

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

---

|                                                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Paper 0457/11</b><br/><b>Written Examination</b></p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------|

## **Key messages**

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

- recognised different perspectives on global issues
- demonstrated good skills of interpretation and analysis
- should explain strengths and weaknesses of sources in greater detail
- should clearly explain how research designs are related to the purpose of research.

## **General comments**

The Written Examination consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In November 2021, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Transport Systems. The paper explored issues related to the global movement and transport of food.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Candidates were able to analyse sources and data presented in a variety of different ways. Many candidates clearly understand that there are different perspectives on global issues and were able to use reasons and evidence to support their own points of view.

However, candidates should explain research designs and choice of research methods in greater detail, explicitly relating their research strategy to the claim being tested. Many candidates were able to identify a range of strengths and weaknesses in sources, considering both reasoning and evidence. However, some candidates should explain in more detail why an aspect of a source is a strength or a weakness.

Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the global issues raised by the transportation of food. Many candidates discussed arguments and counterarguments very well and carefully justified their opinions and judgements. Candidates appear to be more confident in using material drawn from the sources as evidence to support and explain their responses to the questions and tasks in the written exam.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- link research methods to research questions and claims to be tested
- explain strengths and weaknesses in greater detail when evaluating sources.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### **Question 1**

- (a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified from Source 1, that the average plate of food in the United States has travelled 2400 kilometres before being eaten and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.
- (b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two problems of transporting food over long distances from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks.

- (c) Most candidates responded very well to this question, identifying and justifying a problem of transporting food over long distances which, in their opinion, was the most significant. Most candidates chose to discuss pollution, carbon dioxide emissions and congestion.

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

- the number of people affected, at an individual, local, community and global level
- the impact on farmers and local businesses
- the effects on choice of food
- the long-term consequences of pollution and carbon emissions on climate change
- impact on other aspects of social, political and economic life, including health.

Many candidates showed awareness of the link between cause and consequence in this context, as well as a possible 'vicious circle' effect with one problem leading to another.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why one problem was more significant than others. Weaker responses often simply stated or described the problem without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion without evidence or careful reasoning. Some candidates compared the impact or significance of different problems, 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 global consequence of transporting food over long distances, thereby revealing a good understanding of the concepts of 'local' and 'global'.

Local consequences of transporting food over long distances most frequently identified by candidates were increased congestion, more pollution and less business for local farmers. Some candidates explored the impact of travel on food quality and packaging.

Most candidates successfully identified a global consequence of food travelling long distances, most frequently referring to increased pollution, greater use of fossil fuels and economic growth.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about food transportation in general without reference to 'local' or 'global' consequences.

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

## Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate Source 3 and identify some strengths and weaknesses of the argument used to support the claim that, 'it is good to transport food over long distances.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- A variety of evidence is presented to support the argument which strengthens the case and makes it more convincing.
- Clear use of language and strong tone means that the argument is easy to follow.
- Uses the professor as an expert to increase credibility.
- Refers to personal experience which is likely to be valid and 'first hand', therefore accurate.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- Few facts and statistics used to support the argument/claim.
- Sources not clearly referenced may mean evidence is not reliable or valid.
- Potential media bias may make the evidence selective or inaccurate.
- Author unknown making it difficult to verify knowledge claims.
- Emotive tone of language that may not be balanced.

The strongest responses provided clear explanation of their identified strengths and weaknesses, usually explaining three or more strengths and/or weaknesses. Weaker responses often described or listed some of the reasons and evidence used to support the claim but did not evaluate the identified elements of the argument.

Candidates should be encouraged to refer to material from the source to provide examples and explain why an element of the argument is a strength or weakness.

- (b) Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources of information and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, 'people now eat a wider range of food than they did in the past.' 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 food retailers, the wider community and other relevant organisations. Surveys of local people were also suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts, local government and researchers. 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.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanations for their suggestions *clearly and explicitly linked to the claim being tested*. Weaker responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence, they 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. This did not answer the question satisfactorily.

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

### Question 3

- (a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified a prediction from Adib's statement and explained that predictions are statements or claims about events in the future.

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

- (b) Most candidates were able to give several reasons why Hani's statement might be biased. These included:

- Her family lives on a farm and she has a vested interest.
- Her father is a farmer and so her family may influence her opinions.
- She is a representative on the school environmental committee which may encourage her to take an unbalanced perspective on the issue.
- Lack of balance in the argument, for example no focus on the positives of transporting food.
- Emotive use of language.
- Lack of evidence to support her opinion, she relies on assertion.
- Focused only on personal/local experience.
- Mainly opinion with little systematic research evidence to support her ideas.

The strongest responses gave a full explanation of several reasons why the statement may be biased, these were supported with reference to material and examples taken from the statement.

This question was challenging for some candidates who did not understand the concept of bias and were not able to use the idea to analyse the source material.

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

- (d) Nearly all candidates compared both statements explicitly, Hani's and Adib's. Candidates 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 presented well supported evaluation of the reasons and evidence within both statements, with a clear assessment of the value of each statement. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion. These responses also included material taken from the statements in the source as evidence to support the candidate's judgement.

Weaker responses lacked supporting evidence and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument.

Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to compare and evaluate sources. 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 different suggestions for action to reduce pollution from transporting food over long distances and recommend one of the proposed actions to the government. Candidates were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

Candidates usually presented a perceptive and balanced discussion of their chosen suggestion for action, exploring both strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. Most candidates recommended either increasing funding to local food producers or taxing food transportation from other countries. Some candidates successfully compared all three suggestions for action before reaching a conclusion.

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 explicitly and frequently back to the issue of reducing pollution from food transportation over long distances.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the issue of food transportation in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed or described ways to reduce food transportation. These responses did not use the material in the sources to support their answers.

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 for the perspective or action.

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

---

|                                                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Paper 0457/12</b><br/><b>Written Examination</b></p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------|

## **Key messages**

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

- recognised different perspectives on global issues
- demonstrated good skills of analysis
- should explain strengths and weaknesses of sources in greater detail
- should clearly explain how research designs are related to the purpose of research.

## **General comments**

The Written Examination consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In November 2021, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Employment. The paper explored issues related to the productivity and job satisfaction of workers.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Candidates were able to analyse sources and data presented in a variety of different ways. Many candidates clearly understood that there are different perspectives on global issues and were able to use reasons and evidence to support their own points of view.

However, candidates should explain research designs and choice of research methods in greater detail, explicitly relating their research strategy to the claim being tested. Many candidates were able to identify a range of strengths and weaknesses in sources, considering both reasoning and evidence. However, some candidates should explain in more detail why an aspect of a source is a strength or a weakness.

Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the global issues raised by work and employment. Many candidates discussed arguments and counterarguments very well and carefully justified their opinions and judgements. Candidates appear to be more confident in using material drawn from the sources as evidence to support and explain their responses to the questions and tasks in the written exam.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- link research methods to research questions and claims to be tested
- explain strengths and weaknesses in greater detail when evaluating sources and arguments.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### **Question 1**

- (a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified from Source 1, that Germany or the United States are countries with high worker productivity and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.
- (b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two factors that affect the productivity of workers from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks.

- (c) Most candidates responded very well to this question, identifying and justifying a factor affecting the productivity of workers which, in their opinion, was the most important. Most candidates chose to discuss the use of technology, or work environment or training.

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

- the number of people affected within the workplace or team
- the impact on job satisfaction, health and security
- the impact on the success and growth of businesses
- the long-term consequences for workers and businesses
- the motivation of workers
- improvements to the quality, ease and speed of work
- impact on other aspects of social, political and economic life.

Many candidates showed awareness of the link between cause and consequence in this context, as well as a possible 'virtuous circle' effect of one factor positively affecting another factor.

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

- (d) Many candidates responded well to this question and could explain why the productivity of workers is an important national issue. These candidates were able to demonstrate a clear understanding of the concept of 'national'.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. There were many thoughtful discussions of the impact of the productivity of workers on business and national economies, including standards of living, provision of social services and education from taxation, the development of countries and international trade.

Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about productivity in general without reference to the national issue, which was the focus of the question. Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences of low or high levels of productivity taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'national' context.

## Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate Source 3 and identify some strengths and weaknesses of the argument used to support the claim that, 'my business is successful because I take care of my workers.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- A variety of evidence is presented to support the argument which strengthens the case and makes it more convincing.
- Uses examples to support explanations.
- Provides some supporting factual and statistical evidence that is likely to be accurate.
- Clear use of language and strong tone means that the argument is easy to follow.
- Uses a professor as an expert to increase credibility.
- Refers to personal experience which is likely to be valid and 'first hand', therefore accurate.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- Overly confident and assertive; arrogant tone.
- Sources not clearly referenced may mean evidence is not reliable or valid.
- Potential bias may make the evidence selective or inaccurate.
- Author unknown therefore difficult to verify claims.
- Emotive tone of language that may not be balanced.

The strongest responses provided clear explanation of their identified strengths and weaknesses, usually explaining three or more strengths and/or weaknesses. Weaker responses often described or listed some of the reasons and evidence used to support the claim but did not evaluate the identified elements of the argument.

Candidates should be encouraged to refer to material from the source to provide examples and explain why an element of the argument is a strength or weakness.

- (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, 'workers are happier when they work in teams.' The methods of testing the claim suggested were carefully explained and related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example, with workers, managers and directors of businesses, and other relevant organisations. Surveys of local people and businesses were also suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts, local government, consultants and researchers. 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.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanations for their suggestions *clearly and explicitly linked 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. This did not answer the question satisfactorily.

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

### Question 3

- (a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified an opinion from Siya's statement and explained that opinions are a subjective view or belief that may not be shared by others.

Most candidates were able to explain convincingly why their selection was an opinion.

- (b)(i) Most candidates correctly identified a fact from Ruben's statement. A fact is a statement or information that is true or accurate and can be verified.
- (ii) Most candidates were able to relate the identified fact to Ruben's argument. The most effective responses explained how the fact related to the argument and explained a strength and/or a weakness of the fact within the context of this argument. For example, a good response was, '*strong support as this fact is based on evidence from personal experience that gives confidence to the reader about the claim.*' Another good response was, '*This fact gives limited support because it is only one person's experience that may not be representative or true for other people.*'

This question was challenging for some candidates who did not evaluate the fact as part of the reasoning used to support or reject the argument.

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

- (c) Nearly all candidates compared both statements explicitly, Ruben's and Siya's. Candidates 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 presented well supported evaluation of the reasons and evidence within both statements, with a clear assessment of the value of each statement. These responses were

usually balanced with a clear conclusion. These responses also included material taken from the statements in the source as evidence to support the candidate's judgement.

Responses at the lower level lacked support and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument.

Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to compare and evaluate sources. 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 different suggestions for action to improve the productivity of workers in a large company and recommend one of the proposed actions to the company. Candidates were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

Candidates usually presented a perceptive and balanced discussion of their chosen suggestion for action, exploring both strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. Most candidates recommended either increasing training or encouraging teamwork and collaboration. Some candidates successfully compared all three suggestions for action before reaching a conclusion.

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 explicitly and frequently back to the issue of improving productivity in a large company.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the issue of productivity in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed or described ways to increase productivity. These responses did not use the material in the sources to support their answers.

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 for the perspective or action.

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

---

|                                                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Paper 0457/13</b><br/><b>Written Examination</b></p> |
|------------------------------------------------------------|

## **Key messages**

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

- recognised different perspectives on global issues
- demonstrated good skills of analysis
- should explain strengths and weaknesses of sources in greater detail
- should clearly explain how research designs are related to the purpose of research.

## **General comments**

The Written Examination consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In November 2021, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Fuel and Energy. The paper explored issues related to the production and use of electrical energy.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Candidates were able to analyse sources and data presented in a variety of different ways. Many candidates clearly understand that there are different perspectives on global issues and were able to use reasons and evidence to support their own points of view.

However, candidates should explain research designs and choice of research methods in greater detail, explicitly relating their research strategy to the claim being tested. Many candidates were able to identify a range of strengths and weaknesses in sources, considering both reasoning and evidence. However, some candidates should explain in more detail why an aspect of a source is a strength or a weakness.

Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the global issues raised by the production and use of energy. Many candidates discussed arguments and counterarguments very well and carefully justified their opinions and judgements. Candidates appear to be more confident in using material drawn from the sources as evidence to support and explain their responses to the questions and tasks in the written exam.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- link research methods to research questions and claims to be tested
- explain strengths and weaknesses in greater detail when evaluating sources and arguments.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### **Question 1**

- (a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified from Source 1, that global energy use is estimated to increase by 50 per cent between 2020 and 2035 and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.
- (b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two advantages of solar power from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks.

- (c) Most candidates responded very well to this question, identifying and justifying an advantage of solar power which, in their opinion, was the most important. Most candidates chose to discuss the production of less noise and pollution, the reduction in dependency on fossil fuels and the provision of electricity to people not connected to a national supply.

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

- the number of people affected
- the impact on pollution and the environment
- the impact on the availability of power to remote areas
- the long-term consequences for standards of living
- impact on other aspects of social, political and economic life.

Many candidates showed awareness of the link between cause and consequence in this context, as well as a possible 'virtuous circle' effect of one advantage positively affecting another advantage.

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

- (d) Candidates responded well to this question and could explain both a global advantage and a local disadvantage of solar power, thereby revealing a good understanding of the concepts of 'local' and 'global'.

Many candidates successfully explained a global advantage of solar power, most frequently referring to decreased pollution, less use of fossil fuels and reduced global warming.

Most candidates successfully explained a local disadvantage of solar power, most frequently referring to dependency on local weather conditions, the extensive use of land and high initial costs.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about solar power and energy use in general without reference to 'local' or 'global' consequences.

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

## Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate Source 3 and identify some strengths and weaknesses of the argument used to support the claim that, 'it is easy to use less energy in your home.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- Some evidence is presented to support the argument which strengthens the case and makes it more convincing.
- Uses examples to support explanations.
- Clear use of language and strong tone means that the argument is easy to follow.
- Refers to personal experience which is likely to be valid and 'first-hand', therefore accurate.
- Uses the professor as an expert to increase credibility.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- Overly confident and assertive; arrogant tone.
- Unbalanced; does not refer to counterarguments.
- Little supporting evidence.
- Potential bias may make the evidence selective or inaccurate.
- Author unknown making it difficult to verify claims.
- Does not discuss costs.

The strongest responses provided clear explanation of their identified strengths and weaknesses, usually explaining three or more strengths and/or weaknesses. Weaker responses often described or listed some of the reasons and evidence used to support the claim but did not evaluate the identified elements of the argument.

Candidates should be encouraged to refer to material from the source to provide examples and explain why an element of the argument is a strength or weakness.

- (b)** Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources of information and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, 'most people know that climate change is affected by energy use.' 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, with members of the public and relevant organisations. Other methods included talking to experts, local government officials, energy companies and researchers. Nearly all candidates suggested secondary research using sources from the internet and other media. Many suggested and described sources that were likely to be reliable and free from bias or vested interest.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanations for their suggestions *clearly and explicitly linked to the claim being tested*. Weaker responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence, they 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. This did not answer the question satisfactorily.

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

### Question 3

- (a)** Nearly all candidates correctly identified a fact from Dhia's statement. Most explained that a fact is a statement or information that is true or accurate and can be verified.
- (b)(i)** Nearly all candidates correctly identified a prediction from Arif's statement.
- (ii)** Most candidates were able to relate the identified prediction to Arif's argument. The most effective responses explained how the prediction related to the argument and explained a strength and/or a weakness of the prediction within the context of this argument. For example, a good response was, '*strong support as this prediction is based on evidence from experts and research that gives confidence to the reader about the claim.*' Another good response was, '*This prediction gives limited support because it is only based on a trend that may not continue into the future.*'

This question was challenging for some candidates who did not evaluate the use of the prediction as part of the reasoning or evidence within the argument.

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

- (c) Nearly all candidates compared both statements explicitly, Dhia's and Arif's. Candidates discussed issues relating to evidence, language, knowledge claims and expertise. Some candidates also addressed the reasons and values within each statement. For example, highlighting that Dhia appeared to be quite self-centred, whereas Arif was more community focussed.

Responses at the highest levels presented well supported evaluation of the reasons and evidence within both statements, with a clear assessment of the value of each statement. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion. These responses also included material taken from the statements in the source as evidence to support the candidate's judgement.

Responses at the lower level lacked support and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument.

Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to compare and evaluate sources. 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 different suggestions for action to protect the environment and recommend one of the proposed actions to the government. Candidates were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

Candidates usually presented a perceptive and balanced discussion of their chosen suggestion for action, exploring both strengths and weaknesses of the proposal. Most candidates recommended either greater use of solar and wind power or encouraging people to use less electricity in their homes. Some candidates successfully compared all three suggestions for action before reaching a conclusion.

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 explicitly and frequently back to the issue of protecting the environment.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the issue of environmental protection in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed or described ways to protect the environment. These responses did not use the material in the sources to support their answers.

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 for the perspective or action.

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

---

|                                                          |
|----------------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Paper 0457/02</b><br/><b>Individual Report</b></p> |
|----------------------------------------------------------|

## Key messages

- Candidates should formulate a question that focusses on **one issue**.
- The candidate's response must focus on **different perspectives** on their chosen issue.
- Candidates should write their reports in their own words.

## General comments

Most candidates provided citations and references for their sources. A minority of candidates showed evidence of copy and paste of whole passages from their sources, or possible use of spinners and thesaurus apps.

More candidates attempted to evaluate their sources than previous cohorts.

A growing minority of candidates succeeded in providing a global perspective.

In a minority of centres', candidates are still structuring the IR around the old specifications from the pre 2018 syllabus.

The strongest work for this component was well-structured and logical, and explicitly presented several different well-supported perspectives, including at least one global and one national perspective on the issue identified in their question. It showed clear evidence of research, with accurate citation of the sources used. Successful candidates analysed and explained the causes and consequences of the issue. They explicitly compared the different causes and/or consequences. They provided full details of their proposed course of action, including details of how the course of action would be implemented and the possible impact on the issue. The candidates reflected on their own perspective and how this had been impacted by their findings and by others' perspectives. They answered their question and remained focused throughout on the central issue.

## Comments on specific assessment criteria

### Assessment Objective 1: Research, Analysis and Evaluation:

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

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

- Is sustainable development possible under the global 'fast fashion' industry?
- Is Asian parenting a more effective method to raise children?
- Should vaccinations be mandatory for all children?
- Should the Covid-19 Vaccine be mandatory?
- Is Euthanasia justifiable?
- Are social media sites designed to manipulate society?
- Is the Hijab misrepresented in the media?

### Information from different perspectives:

#### The strongest work shows a clear understanding of perspectives.

For IGCSE Global Perspectives, a perspective is always based on a view, opinion, or attitude: on what people think or feel about the issue. It is not enough to present general information, facts and figures on a topic from different parts of the world.

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

Successful work included direct quotes showing a clear global perspective:

*‘Despite the various threats to global biodiversity – such as climate change, pollution, overexploitation, invasive species (IBERDROLA n.d.) – many experts maintain that habitat destruction is the leading cause of biodiversity loss (Hanski, 2011). The World Animal Foundation (2021) lists habitat destruction as the “primary cause of species extinction worldwide”, and the WWF (n.d.) similarly states that “habitat loss is probably the greatest threat to the variety of life on this planet today’.*

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.

*‘The NZ government believes that EVs can reduce emissions that contribute to climate change and smog, improve public health, and reduce ecological damage. The example they give is that ‘charging your EV on renewable energy such as solar or wind minimizes these emissions even more.’(11)*

Some **weaker work** did not present a global view on the issue, but instead presented views from different countries, these different national views were not drawn together to demonstrate a global view.

Some **weaker work did not present different perspectives** on the issue, but instead presented information about different places. This was sometimes labelled as Global/National Perspective though there were no views or opinions mentioned. This gave the impression that the candidate did not understand, for example, that facts and figures about Australia is not the same as an Australian perspective. Others presented their own viewpoints and opinions, with no supporting information or evidence.

Some **weak work** presented a general topic with 2 or 3 sub-topics (often labelled Issue 1, Issue 2, Issue 3). This work did not present perspectives explicitly and (because it was dealing with multiple topics) did not deal with the required criteria in any depth or detail.

### Analysis and comparison of causes and consequences:

Most candidates explained the consequences of their chosen issue. Where their issue was clear, they were able to discuss causes of the issue. Where candidates had not identified a global issue, or where they wrote descriptive essays, they found it difficult to identify or explain any causes or consequences.

Stronger responses compared different causes of (or reasons for) their central issue. They explained which were the more important, or main causes and/or they explained how and why there were different causes in different countries or regions. They also compared the consequences (sometimes labelled impacts or effects) explaining which consequences were the most serious, and/or why there were different consequences for different groups of people, or different places or different situations.

Developed comparison of consequences is given below:

*‘In contrast, Botswana banned trophy hunting in 2014 but promoted alternative activities such as photo-tourism and according to a study .... The residents... noticed that photographic camps generated more resources and benefits.*

*According to.... there are other ways of promoting conservation apart from trophy hunting. In Africa, viewing wild animals in their natural habitat generated 21.8 million jobs and produced 4.4 per cent of GDP in contrast with the revenue from trophy hunting, 3 per cent of GDP'*

### Course(s) of Action:

The **strongest work** had a developed and focused course of action. The candidate explained the course of action: its implementation (e.g. who would do it and details of how it would be done) and gave a clear explanation of the likely impact of the course of action.

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

*'The most significant consequence of our increase in contact with infectious diseases is loss of life, because this eventually leads to other consequences like economic loss. A possible solution is to strengthen healthcare systems and protect the healthcare workforce. This is because pandemics and diseases often put these systems under a lot of stress.<sup>5</sup> To reduce this a long-term investment in health care is required. First, this can be used for training and educating a healthy and capable workforce, that is provided with safe and secure equipment. Also this investment can be used to gain access to better technologies and essential medical products, or to build new and improved medical areas for the healthcare.*

*Risk communication is also a possible solution. It is referred to as the real time exchange of information between health experts or officials and those who face a hazard to their survival, health, economic or social well-being. The main goal of 'risk communication' is that everyone at risk can make informed decisions to weaken the overall effect of a disease outbreak and take preventive actions. When risk communication is used effectively, it can allow countries and communities to maintain their social, political and economic stability in emergencies.<sup>5</sup>*

*Protecting the front-line responders is vital. Often when an epidemic occurs the frontline responders, known as essential workers, are immediately put into contact with infected communities and individuals. So protecting these individuals is essential.*

*A combination of the solutions would be best. Risk communication allows everybody who is at risk to be informed. Healthcare systems will function properly during disease outbreaks and the frontline responders will be safe and work more efficiently.'*

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

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

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

### Evaluation of sources:

The **strongest work** showed clear evaluation of sources used. Candidates evaluated the sources using different criteria and with an explanation of the impact of the quality of sources on the candidate's thinking, or work.

*'Even though the sources used to make this paper were highly informative and accurate towards the topic, they all contain bias or vested interest in some way. The Netflix documentary 'The Social Dilemma', contains information given by former workers of different social media companies. This shows clear bias as the film does not take into account the changes those same platforms have made regarding the issue, and provides a rather paranoid view of the way those platforms work. Even so, it gives a realistic viewpoint of what happens inside these companies, and spreads awareness about a problem most people are not conscious of. On the other hand, the document 'What the Social Dilemma gets wrong' written by Facebook contains vested interest as it provides little information about the company's mistakes and instead focuses on the positive things the platform has achieved. Although it shows information that contrasts with what is said in the documentary, that helps my paper have a different perspectives by giving a perspective in favour of Facebook and presenting it as a good company... Finally, the article on Trump's victory in the 2016 election contains bias as it only focuses on the social media influence. If it was not biased it would include and analyse all of the means Trump used to promote his campaign, rather than just talking about social media. It*

*would also give information on the opposition (Hillary Clinton's campaign). However, the article had reliable statistics (which I checked with other sources) and good analysis.... Which contributed to my arguments about the ways these platforms can be used to a personal advantage.'*

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

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

*'My sources were all recent and reliable. I found relevant information from trustworthy websites'*

*'When finding my sources I tried to find objective sites. I tried to find organisations which would be more official instead of blogs or reporters who could have a bias'*

These examples seem to indicate that the candidates are not aware of what is required. Their comments may be correct, but they are not specific to one source. Instead they are generalised and unexplained. It is not clear why recent sources are good, or what the issue is with biased sources.

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

### **Assessment Objective 2: Reflection:**

The **strongest work** had a clear section of reflection on the candidate's own perspective, on their research findings and on the perspectives they had explored. The candidate clearly explained how their own perspective had developed, been changed, or impacted by others' perspectives and by the information they had gained about the issue. It included a clear conclusion/answer to their question based on research findings and other perspectives. Some strong candidates reflected throughout and then drew their reflections together at the end coming to a logical and supported conclusion.

*'Before starting this report, I believed that early access to technology was a matter of opinion in which the parent was the regulator and decided how much time their child should spend on it. I have analysed many studies on the topic and have learnt a variety of things like the fact that countries have recommended screen time and some effects that I was not aware of. Writing the perspectives and the course of action made me realise how much of a digital divide there is in the world, as well as taught me that as the years go by the gap is getting smaller. Now, while I still believe that parents are the number one 'gatekeepers' of time spent on screens, I realise that it is equally important to be present during that time. Parents should try and be as present as possible when it comes to their child using technology. That way they are there to regulate the content.*

*Parents nowadays tend to use technology as a 'pacifier' for their children. This type of action needs to stop. This is what enables the negative effects, like affecting emotional development and making them more dependent on it. Interactions at that age are extremely important for them to create bonds with people and not with technology. We saw how schools can become a crucial ally for parents on this topic.*

*As much as there are parents who agree with the implementation of technology at an early age, there are as many who believe that less time spent on a screen will improve their child's development. The truth is, it should not be about these opposing positions. We need to be aware of the risks as well as the benefits to pursue a technology balance for our children and capitalise on the benefits.'*

### **Assessment Objective 3: Communication:**

#### **Structure of the report:**

Candidates are required to write their report in essay form. Their argument should be planned and logical and follow a clear structure to answer their question. They should include all required criteria.

The **strongest work** was easy to follow and provided a clear structured argument with an introduction, addressing all the required criteria and ending with a reflective conclusion. It used the full available word count. This work started with different perspectives on the issue and kept those focused throughout. The candidate kept control of their argument and did not lose contact with their question, the central issue, or their research findings.

**Weaker work** lacked focus. It tended to select several separate issues and present general information about those, making it difficult to follow any central argument. It sometimes included information that was not relevant to the question. It tended to move around from one topic to another instead of developing a central argument.

The **weakest work** often provided a series of headings with some facts and figures on the topic area, with no clear flow of any argument and sometimes with no reflection or conclusion.

Some work showed little evidence of any research; the candidate simply wrote a general philosophical argument. This was particularly common in essays on Belief Systems and the Family, where candidates had a point of view and wrote only about that.

#### **Clarity of arguments, perspectives, and evidence:**

The **strongest work** clearly identifies the required criteria and presents them in separate paragraphs, or by using sub-headings. It is clear that the candidate understands what they are doing and presents the required elements explicitly.

The **weakest work** shows little awareness of the requirements for this component. Candidates may simply discuss their question without presenting any perspectives, causes and consequences. There may be no clear issue and so no course of action with no reflection on their research findings or evaluation of sources.

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

#### **Citation and referencing:**

All candidates should understand the need for **complete in-text attribution**. They should be aware that if they present material as their own when they have found it in other sources, this is considered to be plagiarism. Where they quote directly from sources, this should be in the form of short quotes, clearly attributed, and most of 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, or numbering, or in-text referencing, to indicate where they have used sources. They must include complete references somewhere in their work, either footnotes, endnotes, or in-text references (for ease of reading and control of word count, numbers or brackets are more manageable).

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

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

Some candidates carry out primary research, particularly to explore different perspectives. Where they do so, they should mention this in text; so that it is clear where/how the information has been gained. They may wish to put a note at the end of their reference list or in a footnote, to give details such as date of interview. If candidates wish to include evidence of their primary research, such as statistics, they can append this to the reference list (this should not be included as part of the report, unless it is to be read and counted in the words allowed for the IR).

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

---

|                                                     |
|-----------------------------------------------------|
| <p><b>Paper 0457/03</b><br/><b>Team Project</b></p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------|

## **Key messages**

- Candidates should be discouraged from choosing topics that are locally sensitive.
- Candidates should be involved in the choosing of their topic.
- Candidates should research a cultural perspectives on an issue, and then decide a method of communicating it (an Outcome) to achieve their project aim e.g. raise awareness about the issue.
- Candidates should keep a log of their ways of working and of their work with the Team.
- Candidates are each expected to research an aspect of the work, citing their sources and reporting their findings in the Reflective Paper.
- All members of a Team should be awarded the same marks for the team elements (Collaboration, Explanation and Outcome).

## **General comments**

### **Team Projects**

The most successful projects involved raising awareness or changing the behaviours, of others about an issue of local importance or an issue inspired by personal passion. Issues such as water conservation, engagement with the Human Rights agenda, maintaining physical or mental health for specific age groups during the pandemic all saw work that stood out this season. Establishing regular fitness classes for learners during the pandemic to limit mental health problems, is worthy of special note.

Inevitably the pandemic influenced what a lot of candidates chose to research, some even focusing on cultural perspectives on vaccinations. These ones tended to be very focused on a specific audience, such as the school or local population, and provided comparison to experiences in other countries. It was clear that for many candidates the pandemic has had such a big impact on their lives. Many learners considered their changing work patterns during school closures and new working processes within their reflections section.

The most successful Outcomes were leaflets, short videos, shared via Zoom or Teams, and pamphlets. Websites were popular, however they were difficult for learners to gather feedback from for use in their evaluations. When evaluating, learners were able to balance the problems of gaining feedback, against positive points they had identified.

There was a misconception about how interviews can be used in Outcomes. Making a video of interviews as an Outcome will be recognised as research but not as an explanation of perspectives. This is because learners have not made use of it as part of an explanation. Parts of recorded interviews are helpful in explaining perspectives within the Outcome.

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

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

### **Comments on specific elements**

#### **Team elements: Explanation, Outcome and Collaboration**

##### **AO3 Communication: Explanation and Outcome**

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

One team wrote:

*'As a group, our aim was to raise awareness about the positive impact that practicing some kind of physical activity could have on mental health and how it could potentially help those enduring some degree of anxiety or anguish or overall distress. Our objective was to find an effective solution that was easy to implement and didn't require major financial investment. Moreover, we wanted to develop a cross cultural approach that would enable our proposal to be inclusive as well.'*

*While doing our research, we noticed that in spite of the cultural, ethnic and geographical differences that every country might have, a common denominator prevailed in each of them. There was no country whose citizen's didn't endure some form of anxiety, distress or anguish.*

*To achieve our aim, we wanted to create a set of posters that introduce the issue and showcase the impact that sports have on your life, as well as the advantages and disadvantages of engaging in frequent physical activity.*

*As a result of our research, we found out that 'participation in team sports is associated with better adult mental health outcomes among individuals' and that 'evidence shows that participating in sports assists in better social skills, assertiveness, higher self-esteem, self-confidence, self-control, self-concept, and competence'. This suggests that the impact that sports have on mental health is overall positive. Nonetheless, 'there are only a handful of mental health professionals who recommend children and adolescents to engage in sports'. That is why we wanted to raise awareness about how sports could have a positive impact on mental health no matter gender, nationality or age.'*

##### **AO3: Collaboration**

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

#### **Individual element: The Reflective Paper**

##### **AO1: Research, Analysis and Evaluation**

##### **Evaluating the Outcome**

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

One Team wrote:

##### **Strengths**

*'During the research phase, we achieved quantitative and qualitative data and explored various cultural perspectives. It contributed immensely to the planning phase, such as deciding the target audience and raising awareness methods. To reach a multitude and display it in an eye-catching way, we decided to create a website.'*

*Beyond designing a simple yet informational website, we had the opportunity to interview human rights activists who enlightened us with various unconventional ideas. The addition of an interview gave our website a mixture of secondary and primary research, which further reinforced our cause.'*

### **Limitations**

*'Following recent guidelines, the plan to distribute pamphlets in public areas needed modification. As our programme centred around pamphlets, a considerable number of adjustments were necessary – prolonging the initiation of the task. Consequently, our efforts to gather a crowd took weeks to reach a milestone.'*

### **Suggested improvements**

Evaluation should be well balanced and recognises changes that circumstances made necessary. It should also reflect on and criticise the sharing of the learning.

Suggestions for improvement should come from the weaknesses that have been identified. For a strong response, see below:

*'Contrary to promoting the website to friends, students, and families, collaborating with charitable organisations would've been an efficient use of resources and time. These organisations would've also provided valuable opinions and guidance ideas for our website to strengthen our cause. Simultaneously, we could've spread awareness and broadened our influence in a short period. Alternatively, giving equal importance to each method would've better equipped us for any changes.'*

*Additional refinements could've been made in our surveys to better assess public opinions by distributing to international participants, achieving well-represented data. On the other hand, limiting our focus to represent a national or local perspective meant spreading the survey to selected states and utilising more manageable distribution channels. In addition, amending specific questions would've achieved more diverse and distinct answers, including contradicting opinions.'*

### **Evaluating work processes**

Evaluations of work processes should consider ways in which the learner was an effective worker/ researcher and ways in which the learner was not effective, considering the reasons for this.

One candidate wrote:

*'One of the major weaknesses was that I lack confidence and I rarely give out my own opinions and just listened and did what my other members told me. My members later realised too and tried to ask me if I had opinions from time to time, whenever we need to make important decisions. But a few weeks and months later, I was still the same. But in a short period of time, I managed to be more confident during the meetings that we held, as my teammates always showed much support. I learned and experienced that it's ok to disagree with others and state your opinions that could change ideas for the better. As I held both of these strengths and weaknesses, I manage to confidently produce my work: the pamphlet, the video thumbnail designs, and some help on the website.'*

This example has balance and range of examples and gives some explanation.

### **AO2: Reflection**

#### **Reflecting about working in a team:**

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

One candidate wrote:

*'Initially, we made productive use of our Global Perspective lessons to review and discuss, which accelerated progress. However, COVID-19 restrictions made conversing difficult. So, we planned and managed our time, allocating regular meeting slots through Google Meet. Adopting a virtual meeting routine helped ease our stress and reduce workloads. We shared the work according to our strengths.'*

*Sometimes it was easy to be outspoken online when we would not have been in person. Teamwork at a distance is not easy. Any disputes were calmly settled, which cultivated creativity and mutual understanding.'*

This response is balanced but does not link the strengths or the weaknesses to the Outcome or team aims. This means it can be only achieve a Level 3 mark.

### Reflecting on own role in the Team

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

One candidate wrote:

*'I took the position of the leader of this group project. I made our group's Instagram posts and came up with most of both surveys' questions. I did well with designing the posts for Instagram, as I was able to utilise the graphic design website 'Canva' to create easy-to-read and informative posts. The attractive nature of the posts would draw people in to read each group of information. For the second survey, I came up with good questions that people were able to answer easily. However, I am not proud that when a team member was struggling to find perspectives on the issue, I did not offer to help. I should have done.'*

Most candidates were very descriptive about their work for the team, as this is. However, within this description, strengths and weaknesses of the role in the team can be seen. Consideration of the Outcome is clearly evident, this was awarded Level 4.

### Reflecting about learning:

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

One candidate wrote about skills learned:

*'I discovered that I can be a decent researcher, which is a skill that I thought I lacked. I found I have mediocre communication skills. I should have tried my level best to join all of the meetings.'*

One candidate wrote about perspectives understood better:

*'When I was doing my research for the project, I slowly realised that beauty stereotypes exist in all sorts of form regardless of which region you're from or even your own religion. It seems that different regions and cultures have their own visions and perfect forms of beauty. For example, the ideal visions of beauty for India would be drastically different from that of beauty standards in Korea. However, I had never expected to find out that such stereotypes can actually be harmful to the society as it affects the mental health of numerous individuals. I learnt that it makes people feel really insecure about themselves and thus they spend thousands of dollars on plastic surgery just to make themselves look good. I found it shocking to see that some young teenagers in Korea aimed to have plastic surgery to improve their looks.'*

### AO3: Communication

Each learner is expected to carry out personal research and report their individual findings towards an aspect of the topic. It is expected that findings are summarised and that evidence is cited.

Candidates are asked to explain their evaluations/reflections using examples to set them in context. The degree to which explanations are developed in this way contributes to the AO3 mark. Another factor is the organisation of their Reflective Paper. It is expected that the sections should be clearly seen. Work was very well presented and well organised. Some responses lacked balance and individual research findings, which limited the marks awarded.