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:

- Demonstrated very good skills of interpretation and analysis
- Need to explain in detail how research designs relate to the claim to be tested
- Need to explain in detail the potential impact and consequences of different actions in response to a global issue.

General comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In November 2022, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Fuel and Energy. The impact of electrical energy supply on the environment was the issue explored.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good. Many candidates clearly understood that there are a range of perspectives on global issues. Candidates mainly recognised that opinions should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of perspectives and opinion is not sufficient in response to most questions in the written exam. Candidates were able to analyse sources and data presented in different ways.

Candidates were generally able to identify potential strengths and weaknesses in arguments. Responses need to explain why particular aspects of an argument within a source are strengths or weaknesses. Candidates should use and apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of reasons, evidence and arguments.

In addition, candidates should explain research designs and choice of research methods, explicitly relating their research strategy to the claim to be tested. Candidates should explain how the research method will gather evidence that will enable them to test the claim or answer a research question.

Many candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to reduce the impact of electricity production on the environment. The best responses explained and assessed the potential impact and consequences of proposals in detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgement within the conclusion.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- Fully explain the design of research strategies to test a claim.
- Evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking.
- Evaluate alternative actions in greater detail, explaining and assessing potential impact and consequences more fully.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified the number of people in the world who do not have access to electricity as 1.3 billion, from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two reasons for increasing the production of electricity, from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks. Most candidates identified that the consumption of electricity is increasing, that countries need more electricity to develop, and that not all people currently have access to electricity.

(c) Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying, and justifying which reason for increasing the production of electricity was the most important, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss developing countries' need for more electricity, and that not all people worldwide currently have access to electricity.

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

- number of people affected
- the impact of current trends in energy provision
- the need to reduce the impact of fossil fuels on the environment by increasing electrical energy sources
- to help countries to develop economically and socially
- to ensure fair distribution and equality in access to all countries.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why the chosen reason was more important than others 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 the production of electricity is a global issue, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concept of 'global'.

The reasons given by candidates related mainly to those given within the sources, including the impact of electricity production on the environment, quality of life, economic growth, and the use of scarce resources. There was some attempt to explain why these impacts were important globally.

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

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'global' context. These responses did not access the higher levels of response.

Question 2

(a) Most candidates were able to evaluate Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'we can generate electricity without harming the environment.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- Gives information about his experience which is relevant.
- Refers to his position as a politician.
- Appeals to families when talking about the waste around the area.
- Gives data and statistics on waste produced.
- Explains that other countries have used this method, use of examples.
- Appeals to the idea that it is more reliable and affordable.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- Not many details about the work of the politician, so may be biased and have a vested interest.
- No sources of statistical data.
- Emotive references to family safety may mislead some people.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- Very brief description of what the factory will do.
- No data or examples of other communities.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their opinions, usually discussing a range of distinct evaluative points. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion about the source rather than examining strengths and weaknesses systematically. Some weaker responses did not evaluate or explain why the identified reason or type of evidence was a strength or weakness.

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear statement about the quality of the reasons and evidence in the source and justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means quoting from or summarising 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, 'one person produces about 1.5 kilograms of household waste per day.' The methods of testing the claim suggested were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

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

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanations for their suggestions. These were *clearly and explicitly related to the claim being tested*. Weaker responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence but did not explain them fully or make any link to the claim being tested.

A few candidates responded to the question by describing their opinion on the issue rather than describing how it could be researched. This did not answer the question satisfactorily.

Candidates should be given regular opportunity to design research strategies to test claims or answer research questions as a regular part of their course.

Question 3

(a) Most candidates correctly identified a prediction from Leo's statemen and could explain why the statement was a prediction. A prediction is a statement suggesting something is likely to happen in the future. Most candidates were able to justify and explain their judgement convincingly.

(b) (i) Most candidates correctly identified one fact from Sophia's statement and explained that a fact is a statement which is true or accurate and can be verified. Most candidates were able to justify and explain their judgement convincingly.

(ii) Most candidates were able to relate the identified fact to Sophia's argument that people should adopt a simpler lifestyle and use less electricity. This question was challenging for some candidates who did not evaluate the fact identified.

The most effective responses explained how the fact related to the argument and explained a strength and/or a weakness of the fact within this argument.

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates about facts and their use in arguments. Also, to provide experience of using the concept to analyse and evaluate sources, alongside other critical thinking concepts like value judgement, bias, opinion, vested interest and prediction.

(c) Most candidates compared both Leo's and Sophia's arguments. They 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

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Responses at the highest levels gave well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the value of each statement; this included a structured evaluation of how well the argument worked, with a focus on reasons and evidence and giving a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences, and values for both statements. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion. These responses also included material taken from the statements in the source as evidence to support the candidate's judgement.

Weaker responses lacked supporting evidence and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. There was very little or no overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to assess and recommend different proposed actions designed to reduce the impact of electricity production on the environment. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

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

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

Most candidates recommended cleaner more sustainable ways to produce electricity.

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

Weaker responses tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the option or air pollution in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported. These responses often simply listed ways to reduce the impact of electricity production rather than explaining why one method/action was likely to have greater impact and should therefore be recommended.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

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
- Need to explain in detail how research designs relate to the claim to be tested
- Need to explain in detail the potential impact and consequences of different actions in response to a global issue.

General comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In November 2022, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Demographic Change. Life expectancy and health care provision was the issue explored.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good. Many candidates clearly understood that there are a range of perspectives on global issues. Candidates mainly recognised that opinions should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of perspectives and opinion is generally not sufficient in responses to most questions in the written exam. Candidates were able to analyse sources and data presented in different ways.

Candidates were generally able to identify potential strengths and weaknesses in arguments. Responses need to explain why particular aspects of an argument within a source are strengths or weaknesses. Candidates should use and apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of reasons, evidence and language in sources and arguments.

In addition, candidates should explain research designs and choice of research methods, explicitly relating their research strategy to the claim to be tested. Candidates should explain how the research method will gather evidence that will enable them to test the claim or answer a research question.

Most candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to improve health. Candidates should explain and assess the potential impact and consequences of proposals in more detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgement within the conclusion.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- Fully explain the design of research strategies to test a claim.
- Evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking.
- Evaluate alternative actions in greater detail, explaining and assessing potential impact and consequences more fully.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified life expectancy in Japan as 84 years, from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two factors that influence life expectancy, from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks. Most candidates identified quality of medical care, lifestyle, level of economic development, and housing conditions.

(c) Most candidates responded very well to this question, identifying, and justifying which factor influencing life expectancy was the most important, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss quality of health care and lifestyle.

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

- number of people affected
- the effect of current trends on lifestyle and diet
- poor access to high quality healthcare, especially in developing countries
- impact on people and countries on their ability to fulfil potential and succeed, especially economically and in work
- the potential for multiple positive consequences.

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

(d) Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why life expectancy is a national issue, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concept of 'national'.

The reasons given by candidates related mainly to those given within the sources, including the relationship of life expectancy to the quality of life, economic growth, and the ability of people to fulfil potential, as well as government responsibility to care for citizens and provide quality healthcare.

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

Some candidates simply listed factors which influence life expectancy taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'national' context. These responses did not access the higher levels of response.

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 need to spend more money on healthcare locally.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- Provides some citation to authenticate evidence.
- Has the ability to know as a doctor with some experience and expertise.
- A strong emotional appeal that gets the reader's attention.
- Suggests improving health education and giving people care at home which seem reasonable actions.
- Uses a range of evidence that strengthen credibility.
- Gives statistics about the area's future population which are verifiable.
- Clear and logical reasoning that is easy to follow and persuasive.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- Does not give specific details about their experience as a doctor.
- May have a bias and a vested interested as a provider of health care.
- Very little statistical evidence to support the argument.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- Does not include consideration of cost of provision of healthcare so lacks some credibility.
- Comments that 'some people' will argue about housing are vague and not verifiable.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their opinions, usually discussing a range of distinct evaluative points. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion about the source rather than examining strengths and weaknesses systematically.

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

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear statement about the quality of the reasons and evidence in the source and justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means quoting from or summarising 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 in this area are healthier than they were a year ago.' The methods of testing the claim suggested were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

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

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanations for their suggestions. These were *clearly and explicitly related to the claim being tested*. Weaker responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence but did not explain them fully or make any link to the claim being tested.

A few candidates responded to the question by describing their opinion on the issue rather than describing how it could be researched. This did not answer the question satisfactorily.

Candidates should be given regular opportunity to design research strategies to test claims or answer research questions as a regular part of their course.

Question 3

(a) Most candidates correctly identified an opinion from Zama's statement and could explain why the selected statement was an opinion. An opinion is a thought or belief about something or someone; a view which is subjective and not necessarily shared by other people, often based on assertion. Most candidates were able to justify and explain their judgement convincingly.

(b) Most candidates were able to identify aspects of bias in Sinta'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 Sinta's experience of working for local government may have influenced her viewpoint about health care, shape her perspective on how to improve the health of local people and encouraged her not to consider other perspectives.

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

- Unbalanced argument giving very little consideration to other perspectives or counterarguments.
- Use of exaggerated language and phrases e.g., 'you are forgetting … '.
- Only referring to positive aspects of local provision.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- Lack of evidence.
- Mainly opinion.

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

(c) Most candidates compared both Zama's and Sinta's arguments. They discussed issues relating to evidence, language, knowledge claims and expertise. Some candidates also addressed the reasons and values within each statement.

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the value of each statement; this included a structured evaluation of how well the argument worked, with a focus on reasons and evidence and giving a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences, and values for both statements. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion. These responses also included material taken from the statements in the source as evidence to support the candidate's judgement.

Weaker responses lacked supporting evidence and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. There was very little or no overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to assess and recommend different proposed actions designed to improve the health of people within a country. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

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

Some candidates tended to describe their opinions in a generalised and asserted way, comparing each action without exploring the potential impact on the health of the population.

Most candidates recommended spending more money on healthcare and hospitals.

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

Weaker responses tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about health in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to improve heath rather than explaining why one method/action was likely to have greater impact and should therefore be recommended.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

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
- Need to explain in detail how research designs relate to the claim to be tested
- Need to explain in detail the potential impact and consequences of different actions in response to a global issue.

General comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In November 2022, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Migration. The impact of migration on families and the local community was the issue explored.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good. Many candidates clearly understood that there are a range of perspectives on global issues. Candidates mainly recognised that opinions should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of perspectives and opinion is generally not sufficient in responses to most questions in the written exam. Candidates were able to analyse sources and data presented in different ways.

Candidates were generally able to identify potential strengths and weaknesses in arguments. Responses need to explain why particular aspects of an argument within a source are strengths or weaknesses. Candidates should use and apply key concepts in critical thinking to the evaluation of reasons, evidence and language in sources and arguments.

In addition, candidates should explain research designs and choice of research methods, explicitly relating their research strategy to the claim to be tested. Candidates should explain how the research method will gather evidence that will enable them to test the claim or answer a research question.

Most candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in discussing the impact of migration on families. However, candidates should explain and assess the potential impact and consequences of proposals in more detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgement within the conclusion.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- Fully explain the design of research strategies to test a claim.
- Evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking.
- Evaluate alternative actions in greater detail, explaining and assessing potential impact and consequences more fully.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified that the region with the highest number of international migrants in 2019 was Asia, from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two effects of migration on families, from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks. Most candidates identified that children may grow up without a mother or father as a role model, disruption to family life, sending money home, improvements to family income and standard of living.

(c) Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying, and justifying which effect of migration on families was the most significant, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss disruption to family life, sending money home, improvements to family income and standard of living.

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

- number of people affected in the family
- multiple positive effects on standard of living
- multiple positive effects on quality of life
- potential harm to children and family relationships
- short term sacrifice for long term gain.

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

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

The reasons given by candidates related mainly to those given within the sources, including the impact of migration on family life, standards of living, schooling, and the local economy. There was some attempt to explain why these impacts were important locally.

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

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'local' context. These responses did not access the higher levels of response.

Question 2

(a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'migrant workers are good for our businesses.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- Gives information about his experience which is relevant.
- Refers to his position as an employer so has some ability to know and expertise.
- Uses a range of relevant examples to support his case and provide evidence.
- Gives relevant data and statistics on productivity.
- Discusses the positive impact of migrants on businesses and the local economy, which is credible.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- Not many details about the work of the employer, so may be biased and have a vested interest.
- No sources of statistical data so cannot be verified and checked.
- Some exaggeration of examples that undermines credibility.
- Some generalisations that may not be true.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- No data or examples of other communities, therefore a small sample that may not be representative.
- Relies heavily on anecdotal evidence that may not be true for other situations.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their opinions, usually discussing a range of distinct evaluative points. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion about the source rather than examining strengths and weaknesses systematically. Some weaker responses did not evaluate or explain why the identified reason or type of evidence was a strength or weakness.

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear statement about the quality of the reasons and evidence in the source and justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means quoting from or summarising 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, 'most migrant workers come from small villages in rural areas.' The methods of testing the claim suggested were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

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

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestions. These were *clearly and explicitly related to the claim being tested*. Weaker responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence but did not explain them fully or make any link to the claim being tested.

A few candidates responded to the question by describing their opinion on the issue rather than describing how it could be researched. This did not answer the question satisfactorily.

Candidates should be given regular opportunity to design research strategies to test claims or answer research questions as a regular part of their course.

Question 3

(a) Most candidates correctly identified one opinion from Niza's statement and could explain why the selected statement was an opinion. An opinion is a thought or belief about something or someone; a view which is subjective and not necessarily shared by other people, often based on assertion. Most candidates were able to justify and explain their judgement convincingly.

(b) (i) Most candidates correctly identified a value judgement from Emele's statement and explained that a value judgement is a view or decision about what is right, wrong or important, based a particular set of standards, principles, or values. Most candidates were able to justify and explain their judgement convincingly.

(ii) Most candidates were able to relate the identified value judgement to Emele's argument that people should not move away from their family for work. However, this question was challenging for some candidates who did not evaluate the value judgement identified.

The most effective responses explained how the value judgement related to the argument and explained a strength and/or a weakness of the value judgement within this argument.

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates about value judgements and their use in arguments. Also to provide experience of using the concept to analyse and evaluate sources, alongside other critical thinking concepts like fact, bias, opinion, vested interest and prediction.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

(c) Most candidates compared both Niza's and Emele's arguments. They 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 gave well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the quality of each statement; this included a structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a focus on reasons and evidence and giving a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences, and values for both statements. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion. These responses also included material taken from the statements in the source as evidence to support the candidate's judgement.

Weaker responses lacked supporting evidence and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. There was very little or no overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to evaluate the view that people should not migrate to find work because of the effects on their families. Candidates were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

There were many thoughtful, well-explained discussions of arguments for and against the view in the statement, exploring different perspectives on the issue. Some candidates simply described their own opinions in a generalised and asserted way.

Most candidates explored issues of:

- Scale of impact on individuals and the family as a whole.
- Reference to consequences and implications for individuals, the family, local economy, and government, for example on income, education, housing, and health.
- How long it might take to find work abroad.
- The breaking of relationships.
- Reaction of local communities to migrants.
- Potential conflicts of interest.
- Costs and benefits of migration.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and made clear judgements about the issue. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses linked their argument to the issue of the impact of migrating to find work and the effect on families.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about migration. Arguments were often unsupported and asserted.

In preparation for this type of question, centres are encouraged to give candidates regular opportunity to write extended essays in which they contrast and compare different perspectives or potential actions in response to an issue. In so doing candidates need to analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence that supports and justifies the perspective or action.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02
Individual Report

Key messages

- Candidates should formulate a question that focusses on **one global issue.**
- The candidate's response must focus on **different perspectives** on their chosen issue.
- Candidates should analyse the causes and consequences of their chosen issue.
- Candidates should evaluate the individual sources they use.
- Candidates should clearly cite all their sources.

General guidance for Paper 02 Individual Report

- Successful work for this component 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. It showed clear evidence of research, with accurate citation of all sources used.
- Successful candidates analysed and explained the causes and consequences of the issue. They explicitly compared the different causes and/or consequences. This could be, for example, a range of causes, compared to identify the main causes or a comparison of causes in different countries. Successful candidates provided full details of their proposed course of action, including details of how the course of action would be implemented and the possible impact on the issue.
- Stronger candidates reflected on their own perspective and how this has been impacted by their findings and by others' perspectives. They answered their question and remained focused throughout on the central issue.

General Observations on November 2022 cohort

Most candidates provided a research question and attempted to answer it.
Most candidates provided citations and references for their sources.
More candidates made some attempt to evaluate their sources.
More candidates succeeded in providing a global perspective.
Some Individual Reports were structured around the specifications from the pre 2018 syllabus.
Some candidates showed evidence of copy and paste of whole passages from their sources, or possible use of spinners and thesaurus apps.

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 this session included:

- What exactly is responsible for the Global obesity epidemic?
- Should aquaculture be considered a threat to biodiversity in the oceans?
- Should fracking and its economic impact, be more important than its environmental impact?
- Can human experimentation be justified on terminal disease patients for the benefit of society?
- Does living with single parents have a negative impact on children?
- Does programmed obsolescence affect daily life?

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

- Are tiny houses the future?
- Is human health seriously at risk with the extent of global air pollution?
- Could veganism be the solution to the severe climate change and environmental damage that society is facing recently?
- Is LGBTQI+ representation in the media important for current and upcoming generations?
- Does gender discrimination interfere with mental health?
- Can we solve racism?

Some work was presented without a clear research question considering a global issue. A minority of candidates did not address an issue in their response. The majority of these gave a purely narrative account of e.g. the rise of social media use or the mechanisms of climate change, but did not then go on to explain why that might be a problem.

A few candidates provided an appropriate research question on a global issue without addressing the issue highlighted in their report.

A small number of reports had no research question and some with no title or topic. This has a clear impact on their success, as the mark scheme is based on the premise that the candidate has researched an issue and is answering a research question by exploring different perspectives and coming up with their own response as a result of their research.

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. It is not enough to present general information, facts and figures on a topic from different parts of the world.

For this component, **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.

Successful work included paraphrased and/or direct quotes showing a clear global perspective:

'The United Nations (UN) states that paid parental leave and the encouragement of leave to be taken by both partners, is vital for women to have access to equal opportunities to progress in their careers.[8] The UN is attempting to reach their sustainable development goal of gender Info equality, by giving its staff 24 weeks of paid parental leave for both parents to foster equality within the home.'[9] An article from UN Women, states that the introduction of a more equal division of parental leave, which has been applied in some Scandinavian countries, has proven to be successful in creating a more equal share of childcare between partners in the long term. [10] This emphasis on maternity and paternity leave, ensures that both parents are taking time off so that the one parent's career is not impacted more than the others. This equal division of leave has also been seen to reduce gender specific roles at home, which will increase equality in the division of unpaid domestic work and childcare in the future. In a United Nations discussion, paid parental leave was deemed vital to diminish the motherhood penalty by changing social and cultural norms to promote the raising of children and unpaid domestic work as an equal responsibility of both partners.'[11]

A global perspective should be clearly identified as such and include an opinion:

'The UN Climate Technology centre and network (UN CTCN) shows a keen posture on the hybridization of vehicles, they stated 'The improved efficiency of hybrid vehicles makes hybridization especially worthwhile for urban passenger cars, small trucks for local delivery and city busses.' (2016) This shows a clear trending global interest on hybrid cars, more governments as well as influential organisations every year are creating incentives to push their citizens into the imminent future of hybridization.'

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.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

National/Local perspectives

'In the Netherlands, the 17th of March there will be new elections for the legislatures of the country. Before these elections can take place, the main leading politicians are showing their viewpoints and opinions for the different quotas. At the moment, political parties are voting for and against the diversity within our legislatures. One of the biggest parties that is against people with a migrant background is the PVV. They see immigrants, but especially Muslim people as terrorists and people that claim jobs, money, and opportunities for residential areas in relation to the Dutch people. Their representative Geert Wilders argues at the 'Verkiezingsdebat' or elections debate in English, that he did absolutely not want politicians in the legislatures with a double nationality, and on his website of the PVV he is stating that he wants to take the Dutch nationality of criminals away when caught. [11] *On the contrary, the Dutch millennials want more racially diverse legislatures, as stated in the NOS. These are the people from the youth organisations for the D66, PvdA, CDA, GroenLinks, en ChristenUnie. They argue that they want their party to consist of different migrational backgrounds, because racial minorities need their political figures to be able to relate to them, and to feel like valued participants in the Dutch elections. This is also because the legislatures would show a good representation of the current population.'* [12]

Some work included a section labelled Global perspective in which views from different countries were presented, however no global view was presented, and the different national views were not drawn together to form a global view.

Some weak work did not present any perspectives or opinions apart from the candidate's own views and these were sometimes unsupported, without evidence, meaning that the report read as an unresearched opinion piece.

Some **weaker work did not present different perspectives** on the issue, but instead presented information about different places. This was sometimes labelled as Global/National Perspective though there were no perspectives presented. In these cases, candidates described actions taken by a government, for example, or provided relevant statistics without telling us what anyone thought or felt about the issue. Others presented their own viewpoints and opinions, with no supporting information or evidence.

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 explained the consequences of their chosen issue. Where their issue was clear, they were able to discuss 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 work compared 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:

'On the other hand, Anemia is another cause of maternal mortality, indigenous people have the worst health and this is because of the increased risk of infectious diseases, poverty, malnutrition, and lack of health care 'infections related to hygiene, sanitation, safe water, and water management are significant contributors to anemia' (Khambalia, Aimone, Zlotkin, 2011). Worldwide there is a higher rate of people being sick of anemia 'The burden of anemia is overwhelmingly higher among indigenous groups compared to the general population and represents a moderate (20 – 39.9 per cent) to severe (240 per cent) public health problem'. (Khambalia, Aimone, Zlotkin, 2011).'

'According to what has been said, the most important and serious cause is poverty since poverty has a great influence and supports all problems, lack of resources, anemia, and other maternal pathologies are favored by poverty but we need to take into account other causes no matter if they are most severe or not./

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Course(s) of Action:

The strongest work had a 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.

It is acceptable for candidates to consider courses of action that have been successful elsewhere and apply them to their own country as in this case:

As the Australian Government plans to introduce a new paid parental leave scheme of a combined 20 weeks, experts believe it will negatively impact Australia on the path to reaching gender equality.[24] To ensure that this leave is not taken solely by mothers, the Australian Government could follow an approach taken by Scandinavian countries.

Scandinavian countries have implemented a three-part parental leave scheme that allocates equal, non-transferable leave to mothers and fathers, with one part to share. This approach positively impacted gender equality in Sweden and Iceland as they currently have the highest percentage of fathers taking parental leave.[25] It has been proven that fathers who take leave have an increased likelihood of parental involvement in the future, as childcare and domestic duties are viewed as shared responsibilities.[26] Currently, Australian fathers are wanting to spend more time with their children but they only get 2 weeks leave, which is the least of all OECD countries. [27]

Australia could implement a three-part division of parental leave with six weeks allocated to mothers, six weeks to fathers and 12 weeks to be shared between parents and paid at a more substantial percentage of their income. This would help to make fathers taking parental leave and the involvement of fathers in the raising of children, more prominent in Australian society which would ultimately help to close the gender pay gap.

Weaker work described solutions already in place but did not develop these to 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. Others provided a detailed course of action that was not clearly linked to the issue they were considering.

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.

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.

The evaluations made should be explained:

'The information given by the interviewee is somewhat reliable because it is from their personal experience (primary data) and the events that they talked about are recent. However, this source might not be the most reliable as it is only the experience of a specific individual, and other members of the community in other parts of the world and from different backgrounds could have differing responses. The information given by the interview is reliable as the interviewee has been an 'open' member of the community for a long time thus, they have a lot of experience and knowledge on the topic. On the other hand, there may be a bias or the information received may not be all correct as we only know what the interviewee is telling us thus we only know one side of the story.'

There should be comment on what the evaluation means for the candidate's research or perspective:

'The most useful source was the article on the BBC Future article because it provided a handful of relevant information, supported by evidence such as graphs and statistic values. Information about carbon offsetting from BBC Future was cross-referenced in my second source, proving its reputability. Its credibility is shown through incorporating expert opinion. For example, Gossling, a professor at Linnacus University is featured in the article, stating his opinion on the issue which he has extensive knowledge on.'

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

In order to fully achieve this criterion, the candidate must provide at least 3 **different** points of evaluation on **more than one** source used.

A common confusion about what is required is shown when candidates provide a generalised evaluation of their research, without any evaluation of individual sources:

'During this individual report, the sources used were helpful in every single aspect. I ensured I was using certified and professional sources in order to get the most accurate information possible. I consider I have used different sources from different places to expand the knowledge acquired during this process. The sources such as graphs and tables, help me visualize into a more statistical matter how the population and the contamination present in these places.'

This example seems to indicate that the candidate is not fully aware of what is required. Their comments are general and unexplained and not specific to one source. It is not clear why certified or professional sources are good, or why it matters that the candidate visualised aspects in a statistical way. 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 to their question based on research findings and other perspectives. Some strong candidates reflected throughout and then drew their reflections together at the end coming to a logical and supported conclusion.

'Before commencing research, I was aware that short-term foreign aid policies had the capacity to quickly relieve inequality created by natural disasters and other emergencies. After reviewing the effectiveness of aid in the context of various bilateral I have concluded that foreign aid can be insufficient in solving systemic issues and eliminating the root causes of inequality. This is often due to a lack of transparency and accountability on behalf of NGOs and donor governments, leaving aid to be exploited for political reasons. I am now aware that the harms of poorly planned aid programs on local communities and affected people outweigh the potential to create meaningful change.'

'I believe that perception on the success of foreign aid programs should not solely be measured through quantitative measures such as the OECD's measure of Official Development Assistance but rather the reform and long-term benefits for developing countries, as evaluated by affected individuals and governments. In more cases than not, it is difficult to track the tangible benefits of aid, thus leading me to the conclusion that foreign aid is not effective in addressing inequality in the world.'

Weaker work simply provided a general conclusion, with no personal reflection on findings, perspectives, or the issue. The weakest work ended without answering the question or providing a personal perspective or conclusion.

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. They can write between 1500 and 2000 words, and they are advised to use the full word count.

The majority of work was well-structured and the strongest work was cohesive and logical.

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

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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. A surprising number of candidates presented extremely short essays, below 1000 words, some around 700 words and some even shorter, hardly expanding beyond draft notes. Candidates cannot hope to cover all the required criteria in any depth in such short essays.

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. 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.

Citation and referencing:

All candidates should understand the need for **complete in-text attribution**. If they present material as their own when they have found it in other sources, this is considered to be plagiarism. Where they quote directly from sources, this should be in the form of short quotes, clearly attributed, and most of their report should be written in their own words.

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

In-text citation: 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 (retrieval date)**.

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. When candidates quote sources found within material from other sources, they do need to reference the quoted sources as well. It should be possible for the reader to find a reference for every person or organisation quoted in the essay.

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 need an aim that can be met. Local issues provide aims that are helpful to candidates.
- Candidates should choose an issue, and carry out research into different perspectives on the issue.
- The Outcome should be the means by which the Team met their aim, or evidence their Activity.
- The Reflective Paper requires candidates to present their own research findings, 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.
- Candidates should use examples from their team project when they are explaining the strengths and weaknesses/benefits and challenges of the different aspects of the project.
- Teachers should steer candidates away from topics/issues that could be sensitive locally.

General comments

Team Projects

The most successful projects involved a focus on an issue of local concern. Candidates chose a variety of issues on which to focus their projects. Under the topic of *water, food and agriculture*, some candidates focused on the problem of informing local food providers of the benefits of organic methods. Under the topic of *disease and health*, some teams focused on raising awareness about the need for activity for teenagers to limit mental issues by running online yoga classes, while others engaged headteachers in conversations about stress and depression in teenagers.

Outcomes were varied and included school seminars, leaflets, fundraising events and posters. Many candidates stated how much they enjoyed Team Project, as well as being clear about what they learned from the process. It was clear that most candidates had freedom when designing Outcomes. Some who had made websites realised too late that these did not make it easy to gather evidence for evaluating the success In meeting their aim.

Less successful projects tended to give general information about a topic or an issue, without explicitly referring to different cultural perspectives, or perspectives in different parts of the world on the issue. The evaluations of these team projects sometimes made it clear that learners had had limited involvement in the choice of topic, Outcome or team members.

Comments on specific questions

Team Elements: Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration

AO3 Communication: Outcome and Explanation

The Explanation is a planning document: it informs about the Team's aims, research into the issue and perspectives on it, and activity, and then gives decisions about an Outcome that will be developed to inform, and how the team will measure its success. The Explanation should NOT contain team members' research findings.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

The Outcome informs about the activity that has led to the aim being met. The Outcome is necessary to enable the Reflective Paper to contain evidence. The Outcome should not be seen as the most important part of Team project. It should NOT be a series of interviews joined together as this is research.

Example

The main topic of our project is culture and identity. To be more specific, our aim is to educate and raise awareness of the difficulties that people face with culture and identity. Our aim was presented through the use of multiple posters, where were searched and discussed the many aspects of identity and culture crisis. Having said that, we specifically looked the life of being an expat living abroad. We discussed these issues/topics through different locations and cultures all around the world, to really broaden the perspectives and aspects of which these issues are relevant. After interviewing candidates globally, in places like Australia, America, China, Singapore, Philippines and so on, we were able to conclude that these issues are found almost all over the world, which ultimately makes this an even bigger issue than initially expected. This therefore, was able to support our aim as we could find all the necessary information that we could use to educate not only ourselves but also our audience during our presentations. Our target group Upper school candidates and our teachers.

Although these topics may not seem as life threatening or impactful, these issues can severely damage someone and their identity, as who we identify as and where we come from surprisingly plays a relatively big part in who we are. Over the time given to make our posters we as a group were able to collaborate effectively to produce a presentation that contained valid and informative ideas and perspectives that could successfully support our aim and cause.

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. There should be no explanation on ICRC forms of how this mark was arrived at.

<u>Personal Element:</u> Reflective Paper

General 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; when 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.

Rather than give candidates headings from the assessment criteria, give them questions that encourage evaluation. For example: ‘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 did your work processes/time management affect the project?’, ‘How effective was your research in satisfying the aims of the Outcome?’, ‘How would you improve your work processes if you had to complete the project again?’

AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation

Evaluating Outcome: 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 aiming to remove the stigmas attached to mental health issues, a survey was conducted to assess the attitudes of the audiences before and after the presentations. This gave the team information. Analysis led to them being able to discuss their effectiveness in different age groups, enabling them to address how far they had been effective. The very best responses also then made suggestions of ways in which the Outcome could be improved, drawing on the weaknesses identified.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Cambridge Assessment International Education
© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

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.

Very weak responses described the process of finding information, not really ever discussing an Outcome.

Evaluating Work Processes: Only the very best responses were successful in evaluating their own work processes. Successful responses evaluated their time management; for example, explaining why they failed to keep to their research schedule, with examples of the difficulties this caused them and the team. Other successful responses evaluated their research technique; how they went about the task and what they found helpful, or what they wish they had done.

The most successful suggestions for improvement to both the Outcome and own work processes drew on evaluation of weaknesses in these areas, as in here where the candidate wrote: 'I took great care in using sources that were credible such as gathering definitions and statistics from the United Nations. Future-wise, conducting primary research by organising interviews with government officials, or victims comfortable sharing their stories would have elevated our outcome, adding the stories behind the figures'.

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, and how well was I supported by the team? This would lead to help and support that they gave others, and occasions where they themselves needed help or support.

An example of an evaluation into an Outcome: 'My group's outcome consisted of a presentation that we gave for year 8's. Our group made an exquisite presentation that enabled us to grasp our audience's attention. Our interactive activities such as the activity scenario helped us to engage our young audience more. This assisted us when we were trying to teach them. Despite this, I truly believe that we should have rehearsed our speaking parts more since our delivery was not as clear and did not have a flow, according to what our audience told us. But, we did have a lot of informative information in our presentation, and I can confidently say that every single person at least learnt one new thing. Since we conducted an activity at first and we found out the majority of our audience did not know much about our topic and in the end, we did a Kahoot in which mostly everyone's answers were right.'

An example of an evaluation into Work Processes: 'I found details of the healthcare system in Germany. Mostly, I was able to check my sources to confirm that what I was presenting to my team was accurate. I found details of the issue of provision from government level to those receiving help, using advanced searches and choosing websites that had professionals writing. Much of what I found made up part of the presentations. However, not all information could be checked and I found later that I had been misinformed by two commercial advertisements, claiming that German people were receiving faster care than journalists' reports were stating. It has taught me to leave information that I cannot verify alone. It is better to miss something out than be telling lies.'

AO2 Reflection

Reflecting on Teamwork: 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 explain their reflections. In the best responses, candidates explained how the team provided a pool of skills to draw on for presenting to peers or for designing leaflets. Challenges of working in a team that were commonly explained through difficulties found in communicating with other team members, organising meetings, dividing work equally and keeping all members on task. These need examples from this project to make them into more than general identifications. Some candidates began by being certain that they worked best alone, only to find that it was more effective to have different elements or research to discuss. 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 members 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.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Reflecting on being a team member: 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.

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.

Reflecting on learning: There are three elements to reflecting on overall personal learning. Candidates should consider what they have learned about the issue or topic, and about perspectives on it, as well as what personal or practical skills they have developed through completing the project. In each case, explaining how they have learned this from this project is important.

Example of Reflection

Teamwork

As a group, I believe that we were efficient in delegating our research and that led us to a more organized script. We started off the project with a plan of how many sections we wanted to divide the video, then delegate each section to a person. This way we could easily ensure that the research process was organized and time efficient; we avoided mix ups and stayed on track. We also worked together to edit the video, using each of our individual strengths. For example, I had experience with editing the videos, but was unfamiliar with the audio aspect of it. Therefore, my teammates took charge of it as they had a better understanding.

However, I feel as if we could have done more collaboration during our research phase, as we did a lot of research separately for different sections of our project. If we were to communicate more about the type of information needed in the video, it could have produced an overall a more cohesive video and also made it easier to write the script. It could have led to more time efficiency as well as a better understanding of the possible final outcome.

Role in Team: '(Personally, I feel that my partner and I contributed equally to the project; I managed our workflow, organised meetings and interviews, and handled writing content for much of the project.) My attention to visual detail and language skills were useful in producing an effective Outcome that could address our target demographic candidly, as well as look attractive and engaging. I also wrote and designed roughly half the content for both the social media campaign and poster awareness series. In our initial research, I helped network for interviewees, disseminate our primary research survey, and write investigative questions for both that would lead us to a definite conclusion and incentivise our Outcome. Throughout the project, I created and managed work documents and cloud folders for us to back up our work to, and recorded our progress on the Team Log and task list. In many ways, the Outcome was effective because of my work.

There are, however, a few things I could have done differently and improved on regarding my project contributions. I could have done more research for the content we included in our social media campaign, because we received feedback that it was too general at times, probably uninteresting. In hindsight, a decent amount of the statistics and information we posted were general knowledge, so I could have put more effort into looking up more esoteric and engrossing facts to educate people with. This relates to my time management skills, which had great room for improvement; I barely had time for this coursework in between schoolwork and other commitments, which significantly affected the quality of work I produced.'

Learning about the issue and perspectives: 'After working on this project, I have a greater understanding of fitness and physical activity in youth. This globally prevalent issue is present even in developed countries like the United States, where fitness levels in youth are lacking and contribute towards a severe national health crisis (Joe Deutsch) I learned through much research that it is not a clear- cut issue, and factors such as race, gender, country of origin, resource availability, and more can affect fitness level. Different cultures often had different perspectives on fitness too; some prioritising exercise while others neglecting it. Talking to people overseas helped to broaden my perspectives and widen my worldview as well, for which I am grateful I had the opportunity to. I initially had the impression that youth and other people my age who did not care for physical fitness were lazy, but I now realise that it is not so simple, and there can be many reasons why they do not put effort into exercising—or cannot exercise at all.'

Learning about skills: 'I believe I have improved my communication skills. I am usually very quiet in class, but I have been forced to report my research findings to the team and answer questions about the topic.

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

Also, this is the first time I have had to speak in public. I had to go over my words time and time again to put my mind at rest, but I know now that I can do this.'

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 refuse in their area by talking to the office concerned; while other team members looked into the situation internationally by exploring what is happening in Germany and Sweden so that they could make comparisons and draw conclusions. The Outcome in this case might be a letter or a presentation to local government officials and poster for the local population. 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 is expected to 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.

An example of reporting research findings: 'The chosen cultural perspective was based on Chinese culture. Before researching the cultural perspective, I had known about a few beliefs as I am ethnically Chinese, however there was still a significant amount that I did not know about this culture in regard to organ donations. I was still unsure about whether there was a correlation between the high rate of organ trafficking and Chinese culture.

Before the research, I knew that the Chinese believe that when a body is buried, it should be whole. However, through further research, I found that the concept of 'brain death' was unacknowledged in China, leading to the belief that the brain dead are still alive. This causes the decrease in viable organs to donate, leading to organ shortage in China and causing people to turn towards organ trafficking.

Overall, I was able to understand more about my culture's beliefs and link it to why organ trafficking is a large issue in China. I also learned that there are always multiple reasons for one's decision and to respect those who choose not to donate organs, even though there is a global organ shortage.

Works Cited

'Cadaveric organ donation in China.' 19 April 2021, https://journals.lww.com/md-journal/Fulltext/2018/03090/Cadaveric_organ_donation_in_China__A_crossroads.47.aspx. Accessed 3 August 2022.

'Chinese doctors jailed for illegal organ harvesting.' *BBC*, 27 November 2020, https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-55097424. Accessed 3 August 2022.'

Downloaded from eduresourceza.com

© 2022