

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

---

<p><b>Paper 0457/12</b> <b>Written Paper</b></p>
--

## **Key messages**

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

- identify information relevant to an issue
- analyse sources to identify reasons and evidence.

Candidates would benefit from further guidance in:

- evaluating and explaining the strengths and weaknesses of sources
- using evidence and reasons to create an argument to support a claim.

## **General comments**

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In March 2024, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Globalisation. The impact of globalisation on employment was the main issue explored.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good and continue to improve. Many candidates are developing an excellent understanding of global issues. They are aware of causes, consequences, and possible actions in response to problems. They can explain their own perspectives and compare these with the viewpoints of other people and groups.

Candidates understood the source material very well. They were able to identify and analyse the main types of statement, evidence, and reasoning within sources, describing them clearly and accurately. Different perspectives were well understood and explained.

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 in the written exam. 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. Evidence and reasons should be clearly and explicitly related to the claim and used to justify the claim clearly and with some structure. Careful planning of lines of argument and essay structure would help in this process.

Candidates were usually able to identify potential strengths and weaknesses of sources and arguments. However, these evaluative points were often simply described or asserted rather than explained. When evaluating a source, candidates should explain the significance or impact of the identified strength or weakness on the argument.

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

Most candidates showed interest in the topic of globalisation and discussed the impact on patterns of employment and working life with some enthusiasm.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- relate source material explicitly to the perspective or issue being explored

- fully explain the strengths and weaknesses of sources
- plan and organise reasons and evidence with a clear structure when supporting an argument or opinion

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Question 1**

- (a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified that the number of people living in extreme poverty has fallen to one billion, according to Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.
- (b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two problems caused by globalisation, from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks. Most candidates identified loss of local businesses, skills and jobs, and harm to the environment.
- (c) Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying and justifying which problem caused by globalisation was the most significant, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss loss of local businesses, skills and jobs, or harm to the environment.

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

- the number of people affected
- the effect on lifestyle, life chances and the future prosperity of people
- the impact on well-being and health, and on the environment of pollution
- the likelihood of being affected
- multiple negative consequences.

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

- (d) Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why globalisation is an important national issue, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concept of national i.e., affecting a whole country.

The reasons given by candidates related mainly to those given within the Sources, including:

- Loss of businesses and skills
- Exploitation of the labour market
- Loss of jobs
- More scarce resources and fossil fuels used
- More pollution
- Higher carbon dioxide emissions
- Benefits national economy.

There was some attempt to explain why these impacts were important at a national level.

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 globalisation in general without reference to the national element of the question.

#### **Question 2**

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'Globalisation has many benefits.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- some reference to research evidence

- describes relevant examples
- refers to an expert scientist in the field – Professor Green
- clear structure
- reasonable tone and measured language
- some statistical evidence.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- little reference to sources of statistical data or factual evidence
- some assertion
- little citation and referencing
- does not discuss counterarguments
- unbalanced and one-sided.

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

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

Candidates should be encouraged to make clear and explicit reference to the arguments and evidence in the Source to justify their opinion, thereby using the material in the source as evidence. This means quoting from or summarising relevant parts of the source.

- (b)** Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources of information and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, ‘Globalisation helps us understand other cultures.’ 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 of people, businesses, and organisations in the country and overseas. Surveys of local people about culture and globalisation were also suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts, local government, and employers. Nearly all candidates suggested secondary research using sources from the internet. Many described the type of source that was likely to be reliable and free from bias or vested interest, for example from governments, NGOs, and United Nations organisations. Travel agents, migrants and refugees were sometimes mentioned as a source of primary evidence.

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

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

- (a)** Most candidates correctly identified a prediction from Daan’s statement and could explain why the statement was a prediction. A prediction is a statement that makes a claim about the future; or similar.
- (b)** Most candidates were able to explain why Gabriella might have a vested interest in her argument. These candidates showed understanding of vested interest as a personal or financial reason to support or oppose something.

Most candidates explained that Gabriella's father's business and her family income from international trade might influence her perspective on the value of globalisation. She therefore has a vested interest.

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

- Unbalanced argument – only a brief consideration of other perspectives/counterarguments
- Not much evidence and little citation/referencing
- Mainly opinion and personal experience used as evidence

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

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

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

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

#### Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to explain their opinions about the statement, 'We should increase employment by encouraging globalisation'. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

There were many thoughtful discussions. Most candidates recommended increasing globalisation because of the potential for growth in economic activity that could result in more jobs and prosperity for people worldwide, as well as economic development and the sharing of technology and culture. Many also discussed the impact of globalisation on government income and the potential for improved social services like education.

Some candidates did not agree with the statement, for example, explaining that globalisation might lead to increased competition and loss of skills or jobs at a local level in some countries.

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 explicitly and frequently linked the argument back to the issue of globalisation and employment.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and describe their own opinion about globalisation in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted.

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

---

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

## 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 **evaluate** the individual sources they use.
- Candidates should clearly **cite** all their sources.

## General comments

Successful work for this component was well-structured and logical, and explicitly presented several different well-supported perspectives, including **at least one global and one national perspective** on the issue identified in their question. It showed clear evidence of research, with accurate citation of sources used.

Successful candidates analysed and explained the causes and consequences of the issue. They provided full details of a proposed course of action, including details of how the course of action would be implemented and the possible impact on the issue.

Stronger candidates reflected on their own perspective and how this had been impacted by their findings and by others' perspectives. They answered their question and remained focussed throughout on the central issue.

Most candidates provided citations and references for their sources. Some work showed evidence of copy and paste of whole passages from their sources, or possible use of spinners and thesaurus apps. This appeared to include questions, and, in some cases, whole essays. There was some evidence of excessive teacher involvement in coursework.

## 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 that could be answered either Yes or No, allow candidates to be clear about their topic and issue, to focus on that throughout and to identify different views. Successful questions this session included:

- *Should we consider banning animal-sourced food for sustainable living?*
- *Is carbon offsetting an efficient way to reduce the effects of climate change?*
- *Will AI have a beneficial impact on the financial sector?*
- *Is fast fashion worth its environmental and ethical costs?*
- *Can the impact of industrial crop production on surrounding ecosystems be minimised?*
- *Does aid establish an economically exploitative relationship between donor and receiver countries?*
- *Can we balance the effects that the oil trades, their prices and usages have on economic sustainability?*

A number of candidates formulated very long and complicated questions that they struggled to manage. Their essays were then somewhat confused and difficult to follow.

Work presented without a central global issue or a clear research question was still in evidence this series.

There was a significant minority of candidates who did not address an issue in their response. The majority of these gave a purely narrative account of e.g., family dynamics or religious beliefs, but did not then go on to explain why that might be a problem.

A few candidates provided an appropriate research question on a global issue, but their reports did not then address the issue highlighted.

There were still a number of reports 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 coming up with their own response as a result of all the research done.

### Information from different perspectives:

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

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

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

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

On the question: *Does aid establish an economically exploitative relationship between donor and receiver countries?* a candidate wrote:

*'The stance that most countries take toward aid is that it is necessary for the upliftment of poorer countries so that they can benefit from global trade. A report published by the UN Conference on Trade and Development after the 2008 conference states that without aid, weaker economies will likely not be able to liberalise and keep up with the pressure of international demand and competition. (UNCTAD 3) An important principle to the UNCTAD is that aid for trade policies should be based on the current and potential needs.... Therefore, the belief held by international organisations is firmly in favour of aid provision, indicating that while there is a risk of exploitation, the advantages are far too great to ignore. This is proven in the fact....'*

This contextualises the perspective, provides support and evidence and includes a direct quote giving a global perspective on the issue and is related directly to the research question.

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.

On the issue of the environmental and ethical costs of fast fashion, a candidate wrote:

*'... waste water of fabric manufacturers contaminate the river Yamuna in India for extended periods yearly... India has recognised this growing issue, especially in recent years when consumerism... has peaked...' "India is an important... Market. We see consumer mindset changing from short-term fashion to essential long-terms ones ..." Tomohiko Sei, CEP at Uniqlo India, told the Economic Times (Haider, 2022). The Prime Minister of India, Mr Narendra Modi flaunted a jacket made from recycled bottles ... at the recent G7 Summit. This summed up the perspective of the Indian Government that sustainable fashion is the way forward.'*

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

Some **weaker work did not present different perspectives** on the issue, but instead presented information about different places. This was sometimes labelled as Global/National Perspective though there were no perspectives presented. In these cases, candidates described actions taken by a government, for example, or provided relevant statistics without telling us what anyone thought or felt about the issue. Others did not present any perspectives or opinions apart from the candidate's own views and these were sometimes unsupported, without evidence, meaning that the report read as an unresearched opinion piece.

### **Analysis and comparison of causes and consequences:**

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

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

For example, in an essay about the recent impact of westernisation on local traditions and cultures in India, a candidate wrote:

*'One of the main causes of the spread of westernisation in India is the media... Cable and satellite television allowed a generation of young Indians to watch international shows like Baywatch, Friends, Jurassic Park...<sup>1</sup> Over recent years ... According to Ministry of Information and Broadcasting secretary Apurva Chandra... )TT platforms such as Netflix and Amazon Prime highlight shows that feature global issues such as women empowerment and LGBTQ issues which is leading to a sensitisation of these issues in Indian mindsets. This has been instrumental in shaping the minds of young individuals and has affected the way they follow cultural practices and traditions... fashion and preferred language of communication'.*

### **Course(s) of Action:**

**The strongest work** had a developed and focussed 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(s) of the course of action.

For example on the issue of euthanasia, a candidate wrote:

*'To begin the process of euthanasia, the patient must express a clear desire to be euthanised and there must be no chance of improvement in the patient's suffering. Investigations into the patient's mental health, family dynamics and the financial ramifications of their death, in addition to more obvious aspects like the patient's physical condition and illness severity should be done by the country's Judicial Court before deciding if the patient should be euthanised. Regulations must include a time limit for reconsideration to ensure that requests are appropriately examined by the patient, family and authorities. A written document that allows a patient to communicate their clear wishes on the medical care they want to receive in the event that they are terminally ill or otherwise unable to do so should be given to the court. Before a request for euthanasia is entertained, proper regulation must ensure that the patient is receiving adequate palliative care. To carry out the euthanasia operation.... The court must appoint a court official and a medical officer as witnesses..... must be performed under the supervision of the two officials in order to rule out any allegation of murder and the process should only be carried out by a physician.'*

**Weaker work** described solutions already in place but did not develop these to explain how these solutions might be applied to their specific issue or in other countries. Some candidates either explained how the course of action might be implemented **or** what its impact might be – but not both. Others provided a detailed course of action that was not clearly linked to the issue they were considering.

**The weakest work** provided a list of actions that might be taken, but with no further details. Some candidates did not identify an issue – they presented general information about a topic. Without a problem, they could not suggest a course of action to address it.

## Evaluation of sources:

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

*'(Centre for Disease Control and Prevention nd)...While well-reputed and credible publishers and organisations back the source, it is crucial to note that the data presented is confined to the Western regions. This constraint raises the possibility that the findings may not be universally applicable and might not accurately represent other parts of the world.'*

*(Science Direct 2018) The referenced source may be considered unreliable primarily because it contains outdated information. The passage of time may have rendered the content obsolete, diminishing its accuracy and relevance. However it is important to note that the source is highly recognised and respected for high quality content and rigorous standards...'*

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

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

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

*'I researched deeply through any climate change and deforestation related newspaper articles, websites and books to understand the nature of this issue. During my research I came across various websites but most of them .... Sources were chosen for their credibility of information for example newspapers like the Guardian and Times of India, reports of the World Bank, Govt of India reports etc.'*

This attempt is generalised, some statements are made without any identification of the sources referred to and the evaluative comments are unexplained. It is unclear why the Guardian, Times, World Bank, Govt of India would give credible information.

In the weakest work on evaluation, candidates simply stated what they had learnt from their sources but did not provide any evaluation of the quality or credibility of their sources.

A number of candidates did not attempt to evaluate any of their sources at all. As Evaluation carries one sixth of the total marks for the component, this has a considerable impact on their performance. All candidates should understand how to evaluate the credibility of their sources in order to assess the reliability of the information and evidence they take from them.

## 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.

*'As a student it was obvious to me that deforestation was a major issue. Yet, this report changed my perspective in multiple ways. Not only did I become aware of the importance of our forests in truly sustaining our biodiversity and mitigating climate change, for the first time I also became aware of the divergent views on reforestation and climate change. For example, scientists at NASA argue that while reforestation has a lot of potential as a climate mitigation tool, planting trees will never be a substitute for decreasing fossil fuel emissions.'*<sup>18</sup>

*Likewise another interesting observation from my research was that the location does matter. For e.g., research has indicated that while afforestation and reforestation policies are more likely to work in the tropics, the reverse was true in semi-arid areas where planting of more trees could actually help fuel global warming.'*<sup>19</sup> *Eventually the success of reforestation lies in how effectively we are able to manage these activities...The evidence generated has also helped me in answering my research question, on how reforestation, though not a complete, is a very effective solution to mitigating the harmful effects of global warming and climate change.'*



Some strong candidates reflected throughout and then drew their reflections together at the end coming to a logical and supported conclusion.

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

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

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

Candidates are required to write their report in essay form. Their argument should be planned and logical and follow a clear structure to answer their question. They should include all required criteria. They can write between 1500 and 2000 words, and they are advised to use the full word count.

The **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 by introducing and explaining the issue and focussed on the issue and question throughout. The candidate kept control of their argument and did not lose contact with their question, the central issue, or their research findings.

As in previous sessions, **weaker work** lacked focus. It tended to present general information making it difficult to follow any central argument. It sometimes included information that was not relevant to the question.

The **weakest work** often provided a series of seemingly copied sections unrelated to their question and not fulfilling the criteria for this component. Some work showed little evidence of any research. 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 identified the required criteria and presented them in separate paragraphs, or by using sub-headings. The **weakest work** showed little awareness of the requirements for this component. In this work candidates simply discussed their question without presenting any perspectives, causes and consequences. There was no clear issue and so no course of action with no reflection on their research findings or evaluation of sources. Some candidates simply presented information they had gained from primary and secondary research and did not process or discuss it at all.

#### **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 (retrieval date)**.

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

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education  
0457 Global Perspectives March 2024  
Principal Examiner Report for Teachers

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**

- Teams submit an Explanation and an Outcome. Individuals submit a Reflective Paper.
- The Explanation must detail the perspectives/aspects of the issue that will be researched, the team's aim, the activity that will take place, how the activity will be evidenced and how the team will gather information to help them to evaluate their achievement.
- The Outcome must be the means by which the Team met their aim, or the evidence of their activity.
- The Reflective Paper requires candidates to present their own research findings and cite their sources.
- Candidates must evaluate the Outcome as a means of meeting their aim, their own work processes towards the completion of the project and reflect on teamwork, their role in the team and their learning.
- Reflective Papers should evaluate the aspects of the Team Project (see below for details).
- All members of a team must be awarded the same mark for the team elements (Explanation and Outcome, and Collaboration)

## **General comments**

### **Team Projects**

The most successful projects involved a focus on an issue of local concern. Candidates chose a variety of issues on which to focus their projects. Some candidates focused on education e.g., raising awareness about how children can look after their health in order to avoid missing education. Some teams focused on raising awareness about social issues e.g., giving voice to children with impaired hearing about their community involvement. Other teams focused on climate issues e.g., the problem of local farmers and how families can engage with it.

Outcomes were varied and included reports in school magazines and the national press, leaflets, fundraising events and videos. Some who had made websites realised too late that these did not make it easy to gather evidence for evaluating the success in meeting their aim. It was clear that most candidates had freedom when deciding on an aim and when designing an Outcome. Locally important issues made research and activities easier to organise, and easier to give everyone in the team a specific role and responsibility.

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

### **Reflective Papers**

The most successful Reflective Papers were well organised according to the criteria found in the mark scheme: How far did the Outcome meet the team's aim? How effective were my working processes? How could the Outcome and my work processes have been improved? How effective was our team in completing the project? How well did I work as a team member? What have I learned about the issue, other people's perspectives on it, and my skills in project/teamwork? What were my research findings, in summary?

The most successful evaluations consistently used evidence/examples from the Team Project to explain strengths/benefits and weaknesses/challenges. Candidates should keep an ongoing reflective 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. They should note both what was a strength/benefit and what was a challenge/weakness, and what impact this had on the project/the Outcome.

### **Comments on specific parts of the component**

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

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

The Explanation is a planning document: it informs the reader about the Team's aims, plans for research into the issue and perspectives on it, and plans for an activity. It gives decisions about an Outcome that will be developed to inform others, and details of how the team will measure its success. If the aim is to raise awareness, it is clear about the audience for their event. The Explanation should not contain team members' research findings.

The Outcome gives evidence of the activity that has been developed to help the team to meet their aim. The Outcome is necessary to show that the project was completed, thus enabling the Reflective Paper to contain evidence. The Outcome must be fit for purpose. If it meant to raise awareness of an issue, then a presentation or a poster is appropriate. The Outcome should not be seen as the most important part of Team Project. It should not be a series of interviews joined together, as this is research.

#### **AO3 Collaboration**

Teachers must award a mark for how well the team have worked together to complete the project. All members of the team must be given the same mark and teachers should take into account how well team members have worked together over the course of the project, including how well they have communicated with each other, solved problems, resolved conflict and divided work fairly between the team. This mark should be informed by teacher observation of teamwork and questioning of team members individually and collectively. There should be no explanation on ICRC forms of how this mark was arrived at.

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

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

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

Candidates must ask themselves how far the Outcome helped them to achieve their aim. They must then use evidence to show how far the Outcome was successful in meeting their aim, and how far it failed to help them. The evidence that they have can be from a variety of sources. If the team is raising awareness about an issue:

- 1 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 Outcome could be improved to minimise these weaknesses.
- 2 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 Outcome were successful in meeting their aim, and where it had missed its mark.

Suggestions made about improving the Outcome should come from a weakness that was found in the analysis of the data.

An example of an evaluation where strengths and limitations of the Outcome are explained, and its impact on the team's aim is considered. It includes a suggested improvement. This is part of an evaluation on a project about poverty and inequality in urban areas:

*'Nowadays, information is starting to become more and more short form, this has its perks, but it also misses out on many details, leading to today's people not getting the full picture of many problems. For this reason, we decided to make a detailed, Informative Brochure that raised awareness of the unequal nature of neglected regions found in almost all cities by putting people in the perspective of residents in one of these regions. We chose a Brochure as it helps people understand most situations effectively and I believe this was a major strength of our outcome, it allowed us to communicate problems to people by putting them in the shoes of the people who suffered from those problems. We also made our Brochures as concise and easy to understand as possible so anyone can read them. However, one limitation of our outcome was its distribution, we used the classic approach of distribution, hard copies, which made providing the Brochure to*

*as many people as possible a struggle. It also became hard for others to share the Brochure as the only way was word of mouth. We could have eliminated this limitation by either sharing the Brochure on online communities and/or uploading it to a website as that would have allowed it to spread more easily and be more accessible.'*

### **Evaluating own Work Processes:**

Taking part in the team action and carrying out their own research gives candidates the clearest opportunities for evaluating their work processes. Candidates must ask themselves how far their own work processes helped in achieving the Outcome or the team's aim, and how far they held them back. The evidence they have can come from comments made by others e.g. teachers or teammates, or it can be from reflection.

Suggestions made about improving their own work processes should come from a weakness that was found in the analysis of the information.

An example of an evaluation where strengths and limitations of own work processes are explained, and their impact on the team's aim/the Outcome is considered:

*'My research task was to find out about the indigenous tribes of Tamil Nadu. I was really pleased at my ability to investigate this topic, finding IT short cuts that were new to me. I was particularly pleased to find a range of pictures that we used on our website. However, I found myself becoming interested in aspects of culture that had nothing to do with my task, and I had to rush in the end, and was not pleased that some of my work was cut and pasted from websites. I must remember in future that I am part of a team, and need to feel proud about my contribution to the Outcome, so that I do it well, and help us to meet our aim.'*

### **AO2 Reflection**

#### **Reflecting on Teamwork:**

The question candidates must ask is: How effectively did our team work to produce our Outcome or meet our aim? They must then use evidence to explain both the benefits and challenges of teamwork, reflecting on the impact on the team's aim or the Outcome. 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 back on how decisions were made, how much in line 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.

An example of a reflection on teamwork where benefits and challenges are explained, and their impact on the project about Human Rights is considered:

*'Working as a team was quite challenging for this project due to disagreements on decisions, improper communication, and unwilling team members. This made me work individually. For example, although Rohan and Ranvijay were responsible for uploading Instagram posts, I ended up uploading the first several posts. If we spent more time planning, we would have had a balanced work pressure. We only had a few group meetings to discuss because of disagreed time availabilities and absenteeism in class, so we ended up mainly texting each other. If other members had been more serious about working, we would have worked more efficiently, as mentioned earlier, improper communication led to me wasting time searching for organisations for donations.'*

*On the other hand, working as a team helped us divide our work according to our skills which saved time. For example, for the fundraiser, Rohan and Ranvijay planned it, Dhvani made posters, and I made QR codes using ME-QR. Working as a team allowed us to share ideas and methods that I wouldn't have thought of myself, such as spreading the survey by going into different classes in school.'*

#### **Reflecting on being a team member:**

Candidates must ask themselves how well they supported the team, and how far they were supported by the team.

The strengths of being a team member include giving support to the team. This can come from:

- listening to others, and helping develop others' ideas, as well as from contributing their own ideas

- supporting team members who are struggling with an aspect of their teamwork, or asking for help from others
- meeting deadlines so that the Outcome was ready to be tried out before a presentation event
- passing information to others about a part of your work that is just not possible to achieve.

Weaknesses in team members can include:

- taking control of the project and making an Outcome yourself
- ignoring the schedule of events and taking your time doing your task, holding up the finished product
- not offering ideas or helping to clarify the ideas of others
- not turning up to take your part in an event.

An example of a reflection on own role in the team where strengths and weaknesses are explained, and their impact on the project considered. No Level 4 work addressing this criterion was seen this series, so this example comes from a previous series:

*'I was made team leader because I am clever and everyone thought I could guide our team to success. I did my best by keeping good notes of meetings and making sure everyone's ideas were collected when we met. However, I am very busy with sport, and I did not put this project first in my mind. I delayed our meetings when they clashed with a match, and the result was that team members lost interest in their tasks. Our research fell behind and, as a result, our presentation was poor and had little of interest in it.'*

### **Learning about perspectives on the issue:**

Candidates should consider what they have learned from the research of team members as well as their own research. They should ask themselves what they have learned about the issue and about what others' perspectives on it are.

An example showing effective learning from team research:

*'Out of the surveys taken by our team and the people we talked to, I paid attention to one that provided an interesting perspective on these neglected regions<sup>1</sup>, we had a survey of very long-time homeowners and they seemed oddly positive compared to others we had surveyed. This presented an interesting perspective, many of the problems we explored about Wagholi were not problems for the people who had lived here for a very long time, and they just enjoyed the place, which leads me to believe that if you manage to make yourself content with what you have, nothing in the world can bother you.'*

### **Learning about the issue:**

*'I learnt that a vast amount of people are not familiar to the deaf community and in some cases don't even know much about sign language itself. For this reason, I think our aim was appropriate, and from the responses received, I am confident that we were able to advocate the information we learned through this experience. I also learnt about the government helping and paying for the deaf community under certain conditions. I think this should be advocated for more and more awareness could be spread about this, not just in the hearing community, but in the deaf community as well, so they are aware of what they are entitled to.'*

### **Learning about skills:**

Candidates should reflect on what they have learned about working in a team, or about working on a project. The skills they identify may not be new skills, but skills developed further or put to different use.

An example may be:

*'Upon reflecting on the project, I also saw an improvement in my problem-solving skills- the setbacks we faced forced me to streamline my thought process, and brainstorm to find solutions. I learned to note questions as I was working at the computer so that I did not forget them. I learned that what I had been taught about making a mind map was useful in real life. These both allowed me to reflect on what I was learning, and made me a more effective team member.'*

### AO3 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 about own work processes and which are about strengths and limitations of working as a team member.

Many candidates benefit from being offered a template with headings or questions on to guide their report. This has no impact on marks available.

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. For example:

*'For instance, in UAE and India, the factors were gender whereas in South Africa and the USA, the main factor was race. The cultural perspective I gathered was from South Africa through interviewing my family friend living there. Race is the main factor contributing to pay disparity in South Africa since any other race apart from white people is unfairly paid. My family friend also gave a personal testimony of herself where in 1987 when she first became a teacher she would receive 200 grands, whereas her white colleagues would receive about 450-500 thousand regardless of the same contribution of work. It took about 5-10 years of her being in the profession until the gap was closed. Many of her colleagues who were black South Africans earned less than the white South Africans' found out that the pay disparity in South Africa is quite less in recent years than how huge it used to be in earlier years. By doing secondary research and an Interview, I found out that UAE has made gender pay discrimination illegal to promote pay parity.'*