eduresourceza.com

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:

- demonstrate very good skills of interpretation and analysis
- 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. In March 2022, the Written Paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Migration. The specific issue explored was environmental causes of migration.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good. Many candidates clearly developed a good understanding of different perspectives on global issues and demonstrated an ability to use reasoning and evidence to support an opinion or claim. Candidates also analysed evidence in a variety of different forms. However, some candidates should apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of argument within sources and fully explain evaluative points.

Candidates engaged with the sources in the Insert and showed real interest in the issue of migration, and its causes and consequences. Many candidates considered arguments and counter arguments in a balanced way. Candidates explored different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in advising governments on ways to reduce migration.

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
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking like expertise, knowledge claims, opinion, prediction, bias, tone, and vested interest
- explain why identified features of a source are strengths or weaknesses in detail

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified that France was the country that experienced its highest temperature on record in 2019, from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark for this question.

(b) Almost all candidates identified two environmental reasons for migration from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks for this question. The most common answers were to create a more secure future, improve access to food and water, and escape from threat of injury and death.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) Most candidates responded well to this question and identified a reason for migration that, in their opinion, was the most significant. Most candidates discussed increased employment opportunities, finding a better place to grow and sell crops, and create a more secure future.

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

- the frequency of the cause of migration
- the effects of a 'vicious circle' and 'knock-on' effects
- the impact of a 'virtuous circle' of improved lives
- consequences of unemployment and reduced access to the labour market
- the positive impact on employment opportunities and improving security and lifestyle
- the impact on other aspects of society and social life generally

The strongest answers provided clear explanation for the choice of reason for migration and gave some clear justification to support their judgement. 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 causes, but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

(d) Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why migration caused by climate change is an important personal issue. The explanations mainly related to the impact of migration on individuals and their families. The impacts on health, security, employment, and personal well-being were often discussed. Many candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the concept of 'personal'.

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

Question 2

(a) Most candidates evaluated the argument in Source 3 well and assessed how well the author supported the view that, 'In the future, more people will migrate due to climate change.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- many examples help to explain the argument
- clear, logical structure that is easy to follow
- uses some evidence – statistics from research by international organisations
- effective language – uses rhetorical questions that gain attention; evokes sympathy by highlighting effects of migration
- uses predictions based on trends
- recent – up to date and therefore likely to be relevant and accurate
- 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
- doesn't acknowledge counter arguments
- some exaggeration
- poor citation makes the material unverifiable

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 an opinion.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Some weaker responses analysed and described the reasons and evidence within the source but needed to 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 internet blog.'* This statement does not explain why internet blogs are weak evidence.

A better response would be, *'A weakness is that the source was taken from an internet blog because blogs are usually written from the point of view of the author. This type of evidence is not 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.

(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 now more environmental disasters than in the past.' The methods of testing the claim were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

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. Others stressed the value of finding evidence from organisations with expertise in the field of migration, climate change and environmental disasters, thereby clearly linking the choice of method to the claim being tested.

Candidates also tended to describe interviews, surveys and questionnaires with migrants and other people about the issue, often with different social groups in different places and cultures. Other methods included consultation with experts and government officials.

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 achieved 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. This did not answer the question satisfactorily.

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 prediction from the source and demonstrated that they understood that a prediction is a statement or claim about the future. Most candidates justified and explained their selection convincingly.

(b) (i) The majority of candidates identified an opinion from Pana's statement.

(ii) Most candidates related the identified opinion to Pana's argument. However, weaker responses did not evaluate the opinion as a form of support for the argument. Candidates needed to evaluate the opinion as evidence or as a reason to support 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 good response was, *'weak support as this opinion is not based on evidence from statistical trends and research that gives confidence to the reader about the claim.'* Another good response was, *'This opinion gives strong support because it is relevant to the argument and based on personal experience which is likely to be valid and accurate. It is not second hand.'*

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, Uki's and Pana'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 fully explained 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 lacked support 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.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to recommend an action to a government to reduce the impact of environmental migration. 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 governments to work together to reduce climate change, highlighting a good understanding of the link between cause and consequence. Another popular option was to plan new communities in safe places for migrants.

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 way to structure the argument. Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements. Stronger responses reached a clear, balanced assessment or conclusion and linked the argument back to the issue of reducing the impact of migration.

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02
Individual Report

Key messages

- Candidates should be aware that **perspective**s are the main focus of the Global Perspectives Individual Report (IR).
- Teachers and candidates should understand the requirements of the IR as indicated by the **assessment criteria**. These are clearly set out in the mark scheme.
- Candidates should formulate a question that focusses on **one issue.**
- The candidate's response must focus on **different perspectives** on their chosen issue.

General comments

For this component, candidates choose a topic from the list provided in the syllabus. They ask a question about a relevant issue. They research different perspectives (global and national/local) on their issue and present these perspectives with relevant supporting information.

They analyse and compare the causes and consequences of their issue.

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.

Candidates cite all material they use and provide references for all the sources used in their report. They present their report in essay form (continuous prose), in a Word document and should write between 1500 and 2000 words.

General observations on March 2022 cohort

In this March session, more candidates addressed a specific issue and fewer wrote descriptive essays about a general topic.

More candidates included evaluation of sources than previous cohorts. Many candidates cited their sources and provided accurate references.

The strongest work showed a clear understanding of all the requirements for this component. It was clear about the issue at hand; 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, comparing the different causes and/or the impacts in different places or on different groups of people. 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.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

The candidate reflected on their own perspective and how it had been formed or changed by the findings of their research, other people's perspectives, 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

Information from different perspectives:

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.
Simple questions such as:

Why does our belief system continue to judge abortion?
Should State-Run Mass surveillance be permitted?
Will technology replace human workers in the 21st Century?
Does excessive use of social media increase risk of depression in teenagers?
Are wildfires lifesaving or life-threatening?

allowed candidates to be clear about their topic and issue and to focus on that throughout.

Some stronger candidates identified their topic and their issue. This is a helpful approach and makes it easier to focus on different perspectives on the selected issue. These included topics, issues and questions such as:
Topic: Sustainable living
Issue: Food Wastage
Food wastage: is it possible to solve the issue at a local and individual level?

Topic: Changing Communities
Issue – Ageing Population
Question : Ageing Population – are they a demographic dividend or an economic burden.

Philosophical questions or those asking *How? Or 'to what extent'* often led to opinionated, limited, or descriptive responses.

The strongest work shows a clear understanding of perspectives.

For this component, **a global perspective** addresses 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. Information should be presented to explain the perspective and support it.

Global perspective

The Domesday Clock, initiated by the Bulleting of atomic Scientists to measure humanity's chances of survival has gotten closer to 'midnight', terminal disaster, than it ever was during the height of the Cold War. This is due to the climate crisis, but also because of the threat of nuclear war. If a combined effort by developed and developing countries to deal with climate change by transitioning quickly to renewable energy is not made, it could, as Noam Chomsky has said, lead to 'the end of organized human existence.'

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.

National perspective

Seymour (2013) believed this dependency inhibits the beneficiary countries from developing. Teddy Ruge, a prominent Ugandan writer on Uganda's technological development, believes such interventions disincentivise local and national governments from creating self-sufficient industries.[5] Ugandan people might

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

thus have a negative view of humanitarian aid trips as it's from an outspoken member of the national group of Ugandan people. Because Ruge is a writer on such matters, he can be considered an expert….

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 the candidate started with a general opinion and presented their own ideas without any reference to others' perspectives.

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

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. In the case of candidates who had not identified a global issue, or who wrote descriptive essays, they found it difficult to identify or explain any causes or consequences.

Stronger candidates 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.

Weaker candidates struggled to compare causes and consequences explicitly, though some identified the main or most important cause or consequence.

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.

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.

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.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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.

Note: The candidate needs to provide at least 3 **different** points of evaluation on more than one source used in order to fully achieve this criterion.

Evaluation

Reporters without Borders published a paper…

Although the statistics presented date back to 2013, they are still relevant, considering the Chinese government continues to maintain its stronghold over the Internet. Since its publication relevant to the report was outdated, I backed it up with a more recent article by Al-Jazeera which corroborates the data presented. I also used other reliable news websites such as the BBC and the Guardian, and to further ensure this data doesn't have newspaper bias, I tried to use non-contentious, objective data from them. I also used a research paper, which was reliable considering the author Jon Penney has a suitable knowledge claim, having done multiple research projects in Chilling Effects and publishing his works in respectable journals such as the European Law Review. In terms of primary data, I conducted a survey. To make it representative, I collected data across multiple demographics and used social media to share my survey, increasing my reach.

The example above demonstrates a strong response with very detailed evaluation of specific sources.

Many candidates who evaluated sources made quite general and unexplained comments.

Some weaker work mentioned evaluative criteria such as expertise or bias but did not explain these or link them to the issue or consider their impact on the research findings or conclusions.

Weak work presented a section labelled 'Evaluation' but actually only described the sources in general terms and did not evaluate them – or evaluated their own research rather than their sources.

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

Assessment Objective 2: Reflection

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.

The example below followed on from a developed conclusion, provided their own answer to the question and considered the different perspectives and courses of action proposed:

Though I earlier believed that ageing populations are a family's responsibility, I also agreed that they are a burden to the society and soon they will be responsible for most of the governments expenditure. However, after exploring the benefits of an aging population, I was convinced that this new uprising crisis can actually be a global opportunity. The different policies and courses of actions implemented by some countries also contributed to changing my perspective. I think that our world would need to change social attitudes towards the older population and reap the benefits of this valuable human resource.

Weaker 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.

Weak work stated the candidate's opinion without any explanation or justification.

The **weakest work** did not show evidence of reflection at all: did not mention the candidate's own opinion, perspective, or attitude to the question they asked.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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 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.

Weaker 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 **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; 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:

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 simply present information they have gained from primary and secondary research and do not process or discuss it at all.

Some candidates write general philosophical essays on their topic. Others present their own thoughts on their question without any evidence of research.

Citation and referencing:

The main referencing concern is identification of material used by the candidate.

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 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: Their references should include author, date, and title of publication for books or magazines, and 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

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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). They should be clearly organised and easy to find.

Some candidates needed to ensure that their citations and reference lists match. Some candidates provided a name and date in a bracket in-text, but this name and date did not appear in their reference list. Candidates may provide a list of sources they did not quote in their work. However, any sources that are quoted or used in their work must be fully referenced somewhere.

Note: Primary research: 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. (This should not be included as part of the essay, unless it is to be read and counted in the words allowed for the essay).

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

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 team elements (Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration).
- Teams that aim to: 'raise awareness about perspectives on…' as a topic are guided to look for perspectives and share their findings through the Outcome with an appropriate audience.
- 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 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 and cite their sources.
- Candidates should keep an ongoing reflective log of their own ways of working and their work as a part of the team.
- Teachers should steer candidates away from topics/issues that could be sensitive locally.
- Schools should note that there is a Guidance Document for Team Project on the School Support Hub, listed under planning your teaching (ref: The Cambridge Assessment International Education School Support Hub).

General comments

Team Projects:

Candidates were innovative in finding ways of completing a team project whilst not in school. In many cases, their activities were active and their evidence of them was very clear. It was very encouraging to see candidates' engagement with measures to support communities and their fellow students in activities to support mental health during the pandemic. 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 *disease and health*, some teams focused on raising awareness about the increase in support available to teenagers with a mental illness, while others looked at how the pandemic was causing harm to the elderly and producing a leaflet for the community offering activities that could be carried out. Under the topic of *sport and recreation*, some teams focused on exercise programmes or practical yoga to encourage students and their parents to exercise more regularly at home during the pandemic.

Outcomes were varied and included videos, school seminars, leaflets and posters. As was to be expected, there were teams who were unable to carry out their plans as fully as they wished. Those who handled this most successfully used the process of adapting their plans as part of their evaluation.

Less successful projects tended to give general information about a topic or an issue, without explicitly referring to different cultural perspectives on the issue. The evaluations of these team projects usually made it clear that candidates had not been involved in choice of topic or team members.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Comments on specific tasks

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 a PowerPoint Presentation or video that was developed to achieve their aim, but did not include different cultural perspectives on the issue (e.g. an information leaflet simply giving facts about the issue or subject, e.g. an illness, in order to inform or raise awareness).

Guidance: Interviews carried out to gather views/perspectives cannot be an Outcome in themselves. The Outcome should be a product developed to achieve the team's aim, and show the perspectives on the issue that each individual has researched. 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. Candidates find it helpful to plan ways of assessing how far their Outcome met their aim, maybe a survey or just collecting what the audience said as they were leaving. This should be indicated in the Explanation.

Example:

The following is from a team's Explanation:

'*Due to COVID-19 outbreak, our school organized a virtual learning platform for all the students, but some of us felt stressed because of the excessive screen time, boundless assignments, internet connectivity issues and the unsuitable timings of these online classes. We ourselves being students realized that the others might also be facing such complications and that would lead them to lack in studies and cause stress. Most people think that they never get stressed and sometimes don't recognize the symptoms or the causes. We were able to interview the school nurse to find information about the local situation during school closures. She told us about stress amongst our friends.*

'*We decided to hold a showcase in our school to inform students about stress and increase their awareness, following it with a yoga session. Then a Covid-19 outbreak stopped that from happening. We then planned a webinar, with a yoga trainer in one home. We thought this could be interactive and active, an effective method to use. We used PowerPoint to show our information as it was easy to present and simple to understand.*

'*Lastly, we delivered the presentation. It should have been a presentation to people in a hall, but we couldn't do that, so we wrote leaflets instead and shared them through a zoom meeting. It informed the students about stress in teenagers, its causes and symptoms and how to deal with it. The yoga session was followed up with the same questionnaire again. We were able to analyse the data to show how effective we had been. We uploaded the session to YouTube for those who could not attend it. This allowed us to achieve our aim by reaching a larger audience*.'

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. We do not need explanations of how this mark was arrived at.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Personal Element: Reflective Paper

AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation

The most successful candidates provided direct evidence of the impact of their work, of how far the Outcome had achieved the project aim. For instance, in the project on student stress, a survey was conducted to assess the extent to which the webinar had improved understanding and would change behaviour. They had a percentage success rate and feedback about why others would make no changes to their behaviour. Analysis led to them being able to discuss their effectiveness in different age groups and countries. 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. Suggestions for improvement were not linked to any of the weaknesses that had been identified.

Only the very best responses were successful in evaluating their own work processes. Successful responses evaluated their time management; for example, giving reasons why they failed to keep to their research schedule. Other successful responses evaluated their research technique: '*I was researching into access to education and I made use of a few websites about access to primary and secondary schools in a range of countries. However, later I found that the United Nations has graphs that would have shown what we needed much better*'. The most successful responses included examples to illustrate and develop their points of evaluation; for example, an illustration of something that they were unable to achieve due to their failure to better manage time, such as: '*I missed a meeting and was not able to tell my team what I had found out. As a result, they got on with the PowerPoint presentation without information about the elderly people*.' The most successful suggestions for improvement to both the Outcome and own work processes also drew on evaluation of weaknesses in these areas, as in here where the candidate wrote: '*From this I have learned to keep notes of a plan and of the work I need to do before we meet as a team*'.

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'. They should look at the latter with the question: How well did I support the team in its work towards the Outcome? This would lead to help and support that they gave others, and occasions where they themselves needed help or support.

Other candidates did not reflect in a balanced way, focusing on just the strengths or just the weaknesses of their work processes. **Candidates would do well to believe that no work is so good that it cannot be improved, or so weak that it has no strengths.**

Guidance: Rather than give candidates headings from the assessment criteria, give them questions that encourage evaluation. For example: 'How did your work processes/time management affect the project?', 'How effective was your research in satisfying the aims of the Outcome?', 'How well did your Outcome meet your aim?', 'Which elements of the Outcome were more or 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?'

An example about work processes: '*I enjoy research and found the access to research papers on the Learning Platform very helpful. I did make some mistakes. I kept notes on paper and never found time to put them onto the laptop. I didn't have them in school when we met, so only an overview was shared*'.

An example about role in the team: '*Having a total of 8 subjects and I had to give a lot of time towards practicing mathematics and science, so sometimes I couldn't complete my work. This impacted the team because work had to stop because I hadn't done my part. After this had happened, one of the team would remind me to do what I had said. I felt foolish, but I never let them down again*.'

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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. 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. Some candidates began by knowing that they worked best alone, only to find that it was more effective to have different ideas to listen to. Others were looking forward to working with friends, only to find that either they wasted time or that they would have preferred to do the work alone as they were never satisfied with what their team-mates did. In the very best responses, candidates explained how these benefits and challenges impacted upon their project, i.e. insightful evaluation.

Less successful responses simply listed who did what in the team, or, often, which team members 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. Paragraphs that show what they did to support the team, and how they needed support from the team, and how either of these impacted on the team's performance would indicate a mark at Level 4. There were candidates who produced effective reflections. As a weakness, a candidate reflected: '*I took on the task of filming. I knew that I could use a system I had at home. I did not check that the school system was not compatible, so I had to do it all again*'. 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 make the video quickly. This meant that we could edit the content and make sure it met our aim clearly*'.

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

Guidance: Candidates could be given a reflective log to record examples while they are completing the project or asked to take notes. 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; their performance had a negative effect on the team. Some centres have indicated that they are giving classes time to write sections of the Reflective Paper as they progress through Team Project, e.g. to evaluate the Outcome soon after the event at which it was shared.

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. For instance, from the research into the effect of parental ambition on learner health, learners found that achievement often fell when too much pressure was put onto learners and rose when learners were trusted to want to achieve and invited to share their academic progress with parents, giving them a need to take the message home.

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 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 lead a team by planning meetings and getting people involved, and I will be able to use this skill in the future*'.

Guidance: The Team Project is a piece of work that spans several weeks. It would help candidates 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.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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 methods are used to deal with plastic waste in their coastal area by talking to the office concerned; while other team members looked into the situation internationally by exploring what is happening in in other countries so that they could make comparisons and draw conclusions. The Outcome in this case might be photographs of a plastics-from-the-beach collection and a letter to local government officials and poster telling people to stop throwing plastic bottles away. The candidate who had researched the situation locally would then explain in their Reflective Paper what they had found out about their local situation and how this was reflected in the letter/poster.

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.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022