

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

---

<p><b>Paper 0457/01</b> <b>Individual Research</b></p>
--

## **Key messages**

- Candidates are required to produce two Individual Research reports. These reports should be word processed in an essay format with a reference list at the end of the document, after the word count.
- Sub-headings, linked to the assessment criteria, were useful in helping candidates structure their work in order to answer their research question.
- A complete reference list should be given at the end of the report and this should include the author, date and title of the publication, the website address and the date accessed and there should be accurate citations in the body of the work where any direct quotations or specific ideas are taken from sources. Reports should be a maximum of 2000 words in length.
- The requirements for this syllabus and component change in 2018. Centres should ensure that they are familiar with the changes.

## **General comments**

Most Centres demonstrated a good understanding of the requirements for the assessment of this component. However, a small number of Centres confused the requirements for this component with those for the Group Project. Teachers should make use of the documentation available to support this component including the guidance in the syllabus document and the 'Submitting Cambridge Global Perspectives work' administrative guide (both available from the Teacher Support website).

Most candidates used questions to focus their research and their reports. Where candidates did not, the reports were often less focused. Centres should advise candidates that they need one question as the title of their report, which candidates should then answer in their report. Their conclusion should directly answer their question. Teachers can help candidates formulate their questions and give general verbal feedback once first drafts have been reviewed.

Candidates should produce their work as word processed documents so that word counts can be verified. Candidates should also only include pictures and diagrams if they refer to them in the body of their work and they support a point the candidate is making. Candidates should be advised to submit this component in essay format. Candidates who submit work as MS Power Point presentations are rarely able to analyse issues in enough depth to achieve a high mark. In 2018, this component must be submitted as a Word document.

## **Comments on specific criteria**

### **Teacher assessment**

On the whole, the internal assessment of this component was appropriate, with most Centres marking in accordance with the assessment criteria. It was helpful to have comments included on the ICRC to justify the mark given, and often they related directly to the assessment criteria. This will not be an issue in 2018, as all work will be marked externally by Cambridge and Centres should ensure that all work is labelled with the candidate's full name and candidate number. If teachers suspect that any work has been plagiarised they should follow the guidance in the Cambridge Handbook, available at [www.cie.org.uk](http://www.cie.org.uk)

Where an Individual Research report meets the assessment criteria in a band fully, marks at the top of that band should be awarded. To fully achieve the criteria for Band 4, requires thorough analysis of the issues and the possible scenarios identified stemmed from this analysis. The issues should also be explored from different perspectives (global, local/national and personal) and possible scenarios should be evaluated before courses of action are proposed. Courses of action should be developed and not simply identified in

order to fully meet the criteria for Band 4. For the personal response mark, it was not enough that candidates gave their opinion, they are required to explain their response with reference to the research they conducted and the different perspectives they explored. Assessors generally decided on the most appropriate band for each criterion and then decided whether the work met the band fully, in which case the top mark in the band was awarded, or whether there was something missing and the work only met the band partially, in which case lower marks within that band were awarded.

### **Gather information representing different perspectives**

The majority of candidates were able to gather and present some information linked to the topic area in order to answer their research question. This usually came from a range of sources, and in the most successful reports, these sources were well-referenced. The most successful reports also clearly explored different perspectives on the issue(s), outlining evidence of different views and opinions on the issue(s), broadly related to a place, country, organisation or institution. Less successful reports often simply gave information relating to the issue (though not specifically views or opinions on the issue) from different countries. Only the very best candidates were able to successfully explore global perspectives on an issue. A global perspective may come from a specific country, organisation, institution, or even an individual, but it will have influence that spreads beyond any one country. The very best reports not only explained and gave evidence for global perspectives, but also some justification for why they are global.

All work must be in the candidate's own words. If quotations are included they should be shown as quotations with the source directly cited. Teachers should advise candidates to use quotes sparingly and only to support points that have been made in the candidates own words. It was often found that 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. Reports achieving marks in Band 4, presented a broad range of relevant information and used a range of highly appropriate 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. The most successful reports tended to cover fewer issues but explored them in more depth. Less successful reports tended to outline lots of unrelated issues. The key to this criterion is that candidates formulate a focused question (with guidance from their Teacher) which leads the candidate to explore one or two issues in depth; the reasons for the issue/causes of the issue and the consequences/effects of the issue. 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**

Many candidates find this criterion challenging and possible scenarios were on the whole fairly simple with candidates unsure about how they should be generated. This may be because candidates are being asked to think beyond the research they have conducted and they are less confident of their own ability to create/develop possible scenarios and courses of action. The scenarios presented generally already existed and there remains an overall lack of creative thinking about possible scenarios. Even among those who were able to develop possible future scenarios, only the very best reports considered how likely the scenarios were and why. Courses of action generally need to be developed further, including how they might work to resolve/prevent or reduce the issue under discussion.

### **Develop evidence-based personal response demonstrating self-awareness**

Often this was left until the end and had little connection to the rest of the report. Successful reports usually made reference to life at home, in school or where they lived in relation to the question they were addressing. The most successful reports identified and explained how their thinking on the topic had changed or developed as a result of their research, referring directly to the evidence in the report. Some reports very successfully provided a personal response throughout the report, offering a considered personal response directly after presenting the evidence. Less successful reports were more likely to add a paragraph at the end which often offered a simple statement of opinion.

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

---

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

## **Key messages**

- When planning their projects, candidates should identify a single project aim, such as raising awareness about an issue, or addressing a problem and then identify an appropriate active outcome that will achieve that aim.
- Outcomes may take the form of posters, information leaflets, video clips, fundraising events, designs or models etc. Outcomes should not take the form of essays such as research reports, case studies or pure survey analyses.
- Individual evaluations need to address all the various elements contained within the mark band descriptors for each of the assessment criteria. Evaluations need to be critical rather than descriptive. If candidates are to score well across the assessment criteria, it is most important that they are fully familiar with the wording of the top band of performance so that they are able to focus their responses accordingly.
- The requirements for this syllabus and component change in 2018. There are summary notes about these changes at the end of this report.

## **General comments**

Most Centres demonstrated a sound understanding of the requirements for the assessment of the group project. However, some Centres are still confusing the requirements for this component with those for the Individual Research component. The Group Project does not require candidates to consider future scenarios and suggest courses of action and the focus for gathering research information is through collaboration with people of another culture, either at home or overseas, rather than focusing on global, local/national and personal perspectives. Teachers should make use of the documentation available to support this component including the guidance in the syllabus document and the 'Submitting Cambridge Global Perspectives work' administrative guide (both available from the teacher support site).

Once again, topic choices for this session were varied and interesting and included, among others, the following: the impact of incarceration on juveniles; internet addiction; the Syrian refugee crisis, the risks of head injuries in sport; the impact of social media on teenage body image; valuing the elderly and gender inequality. There were also some highly appropriate and often creative project outcomes that were well-supported by the research and cross-cultural collaboration carried out by the groups concerned. Some of these outcomes included: a green awareness day; a beach clean-up event; a variety of fundraising events, including one to raise funds for, purchase and install a water purifying water store; charity volunteering activities including one to help underprivileged children; lesson planning and delivery to educate younger students; video clips (often showing evidence of cross-cultural collaboration through interviews); information brochures, leaflets and posters to raise awareness about particular issues. Where candidates' work fully matches the description given within a mark band for any of the assessment criteria, then it is appropriate to award a mark at the top of that band. If an element or the work only partially meets the description, then a mark lower down the band should be awarded.

### **Comments on specific criteria**

#### **Production of a project plan**

[Group assessment]

Most candidate groups managed to produce detailed project plans which were awarded marks in the top band because they contained all the elements identified in the top mark band descriptor. These plans contained a well-thought out rationale behind the choice of project; the project aim was clearly stated and the outcome well-suited to it; all planned activities were identified with appropriate timeframes provided and the roles and responsibilities of all group members were clearly defined with a clear rationale for role allocation. Some candidate groups identified multiple aims for their projects and this often made it difficult for individual group members to do adequate justice to their individual evaluation of how far the outcome had been successful in achieving the aim. Groups should be advised that a single project aim is sufficient.

#### **Representation of different perspectives including cross-cultural**

[Group assessment]

Most project outcomes were supported by research information to some degree, though there were some groups whose work showed little evidence of research being used to underpin the outcome; rather, they focused on the execution of the outcome only. The strongest responses to this criterion came from groups who had given careful consideration to the nature of the research they needed to carry out in order to develop their project outcome and this included direct and purposeful collaboration with people of another culture, either in the candidates' home country or overseas. Blanket surveys gathering data from respondents in many different countries tended to yield little of real value and were sometimes offered as outcomes in themselves that candidates spent the bulk of their project write-up analysing and drawing conclusions from. This meant that the candidates ended up with a research report as their outcome which did not adequately fulfil the requirements of the syllabus and often made it very difficult for individual group members to successfully evaluate the success or otherwise of their outcome in achieving the project aim. On the other hand, candidates who went out and interviewed people from different cultures in their own neighbourhood in order to ascertain their views on the issue being investigated were often far more successful in using this information to develop their outcome. In the strongest work, the information gathered was reflected in some way in the outcome itself.

#### **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 should be included on the Individual Candidate Record Cards.

#### **Evaluation of project plan and process**

[Individual assessment]

Some candidates seemed unsure of what elements they should be considering in evaluating the project process. The process of carrying out the project should focus on such elements as the information gathering process; research methodology and analysis of findings; the execution of other activities relating to the production of the outcome; time management etc. There were some 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 the processes involved in carrying out the project, as well as providing well-thought out suggestions as to how both could have been improved. Weaker evaluations tended not to score well because they focused on what the group had done and were largely descriptive in nature. Candidates often find it easier to fully address all the elements within the mark band descriptor if they structure their work with sub-headings aligned to the wording of the descriptor: strengths of the plan; weaknesses of the plan; suggestions as to how the plan could have been improved; strengths of the project process; weaknesses of the process; suggestions as to how the process could have been improved.

### **Evaluation of project outcome**

[Individual assessment]

Some candidates did not score well on this criterion, usually because they did not make clear and consistent reference to the project aim when making their evaluation. Simply describing what was good and what was weak about their outcome without considering what the original aim of the project was, will not allow them to access marks at the upper band of the mark scheme. Candidates need to remember that the production of the outcome is not an end in itself, but the means by which the project aim is to be achieved. The strongest evaluations of outcomes generally came from groups who had identified a single, clear aim, such as raising awareness about a specific issue, or trying to solve a particular problem in their local area, and had produced or carried out an active outcome, such as designing and making an item, producing a video, organising and carrying out 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 general (e.g. 'we want to find out more about...' or 'we want to expand our learning on...') and the outcome was essentially a group research report, or survey analysis, candidates found it very difficult to make any meaningful evaluation of how far the outcome had achieved the project aim. Candidates should be advised that they need to spend some time individually at the outset of the project considering how they might judge the effectiveness or otherwise of the outcome in achieving the aim.

### **Evaluation of individual contribution (including what was learnt from cross-cultural collaboration)**

[Individual assessment]

Less successful responses simply listed all the positive things they had done. This is not evaluation. Candidates needed to consider not only the strengths and weaknesses of their own contribution in terms of what they did and how well they did it, but also show some awareness of the impact their contribution had on the progress of the project. Some candidates seemed to be unaware that they also needed to critically consider both the benefits and challenges of working as a team in general. Reflections on learning from cross-cultural collaboration were often weak. This was largely because the candidates had not engaged in any meaningful cross-cultural collaboration in the first place and so there was little or nothing for them to reflect on. The strongest responses to this criterion generally approached it in a very systematic way, again using sub-headings aligned to the three elements within the mark band descriptor, in order to ensure that each element was adequately addressed. Candidates who scored well generally produced work that was detailed and thoughtful, showing careful critical analysis of their own performance and contribution; the benefits and challenges of working in a group setting as opposed to working individually and what they had learned about other cultures from their research and cross-cultural collaboration and the impact it had had on them.

### **Important notes on the 2018 Syllabus (for implementation in March 2018)**

There are a number of important changes to the existing project component of the 0457 syllabus in the revised version to be implemented in **March 2018**. In the revised syllabus, this component will become component **3** and will be called the **Team Project**. The maximum mark will be **70**, rather than the current 60.

Candidates taking the revised syllabus should be made clearly aware of the following changes to the requirements for the project component:

#### **Group**

- 1 There are 8 specified topics on which the team project may be based. Any projects on topics outside of these 8 must be awarded zero marks.
- 2 Teachers will be required to award a group mark (with the same mark awarded to each team member) on the basis of the group's teamwork and commitment during the process of carrying out the project.
- 3 Teams will no longer submit a project plan for assessment. The team's collaborative submission will comprise 2 elements: a project Outcome and an Explanation.

- 4 Direct cross-cultural collaboration will no longer be a compulsory element of the project. However, as part of their research, candidates will still be required to explore different cultural perspectives on the issue they have chosen to investigate and teams will need to take this into consideration when planning their projects. Research into different cultural perspectives may still encompass some degree of cross-cultural primary research, if the team so chooses, as well as secondary research via the internet and/or other sources of information. The different cultural perspectives explored should be reflected in the Outcome itself and the Explanation.
- 5 The project Outcome is what the team produces collaboratively to achieve the project aim and it must involve the team addressing an issue; for example, raising public awareness about an issue; or solving a problem etc. The Outcome could take a variety of forms, such as: a poster; information leaflet or brochure; a song; a video, or a series of photographs possibly depicting an event such as a fundraiser, lessons; or cartoons with captions; a model or design; a webpage etc. An essay such a group research report or case study must not be accepted as an Outcome.
- 6 The Explanation (200–300 words) accompanying the Outcome should include the following information: the project aim; a brief description of the Outcome and an explanation of how the team's exploration of different cultural perspectives has informed or supports the Outcome. If the Explanation exceeds the word limit, teachers must not give credit beyond the first 300 words.

### Individual

- 1 Individual marks will no longer be awarded for individuals' participation in group work and activities.
- 2 Individual work will be made up of a single Reflective Paper (750–1000 words) in which candidates will individually reflect on:
  - their **personal research** findings and their own **work processes**
  - the **effectiveness** of the **project outcome** in **achieving the project aim**
  - what they have learned about **different cultural perspectives** on the issue
  - what they have learned about **teamwork overall** and their **own performance as a team member**
  - what they have learned **overall** from carrying out the project.

If the Reflective Paper exceeds the word limit, teachers must **not** give credit beyond the first **1000** words.

Teachers are strongly urged to thoroughly familiarise themselves with the revised requirements of the 2018 syllabus well before candidates embark on the Team Project component. The teacher support site and the Teachers' Guide for this qualification provide some examples of possible Team Project responses for teacher guidance. In assessing this component in 2018, teachers should, as previously, be closely guided by the wording of the performance descriptors within each of the mark bands.



# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

---

**Paper 0457/31**  
**Written Paper**

## **Key messages**

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

- analysed sources and evidence very well
- supported judgements carefully using reasons and evidence drawn from sources
- need more experience in designing research strategies to test claims
- should evaluate using critical thinking skills in greater depth.

## **General comments**

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions related to a range of sources linked by a common theme or issue. The sources represent different perspectives on a global issue, which is drawn from the syllabus. In June 2017, the paper was based upon source material related to global inequalities in wealth.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Many candidates are clearly developing an excellent understanding of global issues and an ability to argue effectively using evidence to support an opinion or claim. They interpret evidence, in a variety of different forms, with some confidence and insight. However, candidates need to develop research and evaluation skills to higher levels.

Candidates responded very well to the source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates explored different perspectives on the issues raised by the sources, particularly in relation to the need to reduce poverty.

Examination technique was generally very good. Candidates had sufficient time for the tasks. Nearly all candidates completed 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 drawn from the sources
- design and justify research strategies for different purposes
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### **Question 1**

- (a) Most candidates correctly identified the continents with high levels of wealth as Europe or Asia. Most candidates also correctly identified the continents with low levels of wealth as Africa or South America.

Some candidates misread the table and incorrectly identified countries.

- (b) Most candidates identified a consequence of poverty from the source. The consequences most frequently chosen were unemployment, difficulty in finding a job and children not getting an education.

Most candidates usually gave one reason for their judgement, simply stated. The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why the identified consequence was more significant than others; this occasionally involved comparing the significance of different consequences. Weaker responses often simply stated the consequence without explanation or tended to rely upon assertion.

To do well in this type of question candidates should state the identified characteristic and give two reasons for their judgement, carefully explained.

- (c) Candidates found this question quite challenging.

Some responses were clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanations of why inequality of wealth is a significant global issue with two (or more) developed reasons clearly linked to the issue. The global and inequality dimensions to the question were addressed explicitly.

However, many candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about trade in general, often without reference to inequalities.

## Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 2 and assess to some extent how well the author supported the view that, 'It is not fair that the difference between rich and poor people is so great.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified related to the commitment and passion of the writing, the use of some factual evidence and the citing of evidence. The weaknesses of the argument most frequently identified related to the 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 assertion and that the evidence may be out of date.

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

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

- (b) Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, 'Living in poverty affects your health.' These methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe surveys of health in different communities, some rich and some poor, using questionnaires and interviews. Some candidates suggested observation and 'inspection' of local health provision and facilities. Other methods included consultation with experts, local authorities and providers of medical treatment. Most suggested secondary research using sources from the internet.

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

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

Candidates should be given regular opportunity to design research strategies to test claims as a regular part of their courses.



### Question 3

- (a) Many candidates correctly identified a value judgement from the source and were able to explain the selection as an example of a view or belief about what is important, moral or ethical.

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

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

- (b) Most candidates found this question straight forward and gained a relatively high level of marks in comparison to **Question 3(a)**.

Many candidates correctly identified a fact from the source and explained the reasons why the statement was a fact, relating the example to a definition of a fact as a statement or information which is true or accurate and that can be verified.

- (c) Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the arguments and reasoning for both statements by Li Na and Tao in the source. The comparison of the statements included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a focus on reasons and evidence, with a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences and values for both statements. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion about which statement was most effective. The statements were also explicitly quoted and used directly in the response.

At the lower levels of response, the discussion was unlikely to be supported and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues relating to inequality in wealth and income rather than the quality of the reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences and values embedded in the statements.

There was very little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Most candidates identified Tao's statement as the most effective of convincing. Reasons related to his use of statistical material, values and use of rhetorical questions. Most candidates suggested that Li Na relied too heavily upon personal opinion and had limited knowledge of the issue.

Candidates found this question quite challenging. Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to evaluate sources during their courses. This should involve a consideration of the reasons and evidence used to support the argument or perspective in the source. Candidates should also be encouraged to quote and refer directly to material within sources, to support the points they are making.

### Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to consider three ways to reduce poverty, including:

- giving training to unemployed people
- increasing taxes on people with high incomes and wealth
- introducing a minimum wage for people in work.

The most popular solution was giving training to unemployed people. The arguments used by candidates mainly related to the costs, taxation issues, short and long-term impacts, importance of education for breaking the cycle of poverty, motivating workers, and encouraging people to take responsibility for themselves.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the most effective solution, sometimes providing a balanced assessment of the potential role of more than one of the possibilities. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and describe personal opinion. These arguments tended to be mainly unsupported and asserted.

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education  
0457 Global Perspectives June 2017  
Principal Examiner Report for Teachers

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:

- analysed sources and evidence very well
- supported judgements carefully using reasons and evidence drawn from sources
- need more experience in designing research strategies to test claims
- should evaluate using critical thinking skills in greater depth.

## **General comments**

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions related to a range of sources linked by a common theme or issue. The sources represent different perspectives on a global issue, which is drawn from the syllabus. In June 2017, the paper was based upon source material related to inequalities in global trade and the Fairtrade movement.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Many candidates are clearly developing an excellent understanding of global issues and an ability to argue effectively using evidence to support an opinion or claim. They interpret evidence, in a variety of different forms, with some confidence and insight. However, candidates need to develop research and evaluation skills to higher levels.

Candidates responded very well to the source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates explored different perspectives on the issues raised by the sources, particularly in relation to the need to reduce inequality in world trade.

Examination technique was generally very good. Candidates had sufficient time for the tasks. Nearly all candidates completed 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 drawn from the sources
- design and justify research strategies for different purposes
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### **Question 1**

- (a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified the trend in world trade as increasing.

Some candidates described the change using numerical analysis. However, candidates needed to identify the trend explicitly to gain the mark.

- (b) Most candidates identified Norway as the country with the highest level of trade, from Source 1.

- (c) Most candidates identified a benefit of trading from the source. The benefits most frequently chosen were increased opportunity to find a job and increased standard of living.

Most candidates usually gave one reason for their judgement, simply stated. The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why the identified benefit was more significant than others; this occasionally involved comparing the significance of different benefits. Weaker responses often simply stated the benefit without explanation or tended to rely upon assertion.

To do well in this type of question candidates should state the identified characteristic and give two reasons for their judgement, carefully explained.

- (d) Candidates found this question quite challenging.

Some responses were clearly reasoned, credible and structured explain why inequalities in world trade are an important issue for governments. The global and inequality dimensions to the question were addressed explicitly.

However, many candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about trade in general, often without reference to inequalities.

## Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 2 and assess to some extent how well the author supported the view that, 'Rich countries have many advantages in world trade.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- Some factual evidence is used.
- Several different types of evidence are used – opinion, fact, statistics, values.
- The evidence is generally relevant.
- The evidence is used forcefully in a strongly worded argument.
- Research evidence is cited.
- Personal experience is used as evidence.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- The research evidence is partially cited – the source and authorship are not clear.
- Level of expertise of the author is not clear – may have poor knowledge claims.
- There is only a little clear, specific statistical/numerical evidence.
- The evidence is not easy to verify/check from the information provided.
- Too much reliance on opinion and personal anecdote.
- The evidence may be out of date.
- The personal testimony/anecdote/values may not apply to other places/countries, etc.

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

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the argument in the source and justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means being unafraid to quote from or précis the source, to support points made.

- (b) Although candidates generally performed better on this type of question this year, some still found this question quite challenging.

Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, 'Rich countries spend more money on science and research than poor countries.' These methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe surveys about expenditure on scientific research in different countries, some rich and some poor, using questionnaires and interviews. Some candidates suggested observation and 'inspection' of local research facilities. Other methods included consultation with experts, local government and providers of research. Most suggested secondary research using sources from the internet.

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

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

Candidates should be given regular opportunity to design research strategies to test claims as a regular part of their courses.

### Question 3

- (a) Many candidates correctly identified an opinion from the source and explained the selection as an example of a personal view or belief.

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

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

- (b) Most candidates found this question straight forward and gained a relatively high level of marks in comparison to **Question 3(a)**.

Many candidates correctly identified a prediction from the source and explained the reasons why the statement was a prediction, relating the example to a definition of a prediction as a statement about the future, or similar.

- (c) Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the arguments and reasoning for both statements by Pavel and Lara in the source. The comparison of the statements included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a focus on reasons and evidence, with a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences and values for both statements. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion about which statement was most effective. The statements were also explicitly quoted and used directly in the response.

At the lower levels of response, the discussion was unlikely to be supported and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues relating to fair trade rather than the quality of the reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences and values embedded in the statements.

There was very little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Most candidates identified Pavel's statement as the most effective of convincing. Reasons related to his use of statistical material and a wide range of evidence. Most candidates suggested that Lara relied too heavily upon personal opinion and had limited evidence, as well as a 'harsh' tone.

Candidates found this question quite challenging. Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to evaluate sources during their courses. This should involve a consideration of the reasons and evidence used to support the argument or perspective in the source. Candidates should also be encouraged to quote and refer directly to material within sources.

#### Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to consider three ways to reduce inequality in world trade, including:

- promoting fair trade organisations
- giving more aid to developing countries
- funding scientific research in developing countries.

The most popular solution was promoting fair trade organisations. The arguments used by candidates mainly related to the costs, short and long-term impacts, importance of cooperation in responding to world problems, motivating and empowering workers, and encouraging people to take responsibility for themselves.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the most effective solution, sometimes providing a balanced assessment of the potential role of more than one of the possibilities. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and describe personal opinion. Arguments tended to be mainly 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 0457/33**  
**Written Paper**

## **Key messages**

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

- analysed sources and evidence very well
- supported judgements carefully using reasons and evidence drawn from sources
- need more experience in designing research strategies to test claims
- should evaluate using critical thinking skills in greater depth.

## **General comments**

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions related to a range of sources linked by a common theme or issue. The sources represent different perspectives on a global issue, which is drawn from the syllabus. In June 2017, the paper was based upon source material about mobile communications and social networking.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Many candidates are clearly developing an excellent understanding of global issues and an ability to argue effectively using evidence to support an opinion or claim. They interpret evidence, in a variety of different forms, with some confidence and insight. However, candidates need to develop research and evaluation skills to higher levels.

Candidates responded very well to the source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates explored different perspectives on the issues raised by the sources, particularly in relation to the impact of new technology on the quality of communication between people.

Examination technique was generally very good. Candidates had sufficient time for the tasks. Nearly all candidates completed 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 drawn from the sources
- design and justify research strategies for different purposes
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### **Question 1**

- (a) (i) Nearly all candidates correctly identified that there were 7 billion mobile telephones in use in 2015, from Source 1.
- (a) (ii) Nearly all candidates correctly identified that developing countries had the fastest growth in people using mobile telephones to access the internet, from the graph in Source 1.

**(b)** Most candidates identified a benefit of using mobile telephones and the internet for communication from Source 2. The benefits most frequently chosen were:

- communicate more cheaply
- make friends in foreign countries
- shop and buy things from across the world
- businesses can trade overseas
- keep in contact with friends and family.

Most candidates usually gave one reason for their judgement, simply stated. The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why the identified benefit was more significant than others; this occasionally involved comparing the significance of different benefits. Weaker responses often simply stated the benefit without explanation or tended to rely upon assertion.

To do well in this type of question candidates should state the identified characteristic and give two reasons for their judgement, carefully explained.

**(c)** Candidates found this question quite challenging.

Some responses were clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanations of how growth in the use of mobile telephones and the internet has global impact. The global impact element of the question was addressed directly and explicitly; for example by explaining that the increase in mobile phone use is happening all over the world, in both developed and developing countries or by explaining that increased internet access makes it possible for people to communicate easily and cheaply with people in other parts of the world.

However, many candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion the use of mobile telephones in general, often without reference to global impact.

## Question 2

**(a)** Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and assess, to some extent, how well the author supported the view that, 'Mobile telephones are creating problems.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- some factual evidence is used
- several different types of evidence are used – opinion, fact, statistics, values
- the evidence is used forcefully in a strongly worded argument
- research evidence is cited
- personal experience used.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- the research evidence is partially cited – the source and authorship are not clear
- level of expertise of the author is not clear – may have poor knowledge claims
- there is only a little clear, specific statistical/numerical evidence
- the evidence is not easy to verify/check from the information provided
- too much reliance on opinion and personal anecdote.

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

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the argument in the Source and justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means being unafraid to quote from or précis the source, to support point made.

**(b)** Although candidates generally performed well on this type of question this year, some still found this question quite challenging.

Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that 'Some young people text their friends over 250

times a day'. These methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe surveys about texting amongst young people, using questionnaires, observation and interviews. Other methods included consultation with experts and providers of mobile telephone services, as well as monitoring usage with software. Most suggested secondary research using sources from the internet.

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

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

Candidates should be given regular opportunity to design research strategies to test claims as a regular part of their courses.

### Question 3

- (a) Many candidates correctly identified a fact from the source and explained the selection as an example of a statement which was accurate or true and could be verified.

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates how to analyse sources using critical thinking concepts like fact, bias, vested interest, opinion, value judgement and prediction.

- (b) Most candidates also found this question straight forward and gained a high level of marks. Many candidates correctly identified a prediction from the source and explained the reasons why the statement was a prediction, relating the example to a definition of a prediction as a statement about the future, or similar.

- (c) Responses at the highest levels contained well-supported judgements about the arguments and reasoning for both statements by Alya and Umar in the source. The comparison of the statements included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a focus on reasons and evidence, with a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences and values for both statements. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion about which statement was most effective. The statements were also explicitly quoted and used directly in the response.

At the lower levels of response, the discussion was unlikely to be supported and mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues relating to the use of mobile telephones rather than the quality of the reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences and values embedded in the statements.

There was very little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Most candidates identified Umar's statement as the most effective or convincing. Reasons related to his use of statistical material and a wide range of evidence, including expert testimony. Most candidates suggested that Alya relied too heavily upon personal opinion and had limited, anecdotal evidence.

Candidates found this question quite challenging. Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to evaluate sources during their courses. This should involve a consideration of the reasons and evidence used to support the argument or perspective in the source. Candidates should also be encouraged to quote and refer directly to material within sources.

### Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to consider the whether or not mobile telephones and social media are improving communication between people.

Most candidates argued that mobile telephones and social media were having positive effects upon communication between people. The arguments used by candidates mainly related to cheaper costs, ease of use, keeping in touch with friends and relatives, extending social networks and making new friends and

relationships, supporting businesses and enhancing education. Arguments against this view discussed issues like security, cyber bullying, data loss, distraction and loss of social skills.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well-supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the issue, sometimes providing a balanced assessment of several perspectives on the issue. A clear, balanced conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and describe personal opinion. Arguments tended to be mainly 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.