GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

> **Paper 0457/11**
> **Written Paper**

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.
- Assess the significance of causes and consequences of global issues.
- Analyse sources to identify predictions and facts in arguments.

General comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In June 2024, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Employment. Gender inequality in work was the specific issue explored.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement have become very good. 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 them with the viewpoints of other people and groups.

Candidates analysed and interpreted the source material with confidence. 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 usually well understood and explained carefully.

Candidates generally recognised that perspectives and judgements should be supported with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of opinion is generally not sufficient in response 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 candidate's argument and used to support the argument clearly. Responses should be planned and carefully structured.

Most candidates were able to identify potential strengths and weaknesses of sources, including the evidence and reasons to support a claim or argument. However, fewer candidates were able to explain the significance of the strengths and weaknesses for the claim or argument. When evaluating a source, candidates should explicitly explain the significance or impact of the identified strength or weakness to the argument. In addition, candidates should explain research designs and choice of research methods, explicitly and frequently 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.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- Explain strengths and weaknesses of sources and arguments in more detail.
- Plan and organise reasons and evidence with a clear structure to address the issue in the question.

CAMBRIDGE
International Education

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a)   Nearly all candidates correctly identified the trend in women working in paid employment as increasing from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.

(b)   Nearly all candidates were able to identify two reasons for gender inequality at work from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks. Most candidates identified caring for children and family, pregnancy and childbirth, educational opportunities, and cultural attitudes.

(c)   Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying and justifying which reason for gender inequality at work they thought was the most significant. Most candidates chose to discuss caring for children, cultural attitudes and educational opportunities The most common justifications given by candidates related to issues of impact, including:

- the number of people affected
- the effect of multiple consequences
- the effect of cultural attitudes and education on life chances and the future prosperity of people
- employment opportunities and the role of men in appointments and access to work.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why the chosen reason was more important than others and gave some evidence to support their judgements. Weaker responses often simply stated the reason without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion without careful explanation.

(d)   Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why gender inequality at work is a significant issue for employers.

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

- ethical responses to gender inequality
- influences efficiency and profitability
- loss of female strengths to businesses
- prevention of women from getting work
- reduces access to skilled workers for employers
- enables businesses to find more customers
- provides new business opportunities.

There was usually some attempt to explain why these impacts were important to employers.

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 inequality at work in general without reference to employers.

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences of gender inequality taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'employer' context. This type of response only reached the lower levels of response within the mark scheme.

Question 2

(a)   Most candidates were able to evaluate Source 3 and identify several strengths and weaknesses in the argument that, 'we need more women in management.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- uses various pieces of relevant research as evidence
- the author has ability to know
- describes benefits of women in management as examples
- clear and logical argument
- uses statistical evidence.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- evidence may not relate to all countries
- much assertion
- little citation and referencing
- does not discuss counterarguments
- unbalanced focus on women.

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

Some weaker responses simply identified the reasons and evidence within the source that might be a strength or weakness but did not 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 analysis and evaluation, thereby using the material in the source as evidence to support their views. 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, 'women leaders are often better than men at encouraging teamwork.' 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 sectors of work and employers. Surveys of local people about gender differences in management 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. Chief executives, business leaders and managers were often mentioned.

Many candidates suggested experiments, sometimes psychological, to compare the differences between male and female leaders in supporting teamwork in carefully designed and controlled tasks.

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

Question 3

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

(b)(i) Most candidates correctly identified a fact from Koa's statement and explained that facts are something which is true, correct, accurate or can be proven/verified.

(ii) Most candidates were able to relate the identified fact to Koa's argument that women can help themselves to become more successful at work. However, this question was challenging for some candidates who did not evaluate the use of the fact as reasoning or evidence to support the argument.

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

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

(c) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, Mia's and Koa'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.

Candidates should be encouraged to refer to the issue in the question frequently in their responses, relating their argument to the discussion of which argument is the most convincing.

Some responses included a description of many different parts of both arguments in the source and simply identified or listed those aspects that might be a strength or weakness. However, the reason or explanation for these aspects of the statement being a strength or weakness was not given. This meant that the evaluative point was not developed or explained and was simply asserted. The impact upon the credibility or relative strength of each argument was only asserted or even omitted. This approach did not reach higher levels of response and gain many marks.

Responses that described in detail just two or three strengths and/or weaknesses of each person in the source, explaining carefully how they affected credibility or reliability, and how convincing their argument was, reached higher levels of response.

An example of a weaker or asserted evaluative point is, *'Mia's argument is supported by lots of examples which is a strength, for instance businesses should provide free childcare in the workplace.'* Whilst the evaluative point is appropriate and is supported by material quoted from the source, it is not explained or related to the question about which argument in the source is the most convincing. This response does not explain why examples are a strength and therefore make the argument more convincing.

An example of a strong, developed evaluative point is, *'Mia's argument is supported by lots of examples which is a strength, for instance businesses should provide free childcare in the workplace. This is a strength because examples help the reader to understand the argument and make it clearer. The example is also evidence that supports the reason being given by Mia for inequality being a good thing. Therefore, the use of examples in Mia's argument makes it more convincing than Koa's argument.'* This evaluative point is developed, explains its strength, and why it increases confidence in the argument.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to assess and recommend different proposed actions designed to increase gender equality in employment. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

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

However, some candidates tended to describe their opinions in a generalised and asserted way, comparing each action without exploring the potential impact on gender inequality.

Most candidates recommended introducing laws to protect the rights of women workers.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the proposed actions. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses explicitly and frequently linked the argument back to the issue of increasing gender equality and the recommended action.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the recommended action or gender inequality at work in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to increase equality rather than explaining why one of the proposed actions was more likely to have greater impact and be successful at achieving the desired aim and should therefore be recommended.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/12
Written Paper

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.
- Assess the significance of causes and consequences of global issues.
- Analyse sources to identify predictions and facts in arguments.

General comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In June 2024, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Employment. The impact of digital labour platforms on work was the specific issue explored.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement have become very good. 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 them with the viewpoints of other people and groups.

Candidates analysed and interpreted the source material with confidence. 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 usually well understood and explained carefully.

Candidates generally recognised that perspectives and judgements should be supported with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of opinion is generally not sufficient in response 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 candidate's argument and used to support the argument clearly. Responses should be planned and carefully structured.

Most candidates were able to identify potential strengths and weaknesses of sources, including the evidence and reasons to support a claim or argument. However, fewer candidates were able to explain the significance of the strengths and weaknesses for the claim or argument. When evaluating a source, candidates should explicitly explain the significance or impact of the identified strength or weakness to the argument. In addition, candidates should explain research designs and choice of research methods, explicitly and frequently 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.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- Explain strengths and weaknesses of sources and arguments in more detail.
- Plan and organise reasons and evidence with a clear structure to address the issue in the question.

CAMBRIDGE
International Education

© 2024

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a)   Nearly all candidates correctly identified the meaning of digital labour platform from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.

(b)   Nearly all candidates were able to identify two types of work that use digital labour platforms, from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks. Most candidates identified plumbing, taxi driving and food delivery.

(c)   Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying and justifying which benefit of digital labour platforms they thought was the most significant. Most candidates chose to discuss the new job opportunities locally and internationally, flexible working and enabling businesses to find more customers. The most common justifications given by candidates related to issues of impact, including:

- the number of people affected
- the effect of multiple consequences
- the effect on life chances and standard of living
- increasing flexibility in working patterns to enhance well-being.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why the chosen reason was more important than others and gave some evidence to support their judgements. Weaker responses often simply stated the reason without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion without careful explanation.

(d)   Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why digital labour platforms are a significant issue for workers.

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

- creates more competition between workers
- creates stress and pressure at work
- uncertainty about availability of work
- makes the allocation and completion of tasks quicker and easier
- creates new job opportunities locally and internationally
- helps women, young people, and those with disabilities to get work.

There was usually some attempt to explain why these consequences or impacts were important to workers.

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 the gig economy in general without reference to workers.

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences of digital labour platforms taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'worker' context. This type of response only reached the lower levels of response within the mark scheme.

Question 2

(a)   Most candidates were able to evaluate Source 3 and identify several strengths and weaknesses in the argument that, 'working in the gig economy is difficult!'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- the author has ability to know
- refers to personal experience
- clear and logical argument
- uses some relevant examples
- recent and up-to-date testimony

- appeal to emotion.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- evidence may not relate to all countries
- much assertion
- little research evidence or statistical evidence
- little citation and referencing
- does not discuss counterarguments
- some exaggeration
- small sample.

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

Some weaker responses simply identified the reasons and evidence within the source that might be a strength or weakness but did not 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 analysis and evaluation, thereby using the material in the source as evidence to support their views. This means quoting from or summarising relevant parts of the source.

(b) Candidates that performed well in this question described several methods, sources of information and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, 'our pay is going down.' 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 sectors of the gig economy. Surveys of local people about income, costs and prices 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. Workers, trade unions, business leaders and managers were often mentioned.

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

Question 3

(a) Most candidates correctly identified a fact from Saga's statement and most candidates could explain why the statement was a fact. A fact is a statement that is true, correct, accurate or can be proven/verified.

(b)(i) Nearly all candidates correctly identified an opinion from Nil's statement.

(ii) Most candidates were able to relate the identified opinion to Nil's argument that new technology causes many problems for workers. However, this question was challenging for some candidates who did not evaluate the use of the opinion as reasoning or evidence to support the argument.

The most effective responses explained how well the opinion related to the argument and explained a strength and/or a weakness of the opinion for this argument.

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

(c) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, Saga's and Nil'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 of the arguments at the lowest levels of response.

Candidates should be encouraged to refer to the issue in the question frequently in their responses, relating their argument to the discussion of which argument is the most convincing.

Some responses included a description of many different parts of both arguments in the source and simply identified or listed those aspects that might be a strength or weakness. However, the reason or explanation for these aspects of the statement being a strength or weakness was not given. This meant that the evaluative point was not developed or explained and was simply asserted. The impact upon the credibility or relative strength of each argument was only asserted or even omitted. This approach did not reach higher levels of response and gain many marks.

Responses that described in detail just two or three strengths and/or weaknesses of each person in the source, explaining carefully how they affected credibility or reliability, and how convincing their argument was, reached higher levels of response.

An example of a weaker or asserted evaluative point is, '*Nil's argument is supported by lots of examples which is a strength, for instance gig economy workers do not get a national minimum wage, paid holidays or sick pay.*' Whilst the evaluative point is appropriate and is supported by material quoted from the source, it is not explained or related to the question about which argument in the source is the most convincing. This response does not explain why examples are a strength and therefore make the argument more convincing.

An example of a strong, developed evaluative point is, '*Nil's argument is supported by lots of examples which is a strength, for instance gig economy workers do not get a national minimum wage, paid holidays or sick pay. This is a strength because the examples help the reader to understand the argument and make it clearer. The example is also evidence that supports the reason being given by Nils for the gig economy being a cause of problems. Therefore, the use of examples in Nils argument makes it more convincing than Saga's argument.*' This evaluative point is developed, explains its strength, and why it increases confidence in Nil's argument.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to assess and recommend different proposed actions designed to improve the working conditions of gig economy workers. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

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

However, some candidates tended to describe their opinions in a generalised and asserted way, comparing each action without exploring the potential impact on working conditions.

Most candidates recommended introducing laws to protect the rights of gig economy workers.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the proposed actions. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses explicitly and frequently linked the argument back to the issue of improving working conditions and the recommended action.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the recommended action or working conditions in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to improve working conditions, or described the gig economy and its problems, rather than explaining why one of the proposed actions was more likely to have greater impact and be successful at achieving the desired aim and should therefore be recommended.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

> **Paper 0457/13**
> **Written Paper**

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.
- Assess the significance of causes and consequences of global issues.
- Analyse sources to identify predictions and facts in arguments.

General comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In June 2024, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Law and Criminality. The impact of prisons on criminality was the specific issue explored.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement have become very good. 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 them with the viewpoints of other people and groups.

Candidates analysed and interpreted the source material with confidence. 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 usually well understood and explained carefully.

Candidates generally recognised that perspectives and judgements should be supported with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of opinion is generally not sufficient in response 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 candidate's argument and used to support the argument clearly. Responses should be planned and carefully structured.

Most candidates were able to identify potential strengths and weaknesses of sources, including the evidence and reasons to support a claim or argument. However, fewer candidates were able to explain the significance of the strengths and weaknesses for the claim or argument. When evaluating a source, candidates should explicitly explain the significance or impact of the identified strength or weakness to the argument. In addition, candidates should explain research designs and choice of research methods, explicitly and frequently 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.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- Explain strengths and weaknesses of sources and arguments in more detail.
- Plan and organise reasons and evidence with a clear structure to address the issue in the question.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified the purpose of a prison from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.

(b)(i) Nearly all candidates were able to identify the prison population rate in Finland as 50 per 100 000, from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.

(ii) Nearly all candidates were able to identify the USA as the country with the highest prison population rate from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.

(c) Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying and justifying which reason for imprisonment they thought was the most important. Most candidates chose to discuss the protection of the public, punishment and deterrence. Some candidates discussed helping criminals to become better citizens. The most common justifications given by candidates related to issues of impact, including:

- the number of people affected
- the effect of multiple consequences
- effect on life chances and standard of living of both criminals and the public
- impact on safety for society
- chances of rehabilitation and employment for criminals.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why the chosen reason was more important than others and gave some evidence to support their judgements. Weaker responses often simply stated the reason without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion without careful explanation.

(d) Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why prisons are a significant issue for governments.

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

- the cost to governments and people in taxes
- protect citizens from harm
- ensure justice in society
- to prevent crime
- to keep peaceful, secure relationships in the community
- help criminals to learn skills and get jobs
- promote rehabilitation of offenders
- to enhance the reputation of governments.

There was usually some attempt to explain why these impacts were important to governments.

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 the prisons in general without reference to the government.

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences of prisons taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'government' context. This type of response only reached the lower levels of response within the mark scheme.

Question 2

(a) Most candidates were able to evaluate Source 3 and identify several strengths and weaknesses in the argument that, 'we need more police and prisons.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- the author has ability to know

- refers to personal experience of the local police officer
- clear and logical argument
- uses some relevant examples
- recent and up-to-date testimony.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- evidence may not relate to all countries
- much assertion
- little citation and referencing
- little research evidence or statistical evidence
- evidence may be out-of-date
- does not discuss counterarguments
- some exaggeration
- potential newspaper or respondent bias.

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

Some weaker responses simply identified the reasons and evidence within the source that might be a strength or weakness but did not 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 analysis and evaluation, thereby using the material in the source as evidence to support their views. 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, 'religion has less influence on people.' 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 faith groups and religious organisations, or academics in sociology and psychology. Surveys of local people about involvement in religious practice like attendance in places of worship 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. Religious leaders were often mentioned.

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

Question 3

(a) Most candidates correctly identified a fact from Pedro's statement and most candidates could explain why the statement was a fact. A fact is a statement that is true, correct, accurate or can be proven/verified.

(b)(i) Most candidates correctly correctly identified an example of vested interest from Luna's statement. A vested interest is where an individual or group may benefit from a situation or argument, often financially; a strong personal interest in something because you could get an advantage from it.

(ii) Most candidates were able to relate the identified vested interest to Luna's argument that prisons need to be improved. However, this question was challenging for some candidates who did not evaluate the vested interest within the reasoning or as evidence to support the argument.

The most effective responses explained how well the vested interest related to the argument and explained a strength and/or a weakness of the vested interest for this argument.

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

(c) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, Pedro's and Luna'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 of the arguments at the lowest levels of response.

Candidates should be encouraged to refer to the issue in the question frequently in their responses, relating their argument to the discussion of which argument is the most convincing.

Some responses included a description of many different parts of both arguments in the source and simply identified or listed those aspects that might be a strength or weakness. However, the reason or explanation for these aspects of the statement being a strength or weakness was not given. This meant that the evaluative point was not developed or explained and was simply asserted. The impact upon the credibility or relative strength of each argument was only asserted or even omitted. This approach did not reach higher levels of response and gain many marks.

Responses that described in detail just two or three strengths and/or weaknesses of each person in the source, explaining carefully how they affected credibility or reliability, and how convincing their argument was, reached higher levels of response.

An example of a weaker or asserted evaluative point is, *'Pedro's argument is supported by lots of examples of the problems of prisons which is a strength, for instance prisons are schools for crime and human rights are denied.'* Whilst the evaluative point is appropriate and is supported by material quoted from the source, it is not explained or related to the question about which argument in the source is the most convincing. This response does not explain why examples are a strength and therefore make the argument more convincing.

An example of a strong, developed evaluative point is, *'Pedro's argument is supported by lots of examples of the problems of prisons which is a strength, for instance prisons are schools for crime and human rights are denied. This is a strength because the examples help the reader to understand the argument and make it clearer. The example is also evidence that supports the reason being given by Pedro that prisons do not work. Therefore, the use of examples in Pedro's argument makes it more convincing than Luna's argument.'* This evaluative point is developed, explains its strength, and why it increases confidence in Pedro's argument.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were asked to assess and recommend to a government actions designed to reduce crime. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

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

However, some candidates tended to describe their opinions in a generalised and asserted way, comparing each action without exploring the potential impact on crime rates.

Most candidates recommended improving prison conditions and training.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the proposed actions. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses explicitly and frequently linked the argument back to the issue of reducing crime and the recommended action.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the recommended action or crime and prisons in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to reduce crime, or described prisons and their problems, rather than explaining why one of the proposed actions was more likely to have greater impact and be successful at achieving the desired aim and should therefore be recommended.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

<div style="border:1px solid black">

Paper 0457/02
Individual Report

</div>

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.
- The Individual Report should be an **independent** piece of coursework.
- Teachers and candidates should keep in mind the distribution of marks through the mark scheme and ensure that the focus of different sections reflects this.

General Comment

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

Successful candidates analyse and explain the causes and consequences of the issue identified in their question. Successful candidates provide full details of their proposed course of action, including details of how the course of action would be implemented and the possible impact on the issue.

Stronger candidates reflect on their own perspective and how this has been impacted by their findings and by others' perspectives. They answer their question and remain focussed throughout on the central issue.

Some candidates formulated complex questions that caused them difficulty in controlling their work. These questions sometimes included more than one issue, leading to less depth and detail on each. Some candidates included a section of reflection on what they might do differently in future. Please note that is not required, attracts no credit, and uses up space that would be better used in developing other criteria.

Comments on specific Assessment Criteria

Assessment Objective 1: Research, Analysis and Evaluation:

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

Direct, issue-based questions allow candidates to be clear about their topic and issue, to focus on that throughout and to identify different views.

Successful questions this session included:

- *Should 12-year-olds be held criminally responsible for their actions?*
- *Is beekeeping ethical in the 21st century?*
- *Is it time for governments to forcibly limit screen time for teenagers?*
- *Does globalisation lead to economic downfall in industries worldwide?*
- *Has access to the internet desensitised society to violence and death?*
- *Are forest fires a major reason for the loss of important ecosystems?*
- *Can humans rely on AI for competent medical intervention and treatment?*
- *Can global deforestation be halted completely, or not?*

Some candidates formulated long and complicated questions, with several different embedded issues and areas of concern. This made their task of research and response much more difficult than it needed to be.

A surprising number of candidates did not identify an issue in their question. They asked general topic questions and then wrote about 2 or 3 different issues in their response. In many cases, these 'issues' could usefully have been presented as consequences of a central issue. There was a significant minority of candidates who did not address an issue at all in their response. The majority of these gave a description of e.g., trade and aid, but did not explain why there might be a problem.

There were 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.

Note: For 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 explicitly who, or which group of people has this perspective. In all cases, information should be presented to explain the perspective and support it.

Successful work included paraphrased and/or direct quotes showing a clear global perspective. **A global perspective** should be clearly identified as such and include an opinion:

Research question: Should 12-year-olds be held criminally responsible for their actions?

Publications by the UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC) have stated international agreements regarding an appropriate MACR (minimum age for criminal responsibility) …to protect the rights and interests of the child.[2] In 2007, the General Comment No 10 on Children's Rights in Juvenile Justice addressed the wide differences in MACR across different countries and encouraged countries to set theirs to 14–16 years of age or higher, in accordance with being 'internationally acceptable'.[3] Additionally, it gravely suggested that countries do not establish their MACR to any lower than 12 years old and set this age as an 'absolute minimum'.[4] The United Nations' perspective on the issue is inherently a global one, as its publications aim to be applied in all countries, as an international standard. This would mean that all countries' penal systems would ensure that all cases of children in conflict with the law will be treated according to the CRC's standard to ensure the protection of the child's rights and development.

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

Contrastingly some countries have opted to instead lower their MACR with the argument that some children are in fact aware of the further implications of their actions…

The MACR in Australia is 10 years of age, however, both legislation and many members of the population are against raising it.[10] It is argued that regardless of whether a child is aware of the wrongness of their actions, the victims of these crimes need to be accounted for, as they would not want their perpetrator's crimes to go unpunished.[11] ... Goldsworthy argues that raising the MACR in Australia would not have any real effect on crime rates, but rather, it would ensure individuals are not held accountable for their actions.[13] A parent in Australia states that if the MACR was set to 10 due to an increase in juvenile crime, it shouldn't be changed back and that most children are aware of their actions due to their early exposure to social media.[14] Both these statements heavily adhere to the principle of not letting criminals run free without repercussion.

Some work included a section labelled Global perspective in which views from different countries were presented. However, no global view was presented, and the different national views were not drawn together to form a global view. This work can only be credited as National perspectives.

Some **weaker work did not present different perspectives** on the issue, but instead presented information about different places. This was sometimes labelled as Global or National Perspective though there were no perspectives presented. In these cases, candidates described actions taken by a government, for example, or provided relevant statistics without 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, with no relevant information or evidence, meaning that the report read as an unresearched opinion piece.

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 of causes and consequences:

Most candidates explained the consequences of their chosen issue.
Where their issue was clear, they were able to discuss causes of the issue, explaining in some detail:

(teenage self-esteem issues related to Tik-Tok use)

Possible Causes: …. I have identified 2 main causes: inappropriate Tiktok trends and Tiktok algorithmic problems. Trends are a group of short videos that have similar features to each other (Jaudon 2022) While some trends can be harmless others are not….

Another trend is the #richflex which has 366 million views in total where people show off their goods that are expensive to most people. These types of trends can result in teenagers looking down upon themselves as others are doing better than them, making them feel incompetence. However, those trends' contents are far from reality as they do not represent a person's life accurately, as people can rent accessories for videos (Yurkevich,2023). This is supported by the study of CCDH (Joyner, 2022) as their studies show that over 60% of these content on Tiktok is not accurate or realistic. With the number of inappropriate videos recommended to teens, more and more teenagers will be exposed to the toxic contents, leading to more insecurities among teenagers.

Where candidates had not identified a global issue, or where they wrote descriptive essays, they found it difficult to identify or explain any causes or consequences.

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

Course(s) of Action:

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 of the course of action.

To effectively combat the exploitation of animals drive by economic gain, the government will implement measures to address the root causes within intensive farming and related industries. The main objective will be to shift economic incentives away from exploitative practices towards sustainable and ethical alternatives, thereby improving animal welfare and environmental sustainability.

First, government agencies will conduct economic analysis to identify drivers of animal exploitation in farming. Based on this analysis, they will develop frameworks to discourage harmful practices and promote sustainable alternatives. These frameworks may include penalties for unethical practices and incentives for welfare improvements. Additionally, a public awareness campaign will be launched to educate consumers on ethical consumption, aiming to raise awareness of the impact of their purchasing decisions. Collaboration with stakeholders will be crucial in establishing industry-wide standards and practices for ethical and sustainable production. Finally robust monitoring and enforcement mechanisms will be established to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements including regular inspection and penalties for non-compliance.

The Netherlands is a country highly likely to succeed with this plan due to its strong commitment to animal welfare and sustainable agriculture. The country already has regulations in place for animal welfare, and initiatives promoting sustainable farming practices are well-supported by both the government and the public. Additionally, the Netherlands has a history of successful collaboration between government agencies, NGOs, and industry stakeholders, which would facilitate the implementation of comprehensive regulations targeting industrial farming practices. Furthermore, the Dutch government has demonstrated leadership in environmental sustainability and is likely to prioritise measures to mitigate the environmental impact of industrial agriculture. Overall, the Netherlands is well-positioned to successfully implement and enforce legislation aimed at reducing animal exploitation and promoting ethical and sustainable farming practices.

Note: It is acceptable for candidates to consider courses of action that have been successful elsewhere and apply them to their own country.

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.

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:

Another notable source we need to take a look at is an article published by UNICEF in 2018 titled "Is social media bad for teens' mental health?" by Henry Fersko. UNICEF is an international organization founded by the United Nations that revolves around helping children. With that, not only are the articles the website provides reliable, but it also avoids any kind of political biases as the organization is international and not influenced by any countries. However, the fact that the article only generalized social media in general and not Tiktok can make the source slightly inaccurate as we cannot generalize Tiktok to be similar like other social media. Making some of the statements given in the article incorrect when it comes to Tiktok as a whole. But, despite the generalization in the article, I would still say UNICEF is a very reliable site to use in this report as they are a trustworthy organisation.

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.

Some candidates provide a generalised evaluation of their research, without any evaluation of individual sources.

In these cases candidates' comments are sometimes relevant but they are descriptive rather than evaluative; general and unexplained; and not specific to one source. It is not clear, for example, which sources were biased and which unbiased, how the candidate knows this and why it might matter.

A disappointing number of candidates did not attempt to evaluate any of their sources at all, or merely listed what information they had found in each source.

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 researching this topic, I always believed that an increase in carbon emissions would not affect me directly as I only thought of how burning fossil fuels would cause global warming. I have never felt the urgency to do anything due to a lack of information about the consequences of global warming. However, during my research, I slowly realised how severe and impactful global warming can be, which took a turn to

my perspective toward the consequences of carbon emissions. When researching the effects of global warming, I was shocked to realise how quickly cities would be submerged along with their unique culture and animals. I also sympathised with the people who lost their homes or their lives due to climate change and was horrified by the number of zeros in the death toll caused by natural disasters. Moreover, I did not know that an increase in carbon emission can severely pollute a country's air quality to the point where millions will die due to the impure air in the area.

Ultimately the additional information helped me to understand the perspectives of currently affected individuals, governments of cities, and presidents of countries regarding the problem of increased carbon emissions. After the research, I also started to recognise the urgency of this issue and feel the urge to support using renewable energy to save the environment. I have decided to……

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

Assessment Objective 3: Communication:

Structure 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.

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

Some of the work seen this session was well-structured and the strongest work was cohesive and logical.

The **strongest work** was easy to follow and provided a clear structured argument with an introduction outlining the global issue, 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 focussed 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 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 appeared to have copied and pasted sections from different sources, with no apparent connection between the different paragraphs or with the question or issue.

Some work was structured via headings perhaps based on a template. However, nothing below the headings was relevant. It appeared that these candidates simply did not understand what they had to do, or what the headings meant.

Some work showed little evidence of any research; the candidate simply wrote a general philosophical argument, or opinion piece. This was particularly common in essays on Belief Systems and the Family, where candidates started with their own point of view and, as in past sessions, wrote only about that.

Some work presented was clearly based on the requirements of some other subject. We saw some Sociology essays, Philosophy essays and others. This is an inappropriate approach as it leads to informative, descriptive essays and generally means that the requirements for a Global Perspectives essay at this level are not met. The structure and headings bear no relation to the skills criteria for this component.

Clarity of arguments, perspectives, and evidence:

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

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

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

Citation and referencing:

More candidates than in the past showed evidence of copy and paste of whole passages from their sources, or possible use of spinners and thesaurus apps. 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 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. Some work showed unacceptable involvement and comment from teachers.

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.

Note: 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 way by which the Team met their aim, or 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 and should not tell the story of the project nor repeat what is in the Explanation.
- 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 the problem of stress/pressure to achieve, or lack of sports facilities locally. Some teams focused on raising awareness about *health issues* e.g., how lack of family time makes it harder to connect. Other teams focused on *social issues* e.g. the problem of human rights and how schools can engage with it.

Outcomes were varied and included school year assemblies, leaflets, fundraising events and posters. 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 through which to evaluate their skills.

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), 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 role.

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 could keep an ongoing log of their own ways of working and their work as a part of the team and use these details to evidence their evaluations and reflections: examples do make a difference to marks available. They should note both what was a strength/benefit and what was a challenge/weakness, and what impact this had on the project/the Outcome.

Comments on specific questions

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.

An example of an Explanation:

'*While our school is well known for sports competence locally, a conversation with our teacher and a college principal informed us that there are very many children locally who love sport but have no facilities to develop their skills. This may be because of space, but mostly it is because of lack of equipment. We researched to find out if investment in sport at school level is worth it, both to children and to their schools. We split up our research, each taking one of India, Japan, S Africa, our school year group and local schools. We found a link between heathy minds and healthy bodies, enough to show that interest in sport should be encouraged. Our posters, showing different sports, were displayed while we held quizzes and competitions that our students paid to take part in. Interest was so great that we had to repeat the event several times.*'

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.

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 consider how well team members have worked together over the course of the project, including how well they have communicated with each other, solved problems, resolved conflict and divided work fairly between the team. This mark should be informed by teacher observation of teamwork and questioning of team members individually and collectively. There should be no explanation on ICRC forms of how this mark was arrived at.

Personal Element: *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 raining 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, its impact on the team's aim is considered, and an appropriate suggestion for improvement made:

'*I believe that our presentation was effective and kept most students entertained. We added a video from the UN to present more facts about the seriousness of the lack of human rights in xxxxx, as it was to the point, showed awful situations and added a dimension to our message. Most students reported being horrified but stated that this kept their attention as well as gaining their sympathy. However, we gave out our survey at the beginning of the session and asked the year group to complete it during the presentation. Some said that this distracted them from our message. Next time we must gain survey evidence before and after the presentation*'.

Evaluating my own Work Processes:

Taking part if the team action and carrying out their own research give 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 our team's aim, and how far they held them back from helping. 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 personal biggest strengths were having an assertive approach towards my teamwork. My creative abilities led me to take charge of all the visual aspects of the slideshow. I organised them made them presentable and visually appealing because I believe presentation makes a difference to the success of the Outcome i.e. others hearing our message. However, I can get caught up in this and it can take ages to be happy with my work. The reality was that I took time that we needed as a team to put together our words/ our script for the presentation. While my slide show might have been strong, our words were less so, and details we wanted to stress were lost in description. I must work with my team in future.*'

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 considered:

'*We were all looking forward to our Team Project. We were both friends in school and in sports teams. We were used to working together and thought this would be really easy. To begin with, we were right. Our meetings were lively discussions and even the online meetings were so engaging that we all turned up. We decided on an aim straight away- to promote fitness as a way of improving concentration. We could deliver fitness sessions after school. We would make them enjoyable and we would enjoy them too. That was before we had done our research. We all did different research, sharing out countries fairly. We showed each other our findings. We found that there was little find that engaged us – evidence was very scientific and not at all conclusive. That was when we began to disagree. Because we had not planned an aim and an activity properly, out project fell apart. Did it matter that we didn't have sound evidence? Could we just do posters advertising events? Some team members lost interest and said they would come back when we had a plan. Not being able to listen to each other and work together to find a solution finished out team off. We did an after- school run, but it was far from what we wanted it to be*'.

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:

1   listening to others, and helping develop others' ideas, as well as from contributing their own ideas
2   supporting team members who are struggling with an aspect of their teamwork, or asking for help from others
3   meeting deadlines so that the Outcome was ready to be tried out before a presentation event
4   passing information to others about a part of your work that is just not possible to achieve.

Weaknesses in team members can include:

1   taking control of the project and making an Outcome yourself
2   ignoring the schedule of events and taking your time doing your task, holding up the finished product
3   not offering ideas or helping to clarify the ideas of others
4   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:

'*I learned to work with people I do not know. One team member was quite shy, and the other was very outgoing. I was team leader and it fell to me to decide on roles. We discussed many ideas for our project, but I decided that we should do a presentation about healthy diet. My quiet team member could research and I could make the PowerPoint and my outgoing team member could present- everyone's strengths would be catered for. It was effective and our presentation was both useful and well received. However, when we met for a debrief and shared memories for our RPs, my teammates said they had learned no social skills at all during our work, and that taking part in a community service would have given us more to do and stretched our skills more. I have learned that I must not take the easy way out and should look for opportunities rather than solutions*'.

Learning about the issue and perspectives:

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:

I have learned that the problem some people have is not what you would think. My own research made me realise that the scarcity of domestic drinking water can be an engineering problem in places that have lots of water available. This dawned on me when xxxxx said how, in desert areas, putting slate across shallow channels made water condense overnight, providing very pure water for drinking. This could be done in such quantities that pipes could be laid to take it to a village tap. It was interesting that this could happen because there is public awareness and global support for solving his problem: not the case in Brazil. We must really find out before jumping to conclusions about people and their issues'.

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:

'*I am quite lazy. I took the easy way out when I said I would do leaflets and price lists for our afternoon tea party. That meant I had to sit at my laptop and be creative and send what I had done to the school office for printing. Actually, the task was bigger than that. I had to organise the hall, in case of poor air quality, as well as the lawns. I had to sort out tables and chairs. This meant co-ordinating with xxxxx about numbers and xxxxx about what we might be able to sell. I took on dealing with the contributions and takings, so sorting out cash boxes and organising the office to look after our takings, for safety. What I have found out about myself is that I am not lazy when I really want something, and I wanted this project to raise enough money to make*

a difference to local schools. I am able to think on my feet, to do what needs doing and I can do my part well to organise quite a big event'.

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 heading 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:

'*My research was about potable water scarcity in Brazil. Many industries there pollute the water, and some cultural practices also lead to heavy metal water pollution. In fact, water shortage was not the problem at all. There are plenty of rivers and tributaries of them in most areas. It was the water distribution system that limited the extent of households that could regularly access safe drinking water. Collecting water before it was polluted was difficult at a local level and not a priority at a national one. There was little enthusiasm for investing in local water delivery systems, except to large towns*.'

Administration

Where there is one teacher marking all the Team Projects, internal moderation should not be carried out. Where several teachers have marked work, then internal moderation should be carried out and the Centre's marks must not be submitted to Cambridge until final marks resulting from internal moderation have been confirmed. These new marks should be explained on the ICRC forms.