

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/12 Written Examination
--

Key messages

The key messages from this series are that candidates:

- demonstrated good skills of interpretation and analysis
- need to explain research designs
- should use material from sources as evidence to justify their opinions
- need to fully explain the potential impact and consequences of different actions.

General comments

The Written Examination consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In March 2020, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of 'education for all'.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good. Many candidates clearly understand different perspectives on global issues and use credible argument to support their opinions. Candidates were able to analyse sources and data presented in different ways. However, candidates should carefully explain their research designs and choice of research methods in greater detail, explicitly relating their research strategy to the claim to be tested.

Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the global issues in education raised within the sources. Some candidates were able to justify recommended actions to improve education for local people. However, candidates should explain and assess the potential impact and consequences of different proposals in more detail.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn from the sources, including through quotation and citation of sources
- provide reasons and evidence to justify opinion
- fully explain research strategies
- 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 trend in government spending on education worldwide as increasing and therefore gained the maximum of 1 mark.
- (b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two global issues in education from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of 2 marks.
- (c) Most candidates responded very well to this question, identifying and justifying a global issue in education which, in their opinion, was the most important. Most candidates chose to discuss access to education for girls, providing skills for work, or employing more teachers.

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

- the number of people affected
- impact on individual or group life chances and lifestyle
- the range of impact e.g. number of countries/organisations affected
- the depth of impact e.g. how much difference will be made
- the speed of impact e.g. how soon the impact would occur costs
- impact on other aspects of social, political and economic life.

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

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why one benefit was more important than others. Weaker responses often simply stated the issue without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion without evidence or careful reasoning. Some candidates compared the significance of different benefits, but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

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

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

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'more money should be spent by governments on local schools and teachers.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- some facts/statistics e.g. class sizes
- strong tone of language – passionate
- uses a research source as evidence
- counterarguments used
- strong knowledge claims/ability to see as a teacher
- references United Nations.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- few facts and statistics to back up claim
- source not referenced
- potential newspaper bias
- author unknown – difficult to verify knowledge claims, though has some as a teacher
- emotive tone of language
- potential bias as a teacher.

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

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

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the quality of the reasons and evidence in the source and justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means 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, 'better qualifications help students to get jobs with higher pay.' 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 schools, businesses and organisations in different areas. Surveys of local people were also suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts, local government and head teachers. Nearly all candidates suggested secondary research using sources from the internet. Many described the type of source that was likely to be reliable and free from bias or vested interest, for example from governments, NGOs and United Nations organisations.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestions *clearly and explicitly related to the claim being tested*; weaker responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence but did not explain them fully or make the link between the evidence being gathered and how it could be used to evaluate the claim being tested.

A few candidates responded to the question by describing their opinion on the issue rather than describing how it could be researched.

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

Question 3

- (a) Most candidates correctly identified a prediction from Source 4.
- (b) Most candidates correctly identified a fact from Source 4.
- (c) Many candidates correctly identified bias in Juan's statement, revealing an understanding that bias is a predisposition for or against something; an attitude of strong like or dislike; an unbalanced approach not prepared to consider counterarguments or other points of view

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

- Juan works for a company developing computer software for schools which may influence his views about technology and schools.
- Juan's father is a school principal and may influence Juan's opinions due to his status in education and the family.
- There is a lack of balance/focus only on the positive impact of technology.
- There is exaggeration – 'information does not need to be remembered anymore'.
- There is a lack of evidence to support most of the argument.

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

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

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

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

At the lower levels of response, the discussion was unlikely to be supported and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues rather than reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was very little or no overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

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

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to assess and recommend different proposed actions designed to improve education for local people.

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.

However, some candidates tended to describe their opinions in a generalised and asserted way, describing benefits for business, the economy and society without exploring the potential impact of the action on the quality of education for local people.

Most candidates recommended reducing class sizes by employing more teachers.

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

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about how to improve education in general or discuss the impact of education on the economy, employment and lifestyle. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to improve schools or reasons why improved education would improve lives.

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.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02 Individual Report
--

Key messages

- Analysis of perspectives is a key focus of the Global Perspectives Individual Report (IR).
- Teachers and candidates must be aware of and fully 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 an issue.
- The candidate's response must focus on different perspectives on their chosen issue.

General comments

For this component, candidates must select one of the eight topics in the syllabus. They identify a global issue within their topic area and formulate a question about the chosen issue, which they should answer in the report. Candidates should research and present different perspectives (global and national/local) on their issue, with relevant supporting information. They should also analyse the causes and consequences of their issue, making comparisons between different causes and consequences. Candidates should also propose and develop a course of action to help resolve their chosen issue.

Candidates should evaluate some of the sources of information they have used in their report. They should also reflect on their personal perspective and how this has been impacted by their research and the perspectives explored.

Candidates must cite all material they use and provide references for all the sources used in their report.

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.

Very narrow questions or those asking *How?* Or *'to what extent'* lead to limited or descriptive responses. Questions with very wide topics tended to encourage candidates to write about several issues in little detail. This limited the quality of their analysis and explanation. In these cases, candidates tended to present their own perspective in their conclusion, with no other perspectives at all.

The strongest work shows a clear understanding of perspectives.

For this component, a global perspective is a viewpoint, an attitude to, an opinion, or a feeling about the 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. 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.

Some less successful work did not present different perspectives on the issue, but instead presented information about different places, viewpoints and opinions with little supporting evidence. These viewpoints or opinions were asserted with little or no explanation.

In other less successful work, candidates did present some developed and explained perspectives, but these were not relevant to the issue chosen by the candidate and only tenuously connected to the topic. For example, a candidate who chose an issue that is impacted by religious views and instead of presenting perspectives on the specific issue, they described the religious views in detail.

Some candidates provided sub-headings such as Global Perspective/National Perspective. However, what followed did not include any perspectives, viewpoints or opinions, just general information. In other cases, candidates presented a range of National Perspectives, from two or three countries and labelled this as Global Perspective.

Some candidates 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 present and explain the causes and consequences of their chosen 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.

In the most successful reports, candidates compared different causes of their central issue. They explained which were the more important, or main causes and/or they explained how and why there were different causes in different countries or regions. They also compared the consequences (sometimes labelled impacts or effects) 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.

In less successful reports, candidates did not compare causes and consequences explicitly, though some identified the main or most important cause or consequence.

Course(s) of Action

The most successful reports 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.

Less successful reports 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 explained either how the course of action might be implemented or what its impact might be – but not both.

The least successful reports provided several suggestions of solutions, with no details of how they could be implemented or by whom, or what their impact would be.

Some candidates had not identified any central issue and so were unable to present a course of action as there was no issue to resolve/improve.

Evaluation of sources

The most successful reports 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. Examples of some evaluative comments seen this session:

Strategic Initiative for Women in the Horn of Africa (SIHA) is a multinational organization focusing on multiple countries in Africa facing similar issues. It is a reliable source as it works within Sudan and, therefore, can also provide a credible national view on the issue after detailed research. (evaluation is explained clearly)

Less successful reports often provided some explanation of their evaluation:

I believe that The Balance is reliable as it employs economy experts, and the data is recent, making it relevant. (partial though limited explanation with mention of own view and relevance to research.)

Some of the least successful reports provided unexplained evaluative comments:

The Hindustan Times reports international news with low bias. It uses credible sources, so I believe that its reports are reliable (what is the basis for the evaluation of bias and what are the sources?)

The least successful evaluation provided assertion or description rather than evaluation:

FAS's factual reporting is very high and it is a legitimate scientific source of information (assertion/description rather than evaluation)

Some candidates 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.

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

Assessment Objective 2: Reflection

The strongest reports 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 other 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.

Less successful reports 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.

The least successful reports stated the candidate's opinion without any explanation or justification.

Assessment Objective 3: Communication

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.

The most successful reports were easy to follow with a clear argument. They progressed from an introduction, through all the required criteria to a reflective conclusion. They used the full available word count. Successful candidates clearly communicated their argument throughout the report and did not lose contact with their question, the central issue or their research findings.

Less successful reports tended to select several separate issues and present general information about those, and so did not communicate a central argument. They sometimes included information that was not relevant to the question and tended to move around from one topic to another.

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

Citation and referencing

The main concern in terms of referencing in the IR is citation of material used.

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

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 may be 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.

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.

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).
- The most successful projects usually focus on one clear aim and one clear Outcome.
- Candidates should think carefully about how they will evaluate the effectiveness of their Outcome in achieving their 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, citing their own 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 give balanced reflection and evaluation, considering what went well and what went less well, and how this affected the project.
- Teachers should steer candidates away from topics/issues that could be sensitive locally.

General comments

The most successful projects involved raising awareness of different cultural perspectives on an issue of local concern and changing the behaviour or perception of others in relation to the issue. Candidates chose a variety of issues on which to focus their projects. Under the topic of *water, food and agriculture*, some candidates focused on practical projects, e.g. lake cleaning and included an impressive range of perspectives on the changes that were seen. Some teams focused on raising awareness about the increase in support available to those with a mental illness and a number of teams that focused on the causes of teenage mental illness, looking at stress due to demands for high results in most instances. One group brought yoga to their school to lower stress levels amongst the pupils in exam years. Under the topic of *sport and recreation*, some teams focused on bringing sporting activities to a local group of children, while others looked at developing and promoting exercise programmes to encourage students to exercise more regularly.

Outcomes were varied and included websites, videos, school presentations, handbooks, leaflets, debates, mediation events, fundraising events and posters.

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

Team Elements: Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration

AO3 Communication: Outcome and Explanation

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

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

perspectives on the issue e.g. a PowerPoint presentation simply giving facts about e.g. a fundraising event in order to raise awareness of e.g. poverty.

Guidance: Interviews carried out to gather views/perspectives cannot be an Outcome in themselves. The Outcome should be an action taken to achieve the aim. The process of how initial research led to identification of the aim and the development of the Outcome should be made clear in the Explanation. There should be communication of different cultural perspectives in the Outcome and some discussion of how the research into these different perspectives has informed the Outcome should be part of the Explanation. If candidates research different cultural perspectives on an issue through interviews with people from different backgrounds, then they should use information (or video clips) from these interviews as a part of their Outcome, clearly highlighting what the perspective is.

Example: The following example is drawn from the work of a team who chose the topic of *water, food and agriculture* for their project, which focused on the issue of reducing water usage. The Team entered into a research project using different ways of irrigating crops and looking at their resulting crops. The team's aim then became to reduce the amount of water wasted. To achieve this aim, the team produced an Outcome in the form of posters for use around schools and homes, with reminders about how much water is used in teeth cleaning, toilet flushing and taking baths. They conducted a survey to see how many teachers, students and their families had changed their behaviour as a result. This is an example of a project that addresses a specific national problem and tries to solve it.

AO3 Collaboration

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

Personal Element: Reflective Paper

AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation

The most successful candidates provided direct evidence of how far the Outcome had achieved the project aim. For instance, in the case of the example given above, a survey was conducted to assess the extent to which posters had changed the behaviour of each group surveyed. They had a percentage success rates from each group of people and feedback about why others had made no or fewer changes to their practice. The team members were able to use this to reflect upon what they could have done differently to have more impact (suggested improvement to the Outcome arising from a weakness that has been quantified). Where the aim is to raise awareness about an issue, a survey of the target audience before and after the awareness-raising session was often used successfully to show how far the Outcome was successful in achieving the aim. The very best responses also then made suggestions of ways in which the Outcome could be improved, drawing on the weaknesses identified.

Less successful responses often simply described the Outcome and the process by which it was produced. Where there was evaluation, these responses explained only weaknesses or strengths. Examples used were often about which team member took which actions, rather than details of the Outcome that were felt to support the team in meeting its aims and aspects that did not. Suggestions for improvement were not linked to any weakness identified.

Only the very best responses were successful in evaluating their own work processes. Some successful responses evaluated their time management; for example, giving reasons why they failed to keep to schedule. Other successful responses evaluated their research technique: 'I asked xxx minister for xxx', but his office did not reply. I waited too long when I should have phoned xxx instead. At least then I would have found a national perspective' Or, 'I made good use of a few general websites about water pollution and only when it was too late did I find that there were specialist journals on environmental issues relating to pollution, and I would have gained more relevant and wider information if I had used these. This meant that my part of the presentation was weak'. 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 of time management. The most successful suggestions for improvement to both the Outcome and own work processes also drew on evaluation of weaknesses in these areas.

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

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

AO2 Reflection

This assessment objective requires candidates to reflect on the overall benefits and challenges of working in a group situation, as opposed to working alone and they need to provide specific examples drawn from their experience to illustrate their reflections. In the best responses, candidates commented that sharing work allowed the team to achieve more in a shorter space of time; or that it provided a greater pool of skills to draw on (giving examples from their project). Challenges of working in a team that were commonly mentioned include difficulties of communicating with other team members, organising meetings, dividing work equally and keeping all members on task. In the very best responses, candidates explained how these benefits and challenges impacted upon their project e.g. the team who were also friends saw one candidate reflect that she was afraid that being critical of the contribution of others to the research would affect their friendship. The impact was lack of readiness for the awareness raising event.

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

Reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of own performance as a team member is concerned with those things the individual does that either move the team forward or hold it back. It is about the individual's impact on the team as a whole. There were candidates who produced effective reflections. As a weakness, a candidate reflected that: 'I am a very shy person and not a confident speaker, so I let the others do all the presenting and this meant that others had to carry my burden (own performance as team member). As well as not being fair, this also meant that I missed out on learning new skills of public speaking while I had the opportunity' (personal learning). Giving balance, another candidate reflected that: 'I am really interested in making videos and am familiar with many different types of software, so I was able to use my expertise to make the video quite quickly, which gave each of us more time to work on our Reflective Papers'.

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

Guidance: Give candidates a reflective log to record examples while they are completing the project. They need to keep their aim in mind. They need to keep details at hand. A log could include examples of when working as a team helped them to achieve something positive; when working as a team was difficult, and why; when they did something positive to help the team achieve their goal; when their performance had a negative effect on the team.

In reflecting on what they have learned about different cultural perspectives, candidates should not just consider what they have learned, but should think about whether and how their learning has made them think differently about those cultures or has changed what they do or how they behave. In other words, what impact this learning has had on them. For instance, from the research into water shortages a candidate had learned that the only group to sustain actions to use less water were those who had attended the awareness raising event. Those who had received the leaflet were affected less by the team project. This led to personal learning about how to effectively change people's actions.

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

Guidance: The Team Project is a piece of work that spans several weeks. It would help candidates to reflect if they had recorded notes throughout the process about what they have learned about different perspectives, the topic/issue, working as a team and their own skills and abilities. This could form part of a log book.

AO3 Communication

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

It is expected that each member of the team will have been involved in some personal research towards to the work overall. These personal research findings need to be clearly flagged up in the Reflective Paper. For instance, through a combination of primary and secondary research, one team member might have found out what diseases were prevalent in their local area; their causes and possible methods of prevention; while other team members looked into the situation nationally and internationally so that they could make comparisons and draw conclusions. The Outcome in this case might be a series of posters targeted at a particular audience to raise awareness about a disease and reduce its spread. The candidate who had researched the situation locally would then explain what they had found out about their local situation and how this was reflected in the Outcome.

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

Teacher Assessment

The Individual Candidate Record Cards (ICRC) must be completed by teachers. Teachers are requested to comment on the ICRC and are reminded that they must include comments on the ICRC to support/explain the marks awarded. Using the wording from the assessment criteria level descriptors is helpful in reaching a mark that moderators could support. Changes made through internal moderation should be explained through the wording and marks on the ICRC. Any internal moderation should be completed before these final marks are submitted.