eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/11
Written Examination

Key messages

The key messages from this series are that candidates:

- demonstrated excellent skills of interpretation and analysis
- need to use critical thinking concepts in evaluating sources
- should use material from sources as evidence to justify their opinions
- need to fully explain the potential impact and consequences of different actions.

General comments

The Written Examination consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In June 2019, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of transport systems. The specific issue explored was about the impact of shipping and sea transport on the environment.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Many candidates respect and appreciate different perspectives on global issues and use reasons and evidence to support their own opinions. Candidates are also able to analyse sources and data presented in different ways. However, some candidates need to develop evaluative skills to higher levels and apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of sources.

Most candidates engaged enthusiastically with the issue outlined in the sources. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to reduce pollution of coastal areas and beaches. However, candidates should explain and assess potential impact and consequences of proposals in more detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgement within the conclusion.

Examination technique was usually very good. The majority of candidates completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn from the sources, including through quotation and citation of sources
- provide evidence and reasons to justify their opinion
- avoid assertion, simple description or repetition of sources
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, bias, tone, language, and vested interest
- evaluate alternative actions in greater detail, explaining and assessing the potential impact and consequences more fully.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified the number of cruise ship passengers in 2015, from Source 1, as 22 million, and therefore gained the maximum of 1 mark for this question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two benefits of growth in sea transportation, from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of 2 marks for this question. Most candidates identified greater variety of products, exchange of cultures and more international trade.

(c) Most candidates responded well to this question and clearly suggested a disadvantage of growth in sea transportation which was most significant, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss pollution by plastic waste, loss of cultural heritage and loss of biodiversity and marine life.

The most common justifications given by candidates related to issues of impact, including:

- the number of people affected
- the range of impact e.g. number of countries/businesses/organisations affected
- the depth of impact e.g. how much difference will be made
- the speed of impact e.g. how soon the impact would occur
- costs
- impact of growth in sea transportation on other aspects of social and economic life.

Many candidates showed awareness of the link between cause and effect in this context, as well as the 'snowball' effect of a consequence or cause leading to another. Some discussed a possible 'vicious circle'.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why one disadvantage was more significant than others and gave some evidence to support their judgements. Weaker responses often simply stated the reason/cause without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion without evidence or careful reasoning. Some candidates compared the significance of different reasons/causes, but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

(d) Many candidates responded well to this question and could identify both a national and a global consequence of the growth in sea transportation, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concepts of 'national' and 'global'.

National consequences of increased sea transportatio most frequently identified by candidates were increased international trade benefiting the national economy, increased tourism, more national employment and exchange of culture. Some candidates explored the significance of losing elements of local culture and heritage.

Similarly, most candidates identified a global consequence of increased sea transportation as increased global trade and development, cheaper transport of goods, sharing of culture, and pollution.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about sea transportation in general without reference to 'global' or 'national'.

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'national' or 'global' context.

Question 2

(a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'shipping harms the environment'.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- balanced
- gives an example to illustrate
- cites sources
- a lot of evidence of different types
- statistical evidence and facts
- some recent evidence
- expert evidence used.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- little authority
- author unknown
- no personal experience apparent
- some evidence old
- does not consider counterarguments.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their opinions, usually discussing four or more distinct evaluative points. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion.

Some weaker responses described the reasons and evidence within the source but did not evaluate or explain why the identified reason or type of evidence was a strength or weakness.

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the quality of the reasons and evidence in the source and justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means being willing to quote from or summarise elements of the source.

(b) Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources of information and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, 'Tourism brings jobs to local people'. The methods of testing the claim suggested were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example from different jobs in different places and cultures. Surveys of local people about tourism and job opportunities were also suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts, local government and employers. Nearly all candidates suggested secondary research using sources from the internet. Many described the type of source that was likely to be reliable and free from bias or vested interest, for example from governments, NGOs and United Nations organisations.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestions, clearly and explicitly related to the claim being tested; 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 opinion on the issue rather than describing how it could be researched. These responses gained very few, if any, marks.

Candidates should be given regular opportunities to design research strategies to test claims.

Question 3

(a) Most candidates correctly identified a prediction from the Kiri's statement.

(b) Most candidates correctly identified a fact from Tane's statement.

(c) Many candidates correctly identified bias in Tane's statement, revealing an understanding that bias is a predisposition for or against something; an attitude of strong like or dislike; an unbalanced approach not prepared to consider counterarguments or other points of view

Candidates most frequently identified the following examples of bias from the source:

- Tane has conducted research for the United Nations.
- Tane does not consider counter-arguments.
- Lack of balance.
- The statement contains mainly personal opinion.
- Tane only supports one point of view.
- There is little evidence to support the assertion in the statement.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

The most effective responses tended to quote from the source and clearly describe evidence from the source to support their judgment.

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

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

(d) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly and discussed issues relating to evidence, language, knowledge claims and expertise. Some candidates also addressed the reasons and values within each statement.

Responses at the highest levels contained well-supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the value of each statement; this 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 each statement. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion. The statements were also quoted explicitly and material from each statement was used directly in the response as evidence to support the candidate's opinion.

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 rather than reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was very little or no overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to evaluate sources. This should involve a consideration of the reasons and evidence used to support the argument or perspective in the source.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to assess and recommend different proposed actions designed to reduce pollution of the coast and beaches in a local area. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

There were many thoughtful discussions of each proposed action. Some candidates chose to compare all options, which was a more challenging, but at times very effective, way to structure the argument.

However, some candidates tended to describe their opinions in a generalised and asserted way, comparing each action without exploring the potential impact on coastal areas and beaches.

Most candidates recommended organising community volunteers to clean local beaches every week.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well-supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the issue. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses linked the argument back to the issue of reducing pollution explicitly and frequently.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the option or pollution in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to reduce pollution.

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.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/12
Written Examination

Key messages

The key messages from this series are that candidates:

- demonstrated excellent skills of interpretation and analysis
- need to use critical thinking concepts in evaluating sources
- should use material from sources as evidence to justify their opinions
- should fully explain the potential impact and consequences of different actions.

General comments

The Written Examination consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In June 2019, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of demographic change. The specific issue explored was about the impact of access to clean water and sanitation on child mortality.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Many candidates respect and appreciate different perspectives on global issues and use reasons and evidence to support their own opinions. Candidates are also able to analyse sources and data presented in different ways. However, some candidates need to develop evaluative skills to higher levels and apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of sources.

Most candidates engaged enthusiastically with the issue outlined in the sources. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to a local community for improving the quality of water in the area. However, candidates should explain and assess potential impact and consequences of proposals in more detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgement within the conclusion.

Examination technique was usually very good. The majority of candidates completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn from the sources including through quotation and citation of sources
- provide evidence and reasons to justify their opinion
- avoid assertion, simple description or repetition of sources
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, bias, tone, language, and vested interest
- evaluate alternative actions in greater detail, explaining and assessing the potential impact and consequences more fully.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified the trend in global child mortality from Source 1 as decreasing or going down, and therefore gained the maximum of 1 mark for this question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two reasons for high rates of child mortality from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of 2 marks for this question. Most candidates identified unclean drinking water, poor sanitation and poor health education.

(c) Most candidates responded well to this question and clearly explained the most effective way to reduce rates of child mortality, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss providing water treatment services, building more toilets, increasing access to doctors and medicines, and improving health education and training of parents.

The most common justifications given by candidates related to issues of impact, including:

- the number of people affected
- the range of impact e.g. number of countries/businesses/organisations affected
- the depth of impact e.g. how much difference will be made to child mortality
- the speed of impact e.g. how soon the impact would occur
- costs
- impact on other aspects of social and economic life.

Many candidates showed awareness of the link between cause and effect in this context, as well as the 'snowball' effect of a consequence or cause leading to another. Some discussed a possible 'virtuous circle'.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why one action was more effective than others and gave some evidence to support their judgements. Weaker responses often simply stated the action without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion without evidence or careful reasoning. Some candidates compared the effectiveness of different actions, but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

(d) Many candidates responded well to this question and could explain why child mortality is an important local issue, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concept of 'local'.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. There were many sensitive explorations of the impact on local communities and families, including on birth rates, emotional and mental health, the local economy and family income in later life.

Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about child mortality in general without reference to 'local'. Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences of child mortality taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'local' context.

Question 2

(a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'Governments must spend more money to provide clean water'.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- strongly worded
- uses rhetorical questions
- passionate argument
- uses WHO as evidence
- refers to local doctor as evidence
- uses expert views
- gives an example to illustrate.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- much opinion
- anecdotal evidence
- a rant

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- exaggerated
- little authority
- poor knowledge claims
- little if any factual evidence
- no references or citation
- not much evidence
- emotional.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their opinions, usually discussing four or more distinct evaluative points. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion.

Some weaker responses described the reasons and evidence within the source but did not evaluate or explain why the identified reason or type of evidence was a strength or weakness.

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the quality of the reasons and evidence in the source and justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means being willing to quote from or summarise elements of the source.

(b) Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources of information and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, 'Access to clean water saves children's lives'. The methods of testing the claim suggested were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example from different jobs in different places and cultures. Surveys of local people about health, sanitation and water supplies were also suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts, local government and health professionals like doctors and nurses. Nearly all candidates suggested secondary research using sources from the internet. Many described the type of source that was likely to be reliable and free from bias or vested interest, for example from governments, NGOs and United Nations organisations.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestions, clearly and explicitly related to the claim being tested; 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 opinion on the issue rather than describing how it could be researched.

Candidates should regularly be given regular opportunities to design research strategies to test claims.

Question 3

(a) Almost all candidates correctly identified an opinion from Source 4.

(b) Almost all candidates correctly identified a fact from Source 4.

(c) Many candidates correctly identified bias in Saba's statement, revealing an understanding that bias is a predisposition for or against something; an attitude of strong like or dislike; an unbalanced approach not prepared to consider counterarguments or other points of view.

Candidates most frequently identified the following examples of bias from the source:

- Saba works for the government (and so is likely to think that governments are best placed to make a difference).
- Lack of balance in the argument – 'It is only governments that can make a real difference', 'Charities only help a few people', 'Only governments can afford national strategies'.
- Little objective research or evidence to support.
- The source/statement contains much opinion and personal ideas.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

The most effective responses tended to quote from the source and clearly describe evidence from the source to support their judgment.

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

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

(d) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly and discussed issues relating to evidence, language, knowledge claims and expertise. Some candidates also addressed the reasons and values within each statement.

Responses at the highest levels contained well-supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the value of each statement; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well each 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. The statements were also quoted explicitly and material from each statement was used directly in the response as evidence to support the candidate's opinion.

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 rather than reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was very little or no overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

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.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to assess and recommend to the local community different proposed actions designed to improve the quality of water in the area. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

There were many thoughtful discussions of each proposal or option. Some candidates chose to compare all options, which was a more challenging, but at times very effective, way to structure the argument.

However, some candidates tended to describe their opinions in a generalised and asserted way, comparing each action without exploring the potential impact on the quality of water.

Most candidates recommended getting help from charities for hygiene projects like toilet twinning and health education.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the issue. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses linked the argument explicitly and frequently back to the issue of improving water quality.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the option or the importance of clean water in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to improve water quality.

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.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/13
Written Examination

Key messages

The key messages from this series are that candidates:

- demonstrated excellent skills of interpretation and analysis
- need to use critical thinking concepts in evaluating sources
- should use material from sources as evidence to justify their opinions
- need to fully explain the potential impact and consequences of different actions.

General comments

The Written Examination consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In June 2019, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of globalisation. The specific issue explored was about the impact of globalisation on homelessness and access to housing.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Many candidates respect and appreciate different perspectives on global issues and use reasons and evidence to support their own opinions. Candidates are also able to analyse sources and data presented in different ways. However, some candidates need to develop evaluative skills to higher levels and apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of sources.

Most candidates engaged enthusiastically with the issue outlined in the sources. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to a local community for reducing homelessness in the area. However, candidates should explain and assess potential impact and consequences of proposals in more detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgement within the conclusion.

Examination technique was usually very good. The majority of candidates completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn from the Sources including through quotation and citation of sources
- provide evidence and reasons to justify their opinion
- avoid assertion, simple description or repetition of sources
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, bias, tone, language, and vested interest
- evaluate alternative actions in greater detail, explaining and assessing the potential impact and consequences more fully.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified how many people in the world are estimated to be homeless as 1 billion and therefore gained the maximum of 1 mark for this question.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two causes of homelessness, from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of 2 marks for this question. Most candidates identified migration, natural disasters, unemployment and conflict.

(c) Most candidates responded well to this question and clearly explained the most significant cause of homelessness, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss migration, natural disasters, unemployment and conflict.

The most common justifications given by candidates related to issues of impact, including:

- the number of people affected
- the range of impact e.g. number of countries/businesses/organisations affected
- the depth of impact e.g. how much difference will be made to homelessness
- the speed of impact e.g. how soon the impact would occur
- costs
- impact of homelessness on other aspects of social and economic life.

Many candidates showed awareness of the link between cause and effect in this context, as well as the 'snowball' effect of a consequence or cause leading to another. Some discussed a possible 'vicious circle'.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why one cause was more significant than others and gave some evidence to support their judgements. Weaker responses often simply stated the cause without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion without evidence or careful reasoning. Some candidates compared the significance of different reasons/causes, but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

(d) Many candidates responded well to this question and could identify both a local and national consequence of homelessness, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concepts of 'local' and 'national'.

Local consequences of homelessness most frequently identified by candidates were:

- create local danger to others
- make a mess/spoil the local environment e.g. from sleeping/eating/cooking in street
- causing fear and frightening local people e.g. from appearance and begging
- more local crime e.g. steal food and take illegal drugs
- reduce tourism e.g. poor reputation of the local area
- reduce local economy.

Similarly, most candidates identified a national consequence of homelessness as:

- reduced national economic growth e.g. lack of investment due to poor image
- lack of tourists spending money
- higher taxes e.g. to pay for hostels/shelter/health care
- reduced expenditure on other government priorities.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about homelessness in general without reference to 'local' or 'national'.

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'national' or 'global' context.

Question 2

(a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the claim that, 'Homeless people are spoiling our city!'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- strongly worded
- a passionate argument
- uses personal experience as evidence
- gives an example to illustrate.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- much opinion
- anecdotal evidence
- a rant
- exaggerated
- little authority
- poor knowledge claims
- little if any factual evidence.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their opinions, usually discussing four or more distinct evaluative points, linking their criticisms back to the claim. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion.

Some weaker responses described the reasons and evidence within the source but did not evaluate or explain why the identified reason or type of evidence was a strength or weakness.

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the quality of the reasons and evidence in the source and justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means being willing to quote from or summarise elements of the source.

(b) Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources of information and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, 'There are more homeless people on our streets'. The methods of testing the claim suggested were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example from people living in the area. Surveys of local people about the presence of homeless people were also suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts, local government representatives and charity workers. Nearly all candidates suggested secondary research using sources from the internet. Many described the type of source that was likely to be reliable and free from bias or vested interest, for example from governments, NGOs and United Nations organisations.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestions clearly and explicitly related to the claim being tested; 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 opinion on the issue rather than describing how it could be researched.

Candidates should be given regular opportunity to design research strategies to test claims.

Question 3

(a) Almost all candidates correctly identified an opinion from Source 4.

(b) Almost all candidates correctly identified a prediction from Source 4.

(c) Many candidates correctly identified an example of a value judgement from Source 4, revealing an understanding that a value judgement is a view or decision about what is right, wrong or important, based a particular set of standards, principles, or values.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Candidates most frequently identified the following examples of value judgements from the source:

- It is right to help.
- Everyone is equal.
- … is much better than living in a refugee camp/shanty town/on the streets.
- This is much fairer than putting the burden on …
- People have human rights.

The most effective responses tended to quote from the source and clearly describe evidence from the source to support their judgment.

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 bias and provide experience of using the term in the analysis of sources, alongside other critical thinking concepts like value judgement, bias, vested interest, fact, opinion and prediction.

(d) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly and discussed issues relating to evidence, language, knowledge claims and expertise. Some candidates also addressed the reasons and values within each statement.

Responses at the highest levels contained well-supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the value of each statement; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well each argument worked with a focus on reasons and evidence, with a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences and values for each statement. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion. The statements were also quoted explicitly and material from the statements was used directly in the response as evidence to support the candidate's opinion.

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 rather than reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was very little or no overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to evaluate sources. This should involve a consideration of the reasons and evidence used to support the argument or perspective in the source.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to assess and recommend to the local community different proposed actions designed to reduce homelessness in the area. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

There were many thoughtful discussions of each proposal or option. Some candidates chose to compare all options, which was a more challenging, but at times very effective, way to structure the argument.

However, some candidates tended to describe their opinions in a generalised and asserted way, comparing each action without exploring the potential impact on homelessness.

Most candidates recommended funding local charities to support homeless people.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the issue. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses linked the argument explicitly and frequently back to the issue of reducing homelessness.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the option or homelessness in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to reduce homelessness.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02
Individual Report

Key messages

Teachers and candidates must be aware of and fully understand the **assessment criteria**.
Candidates are most successful when they focus on **one issue** and formulate a question on this issue.
The candidate's question must allow for research into global and national/local perspectives on a global issue under one of the **eight topics** stated in the syllabus for this component.

General comments

For this component, candidates select one of the 8 topics in the syllabus. They identify a global issue and formulate a question, which they should answer. They research and present different perspectives (global and national/local) on their issue, with relevant supporting information. They analyse the causes and consequences of their issue. They compare causes and consequences. They propose and develop a course of action to help resolve their chosen issue. They evaluate the sources of information they have used to support their argument. Finally, they reflect on their personal perspective and how this has been impacted by their research and the perspectives explored. They should also cite and reference the sources of information they use in their report. They should present their report in essay form (continuous prose), in a Word document and should write between 1500 and 2000 words.

Comments on specific assessment criteria

Assessment Objective 1: Research, Analysis and Evaluation

Information from different perspectives

The strongest work responds to a clear question about a single issue. This enables candidates to present clear global perspectives, national perspectives and their own perspective on this issue.

Less successful work responds to more general questions often starting with 'To what extent…' or 'How' which tend to encourage a more descriptive answer with no central issue. Philosophical questions such as *What is the purpose of human life?* are so general and vague that it is difficult for the candidate to find relevant material or to include any required criteria in answering it.

The strongest work shows a clear understanding of perspectives.

A global perspective should show a viewpoint, an opinion, a feeling about, or an attitude to the global situation or issue raised in the question. It should be clear whose perspective this is. Information should be presented to explain the perspective and support it. Similarly, a national perspective should show a national viewpoint on the issue presented, or an opinion, or a feeling about, or an attitude to the national situation. Again, it should be clear whose perspective is being presented. There should be evidence of the perspective and supporting information to explain it.

Some candidates find it a challenge to present different perspectives on their issue, giving instead information about different places, viewpoints and opinions.

Some less successful work presented a general topic with 2 or 3 sub-topics (often labelled Issue 1, Issue 2, Issue 3). This work did not present perspectives explicitly and, because it was dealing with multiple topics, did not deal with the required criteria in any depth or detail.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Analysis and comparison of causes and consequences

Most candidates were able to present and explain the causes and consequences of their chosen issue.

Where candidates had not identified issues, or where they wrote descriptive essays, they lost out on this criterion.

More successful candidates were able to compare different causes of their central issue. They explained which were the more important, or main causes and/or they explained how and why there were different causes in different countries or regions. They also compared the consequences (sometimes labelled impacts or effects) explained which consequences were the most serious, and/or why there were different consequences for different groups of people, or different places or different situations.

An example of a strong comparison of consequences seen this session:

The two effects of overpopulation listed above were that it caused an increase in pollution, and it left many people without a job. While these two are big problems that might have negative effects on individuals living in an overpopulated country, I think the increase in pollution is a bigger problem. Air pollution, for example, affects everyone living in that area, while the increase in unemployment affects people who are unemployed. Also, pollution can cause many deaths and health problems, while unemployment causes poverty and an increase in crime rates. Living in poverty and high crime rate means life is going to be harsh, but it would not cause the deaths of many people. As mentioned previously, pollution causes many people to die and have health problems. Therefore, the increase in pollution is a bigger problem than the increase in unemployment.

Less successful candidates struggled to compare causes and consequences explicitly, though some identified the main or most important.

Course(s) of Action

The strongest work had one developed and focused course of action. The candidate explained the course of action: its implementation (e.g. who would do it and details of how it would be done) and gave a clear explanation of the likely impact of the course of action.

In some cases, candidates successfully outlined a course of action already in place in another part of the world and suggested how it could be adapted to be carried out in their own country, again giving details of who could do it and how it could be implemented and what the impact might be.

The least successful work provided *self-help* style bullet lists of advice – often limited, with no details of how they could be done or by whom, or what their impact would be.

Evaluation of sources

The strongest work showed clear evaluation of sources used. Candidates evaluated the sources using different criteria and with an explanation of the impact of the quality of sources on the candidate's thinking, or work. An example of strong evaluative comments seen this session:

Overall, I think that my sources are trustworthy. I have tried my best to take from different sources, which I then tried to check with other trusted source materials. I was happy to find that whilst checking for the reliability of some sources I ended up on other interesting material, which could help me take an even deeper look into my essay subject. I have used webpages like 'National Geographic' or even 'WWF' known worldwide for their help and contribution to a sustainable environment. These sources contain particularly helpful facts and information since the authors are experimented. In this case my article was written by Christina Nunez who; '(...) spent five years at National Geographic covering energy for the website, including stories about the hidden clean energy labyrinths underneath cities' (National Geographic). I have used educational pages such as 'Earth Institute Columbia University' and 'University of Southern Indiana' so that I could make sure that my collected data was proved right by such sources and that I could gather different worldwide perspectives on this issue. Since deforestation is a growing issue, I have tried to use source work that is not too old and that would not be published more than ten years ago. My research is ranging from websites to book, journals or even articles. Thus, some websites like 'Mongabay' which could be less reliable since the date or publisher (like other webpages) stayed unrecognised, was checked with other sources, which corroborated statements made in my essay.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Some less successful work mentioned evaluative criteria such as expertise or bias but did not explain these or consider their impact on the research findings or conclusions.

Even less successful work presented a section labelled 'Evaluation of Sources' but actually only described the sources in general terms and did not evaluate them.

Many candidates did not attempt to evaluate any of their sources at all.

Assessment Objective 2: Reflection

The most successful work had a clear section of reflection on the candidate's own perspective, on their research findings and on the perspectives they had explored. The candidate clearly explained how their own perspective had developed, been changed or impacted by others' perspectives and by the information they had gained about the issue. It included a clear conclusion/answer to their question based on research findings and other perspectives.

Unsuccessful work explained what the candidate thought and why and mentioned their research but did not explain how the research had impacted their own conclusions or their perspective.

Ineffective work stated the candidate's opinion without any explanation or justification. The weakest work did not reflect at all, or mention the candidate's own opinion, perspective or attitude to the question they asked.

Assessment Objective 3: Communication

Structure of the report

Candidates are required to write their report in essay form. Their argument should be planned and logical and follow a clear structure. They should include all required criteria.

The most successful work was easy to follow with a clear argument. It progressed from an introduction, through all the required criteria to a reflective conclusion. It used the full available word count. This work started with different perspectives on the issue and kept those focused throughout. The candidate kept control of their argument and did not lose contact with their question, the central issue or their research findings.

Unsuccessful work did not focus on one issue or the required perspectives. It tended to select several separate issues and present general information about those, making it difficult to follow any central argument. It sometimes included information that was not relevant to the question. It tended to move around from one topic to another instead of developing the argument from an introduction, through all the required criteria, to a reflective conclusion.

The least successful work often provided a series of headings with some facts and figures on the topic area, with no clear flow of any argument and sometimes with no reflection or conclusion.

Some work showed little evidence of any research; with the candidate's opinions and views presented in a philosophical argument rather than a structured essay on their research.

Clarity of arguments, perspectives and evidence

For this criterion, candidates must present all required elements. The reader must be able to identify and understand the argument, evidence and perspectives, causes and consequences, reflection and evaluation.

The most successful work clearly identifies the criteria and makes them easy to follow by presenting them in separate paragraphs, or by using sub-headings. It is clear that the candidate understands what they are doing and presents the required elements explicitly.

Unsuccessful work misses out some criteria (such as evaluation or reflection, or is disorganised so that it is difficult to work out what each paragraph is about.

Citation and referencing

All candidates should understand the need for complete in-text attribution. They should be aware that if they present material as their own when they have found it in other sources, this is considered to be plagiarism.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

There is no one fixed method of citation or referencing for this component. Any clear and consistent method is acceptable. The main concern is attribution of sources.

Candidates may use bracketed citations, or numbering, or in-text referencing to indicate where they have used sources.

They must include complete references somewhere in their work, either footnotes, end-notes or in-text references, (though for ease of reading and control of word count, numbers or brackets may be more manageable).

Their references should include author, date and title of publication for books or magazines, and online materials should include at least the full url and date of access.

The full reference list/footnotes/endnotes should be clearly linked in one clear, consistent and logical way to the in-text attribution. (one set of numbers, or alphabetical order)

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/03
Team Project

Key messages

All members of a team must be awarded the same mark for the three team elements (Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration).
Candidates should choose an issue to focus on, carry out research into different cultural perspectives on the issue, and then use their findings to decide on an aim and an Outcome to achieve the aim.
The Reflective Paper requires candidates to present their own research findings which means that although the team may work collectively for much of the time, it is expected that each individual team member will each carry out some individual research into the issue.
When reflecting on strengths and weaknesses / strengths and limitations, candidates should identify how these affected the project.
Candidates should keep an ongoing reflective log throughout the project to support their reflection, evaluation and help them to remember what went well and what did not.
Teachers should steer candidates away from topics/issues that could be sensitive locally.

General comments

The most successful projects involved raising awareness of different cultural perspectives on an issue of local concern and changing the behaviour or perception of others in relation to the issue. Candidates chose a variety of issues on which to focus their projects. Under the topic of *water, food and agriculture*, some candidates focused on the problem of water shortage and developed activities showing how water use can be reduced safely. Under the topic of *disease and health*, some teams focused on raising awareness about the increase in support available to those with a mental illness, while others looked at combatting obesity by producing a guide to healthy living. Under the topic of *sport and recreation*, some teams focused on bringing sporting activities to a local group of children, while others looked at developing and promoting exercise programmes to encourage students to exercise more regularly. One group looked at the development of basketball.

Outcomes were varied and included promotional videos, school presentations, handbooks, leaflets, fundraising events and posters.

Less successful projects tended to give general information about an issue, without explicitly referring to different cultural perspectives on the issue.

Team Elements: Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration

AO3 Communication: Outcome and Explanation

In the most successful projects, the Outcome clearly demonstrated an action taken by the team to achieve their aim. The Outcome also clearly communicated different cultural perspectives on the issue; that is to say, different views or opinions on the issue from people in different countries, or from different groups within one country such as young/old, urban/rural, wealthy/poor, etc.

In less successful projects, the Outcome was often not an action taken to achieve the aim but instead an information gathering activity (e.g. a video of interviews being undertaken) or a description of other activities relating to the project process (e.g. a video of candidates talking about what they have done). In other projects, the Outcome was an action taken to achieve an aim, but did not include different cultural perspectives on the issue (e.g. an information leaflet simply giving facts about the issue in order to raise awareness).

Guidance

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Interviews carried out to gather views/perspectives cannot be an Outcome in themselves. The Outcome should be an action taken to achieve the aim. The process of how initial research led to identification of the aim and the development of the Outcome should be made clear in the Explanation. There should be communication of different cultural perspectives in the Outcome and some discussion of how the research into these different perspectives has informed the Outcome should be part of the Explanation.

Example

The following example is drawn from the work of a team who chose the topic of *sport and recreation* for their project, which focused on the development of basketball. The team carried out research to identify how the sport began and how it has gained importance internationally. Secondary research involved reading about the origins of the sport, with people's views about the value of it, and its recognition through time. During their research, they identified school members and their families as a group that saw the value of basketball and made use of the Global Perspectives Online Learning Area for learners to enable them to engage with learners in other countries. The team's aim then became to share awareness of perspectives on basketball through time. To achieve this aim, the team produced an Outcome in the form of a PowerPoint presentation for use in local schools for learners, parents and teachers. They conducted a survey to see how many learners and teachers had changed their view of the sport as a result. This is an example of a project that addresses a specific interest and tries to promote it.

AO3 Collaboration

Teachers must award a mark for how well the team have worked together to complete the project. All members of the team must be given the same mark and teachers should take into account how well team members have worked together over the course of the project, including how well they have communicated with each other, solved problems, resolved conflict and divided work fairly between the team. This mark should be informed by teacher observation of teamwork and questioning of team members individually and collectively.

Personal Element: Reflective Paper

AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation

The most successful candidates provided direct evidence of how far the Outcome had achieved the project aim. For instance, in the case of the example given above, a survey was conducted to assess the extent to which attitudes had changed. They had a percentage success rate and feedback about why others had made no or fewer changes to their views. Where the aim is to raise awareness about an issue, a survey of the target audience before and after the awareness-raising session was often used successfully to show how far the Outcome was successful in achieving the aim. The very best responses also then made suggestions of ways in which the Outcome could be improved, drawing on the weaknesses identified.

Less successful responses often simply described the Outcome and the process by which it was produced. Where there was evaluation, these responses explained only weaknesses or strengths. Examples used were often about which team member took which actions, rather than examples of specific ways the Outcome helped to meet the aim of the team (or not). Suggestions for improvement were not linked to the weakness identified.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

It was encouraging to see more learners offering responses that were successful in evaluating their own work processes. Some successful responses evaluated their time management; for example, giving reasons why they failed to keep to schedule. Other successful responses evaluated their research technique: e.g. '*My role in the team was to research the fixing cases that there have been in cricket in the last ten years and provide the data in a form that could go into the Outcome. I found it time consuming to research from different websites and the data they each presented differed, and I was not confident about how to do my best to make sense of it. However, by writing my findings down in table form, I was able to work out which were the most reliable figures. The table I produced was part of our Outcome*.'

The most successful responses included examples such as this to illustrate and develop their points of evaluation; other examples may include an illustration of something that they were unable to achieve due to their failure of time management or changes that had to be made due to family commitments. The most successful suggestions for improvement to both the Outcome and own work processes also drew on specific weaknesses that were identified in the evaluation.

More commonly, candidates were unclear on the difference between 'strengths/limitations of own work processes' and 'strengths/weaknesses of own performance as a team member'. Other candidates who were able to evaluate did not do this in a balanced way, focusing on just strengths or just weaknesses of their work processes.

Guidance

Rather than give candidates headings from the assessment criteria, give them questions that encourage evaluation. For example: 'How did your work processes affect the project?', 'How well did your Outcome meet your aim?', 'Which elements of the Outcome were less successful?', 'How could you improve the Outcome to better meet the aim', 'How would you improve your work processes if you had to complete the project again?'

AO2 Reflection

This assessment objective requires candidates to reflect on the overall benefits and challenges of working in a group situation, as opposed to working alone and they need to provide specific examples drawn from their experience to illustrate their reflections. In the best responses, candidates commented that sharing work allowed the team to achieve more in a shorter space of time; or that it provided a greater pool of skills to draw on (giving examples from their project). Challenges of working in a team that were commonly mentioned include difficulties of communicating with other team members, organising meetings, dividing work equally and keeping all members on task. In the very best responses, candidates explained how these benefits and challenges impacted upon their project.

Less successful responses simply listed who did what in the team, or, often, who failed to do tasks that were assigned to them.

Reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of own performance as a team member is concerned with those things the individual does that either move the team forward or hold it back. It is about the individual's impact on the team as a whole. There were candidates who produced effective reflections. As a weakness, a candidate reflected that: '*I am a very shy person and not a confident speaker, so I let the others do all the interviewing and this meant it took much longer than it should have, leaving us short of time to develop our Outcome*'. Giving balance, another candidate reflected that: '*I am really interested in making videos and am familiar with many different types of software, so I was able to use my expertise to make the video quite quickly, which gave each of us more time to work on our Reflective Papers*'.

Less successful work focused only on a role in the team, identifying what work had been done, or what difficulties had prevented work from being completed.

An example from work seen in 2019 to show how work is best presented:

We learned to listen to everyone's ideas and thoughts about the project in the group which has not only improved our project but also improved the relationship of our group and the pace at which we finished it. In the beginning, we were making our project in the form of a presentation. But soon we dumped the whole idea of it because it was not able to show readers our outcome. We knew that the main reason we could not do it was because we were trying to complete the work individually without any communication between the group mates. We then realised the importance of teamwork and communication in completing a project like this and started a new presentation with full determination, focus and teamwork. During this time, I realised

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2019

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

that I had to improve a lot of teamwork skills like communication and listening to be a valuable teammate for my group members. After this, I think my performance as a teammate was improved as I was performing better with the group and my productivity was improved as compared to the past.

This paragraph covers three assessment criteria, reflection on teamwork, reflection on my role in the team and aspects of my learning. So, to make it more clear, reflecting using evidence to support individual criteria:

Teamwork is helpful for project work because there are enough people to offer ideas, which meant that we could……(an example). However, teamwork was quite difficult because of the circumstances in which we were working. For example, we were trying to make a presentation in bits, each of us putting together our slides on part of the PowerPoint. This was impossible as we were not in communication contact when we were doing the work. It was a mess.

Initially, one of my roles in the team was to develop the part of the presentation about…… .(detail). I thought I did this well, but, when I took what I had done to my Team, it was not in the right format and had to be scrapped. I did it as fitting our plan once I listened carefully to what my team members said. I know it was better because it was used in our presentation.

One of the lessons I learned from this experience was the importance of clear communication in teamwork. It makes the difference between frustration and a job well done. When I realized this I was able to support my team towards a successful presentation.

Guidance

Give each candidate a reflective log to record examples while they are completing the project. This could include examples of when working as a team helped them to achieve something positive; when working as a team was difficult, and why; when they did something positive to help the team achieve their goal; when their performance had a negative effect on the team.

In reflecting on what they have learned about different cultural perspectives, candidates should not just consider what they have learned, but should think about whether and how their learning has made them think differently about those cultures or has changed what they do or how they behave. In other words, what impact this learning has had on them. For instance, from the research into water shortages a candidate had learned that actions in cities and towns affect water availability across the whole country, giving them a determination to save water by turning off the tap when cleaning teeth and encouraging friends and family to do the same.

There are two elements to reflecting on overall personal learning. Candidates should consider what they have learned about the issue or topic, as well as what personal or practical skills they have developed through completing the project. For instance, having investigated the issue of food poverty in their country, a candidate might conclude that while there is sufficient food for in the country for everyone to avoid hunger, food wastage is a major issue and there are a number of ways that this could be improved. On learning of personal or practical skills, a candidate might say, 'I worked with a team that gave a presentation to a year group of 100 children and I learned to overcome my fear of public speaking because I knew the team were relying on me'; or 'I learned how to use video editing software to help my team produce an effective Outcome and I will be able to use this skill in future projects'.

Guidance

The Team Project is a piece of work that spans several weeks. It would help candidates to reflect and record notes throughout the process on what they have learned about different perspectives, the topic/issue, working as a team and their own skills and abilities.

AO3 Communication

This assessment objective requires reflective reports to flow meaningfully with signposting and linking making sense of the flow of ideas. For instance, it should not be difficult to follow which paragraphs are about own work processes and which are about strengths and limitations of working as a team member.

It is expected that each member of the team will have been involved in some personal research towards to the work overall. These personal research findings need to be clearly flagged up in the Reflective Paper. For instance, through a combination of primary and secondary research, one team member might have found out what diseases were prevalent in their local area; their causes and possible methods of prevention; while

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

other team members looked into the situation nationally and internationally so that they could make comparisons and draw conclusions. The Outcome in this case might be a series of posters targeted at a particular audience aimed at raising awareness about a disease and stopping its spread. The candidate who had researched the situation locally would then explain what they had found out about their local situation and how this was reflected in the Outcome.

Where this individual research has involved secondary research, candidates must include citation and referencing. This referencing should be included in the Reflective Paper and detail the author, date, title, URL and date accessed for all sources used, in a consistent format.

Teacher Assessment

The Individual Candidate Record Cards (ICRC) must be completed by teachers. Teachers are requested to comment on the ICRC only. Teachers are reminded that they must include comments on the ICRC to support/explain the marks awarded and they should use the wording from the assessment criteria level descriptors when formulating these supporting comments. Changes made through internal moderation should be explained through the wording on the ICRC. Any internal moderation should be completed before these final marks are submitted.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2019