

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 9777/01
Written Paper

Key messages

- Candidates should focus on the wording of the questions.
- Candidates should be aware of and understand the criteria assessed in this component, so that they know what is required of them in each question.
- Candidates should assess and evaluate both strengths and weaknesses of the documents, not simply describe them.

General comments

The general standard of work was good. Most candidates attempted all three questions, engaged with the two documents and showed that they followed the arguments.

Candidates who read the documents carefully and depended only on the content of the arguments for their evaluation tended to give more accurate and focused answers.

Candidates who wrote full answers to **Questions 2 and 3** showed that they had engaged well with the documents.

Candidates who wrote lengthy answers to **Question 1**, had less time to respond fully to questions 2 and 3.

Less successful candidates applied generic and sometimes irrelevant criteria to **Questions 2 and 3**, leading to generalised comment, or inaccurate evaluation.

The least successful candidates did not read all questions carefully and/or answered a different question.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1 carried 4 marks. It asked candidates to identify and explain two reasons for why technology will increase standards of living. Most candidates identified the reasons as increased income and reduced prices. As standards of living were not defined in the document, any improvements including to quality of life were acceptable.

Candidates who answered concisely, with two simply explained points, drawn from the text, covered the requirements adequately to achieve the marks.

The most successful responses identified two of: increased income/lower prices/less routine jobs/increased productivity and explained how these could lead to better standards of living. They explicitly mentioned some change in standard of living. The changes mentioned by these candidates included: money to spare for better products or for previously unaffordable luxury items, greater financial security/less stress about money, more interesting and fulfilling work, more access to goods and services.

Less successful responses identified increased income and/or cheaper prices and stated that standard of living was improved but did not explain how. These answers tended to lift a description of how income increased or why prices were lowered, rather than looking at the impact of these reasons on standard of living.

Some candidates wrote out or paraphrased large parts of the argument without explicitly identifying specific points or explaining them in their own words.

Question 2 carried 12 marks. It asked candidates to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the argument in Document 2.

Candidates who read the question carefully and answered fully and thoughtfully had the most success in their answers. They assessed a range of aspects of the document, including the content of the argument, its language, coherence, cohesion and structure and the credibility of the author. Each point made was illustrated with reference to the text and evaluated in terms of its impact on the argument and/or the reader. Successful evaluation was developed and explained, and the candidate came to an overall, explained judgement.

The strongest work made a series of valid evaluative points, including both strengths and weaknesses, and supported these with relevant illustration from the text. It explained why each was a strength or weakness, how the author's argument was supported or undermined by it and how the reader was impacted. This work concluded with a supported judgement that the argument was generally strong, generally weak, or had equal strengths and weaknesses.

Weaker work missed out one or more of these elements, leading to undeveloped though valid points. These did not go beyond identification of a weakness or strength with an explanation in general terms, resulting in a more generic answer with little (or irrelevant) reference to the document. In some cases, candidates wrote fully developed points but only looked at the weaknesses of the document.

The weakest work involved candidate speculation; making a series of inaccurate assertions/assumptions (not supported by information in the text) such as:

One weakness is that Burke and Sherk are both academic researchers which sounds good, but they do not have any expertise or knowledge about Automation.

The Heritage Foundation is a Liberal organisation and so Burke and Sherk have a vested interest in business making a profit at any cost. This weakens their argument.

In some cases, candidates clearly misunderstand what was required in evaluation of arguments.

Some wrote a great deal about their own views on the topic, introducing extraneous information and disagreeing with the author in Document 1, taking issue with the argument rather than evaluating it.

Others repeated the content of the argument and, where they agreed with the points made said they were strong and where they disagreed, said they were weak.

Question 3 carried 14 marks.

Candidates who answered the question fully had the most success in their answers. They read the passages carefully to identify where the arguments were similar/different in strength/weakness and where they were more/less convincing and focused on the relative strengths and weaknesses of the two documents. They came to a developed conclusion about which was the more convincing argument.

As in **Question 2**, those candidates who developed justified evaluative points and illustrated them with reference to both documents had most success. They chose a range of comparable points between the documents, included comparison and/or contrast and balanced the strengths and weaknesses of the documents and considered their impact on the reader and/or the strength of the overall argument.

The strongest work clarified the difference in views between the two documents from the outset and provided a balance of comparative evaluations so that strengths and weaknesses of both documents were explored. Some included characteristics where both were equally weak or strong.

The strongest answers considered *at least* two strengths and two weaknesses: explicitly identified, fully explained, illustrated, compared and their impact on the argument and or the reader evaluated.

For each point made, the candidate explicitly identified the characteristic to be evaluated. They clearly laid out the comparative strength/weakness of each document. They illustrated their point with illustration from both texts. They explained the impact of the strength/weakness on how convincing/unconvincing each document was and/or the impact of the strength/ weakness on the reader/s. They provided a clear supported

intermediate conclusion on how convincing or relatively strong or weak the documents were as a result of this strength or weakness.

Strong answers considered a range of evaluation, including content of the two arguments, evidence, cohesion, structure and language, coherence and credibility of the authors. The evaluation was explicit and an overall detailed judgement was presented.

The most successful answers compared the documents directly on the basis of specific criteria. They considered the plausibility of the arguments. They explained the impact of individual strengths or weaknesses and gave an intermediate conclusion on how convincing the documents were, after each comparison was made. This made it easy to follow the candidate's argument.

Less successful answers chose a relevant characteristic and made a valid point about the strength or weakness of one or both documents without development. They then explained how a characteristic impacted the argument or the reader, without any support from text, thus presenting a valid but generic point that could have been written without reading the text.

In some unusual responses, candidates chose to evaluate each document separately. They had a section on Document 2 and then a section on Document 1, looking at strengths and/or weaknesses of each document in isolation. This is a valid approach, however, more difficult to control and, in some cases, there was little link between the two evaluations, so different points were made about each document but there was no direct comparison.

Some candidates struggled despite making a wide range of well-developed and supported points of evaluation. These candidates decided from the outset that Document 2 was stronger and presented between four and six detailed evaluative points comparing the strengths of Document 2 with the weaknesses of Document 1. In order to fully-achieve on this question, candidates are required to present *at least* four fully-developed points, including *at least one* balancing point of evaluation. So, where they present three strengths of Document 2/weaknesses of Document 1, they must **also** present at least one strength of Document 1/weakness of Document 2 (or vice versa).

Some candidates misread the texts and attempted to use credibility criteria that were not clearly relevant or supported by the evidence in the text, instead of relying on the text for their evaluation.

A misreading of the texts led some candidates to state that:

Document 2 is stronger because it presents the downsides of free trade for the poor whereas Document 1 does not present any counter argument or downsides of automation.

Weaker work presented a series of well-developed points, illustrated and explained – but only considered Document 2 with little or no mention or evaluation of Document 1. This did not answer the question.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

<p>Paper 9777/02 Essay</p>
--

Key messages

The key messages from this series are:

- Most candidates created logically structured essays.
- Candidates explored different perspectives on global issues with confidence.
- Reflection should be given greater weight in constructing conclusions.

Suggestions for further research should be fully explained.

General comments

Most candidates produced a well-argued essay which evaluated two contrasting perspectives on a global issue using a range of cross-cultural sources obtained through personal research.

Successful essays were logically structured, providing an analysis and evaluation of the arguments and evidence associated with two different perspectives on the chosen issue. Through direct comparison of the two perspectives, candidates reached a convincing, supported and balanced conclusion which provided a clear answer to the question in the title. Candidates achieving at the highest levels included a thoughtful reflection on their own learning and views about the issue, as well as an evaluation of their own research, which included explicit suggestions for further research that were fully explained.

In general, the research for the essays was completed thoroughly and many candidates used a wide range of sources from different cultural backgrounds, usually gathered from the internet. The selection of sources and evidence was generally very effective and clearly related to the research question embodied in the title. It is pleasing to see candidates gather data and sources using both primary and secondary research methods.

Many candidates reflect on the implications of their research for their own perspectives, including personal beliefs, values and lifestyle. Reflection is a skill that could be developed further. Candidates should be encouraged to write a full paragraph describing and explaining the purpose of several suggestions for further research.

To improve levels of achievement, candidates should be encouraged to:

- reflect on their own learning and perspectives in greater detail
- include fully explained suggestions for further research
- cite and reference all sources used and include a full bibliography.

Specific comments

In this section of the report some further guidance is given to centres on how to improve the quality of the essays.

Reflection and Personal Learning

Candidates should write one or two paragraphs describing and explaining how the outcomes of research and exploration of the global issue has affected their own personal perspectives and beliefs about the issue. This might include:

- a description of their main learning points about the global issue and research in general
- changes to or reinforcement of their own perspectives
- implications for their own behaviour or lifestyle.

Candidates should be encouraged to explain and provide evidence to justify their reflections and judgements. This may take a range of different forms, including examples, quotations from sources or data gathered from primary research that were significant, notes from personal research diaries or course logs, extracts from discussions about the issue, and reference to authors or sources that have been particularly stimulating or convincing.

This part of the essay was sometimes omitted completely or described in a few brief sentences. The inclusion of a fully developed reflection that supported the conclusion would raise the achievement levels of many candidates.

Further Research

Candidates should discuss further research in the essay as this is an important part of the marking criteria. The mark scheme explicitly refers to the inclusion and quality of suggestions for further research. The discussion of several examples of further research, particularly arising from the reflection, would increase overall levels of achievement for many candidates.

Candidates should be encouraged to include further research within their essays at the planning stage. A full paragraph explaining how further research will improve the quality of the data gathered, the strength of the conclusions or scope of the analysis is essential.

Evaluation of previous examples of research on global issues and peer evaluation of research reports and essays during the course would be valuable in developing these skills. Reviewing examples of discussions of further research from past essays demonstrating 'good practice' would also be valuable.

Citation and Referencing

The citation of sources and the inclusion of a bibliography are an important part of the essay. Citation of sources helps to demonstrate the quality of research and the extent, depth and relevance of the information and data gathered. Citation also ensures that plagiarism is avoided.

Citation and referencing of about seven to ten sources is recommended as a working minimum. Using more than twenty sources is difficult to manage effectively within the maximum word count of 2000 words.

The bibliography should systematically and consistently include all sources used in the essay and include enough information for each source to be located by a third party. Whilst it is not essential for a formal academic method of referencing to be used, a standardised approach is helpful. If the source has been found on the internet, the date and time of access needs to be included.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

**Paper 9777/03
Presentation**

Key messages

- Questions should be direct and focus on a central debate.
- Organising the presentation around the main perspectives tends to be the most successful approach.
- The analysis and synthesis of sources should support the argument being made.
- Conclusions should be developed. They should review the main evidence and be closely linked to the main terms of the question.

General comments

The Resource Booklet

For this session, the main topic of the resource booklet was medical tourism, in Documents 1 to 6, drawn from the global issue of medical ethics. An alternative topic was provided in Documents 7 and 8 from the topic of transnational organisations. The vast majority of candidates chose the medical tourism option, although there were some which engaged productively with the ideas underlying the alternative debate between internationalism and localism, tending to select either climate change or — occasionally — Brexit as their example. As in previous sessions, it was the sophistication in selecting and conceptualising perspectives, the treatment of sources and the range of research which distinguished the quality of presentations, rather than the initial document or debate chosen.

Titles

In navigating the range of available documents, many candidates selected a variation of the question of whether medical tourism is a good thing. Others developed questions about free healthcare and human rights. Where those questions focused on a clear debate, they were successful and allowed presentations to access the full range of levels of achievement. Some candidates reduced the potential international range of their debates by focusing on just one country, most often the UK (discussing the impact on the NHS) but sometimes Nigeria or the US. Where the contexts of different countries were compared in a question, candidates found it much easier to demonstrate a global range.

Most titles did construct debates effectively with 'should' or 'does' stems. Those which called for a more descriptive approach — e.g. 'To what extent does medical tourism affect the quality of health care for locals?' — were in the minority and tended to be less successful in identifying and exploring opposing perspectives. The stem 'To what extent' was best used when candidates had carefully considered whether a graduated comparison was most appropriate for their debate; often a straight 'should' or 'do/does' comparison was more effective: for example, 'Do LEDCs benefit from globalisation?'

Some candidates narrowed down the focus of their question to, for example, the economic impact of medical tourism on the countries to which people travel. In order to answer such a question successfully, it was important that the perspectives within the overall question were identified and consistently focused upon through the debate, and that the debate itself was clear. Where this was not the case, a more direct and straightforward question might have been more appropriate. Double questions (such as 'Does geography have an impact on poverty, and, if so, how does geography affect poverty levels?') rarely worked well, as they made it difficult for the candidate to establish a single focus for their argument.

Perspectives

Many candidates structured their work in order to ensure that they remained focused on perspectives. This involved identifying the perspective first, then developing a comparison of sources and evidence supporting

the perspective before turning to another perspective and doing the same. Where standard sequences were used to structure presentations they were most effective when the overall perspective controlled the direction and individual sources were grouped in support. This prevented an excessive focus on the evaluation of individual sources which detracted from the overall perspective-focused progression of the argument. This presentation responding to the question ‘Should all healthcare be privatised?’ introduced its perspectives in the following way:

‘One of the main healthcare models used globally is universal healthcare, defined by the World Health Organisation (or WHO) as ‘all peoples’ and communities’ ability to access promotive, preventive, curative, rehabilitative and palliative health services of sufficient quality to be effective, which ensure that the user of these services is not exposed to financial hardship’. ... In contrast, the hybrid model, adopted by the US (and almost solely the US) uses a system made up mainly of healthcare facilities owned and operated by private sector businesses, with a small proportion of healthcare facilities owned by the government. ... The other two models of care I will be considering are the Bismarck and the ‘out-of-pocket’ models....’

This contrasts with a source-based approach to structure, which makes it harder for the presentation to engage in detail with the development of perspectives:

‘The first document I will look at is document two from the source booklet, titled ‘Medical tourism making India a global wellness hub’. This article, from eHealth, outlines some of the steps India needs to take in order to become a global centre of medical tourism and the possible benefits of doing so. ... Another source, from the Guardian, ‘Poland’s medical tourism clinics offer half price treatment to the world’ also argues that medical tourism is beneficial. ... Another country benefitting from the effects of medical tourism is the UK. This next article from the Guardian ‘Medical tourism generates millions for the NHS and wider economy, finds study’ talks about the effect medical tourism is having on the NHS.’

This presentation, asking about the extent to which medical tourism is beneficial, uses each of these sources to build a perspective arguing for its benefits, but leads this with the sources themselves rather than first identifying the perspective which would have given more scope to select and evaluate specific evidence which would support it.

Treatment of Sources

The vast majority of candidates succeeded in identifying and analysing specific sources. Where the treatment of these was integrated with the argument being made and the perspectives being presented this was particularly effective. Where candidates evaluated the credibility of the author and the reliability of the evidence of each of their sources separately to the argument being made it at least demonstrated their ability to select sources, but not to use them effectively in supporting their presentation. This example is from a presentation with the title, ‘To what extent does an increase in globalisation decrease poverty in developing countries?’:

‘Enrico Santerelli, a professor of economics at the University of Bologna, found 45 per cent of countries experiencing an increase in absolute poverty of \$1 are in Sub-Saharan Africa, which proves to be the region most severely afflicted by poverty associated with an increase in openness and foreign direct investment. According to Dollar and Kraay of the World Bank, figures show the share of the population of the developing countries living below \$1 per day declined from 40 per cent to 18 per cent between 1981 and 2004. However, this was mainly achieved by the substantial reduction of the poor in Asia, in particular China where at the end of the 1990s the shares of the population below the 1 USD/PPP equivalent poverty line barely reached 3 per cent.’

The source of each piece of evidence is identified and contextualised, but also evaluated in order to make claims within the argument, not in order to evaluate the source as something distinct.

Beyond this, synthesis — or specific connections made between different sources in order to present perspectives and build arguments — is a key differentiator for the higher levels. This is a good example of it being done in a sustained and consistent way in this presentation on whether healthcare free at the point of access should be a basic human right:

‘Although initially argued by Dearden, further research prompted me to conclude that this argument [on the value of the NHS as a free source of healthcare] is substantiated because it is well-recognised by other British journalists such as Bid Adewunmi. This should not be surprising when examining the fact that in 2016 an “Opinium” survey, that sampled the responses of 2000 British people on what made them most proud to be British, the NHS was the most common answer. Although this survey is restricted in terms of the number

of individuals who answered it, it does begin to display the value of having access to a system of free health care for the British public. However, another article written for The King's Fund by Laura Fulcher draws on her own personal experience of the NHS as a cancer patient. Fulcher argues that people within the UK have a blindness over the actual quality of care being offered, because of their invested interest, which is ignited by "placing the NHS on a pedestal as being the envy of the Western world" because it offers free healthcare.'

Individual claims and evidence are logically connected from four distinct sources in rapid succession in order to build and critique a perspective in a supported way.

Conclusions

Successful conclusions occupy a significant proportion of the presentation by reviewing and summarising the evidence before using this to reach supported judgements which are relevant to the question. It is important at this stage to retain focus on the exact nature of that question, and repeating its wording in the conclusion is often beneficial. These extracts from the conclusion to a presentation on the economic costs and benefits of medical tourism demonstrate these stages:

'From assessing an alternative perspective to my question, it has been evident that the growth in medical tourism has not just brought negatives but has created an array of positives and further development opportunities to benefit countries' economies. When analysing Nigeria, the negatives brought to the economy from medical tourism have been included but the main focus is on the solutions to these problems, which can offer more positives and help the economy flourish from the global phenomenon. Within the UK it has also been shown that the economy has benefitted from the new source of income ... Overall, this perspective provides a more optimistic approach whilst still providing strong evidence and support to claims made. However, this viewpoint is mainly showing solutions to the fundamental problems medical tourism has created. New opportunities and sources of income have been highlighted but these figures are insignificant when compared to the cost created from medical tourism itself.'

Although there is scope to develop this answer further, it demonstrates a focus on the key terms in the question, a review of each perspective and its evidence, and then a nuanced and relevant conclusion on the basis of this.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

<p>Paper 9777/04 Independent Research Report</p>
--

Key messages

- A range of criteria should be used to evaluate evidence and perspectives.
- Reflection is a key part of the Critical Path which is the basis of the qualification.
- When choosing questions and selecting evidence the requirement for intellectual challenge should be considered.

General comments

The quality of work and the marking by centres continued to be strong. Many centres had high expectations appropriate to a Pre U qualification. Marks for AO1 continued to be consistent with the evidence provided in the feedback forms which generally indicated a mature level of cooperation between teachers and candidates and generally independent approaches by candidates to the task of researching and organising the reports. Most work was firmly based on evidence and relatively few answers had the characteristics of extended essays rather than reports based on the analysis and assessment of a range of sources. Moderators commented on the quality of feedback offered by centres which was helpful and realistic.

AO1

There was very useful feedback given by centres on the degree of cooperation and the way that candidates managed independent research. Part of the process is the mature response to advice and so centres are urged to take advantage of the guidance offered by Cambridge International in the Outline Proposal Forms. It is particularly important even at the planning stage to make sure that a range of sources can be accessed in support of the different perspectives on an issue. It would not be realistic to expect that this will be the final list of evidence, as research may throw up issues which require further research. Candidates need to make sure that there is contrasting evidence and that different perspectives can be established before making a final decision about their titles, so the bibliography which is a requirement is a very useful indication about whether the question will 'work' and is also a check about the depth possible. If the only available sources are outdated or simplistic or if basic blogs and unreliable websites dominate, then this is a warning that should be heeded.

AO2

The key element in this assessment objective is the evaluation of evidence. This is at the heart of decision making about the issue and follows on from the skill development in the earlier papers. Few reports offered no critical analysis but the quality and extent of the evaluation does continue to be a major discriminator between stronger and weaker work. Many markers do show by marginal annotation where evaluation is developed and supported and use a range of critical criteria, but sometimes marking seems misled by noting 'evaluation' when the judgements are merely based on consideration of the authorship of the source. Though tempting to value some sophisticated explanations which contain very little evaluation above work which seems less detailed and developed but nevertheless contains effective critical assessment of evidence, it is important that marks for AO2 focus directly on judgements about sources.

AO3

There was good agreement about the arguments and discussions of perspectives and some well-focused analyses which used knowledge to establish different views. Conclusions generally followed logically from the presentation of different arguments. There was some tendency to over reward reports which contained a lot of discussion. In one recent proposal the intention was set out to offer a considerable amount of

information in case the reader was not interested in the topic. However, as the readers are the teachers marking the work and the Moderators assessing the marking, this should not be a concern. Technical issues do need to be set out clearly for comprehension but the main interest for the readers is the quality of the arguments and the basis of the establishment of a personal view by the candidates. Factual information can be obtained elsewhere but the key element for readers is what the reports' personal views are and how the arguments are seen and assessed. There were some impressive analyses of very complex issues but candidates are reminded that clarity is very important when establishing contrasting perspectives and presenting a convincing personal judgement. Part of the process of judgement should be the reflection on conclusions reached. While this essential element of the Critical Path was well done by some, others neglected it, sometimes completely. What is required is not a personal comment but a consideration of the sufficiency of conclusions given the range of evidence considered and the nature and scope of the evidence used.

A04

Standards of expression and accuracy of English were generally high but it is the communication of argument that is the key requirement. A well-crafted conclusion is essential and while this was often provided, some reports did end too abruptly.

A05

Intellectual challenge is a requirement and this can be met in various ways. Though many met this by considering topics which went beyond A level equivalent study, often resulting in some very complex and demanding material, others met it by the sophistication of analysis and evaluation. Centres were generally realistic in assessing it but sometimes marks seemed rather generous when some standard A level topics were treated or when topics were considered which were not themselves very demanding and were not analysed in an especially rigorous way. It may well be that interest in a topic which is not especially demanding outweighs the relative lack of challenge but this element is worth more consideration at the planning stage, especially in the selection of evidence.

In some cases there may be just one element which might be considered (perhaps Reflection particularly) in order to improve future performance. Our thanks to centres once again for the hard work in supporting this qualification.