eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/11
Written Examination

Key messages

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

- demonstrate very good skills of interpretation and analysis;
- can argue effectively to justify a judgement or opinion;
- need to use key concepts in the evaluation of arguments;
- should use material from sources as evidence to justify their opinions.

General comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. This paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Education for All. The specific issue explored was about the value of formal assessment and testing in education.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Many candidates are clearly developing a good understanding of different perspectives on global issues and an ability to use reasoning and evidence to support an opinion or claim. Candidates are also able to analyse evidence in a variety of different forms. However, candidates should be encouraged to apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of argument within sources.

Candidates engaged enthusiastically with the sources in the insert and showed real interest in the issue of testing in education. Many candidates were able to consider arguments and counter arguments in a balanced way. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in advising governments on ways to raise achievement in schools.

Examination technique was usually very good. The vast 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 direct reference or citation;
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, opinion, prediction, bias, tone, and vested interest.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Virtually all candidates correctly identified that $1.7 billion is spent by the United States government on testing candidates, from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark for this question.

(b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two reasons for testing candidates from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks for this question. Most candidates identified raising the achievement of candidates, measuring progress in learning, helping parents to choose schools, and measuring the quality of teaching.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) Most candidates responded very well to this question and identified a reason for testing candidates that, in their opinion, was the most important. Most candidates chose to discuss measuring progress in learning and helping parents to choose schools.

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

- the number of people or schools involved;
- the range of people e.g. different types of people or social groups;
- the degree of help given to parents and learners;
- the purpose of schools and education;
- the benefits to schools and other social groups, e.g. employers;
- impact on other aspects of society and social life generally;
- reflects public opinion.

The strongest answers provided clear explanation for the importance of testing and gave some evidence to support their judgements. Weaker responses often simply stated the reason without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion without evidence or careful reasoning. Some candidates compared the significance of different reasons, but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

(d) Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why testing in schools is an important personal issue. The explanations mainly related to the value of testing in improving learning for individuals and providing a basis for entry to higher education and employment. These candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the concept of 'personal'.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Weaker responses tended to provide some limited explanation or asserted opinion about testing in general, without reference to the personal dimension of the question.

Question 2

(a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'We should stop having tests in schools.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- uses a source as evidence – television;
- uses expert source from reputable organisation;
- reports positively about school without tests;
- uses first-hand, personal experience;
- recent – up to date.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- some assertion;
- some appeal to emotion;
- little factual/statistical evidence;
- does not acknowledges counter arguments;
- small sample/case study – may not be representative of others.

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

Some weaker responses analysed and 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. For example, *'A weakness is that the source was taken from a diary.'* This statement does not explain why diary sources may not be strong evidence. A better response would be, ''*A weakness is that the source was taken from a diary because diaries are usually written from the*

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

point of view of one person. This type of evidence is not strong because it is likely to be biased and selective. It is also a small sample that may not be representative of other people.'

Candidates should be encouraged to 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, 'Too much testing makes children unhappy at school.' The methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys, and questionnaires with children and teachers about the issue, often with different age groups in different places and cultures. Other methods included consultation with experts, social services, and government officials.

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. Some candidates listed a range of methods and sources but did not relate them to the claim; these responses only reached the lower levels of response.

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 opportunity to design research strategies to test claims as a regular part of their courses.

Question 3

(a) Most candidates correctly identified a value judgement from Olav's statement and explained that a value judgement is a view or decision about what is right, wrong, or important, based on a particular set of standards, principles, or values.

Most candidates were able to justify and explain their selection convincingly.

(b) (i) Most candidates correctly identified an opinion from the source.

Opinions are statements which are subjective points of view or beliefs which cannot be verified and are not necessarily shared by others.

(ii) Most candidates were able to relate the identified opinion to Helen's argument, however, this question was challenging for some candidates who did not evaluate the opinion as reasoning or evidence within the argument.

The most effective responses explained how the opinion related to the argument and explained a strength and/or a weakness of the opinion within this argument. For example, a strong response was, *'the opinion provides good support as this opinion is based on evidence from personal experience and other people that gives confidence to the reader about the claim.'* Another good response was, *'This opinion gives limited support because it is asserted without evidence and is based on local experience which may not be the same as other places or schools due to cultural differences.'*

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, Helen's and Olav's, 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, clearly explained judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of each statement; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a range of evaluative points. 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, language, knowledge claims, and evidence. There was 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 recommend an action to improve the achievement of candidates in a school. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources, as well as their own experience and evidence. Most candidates recommended reducing the number of tests to give more time for learning, highlighting a good understanding of the link between cause and consequence.

There were many thoughtful discussions of the three options. Most candidates chose one action and explained why this was selected. Some candidates chose to compare two or three actions, which was a more challenging, but at times effective, way to structure the argument. Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make credible judgements. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses linked the argument back to the issue of raising achievement.

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

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 doing so, 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
© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/12
Written Examination

Key messages

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

- demonstrated very good skills of interpretation and analysis;
- can argue effectively to justify a judgement or opinion;
- need to use key concepts in the evaluation of arguments;
- should use material from sources as evidence to justify their opinions.

General comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. This paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Poverty and Inequality. The specific issue explored was poverty, economic inequality, and sustainable development.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good. Many candidates are clearly developing a good understanding of different perspectives on global issues and an ability to use reasoning and evidence to support an opinion or claim. Candidates are also able to analyse evidence in a variety of different forms. However, candidates should be encouraged to apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of argument within sources.

Candidates engaged enthusiastically with the sources in the insert and showed real interest in the issue of poverty and income inequality. Many candidates were able to consider arguments and counter arguments in a balanced way. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in advising governments on ways to reduce income inequality.

Examination technique was usually very good. The vast 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 direct reference or citation;
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, opinion, prediction, bias, tone, and vested interest.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Virtually all candidates correctly identified that 82% of the world's wealth is owned by the richest one percent of the population, from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark for this question.

(b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two causes of income inequality from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks for this question. Most candidates identified reduced levels of welfare, technological change, and unequal access to education.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) Most candidates responded well to this question and identified a cause of income inequality that, in their opinion, was the most significant. Most candidates chose to discuss technological change and unequal access to education.

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

- the number of people involved;
- the range of people e.g. different types of people or social groups;
- the effects of a 'vicious circle' and 'knock-on' effects;
- consequences of unemployment and reduced access to the labour market;
- the impact on employment opportunities;
- the impact on other aspects of society and social life generally.

The strongest answers provided clear explanation for the cause of income inequality selected 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 causes, but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

(d) Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why economic inequality is an important national issue. The explanations mainly related to the impact of poverty and inequality on individuals and groups, the potential for social unrest, and economic difficulties for the country. Government responsibility for responding to these consequences was often highlighted. These candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the concept of 'national'.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Weaker responses tended to provide some limited explanation or asserted opinion about economic inequality in general, without reference to the national dimension of the question.

Question 2

(a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'the best way to reduce economic inequality is to increase employment.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- uses a source as evidence – OECD;
- uses expert source from reputable organisation;
- logical argument linking education to employment and inequality;
- uses first-hand, personal experience – lived in poverty as a child;
- recent – up to date;
- strong tone and use of language.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- some assertion;
- some appeal to emotion;
- little factual/statistical evidence;
- does not acknowledge counter arguments;
- press release – may be biased.

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

Some weaker responses analysed and 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. For example, *'A weakness is that the source was taken from a newspaper.'* This statement does not explain why newspaper sources may not be strong evidence. A better response would be, ''*A weakness is that the source was taken from a newspaper because press releases are usually written from the point of view of the organisation. This type of evidence is not*

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

strong because it is likely to be biased and selective. It probably ignores counter arguments and may not be balanced'

Candidates should be encouraged to 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, 'People who work are less likely to be in poverty.' The methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys, and questionnaires with people in poverty, unemployed people, workers, and employers about the issue, often with different social groups in different places and cultures. Other methods included consultation with experts, social services, and government officials.

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. Some candidates listed a range of methods and sources but did not relate them to the claim; these responses only reached the lower levels of response.

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 opportunity to design research strategies to test claims as a regular part of their courses.

Question 3

(a) Most candidates correctly identified a vested interest from Source 4 and explained that a vested interest is a special concern about something due to personal gain or advantage, which could be economic, social, political, or other.

Most candidates were able to justify and explain their selection convincingly.

(b) (i) Most candidates correctly identified a prediction from the source.

A prediction is a statement or claim about the future.

(ii) Most candidates were able to relate the identified prediction to Ivan's argument, however, this question was challenging for some candidates who did not evaluate the prediction as reasoning or evidence within the argument.

The most effective responses explained how the prediction related to the argument and explained a strength and/or a weakness of the prediction within this argument. For example, a good response was, *'strong support as this prediction is based on evidence from statistical trends and research that gives confidence to the reader about the claim.'* Another good response was, *'This prediction gives limited support because it is based on a trend that may change and is based on just one person's view which may not be the same as other people.'*

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

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported, clearly explained judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of each statement; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a range of evaluative points. 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, language, knowledge claims, and evidence. There was 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 recommend an action to a government to reduce income inequality. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources, as well as their own experience and evidence. Most candidates recommended spending more money on training and job creation, highlighting a good understanding of the link between cause and consequence.

There were many thoughtful discussions of the three options. Most candidates chose one action and explained why this was selected. Some candidates chose to compare two or three actions, which was a more challenging, but at times effective, way to structure the argument. Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses linked the argument back to the issue of raising achievement.

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

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 doing so, 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
© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/13
Written Examination

Key messages

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

- demonstrated very good skills of interpretation and analysis;
- can argue effectively to justify a judgement or opinion;
- need to use key concepts in the evaluation of arguments;
- should use material from sources as evidence to justify their opinions.

General comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. This paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Migration. The specific issue explored was about the human rights of refugees.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good. Many candidates are clearly developing a good understanding of different perspectives on global issues and an ability to use reasoning and evidence to support an opinion or claim. Candidates are also able to analyse evidence in a variety of different forms. However, candidates should be encouraged to apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of argument within sources.

Candidates engaged enthusiastically with the sources in the insert and showed real interest in the issue of human rights and refugees. Many candidates were able to consider arguments and counter arguments in a balanced way. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in advising governments on ways to improve the lives of refugees.

Examination technique was usually very good. The vast 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 direct reference or citation;
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, opinion, prediction, bias, tone, and vested interest.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Virtually all candidates correctly identified that about 3% of the world's population are migrants, from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark for this question.

(b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two human rights issues affecting refugees from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks for this question. Most candidates identified being victims of disease and injury, inadequate food and nutrition, having poor working conditions, and no access to legal advice.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) Most candidates responded well to this question and identified a human rights issue that, in their opinion, was the most significant for refugees. Most candidates chose to discuss disease and injury, lack of clean water and inadequate food and nutrition.

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

- the number of refugees involved;
- the effects of a 'vicious circle' and 'knock-on' effects;
- consequences of disease, nutrition, and lack of clean water on health and life chances;
- the impact on employment opportunities and being part of society;
- impact on other aspects of society and social life generally.

The strongest answers provided clear explanation for the significance of the human rights issue for refugees selected 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 human rights issues, but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

(d) Many candidates responded well to this question and could explain why refugees are an important issue for governments. The explanations mainly related to the impact of being a refugee on individuals and groups, for society, and the potential for social unrest and economic difficulties for the country. Government responsibility for responding to these consequences was often highlighted. These candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the concept of 'national' and 'government'.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Weaker responses tended to provide some limited explanation or asserted opinion about refugees in general, without reference to the national or governmental dimension of the question.

Question 2

(a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'refugees are treated badly'.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- uses expert source from reputable organisation – UN worker;
- logical argument linking being a refugee to access to education, employment, and inequality
- uses first-hand, personal experience;
- recent – up to date;
- strong tone and powerful, emotive use of language;
- interview gives credibility/authenticity as primary evidence.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- some assertion;
- some appeal to emotion;
- little factual/statistical evidence;
- does not acknowledge counter arguments;
- interview – may be biased or influenced by the researcher.

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

Some weaker responses analysed and 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. For example, *'A weakness is that the source was taken from an interview.'* This statement does not explain why interviews may not be strong evidence. A better response would be, *'A weakness is that the source was taken from an interview because interviews are usually recorded by an interviewer who might influence what a person says and cause inaccurate results.*

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

This type of evidence is not strong because it is likely to be biased and from just a few people that may not be typical.'

Candidates should be encouraged to justify their evaluative points 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, 'People think refugees are a problem.' The methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys, and questionnaires with people living near to refugees or refugee camps, or refugees themselves, often with different social groups in different places and cultures. Other methods included consultation with experts, refugee agencies, and government officials.

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 stated a method or source of evidence but did not explain it fully or make the link to the claim being tested. Some candidates listed a range of methods and sources but did not relate them to the claim; these responses only reached the lower levels of response.

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 opportunity to design research strategies to test claims as a regular part of their courses.

Question 3

(a) Most candidates correctly identified a fact from Source 4 and explained that a fact is something which can be verified or proven and is true or accurate.

Most candidates were able to justify and explain their selection convincingly.

(b) Most candidates were able to identify aspects of bias in Paola's statement. These candidates showed understanding of bias as a tendency or prejudice for or against something, or an unbalanced approach to an issue, and being not prepared to consider counter arguments or other points of view.

Most candidates explained that Paola's experience of being a refugee may have influenced her viewpoint and biased her arguments towards supporting refugees and not considering other perspectives.

Candidates also raised other issues with the Paola's statement that might be evidence of bias, including:

- unbalanced argument – very little consideration of other perspectives or counterarguments;
- use of exaggerated language and phrases e.g. Would you try to rescue your children from starvation?;
- use of rhetorical questions pressurises listeners;
- use of leading statements e.g. you will expect others to help if you are in trouble in the future;
- not much evidence;
- mainly opinion;
- use of value judgements e.g. It is only right that we help people at risk.

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates about bias in arguments and the presentation of evidence and provide experience of using the term in the analysis and evaluation of sources,

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

alongside other critical thinking concepts like value judgement, prediction, fact, vested interest, and opinion.

(c) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, Jose's and Paola's, 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, clearly explained judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of each statement; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a range of evaluative points. 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, language, knowledge claims, and evidence. There was 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 recommend an action to a government to improve the lives of refugees. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources, as well as their own experience and evidence. Most candidates recommended encouraging businesses to give jobs to refugees, highlighting a good understanding of the link between cause and consequence.

There were many thoughtful discussions of the three options. Most candidates chose one action and explained why this was selected. Some candidates chose to compare two or three actions, which was a more challenging, but at times effective, way to structure the argument. Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make credible judgements. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses linked the argument back to the issue of raising achievement.

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

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 doing so, 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
© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02
Individual Report

Key messages

- Candidates should formulate a question that focuses on **one issue.**
- The candidate's response must focus on **different perspectives** on their chosen issue.
- Schools should take care to upload the correct candidate's work to RM3.

General comments

The majority of candidates addressed a specific issue and fewer wrote descriptive essays about a general topic.

More candidates included evaluation of sources than previous cohorts.

Some centres' candidates are still structuring the Individual Report (IR) around the old specifications from the pre-2018 syllabus.

Some schools mistakenly uploaded work for Component 03 Team Project instead of, or in addition to, candidates' IR. Some uploaded two copies of the bibliography instead of the essay. The bibliography/reference list **must** be submitted as a separate document to the IR.

The strongest work was well-structured and logical, and explicitly presented several different well-supported perspectives, including at least one global and one national perspective on the issue identified in their question. This work gave a full explanation of the causes and consequences of the issue, explicitly comparing the different causes and/or consequences. Any courses of action proposed included full details of how they would be carried out, by whom and what their impact would be. The course of action proposed was directly relevant to the issue, and/or the main cause or the worst consequence of the issue. The candidate reflected on how their own perspective had been formed or changed by the findings of their research, by other people's perspectives, by different causes and consequences and the sources they had found to back up the different perspectives. The candidate answered their own question and did not lose focus on the central issue.

Comments on specific assessment criteria

Assessment Objective 1: Research, Analysis and Evaluation:

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

Direct, issue-based questions allow candidates to be clear about their topic and issue, to focus on that throughout and to identify different views. Successful questions included:

- Should governments promote the use of electric cars?
- Is social media making people lonelier?
- Should Artificial Intelligence replace judges?
- Does free trade help the world's poorer nations?
- Can trophy hunting be justified?

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Information from different perspectives:

The strongest work shows a clear understanding of perspectives.

For IGCSE Global Perspectives, a perspective is always based on a view, opinion, or attitude: on what people think or feel about the issue. Some weak responses produce general information, facts and figures on a topic from different parts of the world. This work will not score highly.

For the IR **a global perspective is a supported view about a global issue** raised in the question. It should be clear whose perspective this is – a quote from the relevant person or organisation should be attributed to them, or the candidate should draw together supporting information and attitudes to tell us which group of people have this perspective. In all cases, information should be presented to explain the perspective and support it.

Some candidates successfully established the different perspectives in their introduction. This helped their essay to flow and reminded them of the focus on perspectives:

'Although globalisation has made trade more trouble-free, it has increased the disparity between the developed and developing countries. Parents are also worried that their children have stopped following their cultural norms and are influenced by western culture. Globalisation is highly supported in continents such as Europe because it has become the most advanced continent. However, developing countries like Pakistan are still feeling insecure about the process.'

Successful work also included direct quotes showing a clear perspective:

'Trade policy can make an important contribution to ensuring an effective exit from the prevailing financial crisis in the developing world. That's why we should work together.' (Fernandes et al, 2020)

Or a clash of perspectives:

'On one hand, free trade is intended to eradicate unfair barriers to global commerce and raise the economy of emerging economies like industrial states. However, free trade can also result in many negative effects, in particular terrible working conditions, job loss, economic damage to some countries, and environmental damage globally' (Teeboom, 2019)

Similarly, **a national perspective** is 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, either by paraphrasing or quoting the person or organisation with clear attribution. There should be evidence of the perspective and supporting information to explain it.

'One country that has reportedly taken into consideration the effect that AI will have on the economy and job industry is Jamaica, whose government has been 'looking to position Jamaica to take advantage of the benefits of artificial intelligence in boosting economic growth and job creation' (the Library of Congress, 2020). According to Andrew Wheatley, a Jamaican technology minister, even though AI may pose a threat to call centre operations, it also does present opportunities in high skill areas such as programming and development……

In Jamaica, as previously discussed, technology minister Andrew Wheatley believes that AI may pose a threat to call centre operations. … Wheatley called for increasing the number of computer science graduates from Jamaican educational institutions 'so that Jamaica can take advantage of the clear opportunities'…. Therefore, despite recognising the risk…. the Jamaican government is choosing to continue AI development instead of implementing stricter regulations.'

Some weaker work did not present different perspectives on the issue, but instead presented information about different places, and/or unsupported viewpoints and opinions. In some cases, candidates started with a general opinion that religion has beneficial impacts on the family, presented 1500 words of anecdote and description, with no evidence of research of others' perspectives.

In some **weak work** candidates simply presented a range of information from two or three countries and labelled this as a Global Perspective.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Some **weak 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.

Analysis and comparison of causes and consequences:

Most candidates were able to detail and explain the consequences of their chosen issue. However, some struggled to explain the causes of the issue. Where candidates had not identified a global issue, or where they wrote descriptive essays, they found it difficult to identify or explain any causes or consequences.

Stronger responses were able to compare different causes of (or reasons for) 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) explaining which consequences were the most serious, and/or why there were different consequences for different groups of people, or different places or different situations.

Developed comparison of consequences is given below:

'I believe the consequences of cybercrime are more serious than social media's effects on people. This is because cybercrime can have devastating global consequences. Cybercrime can cause global companies to completely collapse if done on a large scale. It can cause devastating financial losses to people and with just a few clicks, it can reduce them to poverty. If the data of people, farmed by cybercrimes, falls into the wrong hands it can be a cause of concern for the victim's safety. Although the mental effects of social media on people can be problematic, they do not sum up to the amount of chaos and havoc cybercrimes can cause.'

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. A clear focus on a main cause or worst consequence was also helpful:

'Causes and consequences:

The major cause of increasing mental health issues due to colourism are the increasing advertisements made by the skin whitening industry. These advertisements show that if an individual has a lighter skin tone, only then they will be considered as beautiful or attractive. As a result, individuals with a darker skin tone begin to use such products in order to fit into the community. These advertisements are extremely offensive to individuals who have a dark complexion. While the most alarming part of this is that many knowledgeable entrepreneurs also promote colourism and inequity which increases the number of victims and puts them at greater risk…….

Possible solutions:

The best solution is to protest against companies that promote colourism. This is because the company will suffer huge losses if its products are condemned globally, which will force companies not to sell skin lightening products. These protests can be promoted through social media, NGSOs can also help organise such protests and online petitions can be signed to ban skin lightening creams and bleaches. This has proven to be effective because the 'black lives matter' protest has led to the renaming of Unilever's beautifying range Fair and lovely [1]. In addition, these protests will also help to create awareness about how colourism affects mental health negatively. It will also encourage victims of colourism to speak up and people demoralised by colourism will gain confidence and feel emotionally supported. Thus making the solution even more effective.'

Weaker work described solutions already in place but did not explain how these solutions might be applied to their specific issue or in other countries. Some candidates either explained how the course of action might be implemented **or** what its impact might be – but not both.

The **weakest work** provided a list of actions that might be taken, but with no further details.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Some candidates did not identify an issue – they presented general information about a topic. Without a problem, they could not suggest a course of action to address it.

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.

1. Source Evaluation:

'Furthermore, some sources may not be reliable due to their potential bias: one example of this is Eleni Vasilaki (The Conversation), who works in fields closely related to AI development and is therefore likely to be against restrictions being imposed upon it. While her expertise in AI does grant her some credibility as she is more likely to know what she is talking about, Vasilaki receives funding from organisations such as Google Deepmind and the Amazon Alexa Fund, her possible vested interest further damages her credibility.'

2. Evaluation of Sources:

'I have referenced online newspapers, such as South China Morning Post that informs on the latest local issues. These sources were fact-checked and were written by experienced, professional journalists. In this case, one of my articles was written by Sarah Zheng, who has earned a degree in film and media studies, showing her qualifications (for the topic of media). These articles provide a local perspective, and expanded my understanding of the issue by highlighting the seriousness of the problem. By using a large range of sources, I can ensure the information provided on each site matches with others assuring accuracy. Some websites like Parenta.com could be less reliable since the author stayed unrecognised, but I checked with information from other sources and these corroborated statements made in my research.'

Candidates need to provide at least three **different** points of evaluation on more than one source used in order to fully achieve this criterion.

A common misconception about what is required in evaluation is to address it generally:

'*I used reliable sources although some were out of date.*' This example does not show that the candidate understands the term 'reliability' and is not specific to one source. It does not explain why the date is of any importance.

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

<u>Assessment Objective 2: Reflection:</u>

The **strongest 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.

'In regard to the core issue both sides present, I feel that the side that supports government surveillance falls short because the issue of security and international terrorism is something that is blown out of proportion and studies have shown that terrorism has reduced after 9/11. But even assuming this was the case, the side supporting government surveillance fails to prove why other methods like strengthening the police force and border patrols would not accomplish the same objective…

Moving to the credibility of sources, I feel as though the side against government surveillance wins this comparison as well, because they have articles written by well-versed experts and reliable people like Edward Snowden, while the side that supports government surveillance falls short, because it has an article written who might be biased. The difference is marginal, and I feel this does not really impact the overall decision.

Moving to the most important part talking about privacy versus security, I feel that privacy is more valuable than security. This is because of two reasons: firstly, security is a double-edged sword with the government being able to use it to tighten their control over the citizens of their nation…. I feel the removal of privacy is

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

similar to the removal of autonomy where people will become scared to make their own decisions…. I believe in cases where security is a massive risk, government surveillance is valid as in that case too many lives are at stake for people to worry about privacy…. Even in first world countries, where the threat of authoritarianism is less, even in that case, government surveillance is not worth it because security can be granted without forsaking privacy.'

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 to answer their question. They should include all required criteria.

The **strongest work** was easy to follow and provided a clear structured argument with an introduction, addressing all the required criteria and ending, with 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.

Weaker work lacked focus. 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 a central argument.

The **weakest 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; the candidate simply wrote a general philosophical argument. This was particularly common in essays on Belief Systems and the Family, where candidates had a point of view and wrote only about that.

Clarity of arguments, perspectives, and evidence:

The **strongest work** clearly identifies the required criteria and presents 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.

The **weakest work** shows little awareness of the requirements for this component: information is presented in a generalised way. In this work they may simply discuss their question without presenting any perspectives, causes and consequences. There may be no clear issue and so no course of action with no reflection on their research findings or evaluation of sources.

Some candidates present information they have gained from primary and secondary research and do not process or discuss it at all. This approach will not score highly.

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 will be as plagiarism.

There is no one fixed method of citation or referencing for this component. **Any clear and consistent method is acceptable.**

In-text attribution: 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, endnotes, or in-text references. (For ease of reading and control of word count, numbers or brackets are more manageable).

References: References for books or magazines should include author, date, and title of publication. References for online materials should include **at least** the full url (leading to the document, not just to a website) and date of access.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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

Some candidates carry out primary research, particularly to explore different perspectives. Where they do so, they should mention this in text; so that it is clear where/how the information has been gained. They may wish to put a note at the end of their reference list or in a footnote, to give details such as date of interview. If candidates wish to include evidence of their primary research, such as statistics, they can append this to the reference list, unless it is to be read and counted in the words allowed for the IR.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/03
Team Project

Key messages

- Candidates should be steered clear of topics that are locally sensitive.
- Learners should be involved in choosing their topic.
- Candidates should research cultural perspectives on an issue, then decide on a method of communicating it (an Outcome) to raise awareness. This is helped by learners choosing an aim for their Team of: raising awareness of perspectives on their issue.
- Candidates should keep a log of their ways of working and of their work with the Team.
- Candidates are each expected to research an aspect of the work, citing their sources and reporting their findings in the Reflective Paper.
- All members of a Team should be awarded the same marks for the team elements (Collaboration, Explanation and Outcome).

General comments

Team Projects

The most successful projects involved raising awareness, or changing the behaviours, of others about an issue of local importance or an issue inspired by personal passion. Issues such as water conservation, engagement with the Human Rights agenda, maintaining physical or mental health for specific age groups during the pandemic all saw work that stood out. The writing of a nursery rhyme to explain the demands on little children during the pandemic is worthy of special note.

Inevitably the pandemic influenced what a lot of candidates chose to research, some even focusing on cultural perspectives on vaccinations. It was clear that for so many candidates the pandemic has had such a big impact on their lives. Many candidates in their reflection discussed being provided the option of exempting this component but choosing to still do it because they wanted to complete what they had started. Many learners reflected on their changing work patterns and team working processes to balance their reflections.

The most successful Outcomes were leaflets, short videos, and pamphlets. Websites were popular, but they proved difficult as learners were unable to gather any feedback which they could use to support evaluations.

There is a widely held misconception about the relationship between interviews and Outcomes. Making a video of interviews as an Outcome will be recognised as research but not as an explanation of perspectives. This is because learners have not made use of it as part of an explanation. Parts of videos of interviews are helpful in explaining perspectives within the Outcome.

Reflection on the different elements of the project should see balanced strengths/benefits and weaknesses/limitations. In general, learners find balanced reflection more straightforward when thinking about their Outcome or teamwork, but they struggle to reflect in a balanced way on their own work processes or their role in the team. It may be helpful for teachers to link evaluation of their learners' work processes with the research process, and to link their role in the team to how the team supported their work and how they supported the work of the team.

Few candidates considered the impact of the different elements of their work on the aims of the team or the completion of the Outcome. For example, how did the relative effectiveness of their research support the development of the Outcome? This is the in-depth or insightful reflection indicated in the mark scheme.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Comments on specific elements

Team elements: Explanation, Outcome and Collaboration

AO3 Communication: Explanation and Outcome

The Explanation establishes the aim of the team and may give a reason for the selection of the topic. It states what research into perspectives will be undertaken and how this will be carried out. The form of the Outcome is explained and the process by which awareness will be raised by using it. There is a discussion of how data will be gathered on which the relative success of the Outcome can be based.

One team wrote the following, which was very clear:

As the severe COVID-19 situation continues over a year, more people are refusing to wear masks for the reasons of cultural customs, unbreathable, and misunderstandings. Therefore, even though it is well known, our aim was to raise awareness of the importance of wearing masks. We were particularly concerned with those irresponsible teenagers hanging out without masks. We also wanted to state the fact that masks are the key necessity to be prevented from the virus. Our outcome was a blog website where we could put detailed information, images, and gifs in visually attractive ways. We achieved this by using (wix.com: blog creating website). We completed an eleven-minute presentation. During the presentation, in order to make the presentation clearer and more assured, we tried to memorize the script. When we were practicing, we also recorded our presentation. Watching a recorded video provided us instant insight into where we may struggle with ideas or transitions, and how well we hold our narrative thread from start to close. Then, we created a digital survey to receive feedback on how we could better meet our aim. We made the survey anonymous to be assessed honestly.

Our research was obtained by researching the UK, Korean, and Chinese government websites to get the COVID-19 current statistics and their proposed countermeasures. Moreover, our cultural perspectives were obtained by questionnaires. We made six questions to see how people think of wearing masks. Totally, 15 teenagers had participated. We collected the data of the people from Canada, China, South Korea, Brazil, and the USA. Through the questionnaires, we found out that people are fully aware of the seriousness of the COVID-19, however, they do not always wear masks. Some had conflicting results, which define perspectives do differ by the environment. We found out that most people do not trust masks 100 per cent.

AO3: Collaboration

Teachers should award a mark for how well the team has worked together to complete the project. Judgements should be based on how well team members have communicated with each other, solved problems, resolved conflict, and shared work appropriately between them. All members of the team must be given the same mark. We do not need explanations for marks awarded.

Individual element: The Reflective Paper

AO1: Research, Analysis and Evaluation

Evaluating the Outcome

Evaluations of the Outcome should consider ways in which it contributed to meeting the aim and ways that it did not.

One Team wrote:

I think our outcome almost achieved the project aim; it included all the researches needed to educate others about the LGBT community, especially as I did extra research for us to find the most appropriate courses of actions. Our outcome looked at the laws and efforts made by the officials regarding LGBT rights in different nations and the popularization of LGBT to the citizens to measure the level of concern the government had upon the issue. We then analyzed other factors leading to discrimination such as family pressures, old-fashioned belies and the education system (Human Rights Watch, 2020). We interviewed supporters, opponents and members of the community in Hanoi to record personal perspectives and experiences. Finally, using all the available resources, we purposed resolutions. Funding LGBT-friendly places, participating in Pride Fest parade, educating others, being a straight-ally and standing up against discrimination are all efficient actions that we as candidates can take to show our support and raise

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

awareness about LGBT. We shared our presentation with our class virtually. Some asked why we had included arguments people had made against increasing awareness and support. We had not thought to not include any findings-perhaps we should have. Others asked how they could contribute to a charity-we had not made that clear. Nonetheless, I suppose our team could have taken a further step to fully achieve our aim. We could have held an LGBT lesson/workshop or helped others to donate to a Queer Zone in Hanoi for our influences to be more wide-spread and not just limited inside the classroom.

There is strength in having data to reflect upon when evaluating the Outcome. This evaluation said 'Some' had criticised the presentation. It would have been a stronger evaluation if numbers or percentages of those who disagreed with the presentation and those who wanted to know more had been offered and analysed.

Suggestions for improvement should come from the weaknesses that have been identified. This is true in the evaluation above and flows easily from the evaluation.

Evaluating work processes

Evaluations of work processes should consider ways in which the candidate was an effective worker/researcher and ways in which the candidate was not effective, maybe with reasons.

One candidate wrote:

I believe that I pulled my weight by scouting for the interviewees and extracting and tabulating the data that was provided. I was even approached by a number of volunteers to be a part of the interviewing process. However, due to time constraints, they were unable to be a part of the project. Moreover, there were nights where I consecutively stayed up until dawn broke so that we were able to get ahead of schedule with finding information before the video-editing process had begun. Due to a number of the interviewees living in regions with different time zones, it was required of me to be awake at odd hours. This was because it was especially challenging for the other members of my group to stay awake, as they adhered to a conventional sleeping schedule.

A second candidate wrote:

My strengths would be that I was organized and devoted to my work. I put my best foot forward, dedicating time to strengthen our outcome achieving our aim. However, I would do more global research and include more cultural perspectives rather than just a few. I would also create an effective timetable to improve my time-management.

The first of these reports is positive, lacks balance, but has a wealth of examples. The second one is balanced but lacks explanation of either the strengths or weaknesses of the candidate's work processes.

Suggested improvements should come from the weakness, or one of the weaknesses explained in the evaluation. We would need to see a comment about poor timekeeping to be able to recognise the need for an effective timetable as a suggestion for improvement.

AO2: Reflection

Reflecting about working in a team:

This section asks about how effective the team was in working towards its aims. A balanced reflection is expected, explaining in what ways teamworking was a strength and in what ways it was a limitation.

One candidate wrote:

As a team we contributed fairly and equally, although sometimes we were in conflict, for example, on whether to have physical or virtual meetings and on setting our timeframes. These has put me under pressure as if I were doing an individual project I would have been the decision maker. However, the outcome is definitely successful and rich because of my teammates. For example, without them I would not have been able to go to littered areas to take photos; which would have affected the outcome negatively.

This is balanced but does not link the strengths or the weaknesses to the Outcome or team aims. This means it can be awarded Level 3, but no higher.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Reflecting on own role in the Team

This section asks about how well the individual supported the team effort and where there were failings, or where support was needed.

One candidate wrote:

Through my research, we finalized our two outcomes to deal with causes and consequences of air pollution. Firstly, air filter, after my research, was viewed as the best method to cater the consequences. Secondly, afforestation proved to be one of the most effective ways to eliminate causes of air pollution. We also concluded that air pollution, while it is global predicament, is mostly prevalent in countries that have a low socioeconomic status. Additionally, I researched that thermal-powered stations contribute to progressively worse situations, however, realized that it would not be possible for us to counter those.

Throughout the project, I was indulged in video editing, manipulating and rearranging. Most thoughtful process was to decide video layout. Initially, numerous versions were made to be selected by the group and I was not strong in making them decide. While editing, time restriction was a major issue I faced. Our video exceeded sixteen minutes which after several cutting and time lapsing was reduced to ten. Occasionally, voiceovers did not match the screenplay so I had to rewrite, adjust and get them recorded again. Also, while translating videos and adding subtitles, I ensured that meaning of the sentence remained unaffected so our messages were clear. This was a time-consuming process and I had to spend nights to produce the final version. I should have asked for help with this.

Most learners are very descriptive about their work for the team, as this is. However, within this description, strengths of the role in the team can be seen and weaknesses also. As the section is considered with the Outcome clearly evident, this is awarded Level 4.

Reflecting about learning:

Overall, candidates should reflect on what they have learned about teamworking, perspectives on their topic and the topic.

One candidate wrote about skills learned:

I have to confess that it has also shone light on the fact that I am rather passive in discussions and lack the ability to carry and lead conversations between group members. Although it will be a slow and arduous push, I will strive to continue improving on these weaknesses of mine so that I will not be held back by my own shortcomings later on, during the projects that I will face in the near future.

One candidate wrote about perspectives understood better:

From the data I analyzed I learnt that a lot of people may not necessarily be mentally stable even if they look totally fine on the outside, I learnt that many have been in a mental health dilemma in the past two weeks alone, whether it be feeling sad and depressed, to overly angry, this made me realize that we all have to put others emotions into consideration before making a comment that might hurt someone.

One candidate commented on learning about the topic:

Composing this project has made me change my mind. Before starting our research I did not know how some countries are still so behind in terms of development. I did not have any idea of the unjust laws women are submitted to. Also I did not know how rape statistics were so high, this really shocked me. But what most impacted me was the shadow pandemic. Domestic violence during the covid-19 outbreak increased making women consider home to not be a safe place. This I totally did not know about. My perspective on how women is treated in some countries totally changed. Now I have realized that gender equality is increasingly evident. Although inequality has decreased every time due to protests, but above all due to education that is the reason why our main objective was aimed to educate.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

AO3: Communication

The separate aspect of the work that contributes to this mark is the reporting of individual findings from the personal research that each learner is expected to carry out into an aspect of the topic. It is expected that findings are summarised and that evidence is cited.

One candidate wrote:

The countries we wrote about overcame littering by having recycling bins everywhere and charging fines for littering. Germany charges up to 250€ for littering (Zen, 2019). I discovered Austria's non-profit recycling/waste management organisation; The ARA System provides consumers with recycling bins and has a pick-up service available to 1.6 million households that collects these bins (Jtdadmin). I saw the ugliness of marine litter in the Nile River while filming our primary research. I learned how it pollutes water and kills fish while doing secondary research and about how Germany deals with that issue with its fishing for litter scheme where fishermen fish for litter (Al-Masry Al-Youm, 2016) (litterbins.co.uk, 2017). I learned that although Egypt does not apply laws against littering, we have recycling and cleanup campaigns like Go Clean, a recycling organization and a campaign called 'Red Sea Islands Free from Plastics' promoting tourism by cleaning beaches from litter (Gamil, 2018).

Supported by a reference list, this was awarded Level 4.

Learners are asked to explain their evaluations/reflections using examples to set them in context. The degree to which explanations are developed in this way contributes to the AO3 mark. Another factor is the organisation of their Reflective Paper. It is expected that the sections should be clearly seen or signposted for the reader. It was balance that was the limiting factor in some marks and lack of individual research findings.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2021