report

This session saw a wide range of levels of analysis, from simply listing causes, effects and current situations, to exploring these in more depth. It was found that more successful reports covered fewer issues in depth rather than simply presenting a lot of unrelated issues. The key to this criterion is that candidates formulate a focused question (with guidance from their teacher), explore one or two issues in depth, including: the reasons for them/causes of them, consequences/effects of them and the possible scenarios if the issue(s) continue and whether these scenarios are likely or not and why. Explanation will always attract more marks than identification and candidates need to be aware of this and use words like 'because', 'due to', 'as such', 'therefore' to develop their points.

Identify and evaluate possible scenarios and formulate possible courses of action

Candidates are still finding this criterion a challenge and possible scenarios were, on the whole, fairly simple with candidates unsure about how they should be generated. This may be because candidates are asked to think beyond the research they have done and they are unconvinced about their own ability to create/develop possible scenarios and courses of action. The scenarios presented often already existed and there remains an overall lack of creative thinking about possible scenarios. Where candidates had thought about possible scenarios, they generally forgot about considering how likely the scenarios were and why. Courses of action generally need to be further developed, including how they might work to solve/prevent or reduce the chances of the possible scenario presented.

A useful question which will help candidates to identify possible scenarios is: 'What might happen in the future if this situation continues?' Candidates then need to evaluate the likelihood of this (is it possible that this might happen? How likely is it that this will happen?) and the possible consequences in order to be awarded marks for evaluation. By doing this, candidates can demonstrate that they have really gained a grasp of the research question and issues related to the question.

Develop evidence-based personal response demonstrating self-awareness

This part was generally left until the end of the research report and candidates need to refer to evidence from the rest of the report. Candidates can make reference to their life at home, in school or where they live in relation to the question posed. They should identify and explain using their evidence what they had not realised before they commenced their research or something that they will be doing differently as a result of their research. Better research reports explained how a candidate's thinking and behaviour had changed as a result of something they had found out while doing their research, linking their comments to the evidence presented and answering the question posed. Some work provided a personal response throughout the report in response to the evidence presented rather than adding a paragraph at the end which proved to be a simple statement of opinion. This approach generally worked well. Once again, the importance of the question is emphasised as candidates need to respond personally to the question and what they have found out in order to answer their question.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02 **Group Project**

Key messages

- Project plans should provide evidence of advance planning and should not be a retrospective log of events. They should include a clear aim and the intended project outcome, as well as details of all planned activities, timeframes and all the group members' responsibilities.
- Representation of different perspectives is focused on cross-cultural collaboration in the project component and not on exploration of global, national/local and personal perspectives. Cross-cultural collaboration can take place with people of another culture overseas, or with people from a different culture within the home country. The cross-cultural collaboration that has taken place should be used to inform or support the project outcome and should be represented in the outcome and/or in any accompanying write-up.
- Research reports or case studies, however informative are not appropriate outcomes for the group project. Outcomes should be concrete and active, such as video clips, posters, information leaflets, fundraising events, etc. Outcomes must be produced or carried out and should not simply be planned or hypothetical
- Individual evaluations need to be critically evaluative, rather than descriptive, if they are to score well.
- Teachers are reminded that they need to include brief supporting comments for each of the assessment criteria on the Individual Candidate Record Cards to explain the basis on which they have awarded their marks.

General comments

Topic choices in this session covered a variety of issues, such as child labour; the impact of social media; racism and discrimination; blood diamonds; access to clean water and to education among others. There were some highly creative and effective outcomes intended to achieve project aims. These included videos and posters to raise awareness; volunteer work with non-governmental organisations; school presentations; fundraising events and information leaflets.

Comments on candidate response to assessment criteria

Production of a project plan
(Group assessment)

In general, most groups' project plans were detailed and comprehensive which meant that many candidate groups were able to access marks in the top band. Plans should be developed at the outset of the project and should show details of the project aim; the intended outcome; all planned activities and allocation of roles and responsibilities. Candidates should be advised that if they are to achieve the maximum mark of ten for this criterion, they must provide some reasoning behind the allocation of roles and responsibilities. Retrospective logs of activities are not an appropriate substitute for a plan. It is acceptable to amend the plan as the project progresses, should this be necessary and this might be something that individual candidates might choose to comment on in their evaluation of the plan, if amendment has been necessary.

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

The exploration of global, national/local and personal perspectives is emphasised in the Individual Research component of this qualification, as is the requirement that candidates consider possible scenarios and suggest possible courses of action. None of these is required for the Group Project component. Cross-

cultural collaboration should be the focus for representing or appreciating different perspectives in this component. Cross-cultural collaboration should be meaningful and purposeful. It should be carried out with the intention of helping to develop and support the project outcome and it should form an integral part of the project. The project outcome and/or any accompanying write-up should reflect the cross-cultural collaboration that has taken place.

Constructive participation in group work/activities
(Individual assessment)

Assessment of performance in this criterion should be based on evidence gathered 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 individual evaluations of the project plan and process. These were characterised by the critical nature of their evaluation in considering the strengths and weaknesses of the plan and the strengths and weaknesses of carrying out the project (e.g. the research carried out, time management issues etc.), as well as providing well-thought out suggestions as to how both could have been improved. Less successful evaluations tended to focus on what the group had done and so were largely descriptive in nature. Candidates often found it difficult to do well on this criterion when they had substituted retrospective logs in place of plans.

Candidates often find it helpful to structure their evaluations of the plan and process, the project outcome and individual contribution and learning using sub-headings that are aligned to the wording of the description for performance in the top mark bands.

Evaluation of project outcome
(Individual assessment)

The strongest evaluations of project outcomes generally came from groups which had identified a single, clear aim, such as raising awareness of an issue, or solving a problem, and had produced or carried out an active outcome, such as designing and making an item, producing a video, organising and hosting a fundraising event or making a School presentation etc. Individual group members were then able to critically evaluate the success or otherwise of the outcome in achieving the project aim. Where the aim was vague (e.g. increase group's knowledge of an issue), and the outcome was a research report, or a case study, candidates found it very difficult to make any meaningful evaluation of how far the outcome had achieved the project aim. Candidates should be advised to consider at the outset of the project how they might critically measure the success of their outcome.

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

Most candidates were able to reflect on what they had contributed to their group's project. However, it is not sufficient for candidates to simply list what they did. They should be advised that they need to critically examine the strengths and weaknesses of their contribution. Some candidates did not score well because they forgot that they also needed to discuss the benefits and challenges of working together as a team. Candidates also need to be reminded that if they are to score well on this criterion, they also need to reflect on what they have learned from cross-cultural collaboration. This is why it is very important that candidates do engage in meaningful cross-cultural collaboration so that they are able to critically reflect on their learning from it and its impact on their own perspective on the issue.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/31
Written Paper

Key messages

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

- performed very well in the interpretation of information and argument
- were able to use reasons and evidence to support their judgements to some degree, but this could be improved
- should have more experience in the critical comparison of arguments
- should develop evaluation skills more fully, especially in considering alternative perspectives and arguments.

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. The May/June 2016 paper was based upon source material related to the causes and consequences of the growth of international crime.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good. Many candidates are clearly developing an excellent understanding of globalisation, related issues and an ability to marshal reasoning and evidence to support an opinion or claim. Candidates need to develop evaluative skills to higher levels.

Candidates responded very well to the source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in relation to the dangers of international crime. Candidates were also aware of the need for governments to protect citizens from international crime, and to promote security at a local, national and international level. Different attitudes to the use of prisons were explored

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

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence
- provide explanation rather than simple assertion or description, where appropriate
- consider counter arguments
- evaluate Sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking
- quote from Sources to provide evidence for their judgements and opinions.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1a

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified that the fastest growing type of international crime according to the Source is people trafficking.

Question 1b

Virtually all candidates correctly identified fraud or tax evasion as a type of financial crime, according to Source 1.

A very few candidates incorrectly suggested other types of crime from the table in the Source. A very few candidates incorrectly suggested types of crime not contained within the Source.

Question 1c

Most candidates were able to explain which cause of international crime has the most significant consequences from Source 2, in their opinion. The causes most frequently selected were the growth of the Internet and inequality.

The most successful responses gave several carefully explained reasons and/or some evidence to support the opinion about consequences. This was most effective when the explanation was carefully linked to the suggested reason for international crime.

Less successful responses tended to rely upon assertion without evidence or careful reasoning, or describe the reason in some detail without explaining its consequences.

Question 1d

Most candidates were able to explain why international crime is an important national issue, especially for governments. The main reasons explored related to maintaining personal security, preventing harm, securing human rights and protection from crime, and maintaining a strong economy.

Some candidates mistakenly discussed several different causes of international crime rather than explore the consequences at a national level. Some candidates also discussed local, national and international levels, though only the national level could be credited.

Question 2a

Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 2 and assess to some extent how well the author supported the view that, 'We need more prisons and stronger punishments to prevent international crime.' The strengths of the argument most often identified related to the forceful language and writing, the use of some factual evidence and the range of evidence used. The weaknesses of the argument most frequently identified related to the lack of citation, level of expertise of the author, amount of research and little use of clear, specific statistical/numerical evidence. Some candidates also suggested too much reliance on anecdotal evidence/experience and that the evidence may be out of date.

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the argument in the Source and justify their opinion using the material in the Source as evidence. Candidates should quote from and refer to the Source explicitly.

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

Question 2b

Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim about the attitudes of criminals to punishment in prison. These were carefully explained and related to the aim of the research. Candidates tended to describe interviews or surveys with criminals, or finding relevant information from experts in the field, or by Internet research.

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

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

Question 3a

The majority of candidates correctly identified an opinion from the Source; many were also able to explain their selection to reveal understanding of the nature of opinions.

The most frequently identified opinions were that some people believe that we need to stop international crime by making punishments harsher and if people have a decent standard of living, there will be less international crime. Most candidates were able to explain that opinions were points of view or beliefs that could not be verified.

Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to practise the identification and explanation of different parts of arguments using source material in preparation for the examination.

Question 3b

Candidates found this question quite difficult and tended to give one simple reason why cooperation might be difficult. Few explored the issue in a balanced way, discussing the likelihood that nations might cooperate fully to try to reduce international crime, for example out of shared interests.

The issues most frequently explored were:

- cultural differences
- issues of status and power
- historical background and past relationships
- different approaches to law and order
- difficulties of coordination
- communication issues

Centres are encouraged to give candidates opportunity to consider different types of action in response to global issues, including international cooperation.

Question 3c

In comparing the effectiveness of the reasoning in the two statements candidates tended to consider the knowledge claims, ability to see and quantity/quality of the evidence presented. Some candidates explored the values and opinions of each person in the Source.

Most candidates suggested that Peter had the most effective reasoning in comparison to Anna, primarily due to his greater use of research, examples and sources as evidence. Anna was often criticised for using anecdotal evidence, personal opinion and language that was more emotional and exaggerated in tone, and for a lack of evidence.

Most candidates explicitly referred to the Sources and quoted rom them to provide evidence for their judgements. This should be encouraged further.

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the reasoning in both statements; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a focus on evaluation of reasons and evidence, with a range of points about knowledge claims, values and use of evidence. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion about the relative effectiveness of the arguments. These candidates tended to use the guidance given in the question to plan and structure their responses.

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 the opinions expressed in the statements rather than the quality of the reasoning and evidence presented in the argument. There was little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

A common error was to discuss only one of the statements and not to make a direct comparison of both statements.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to justify their opinion about an issue using material drawn from the Sources, plus their own experience and learning. In this session, most candidates argued that prison does not reduce international crime, though some argued for a reform of prisons to improve their impact on future behavior. Responses used the material from the Sources quite well.

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. Candidates used evidence to support their claims.

Less successful responses tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and focus on the benefits of education in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted.

Candidates should be encouraged to give reasons and evidence to support their opinions, especially drawing upon the Sources.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

| Paper 0457/32 |
| Written Paper |

Key messages

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

- performed very well in the interpretation of information and argument
- were able to use reasons and evidence to support their judgements to some degree, but this could be improved
- should have more experience in the critical comparison of arguments
- should develop evaluation skills more fully, especially in considering alternative perspectives and arguments.

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. The May/June 2016 paper was based upon source material related to Internet surveillance and individual rights to privacy.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good. Many candidates are clearly developing an excellent understanding of globalisation, related issues and an ability to marshal reasoning and evidence to support an opinion or claim. Candidates need to develop evaluative skills to higher levels.

Candidates responded very well to the source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in relation to the dangers of too much surveillance. Candidates were also aware of the need for governments to protect citizens from crime and terrorism, and to promote security at a local and national level. Understanding of global dimensions was less well developed.

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

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence
- provide explanation rather than simple assertion or description, where appropriate
- consider counter arguments
- evaluate Sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking
- quote from Sources to provide evidence for their judgements and opinions.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1a

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified the worldwide trend in the number of surveillance cameras being produced as increasing. Some candidates simply restated the statistical figures for the beginning and end of the time period shown or performed a sum to show the difference. However, the response needed to clearly demonstrate an understanding of the *upward trend* to be awarded a mark.

Question 1b

Virtually all candidates correctly identified a type of personal data that may be gathered using computers, according to Source 1. The main types of personal data identified by candidates tended to be internet searches, income and where you live. A very few candidates incorrectly suggested a consequence of data gathering.

Question 1c

Most candidates were able to explain which reason for gathering personal information from Source 1 they believed to be the most important. The reasons most frequently selected were to target marketing and advertising, prevent corruption, ensure everyone pays for services and improve healthcare.

The most successful responses gave several carefully explained reasons and/or some evidence to support the claim about the importance of the benefit. This was most effective when the explanation was carefully linked to the suggested reason for gathering personal information.

Weaker responses tended to rely upon assertion without evidence or careful reasoning, or describe the reason in some detail without explaining its importance.

Question 1d

Most candidates were able to explain why protection of personal information is an important issue for individuals. The main reasons explored related to maintaining privacy, ensuring personal security, human rights and protection from crime, for example identity theft.

Some candidates mistakenly discussed several different perspectives – individual, local and national. However only those aspects of the discussion relating to individual matters could be credited.

Question 2a

Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 2 and assess to some extent how well the author supported the view that the internet is destroying privacy. The strengths of the argument most often identified related to the commitment and passion of the writing, the use of some factual evidence and effective use of rhetorical questions. The weaknesses of the argument most frequently identified related to the lack of citation, level of expertise of the author, amount of research and little use of clear, specific statistical/numerical evidence. Some candidates also suggested too much reliance on anecdotal evidence/experience and that the evidence may be out of date.

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the argument in the Source and justify their opinion using the material in the Source as evidence.

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

Question 2b

Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim about the future of internet crime. These were carefully explained and related to the aim of the research. Candidates tended to describe interviews or surveys with victims of crime, or finding relevant information from experts in the field, or by Internet research.

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

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

Question 3a

The majority of candidates correctly identified a value judgement from the Source; many were able to explain their selection to reveal understanding of the nature of value judgements. A common error was simply to describe a judgement rather than a judgement based upon values.

The most frequently identified value judgements were respect, right to privacy and security.

Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to practise the identification and explanation of different parts of arguments using source material in preparation for the examination.

Question 3b

The majority of candidates correctly identified that the statement was both an opinion and a prediction; many were able to explain their answer, thereby revealing an understanding of the nature of opinions as a belief or point of view that is not based on fact or verified, and that a prediction is a claim about the future.

Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to practise the identification and explanation of different parts of arguments using source material in preparation for the examination.

Question 3c

In comparing the effectiveness of the reasoning in the two statements candidates tended to consider the knowledge claims, ability to see and quantity/quality of the evidence presented. Some candidates explored the values and opinions of each person in the Source.

Most candidates suggested that Indira had the most effective reasoning in comparison to Vijay, primarily due to her use of research and examples as evidence. Vijay was often criticised for using anecdotal evidence, personal opinion and language that was more emotional and exaggerated in tone.

Most candidates explicitly referred to the Sources and quoted to provide evidence for their judgements. This should be encouraged further.

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the reasoning in both statements; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a focus on evaluation of reasons and evidence, with a range of points about knowledge claims, values and use of evidence. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion about the relative effectiveness of the arguments. These candidates tended to use the guidance given in the question to plan and structure their responses.

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 the opinions expressed in the statements rather than the quality of the reasoning and evidence presented in the argument. There was little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

A common error was to discuss only one of the statements and not to make a direct comparison of both statements.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to justify their opinion about an issue using material drawn from the Sources, plus their own experience and learning. In this session, most candidates argued in favour of the protection of individual's right to privacy, though some argued for privacy with some surveillance in certain circumstances, for example in relation to suspected crime and terrorism. A few candidates argued for complete openness of information and data.

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.

Less successful responses tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and focus on the benefits of privacy in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted.

Candidates should be encouraged to give reasons and evidence to support their opinions, especially drawing upon the Sources.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

<div style="border:1px solid black">

Paper 0457/33

Written Paper

</div>

Key messages

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

- performed very well in the interpretation of information and argument
- were able to use reasons and evidence to support their judgements to some degree, but this could be improved
- should have more experience in the critical comparison of arguments
- should develop evaluation skills more fully, especially in considering alternative perspectives and arguments.

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. The May/June 2016 paper was based upon source material related to the impact of globalisation on indigenous cultures.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good. Many candidates are clearly developing an excellent understanding of globalisation, related issues and an ability to marshal reasoning and evidence to support an opinion or claim. However, many candidates need to develop evaluative skills further to reach higher levels of marks.

Candidates responded very well to the source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly concerning the dangers and threats of globalisation to indigenous and local cultures. Candidates were also aware of the need for governments to protect indigenous cultures and to promote their security at a local, national and global level.

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

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence
- provide explanation rather than simple assertion or description, where appropriate
- consider counter arguments
- evaluate Sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking
- quote from Sources to provide evidence for their judgements and opinions.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1a

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified the worldwide trend in the number of languages as decreasing.

Some candidates simply restated the statistical figures within the Source. However, the response needed to clearly demonstrate an understanding of the *downward trend* to be awarded a mark.

Question 1b

Virtually all candidates correctly identified one feature that indigenous groups share from Source 1.

The main features identified were traditional languages, culture and beliefs, and living in tribal groups.

Question 1c

Most candidates were able to explain which threat to indigenous people from Source 2 they believed to be the greatest. The threats most frequently chosen were governments and organisations that want natural resources, mining companies that want oil and minerals, agricultural interests that want the land and globalisation.

The most successful responses gave several carefully explained reasons and/or some evidence to support the claim about the threat. This was most effective when the explanation was carefully linked to the suggested threat against indigenous people.

Less successful responses tended to rely upon assertion without evidence or careful reasoning, or describe the threat in some detail without explaining its importance.

Question 1d

Most candidates were able to explain why the loss of indigenous people is an important issue. The main reasons explored related to maintaining cultures, preserving languages, human rights and protection from exploitation.

Question 2a

Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 2 and assess the view that the situation of indigenous peoples will not stop economic development.

The strengths of the argument most often identified related to the forceful nature of the writing, the use of some factual evidence and the range of evidence. The weaknesses of the argument most frequently identified related to the lack of citation, level of expertise of the author, amount of research and little use of clear, specific statistical/numerical evidence. Some candidates also suggested too much reliance on anecdotal evidence/experience and that the evidence may be out of date.

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the argument in the Source and justify their opinion using the material in the Source as evidence.

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

Question 2b

Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim about the internet destroying traditional cultures. These were carefully explained and related to the aim of the research. Candidates tended to describe interviews or surveys with people from traditional cultures, or finding relevant information from experts in the field, or by internet research.

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

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

Question 3a

The majority of candidates correctly identified a fact from the Source; many were able to explain their selection to reveal understanding of the nature of facts as something which could be verified. A common error was simply to describe a fact as something that had been researched.

The most frequently identified facts were that some people believe we need to preserve indigenous people, the author finds the counterarguments more convincing, and research by the United Nations shows that there is a higher standard of living in countries where the gap between rich and poor is low.

Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to practise the identification and explanation of different parts of arguments using source material in preparation for the examination.

Question 3b

The majority of candidates correctly identified that the statement was a prediction; many were able to explain their answer, thereby revealing an understanding of prediction as a claim about the future.

Candidates tended to identify the following predictions:

- if we ensure more people have a decent standard of living … then we will all benefit
- tax revenues from oil and mineral wealth … will remove all poverty in our country by 2050.

Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to practise the identification and explanation of different parts of arguments using source material in preparation for the examination.

Question 3c

In comparing the effectiveness of the reasoning in the two statements candidates tended to consider the knowledge claims, ability to see and quantity/quality of the evidence presented. Some candidates explored the values and opinions of each person in the Source.

Most candidates suggested that Wanda had the most effective reasoning in comparison to Carol, primarily due to her use of research and examples as evidence. Carol was often criticised for using anecdotal evidence, personal opinion and language that was more emotional and exaggerated in tone.

Most candidates explicitly referred to the Sources and quoted from them to provide evidence for their judgements. This should be encouraged further.

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the reasoning in both statements; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a focus on evaluation of reasons and evidence, with a range of points about knowledge claims, values and use of evidence. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion about the relative effectiveness of the arguments. These candidates tended to use the guidance given in the question to plan and structure their responses.

At the lower levels of response, the discussion was unlikely to be supported and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on the opinions expressed in the statements rather than the quality of the reasoning and evidence presented in the argument. There was little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

A common error was to discuss only one of the statements and not to make a direct comparison of both statements.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to justify their opinion about an issue using material drawn from the Sources, plus their own experience and learning. In this session, most candidates argued in favour of the protection of local cultures, though some argued for the interest of the majority in a population to take precedence.

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 the benefits of education in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted.

Candidates should be encouraged to give reasons and evidence to support their opinions, especially drawing upon the Sources.