

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/12 Written Exam

Key messages

The key messages from this examination series are that candidates were able to:

- identify information and data from source material relevant to a global issue
- analyse a source to understand and describe the perspective of a group towards a global issue
- explain an opinion about a cause or consequence of a global issue.
- activities encouraging analysis and evaluation of sources and arguments would benefit candidates

General comments

The Written Exam consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In March 2025, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of the Digital World. The impact of the internet on digital communication was the issue explored.

It is apparent that many candidates are developing an excellent understanding of the causes and consequences of global issues. They can explain their own perspectives on global issues and compare these with the viewpoints of other people. It is also pleasing to see candidates assessing the potential impact and effectiveness of different actions, as well as being aware of the ethical and moral dimension to many global issues.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be very good.

Candidates understood the source material in the Insert Booklet very well. They were able to identify the main types of statement, evidence, and reasoning within sources, describing them clearly and accurately. Similarly, candidates were able to analyse a source to identify and clearly describe the main elements of the perspective of a group towards a global issue.

The analysis and evaluation of research into a global issue to identify and explain the strengths and weaknesses of the research is a skill that candidates need to develop further. Candidates were usually able to identify and briefly describe or list several strengths and weaknesses of research. Many candidates did not explain the significance of the identified strength or weakness for the quality of the research and evidence gathered.

When designing a research strategy to test a claim, candidates should explain their choice of research methods and evidence, explicitly relating their approach 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 the research question. Linking the method and source of evidence to the issue in the claim is necessary to reach the higher levels of response.

Candidates were usually able to identify potential strengths and weaknesses of sources and argument. These evaluative points were often simply described rather than explained. When evaluating a source, candidates should explain the significance or impact of the identified strength or weakness on the quality of the argument. This involves describing the impact of strengths and weaknesses on the quality of the argument using critical thinking concepts like reliability, validity, accuracy, representativeness, bias, tone, expertise and ability to know.

Candidates generally recognised that opinions should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of opinion is generally not sufficient in responses to most questions. Whilst most candidates are using material from the sources to support their arguments, for example through summary or

quotation, some would benefit from guidance on how to plan and organise an argument to support a claim or opinion. Careful scaffolding of lines of argument and essay structure would help in this process. Evidence and reasons should be clearly and explicitly used to justify the argument.

Some candidates are using their own experience and material encountered in their courses to supplement material drawn from the sources. This is helpful, though not necessary to reach the highest levels of response. It is not essential as the examination primarily tests the ability to use critical thinking and research skills in the analysis and evaluation of sources and perspectives. It is not necessary to have studied the specific topic or issue in the Written Exam.

Most candidates showed real interest in the topic and discussed the issues with enthusiasm. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to a government to improve access to the internet for citizens. Candidates should assess and explain the potential impact and consequences of the proposals in detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgement within the conclusion.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified from Source 1 that ChatGPT was the communication technology that took the least time to reach 100 million users and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.
- (b)(i) Due to an omission in syllabus content, full marks have been awarded to all candidates for question 1b(i), to make sure that no candidates were disadvantaged.
- (ii) Due to an omission in syllabus content, full marks have been awarded to all candidates for question 1b(ii), to make sure that no candidates were disadvantaged.

Please refer to syllabus version 2 on the Schools Support Hub. The update on Page 14 clarifies which skills may be assessed in Question 1. In this examination, Questions 1b(i) and 1b(ii) tested value and why the example was a value within the context of the source. These are valid questions and can be used when preparing candidates for examination.

- (c) Most candidates successfully analysed the source and were able to describe clearly three or four aspects of the charity's perspective on digital communication. Candidates reaching the higher levels of response often used examples from the source. Some of the most effective responses used several of the following aspects of a perspective towards a global issue in the analysis of the source - issue, cause, consequence, values and action.
- (d) Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying and justifying which consequence of digital communication was the most significant, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss cyberbullying or security.

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

- the number of people affected
- the severity of the impact
- how long the consequence might affect people
- the effect on health and well-being
- the effect on privacy and personal data
- the impact of internet crime on economic aspects of everyday life.

The strongest answers clearly explained three or four reasons why the chosen consequence was most significant and gave some evidence or examples to support their judgement. Some candidates compared the importance of different consequences, this was not necessary to gain full marks.

Weaker responses simply stated the consequence and asserted several reasons without explanation. Candidates should be reminded that the question requires candidates to *explain* the

reasons for thinking that the chosen consequence is the most significant. Some candidates described several consequences of digital communication; this is not necessary as only one consequence is demanded by the question.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the research in Source 3 and identify several strengths and weaknesses of the methods and evidence.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- primary research using interview and observation – first hand gathering of evidence that is likely to be accurate and easily interpreted by the researcher
- clear purpose for the research – guided the methods used and kept the research on-track
- the people in the sample were from a relevant charity – likely expertise and ability to know about the issue being researched; valid data gathered
- a detailed case study – provides much information to help understand the issue from the point of view of the charity; likely to answer the research question
- the research was conducted in 2023 – the information and data were likely to be up-to-date and accurate as they are recently gathered and little may have changed over a short period of time since the research was conducted.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- little information about the charity or expert – difficult to verify the expertise and reputation of the sample/case study material
- interview conducted in a busy lesson with lots of interruptions – may cause inaccuracy in the data and waste time; interference with the class - observer effect caused by presence of the researcher
- small sample local to the area – may not be representative of other people and groups and so difficult to generalise
- potential bias of interviewing an employee of a charity – unbalanced or skewed views to make the charity look positive
- interviewee only estimates extent of the issue - cannot be taken as relevant statistic and requires further investigation.

The strongest responses clearly explained several credible strengths and weaknesses of the research. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted strengths or weaknesses rather than explaining the strengths and weaknesses systematically. Some weaker responses simply described aspects of the research within the source and did not explain why the identified feature of the research was a strength or weakness.

Candidates should be encouraged to explain the identified strengths and weaknesses of the research by referring to the impact on the quality of the evidence and data gathered and the potential of the research to answer the research question.

- (b) Candidates who performed well in this question described in detail several methods and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, *'many households in the local area do not have access to the internet'*. The methods of testing the claim suggested were clearly explained and carefully related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys, and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example from different groups and organisations in the local area. Surveys of local people about their access to and changing use of the internet were also suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts, local government, and internet-related businesses. 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. Charities, politicians and computer retailers were often mentioned.

The strongest responses provided reasoned 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 and did not explain them fully or make any link to the claim being tested i.e. the purpose of the research. A few candidates responded to the question by describing their opinion about internet access and usage rather than describing how it could be researched. These responses gained very few, if any, marks.

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

Question 3

Most candidates carefully compared both Todd's and Hanna's statements in a structured way. They discussed issues relating to reasoning, evidence and use of language. Most candidates suggested that Hanna's statement was more convincing than Todd's 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 discussion of reasons, evidence and language. Use of language was often discussed in relation to the clarity of argument, the logic of the argument, and the tone. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion about which person offered the more convincing argument.

Candidates are expected to cite material from the source to support their view of which argument is more convincing. Higher levels of response quoted the arguments explicitly and used material from the statements directly as evidence to support the candidate's view of which person had the most convincing argument. At the lower levels of response, the discussion was unlikely to be supported by material from the source and their opinions about each statement tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity. These answers tended to focus on internet issues rather than the reasons, evidence, or language in the arguments.

At the lower levels of response, candidates often limited their evaluative comment to one of the arguments or failed to reach a clear conclusion about which argument was most convincing. These responses tended to assert evaluative points rather than explain and use evidence from the arguments to support their views. Some weaker responses lacked structure and had little clarity of argument. To prepare candidates for this type of question, candidates should be given frequent opportunities to compare and evaluate sources on global issues from a variety of different perspectives.

Question 4

This question required candidates to recommend to a government an action designed to improve access to the internet for their citizens. Candidates were expected to justify their recommendation using reasons and material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

Some candidates chose to compare all actions, some to justify just one of the actions. Both approaches to answering the question were effective ways to structure the argument in the candidate's response. Most candidates recommended either encouraging charities to provide internet access to the local community or providing computer education in schools.

Candidates tended to discuss the following factors or reasons in making a recommendation:

- the scale of impact on access to the internet
- different outcomes or consequences of the action for different types of people, groups, organisations and sectors of society
- cost/resources. planning and coordination difficulties needed to implement the action and barriers to change.
- the length of time needed to make a difference
- economic/political considerations and conflicts of interest and power
- planning and coordination difficulties and barriers to change.

Responses at the highest level of response tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the actions, providing a balanced assessment of the impact of the action on access to the internet. These responses explicitly used material drawn from the sources in the insert, often supported by examples and material drawn from their own experience and learning. These responses frequently referred to the effectiveness or impact of the action on the government's aim of increasing access to the internet. A clear, balanced conclusion was also reached.

Some candidates tended to describe how the actions could be implemented rather than explain why one of the actions was most likely to be successful and have an impact on the issue, and therefore should be recommended, or not. Others did not focus on the action, instead described their views about access to the internet, or the internet in general. These responses did not enter the higher levels of response.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the purpose of the actions, and simply described their own opinion. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to increase internet access rather than explaining why one action was likely to be more effective, have greater impact and other positive consequences, and should therefore be recommended.

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 present **different perspectives** on their chosen issue.
- Candidates should analyse the **causes and consequences** of their chosen issue.
- Candidates should present **two courses of action** and select one.
- Candidates should **evaluate** the **evidence** and individual **sources** that they use.
- Candidates should clearly **cite** all their sources.
- Candidates should answer their research question.

General comments

Successful work for this component was well-structured and logical. It provided a clear introduction to the chosen global issue, explaining why it is an issue and demonstrating that it is a global issue. Successful candidates explicitly presented several different well-supported perspectives, including **at least one global and one national perspective** on the issue identified in their question. They showed clear evidence of research, with accurate citation of sources used. Additionally, successful candidates analysed and explained the causes and consequences of the issue identified in their question and provided full details of two courses of action, including details of how the course of action would be implemented and evaluated the practicality and the possible impact on the issue. They selected one and explained their choice.

The Strongest candidates remain focussed throughout on the central issue. They clearly and explicitly concluded by answering their question. They reflected on their own perspective and how this has been impacted by their findings, their learning and by others' perspectives.

Most candidates provided a research question and attempted to answer it. They provided citations and references for their sources and made some attempt to evaluate sources. Few candidates evaluated evidence.

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.

Simple, direct, issue-based questions allow candidates to be clear about their topic/issue and focussed throughout.

Successful questions this series included:

- *Are renewable energy sources the ideal answer to climate change?*
- *Does social media play an important role in cultural erosion?*
- *Do mandatory school uniform policies foster equality and discipline, or do they suppress diversity and freedom?*
- *Is globalisation leading to an erosion of indigenous cultures of tribal societies?*
- *Is plastic pollution more damaging to the marine ecosystem than other sources of marine pollution?*
- *Should certain artworks be censored for religious reasons?*
- *Should asbestos be banned all around the world?*

Some reports were presented without a clear research question. Some candidates did not identify an issue in their question or explain an issue in their introduction. They asked general topic questions and then wrote informative essays on that subject, rather than a Global Perspectives Individual Report.

A few reports were presented without any 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 arriving at their own response as a result of the research carried out.

Information from different perspectives:

The strongest work shows a clear understanding of 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 explicitly who, or which group of people has 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. **A global perspective** should be clearly identified as such and include an opinion or attitude:

'Many international environmental NGOs and intergovernmental organisations oppose the continuation of factory farms. For instance, Regeneration International, a worldwide NGO that raises awareness about the impacts of factory farming, argues that less money should be invested into factory farms from governments as it impacts the climate and global environmental health. This argument is further supported by the UN Environment Programme, an Intergovernmental organisation, which examines solutions to overcome the detrimental impacts of factory farms...'

Similarly, **a national perspective** is a national viewpoint on the issue presented, or an opinion/feeling about/attitude to the national situation. It should be clear whose perspective is being presented, either by paraphrasing or quoting the person/s or organisation/s with clear attribution. There should be evidence of the perspective and supporting information to explain it:

'...As of 2012, 41% of Uruguayans believed that elders should be taken care of by their families and only 26% believed that support must be provided by relatives with State support.

In 2015, Uruguay declared care a human right and implemented a national integrated care system aiming to help elders build healthy emotional attachments... According tocare is a gender inequal topic in Uruguay, women being vital to the system...'

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. This work can only be credited as National perspectives.

Some **weaker work did not present different perspectives** on the issue, instead presented information about different places. This was sometimes labelled as Global or 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 explaining what anyone thought or felt about the issue. Others did not present any perspectives or opinions apart from the candidate's own views and these were sometimes unsupported, with no relevant information or evidence, meaning that the report read as an unresearched opinion piece.

The **weakest work** simply presented the candidate's own opinion on their topic or issue, with no supporting information and no evidence (beyond a reference list) of any research. This was the case particularly where the candidate had a strong view on their topic and did not research or present other views.

Analysis 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, explaining in some detail:

Analysis of the Issue: Causes of use

- **Material properties of asbestos**
'Asbestos is highly resistant to heat and flames, making it a good material for fireproofing. Asbestos is also very strong and durable, making it a good material for a variety of applications. Asbestos is relatively inexpensive to produce, making it a cost-effective material for many applications.'
- **Lack of awareness and health regulations in developing countries**
'India is the largest consumer of asbestos. Asbestos is ready to use, cheap and India uses asbestos predominantly for construction.'
'As per a testimony by an asbestos worker in India (Asbestos: Canada, n.d.), they were not aware that it was dangerous and that they were handling a product which could kill them.'

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.

Weaker work showed a lack of research into the causes or reasons for their issue. This work tended to start with the issue and only consider its impacts or consequences. In some cases these were separately sub-headed as causes and consequences, but both sections presented only consequences.

Course(s) of Action:

Candidates must research and provide full details of **two** courses of action, including details of how the course of action would be implemented and evaluating the practicality and the possible impact on the issue. **Please note** that it is acceptable for candidates to consider courses of action that have been used elsewhere, they are not expected to invent their own solutions. They select one of the two courses of action and explain their choice.

The strongest work had two developed and focussed courses of action. The candidate explained each 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. The candidate then selected one of the two courses of action and justified their choice:

'I think school level changes will be the fastest, easiest and most cost-effective solution, mainly because students spend way more time in school than anywhere else. Making it a mandatory subject does not leave children any choice, thus making it a regular daily activity, which can soon become a habit for life. While governments may need to focus on bigger issues like poverty and education, it may not prioritise physical activity. Changing urban spaces to build sport facilities, bike lanes etc., may not be a feasible option in less developed, crowded countries, where existing infrastructure cannot accommodate any changes.'

Weaker work described solutions already in place but did not select one and explain why that was most effective or most appropriate. Some candidates either explained how a course of action might be implemented **or** what its impact might be – but not both.

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

Evaluation of sources and evidence:

Please note that candidates are required to evaluate their sources and evidence used.

The **strongest work** showed clear evaluation of sources and evidence 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.

'UNESCO's findings are based on thorough research and analysed by experts. This report specifically talks about caste-based discrimination in education and is absolutely relevant to understanding how the caste system affects individuals' opportunities and societal inclusion. The evidence provided is very relevant to the discussion. Examples of caste discrimination in schools are given affecting the mindset of both students and educators making my argument stronger. The UNESCO report provides a thorough analysis of the various

ways caste-based discrimination impacts education, including access to schools, quality of education, and treatment of students from lower castes. The report from UNESCO is recent, reflecting current data and observations on caste-based discrimination in education ensuring that contemporary issues are addressed.'

The evaluations made should be explained. Candidates should consider why their evaluation is relevant and explain how they came to their assessment of their source and what the impact is on the evidence, perspective or the candidate's view.

Some candidates provide a generalised evaluation of their research, without any evaluation of individual sources. In these cases candidates' comments are sometimes relevant but they are descriptive rather than evaluative; general and unexplained; and not specific to one source. It is not clear, for example, which sources were biased and which unbiased, how the candidate knows this and why it might matter.

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

Assessment Objective 2: Reflection:

Candidates are required to answer their own question explicitly. The strongest work included a clear conclusion giving an explicit answer to their question. It included reflection on the candidate's own perspective, on their research findings and on the perspectives they had explored. Strong candidates clearly explained how their own perspective had developed, been changed, or impacted by others' perspectives and by the information they had researched about the issue. Some strong candidates reflected throughout and then drew their reflections together at the end coming to a logical and supported conclusion, giving a well-supported answer to their question.

Research Question: *Should asbestos be banned all around the world?*

Personal perspective

'Before this research, I barely knew about asbestos. I underestimated the health impacts until learning about lung cancer and mesothelioma. I was frustrated and unaware that countries prioritise economic benefits over health threats when quality of life and a safe environment should be most important. I didn't expect the asbestos ban to be widely addressed, with numerous sources and major organisations like the UN discussing it. People around me were unaware of asbestos and its health impacts. If educated citizens are unaware, it justifies concluding a lack of awareness in India. One reason for no ban could be India-Russia's strong relations, as India imports most of its asbestos from Russia. India being the largest consumer and Russia the largest producer, a ban could negatively affect their relations. I am committed to raising awareness on asbestos now.'

Conclusion:

'Governments need to stop ignoring the health effects of asbestos. Multiple studies prove all kinds of asbestos are dangerous and that it cannot be used safely. Public health must be prioritized where locals and workers can live safely and the country must not only focus on economic growth and profit. International push and awareness should facilitate global ban of trade of asbestos and any diseases caused by this known carcinogen.'

Weaker work provided a general conclusion, with no personal reflection on findings, perspectives, or the issue. Some of the weakest work lost contact with the question and the issue and simply summed up a descriptive essay.

Assessment Objective 3: Communication:

Structure and Clarity:

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.

Candidates should be aware of all the required criteria and the weight of marks carried by each skill. Where a skill carries 10 marks for example, they should expect to write much more than for a skill carrying only 5 marks.

The strongest work was easy to follow and provided a clear structured argument with an introduction establishing the global issue, addressing all the required criteria and ending with a reflective conclusion answering the question. It used the full available word count. This work started with different perspectives on the issue and kept focus 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 sometimes included information that was not relevant to the question and did not develop a central argument.

The weakest work had no clear argument and sometimes with no reflection or conclusion. Some appeared to have copied and pasted sections from different sources, with no apparent connection between the different paragraphs or with the question or issue.

Citation and referencing:

All candidates should understand the need for **complete in-text attribution**. They should be aware that if they present material as their own when they have found it in other sources, this is considered to be plagiarism. Where they quote directly from sources, this should be in the form of small amounts of copied work within quotation marks and clearly attributed. Most of the material in their work should be their own.

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, numbering, or in-text referencing, to indicate where they have used sources. They must include complete references in the form of a bibliography. This should be submitted as a separate document to the Individual Report.

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)**.

Please note that 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.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/03 Team Project

Key messages

- For all examination sessions in 2025 and beyond a Team must submit **one** Explanation of Research and Planning, **one** Evidence of Action, and each individual in a team must produce their own Reflective Paper.
- The Explanation of Research and Planning must be a planning document showing details of the preparation and planning of the project, as well as changes that had to be made to the Team Project.
- The syllabus for Global perspectives IGCSE 2025–27 has details of the requirements for the Explanation of Research and Planning. This can be in table form.
- In the Explanation of Research and Planning document, what will be researched is the ‘plan strand’ of Table A. Individual Research findings must be reported in the Reflective Paper.
- The Evidence of Action must be **one** piece of evidence that shows that the Action took place.
- Details of how Team Project’s Reflective Papers are assessed can be found in the syllabus for Global perspectives IGCSE 2025–27 and should be shared with learners.
- Reflective Papers should evaluate the aspects of the team project (see the syllabus for details) and should **not** tell the story of the project **nor** repeat what is in the Explanation.
- Reflections on learning from Team members must be separate from reports of own research findings.
- All members of a team must be awarded the same mark for the team collaboration, but the mark for how that candidate worked in the team can be different for each team member.
- ICRCs must be completed for ALL candidates selected as the moderation sample.
- CASFs should record ALL candidates’ total mark, explaining where marks were awarded by AO and showing the results of internal moderation, (where more than one marker in a centre makes internal moderation necessary). Marks on the CASF must match those submitted to on Submit for Assessment.

General comments

Explanations of Research and Planning

The most successful Explanations of Research and Planning were in table form. Teachers are allowed to support teams in developing effective methods of presenting this work.

Evidence of Action

One piece of evidence that the Action took place is all that is needed- a photograph, a poster, a screenshot. The most successful examples showed audiences engaging with the action.

Reflective Papers

The most successful Reflective Papers were well organised according to the criteria found in the mark scheme. Teachers are allowed to teach effective ways of presenting Reflective Papers. The most successful evaluations consistently used evidence/ examples from the team project to explain their reflections and evaluations of the different criteria.

Candidates should keep an ongoing log of their own ways of working and their work as a part of the team as they will need these details to evidence their evaluations and reflections: examples do make a difference to marks available. They should note both what was a strength/ benefit and what was a challenge/ weakness, what each team member did/ said to make things work well or to make difficulties, and what impact this had on the project.

Candidates need to know and understand the assessment criteria. This will help them to see where benefits are required as well as challenges of teamwork, but just two developed explanations of how effectively their Action met their aims.

Comments on specific elements

The examples below illustrate what good answers might look like. Some weaker Team Projects have been included to show specific aspects of the mark scheme. All Assessment Objectives are covered in this report, but not all criteria.

Team Elements: Explanation of Research and Planning and The Action

A Team Project's Explanation of Research and Planning. This is worth 10 marks:

Topic	Arts in Society
Issue	Lack of Opportunity for artists in Uttarakhand
Candidate names	
Candidate's work	<i>Candidate 1 worked on communication. Candidate 2 focused on digital work and kept notes on how the team worked. Candidate 3 decided on interviews and organized how the team would work.</i>
Secondary research	<i>Our issue: Lack of Opportunity for artists in Uttarakhand. Candidate 1 researched the art market as in platforms. Candidate 2 focused on the topic nationally and art in education India. Candidate 3 looked at the art scene locally.</i>
Primary research	<i>We conducted interviews which helped all gain cultural perspectives. We interviewed 3 art teachers. We interviewed artists in Uttarakhand. They told us that art platforms in the region are gated, and few know about it. They also said that Uttarakhand has handicraft artisans. So, we concluded that artists lack platforms in Uttarakhand. Our interview with Been There Doon That (BTDT), they told us how to hold exhibitions. We interviewed Dr. Lokesh Ohri who told us how to hold an exhibition and about the artists of Uttarakhand.</i>
Plan of action	<i>We started with planning a collaborative chain of exhibitions with BTDT since it would be great to have someone experienced on our team.</i>
Roles and responsibility of each member	<i>Candidate 1 she handles making posters and she asks questions, and her key role is to be the communicator. Candidate 2 focuses on making people aware of it, managing the social account as well as helping with posters. Candidate 2 develops the YouTube video to evidence our action. Candidate 3: Manages all online communications with BTDT and stakeholders. She also takes notes, creates deadlines, and keeps the group on track. Team members collaborate on writing the invitation letter and the registration form.</i>
Action	<i>Our first exhibition held at cafe laata was a success with us earning 47 700 rupees for the respected artists. Many attended the second exhibition, allowing the artists to earn a good sum of money, raising 72 000 plus rupees. This spread their name, making people aware of their unique talents.</i>
Measurement of Success	<i>We will count the number of sales made, the number of people attending and send a feedback form to all.</i>

Note:

The team stated a topic they want to focus on, and the local issue they wish to improve.

What aspect of the issue each member will research: perspectives on it, what other places/ people are doing about that issue- ideas that can help them organise their project. The Explanation of Research and Planning should say something they have found from research that explains the value of their Action. Here we see that exhibitions are gated, so people do not know about artists.

After discussing research findings, the team made a decision about an Action that can help with the local issue.

Detailed planning of that Action, including individual roles and responsibilities.
How they plan to gather evidence about how successful they have been.
What evidence of their Action can be sent to Cambridge.
After the Action was completed, candidates can record any changes that had to be made. This did not happen in this case.

A Team's Evidence of Action

We are looking for one piece of evidence that the Action took place. This team made a YouTube video. Other suitable evidence could be a photograph of giving information in an assembly or conference, people engaging with a poster or leaflet etc.

AO3 Collaboration

Table C: 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 consider 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.

Table D: Teachers must award a mark for how well the individual worked in the team to complete the project. The same method and criteria should be applied.

AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation

Table E: Evaluating the Action

Example 1, giving two developed points:

'The exhibitions brought the artisans international audiences as we had called the French exchange participants from our school while inviting other schools with the public in the region which provided the artists with exposure. The first exhibition gave artists a change in audience. This allowed them to gain a platform and new audience. The earnings of 47 700 from the exhibition helped the artists gain trust as they were willing to put their handcrafts in our second exhibition. The second exhibition was during our schools' founders where all the people attending, and the students could buy the handicrafts. This exhibition raised over 72 000 rupees. The exhibition helped the artists increase their profile as people saw their handicrafts, getting to know about them and their talent.'

Example 2, giving two developed points:

'Our research to find factors impeding children with learning disorders' education showed that discrimination and social stigma had the highest prevalence. This demanded that the collective mentality of the community needed reshaping as a whole. Although complete elimination of the same seemed unviable at our level, its reduction was a definite goal.

As elementary-school children are the most impressionable ^[1], they were the ideal age-group to target. They bear the most promise in positively altering their behaviour and carrying on these values into adulthood. As I researched that interactive activities are more appealing and impactful ^[2], we hosted a bookmark competition alongside the workshop. This made them engaged and passionate about the issue. This made it an easy to implement, quick-acting, low-cost, and long-term solution with a higher guarantee of success rate. Since many people are highly socially connected with access to online platforms like Instagram ^[3], it was ideal to utilise to spread information for broader outreach. However, assessing the success of this was inexact. Even though we reached a moderate number of followers (112), the person-to-screen interface wouldn't be as effective as communicating face-to-face, as it still feels less authentic. Nevertheless, change starts small, and even if it affected a handful individuals, the world still became a better place.'

Note:

In each example we see two developed points about how far the Action helped the Team to achieve its aim, each earning 4 marks.

The evidence that they have can be from a variety of sources. Here it is about funds raised for the artists and what was observed.

If the team is raising awareness about an issue candidates can have a set of questions to ask their audience before the action and the same set asked after the action. These can then be compared to show which parts of their aim had been met and which had not. Candidates can then ask how their Action could be improved to minimise these weaknesses. Candidates can ask verbal questions to their audience about what has been learned about the issue, and what could have been improved. They can compile the team's findings and show which parts of their Action were successful in meeting their aim, and/ or where it had missed its mark.

AO2 Reflection

Table G: Reflecting on Teamwork:

The question candidates must ask is: How effectively did our team work to produce our Action or meet our aim? They must use evidence to explain both the benefits and challenges of teamwork (**Note:** more than one of each), reflecting on the impact on the team's aim or the Action. Evidence could come from the log they have kept on what went well and what proved to be a challenge, or it could come from team discussions, reflecting on how decisions were made, how well they worked with each other they were, how effectively they planned. In the latter case, their interpretation and writing must be their own, as this is an individual piece of work. **Only work in the Reflective Paper can earn individual marks.**

Example 1:

'To effectively reach the local community in Ramagondanahalli, I have coordinated planned and fulfil our visit. A team knows many people and this can help with a project. My mother's friend who is actively involved in social services and has significantly contributed to community welfare, played a vital role in this process. Her guidance helped me identify key areas, connect with local aids, and understand community needs, ensuring our efforts were focused and meaningful. During the Ramagondanahalli visit, when X felt ill, the team ensured smooth operations. I stepped into noting and analyse individuals' problems, covering her role in data collection.

Over the past two months, our team faced challenges in coordination, focusing on individual roles rather than collaborating as time ran short, which slowed progress. Moving forward, we aim to improve communication and work more effective. Our team experienced several changes, including role changes in team member: one who had to focus on it design rather than supporting interviews, adjustments in team size, and many dropouts throughout the project. A team needs to have trust in each other, and these changes made us less certain about our decisions and caused us to rethink how we intended to use social media.'

Note:

The details in the section on benefits of teamwork are quite explicit. Those supporting the challenges are weaker, but still clearly linked to this project. This is just about enough to earn 5 marks.

Example 2:

'The biggest strength of our team was the synergy in our perspectives and therefore the ease in making a plan. For instance, in our very first meeting with THT, we talked about our research for hours and cohesively agreed on the idea of hosting workshops and nature trails. Our successful collaboration is evidenced in readily using management tools like recording minutes for every meeting¹ and assigning roles as per our individual interests or strengths². My strength is public speaking and communications. I was thrilled to engage audiences via exciting activities during our workshops. One of my favourite moments was when I conducted a game of jeopardy we had specially created. As unnerving as it was to try and get over 50 teenagers to open up, we ended the game with laughter and learning!'

The challenge we faced as a team was trying to select time slots that worked for everyone. Personally, I felt that I could have taken out more time to interact with the experts at Mangar. Except for the initial interviews I took of the children, I wasn't able to visit the village again with my teammates and get the feedback of the activists there. While my teammates did a remarkable job of getting their constructive criticism, I felt that interacting with them in-person could have further strengthened my understanding of the problem. A key takeaway therefore is that when structuring a timeline for our project, we should mutually discuss and confirm the dates in advance.'

¹ Minutes of Meeting Tracker

² Roles and Responsibilities chart

Note:

Two benefits are explained using details from this project. However, while there are two challenges, only one is explained in full. The mark therefore is 4.

Example 3:

'Looking back at the whole project, it had many issues and delays, with constant arguments and disagreements. Candidate 1 and I are different people with very different opinions, making working together a tough job. When he was ill, it left me in a mess as I had organised an interview that I was not allowed to do on my own. As a result, a friend had to accompany me. This caused an argument. However, I believe I should have been more cool-minded and should have had a proper talk with Candidate 2 during the early stages of the project along with a well-structured plan. This course of action could have helped us figure out a way for both of us to work together while having a bit of our own personality and ideas be scattered through the research. It was an exquisite learning experience, as it taught me a lot about working in a team, sharing ideas and moderating arguments. Additionally, I also learned a considerable amount of information about social media, to the point where I have been thinking about my own attachment to it and have been trying to work on it.'

On the other hand, social media is important to both of us, as long as it is used properly. As a result, when we did manage to focus on how we could plan an action, our ideas were on the same wavelength and came up with interesting websites and focus groups to spread the message.'

Note:

This shows only **one** benefit and **one** challenge explained through details from the project, so 2 marks. For 5 marks the candidate would need to have explained two benefits and two challenges through details from this project.

There is a suggested improvement at the end of the first paragraph. This is linked to a challenge and so earns 3 marks.

Table G: Reflecting on how teamwork could have been improved

Candidates are asked to consider two challenges they came across in their teamwork, and to look at either how they were overcome, or how they could be avoided in the future.

One example:

'As some stand generally more extroverted and expressive than others, their dominating personalities can overshadow fellow members at times, even if it is unintentional. In my perspective, it was majorly X who got overshadowed during debates and discussions. If this continued any further, we could have risked losing more creative ideas and opinions that could have resolved issues before they happened. Henceforth, the members should occasionally address the ones that may have been seemingly silent for a long period of time, to make sure they feel comfortable and included.'

The major hurdle encountered as a team was during the preparation of interviewing the doctor. Every member of the team wished to participate, and there were heated discussions on who to settle on – under the premise that more than 2 interviewers could overwhelm the interviewee. Here's where X took a stand to diffuse the situation and suggested visiting the teacher with the issue. We learned that there was no such limit and as long as we were co-operative, the interview was guaranteed to proceed smoothly. This proved the importance of giving others a platform to speak.'

Note:

The team member reports two separate issues/ challenges of teamwork, even though it was the same member who is the focus, and two separate pieces of learning from the reflections. This was awarded 5 marks.

AO3 Communication

Table H: Research findings

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 summarised in the Reflective Paper.

Example 1:

'I learned that there are many artists in Uttarakhand trying hard to make money out of their passion and various organizations who try to connect these artists to the market of Uttarakhand. I mainly researched the art scene locally. I learned that there are barely any modern art artists in Uttarakhand. But there are traditional artists that do Jewelry work, woodwork, Kumaon pottery, woolen Textiles (Crafts Council of Indian). Uttarakhand's traditional art is being overthrown by the 'modernization' of Uttarakhand. This pushes them into a difficult situation as their only source of income is being threatened. (Admin, 2023). This influenced the project as our solution would be based on the gravity of the issue locally, hence, this acted as a base for our project. There was not much on the internet so, we moved onto conducting primary research.'

Note:

Notice how this candidate has used learning and research findings to develop the project. This was awarded 5 marks.

Example 2:

'In order to find out about X, we first interviewed teachers and then parents. We visited the school to see what they thought of our plan. We carried out secondary research on the internet to find out how children learn. We spoke to the art teacher to identify what materials we would be able to use. We saw the Headteacher and got permission to hold the event.'

Note:

There are no research findings given. This is about research and earned 2 marks.

Table F: Learning from research

Example:

'One of the most interesting things to come out of this project was being about to understand the socio-cultural influences on career choice. One team member's father was a surgeon, and she was being encouraged to follow in his footsteps. She talked to children of his colleagues and found them under parental influence to do the same. Family appeared so often in feedback about career choice that we could not ignore it. While some were unaware of other choices they could make, or even where information could be gathered, most feared trading into field of employment they were unfamiliar with. This highlights a crucial gap in career guidance within schools, emphasising the need for such programmes as ours to start at an early age.'

Note:

This reflection on learning considers both perspectives and research findings, and also how this influenced/ supported their project. This earned 5 marks.

Example 2:

'Through family therapy, parents gain crucial insights into their children's behavioural patterns and discover effective strategies to manage challenging behaviours while cultivating a supportive and nurturing home environment. The strength of family therapy lies in its ability to empower parents, allowing them to voice their concerns without fear of judgement, while also receiving professional guidance on autism. Therapists work with parents to create a tailored plan that addresses that family's specific needs. This ensures that every session contributes positively towards understanding and acceptance.'

Note:

This reflection on learning is from research findings other than the candidate's own. It is only about the issue and so earned 3 marks.

Table H: Clarity of communication

This assessment objective requires reflective reports to flow meaningfully with signposting and linking to make clear the aspects of the criteria being evaluated or reflected upon, their benefits/ strengths and challenges/ weaknesses/ limitations. For instance, it should not be difficult to follow which paragraphs are evaluating the Action and which are reflecting on the candidate's role in the project. It is important that own research findings are clearly separate from learning about the issue/ perspectives on it from the research of others.