GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

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

Key messages

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

- Identify information and data relevant to an issue.
- Analyse sources to identify reasons and evidence.

Candidates would benefit from further guidance in:

- Describing the main elements of a perspective.
- Explaining the strengths and weaknesses of research and evidence.
- Explaining the reasons for a research design to test 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 November 2024, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Transport Systems. The impact of transport on the environment by pollution was the issue explored.

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

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be very good. Candidates understood the source material in the Insert Booklet very well. They were able to identify and analyse the main types of statement, evidence, and reasoning within sources, describing them clearly and accurately. Different perspectives were generally well understood and explained with some clarity.

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

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. Linking the method and source of evidence to the issue in the claim is vital to reach the higher levels of response.

Candidates generally recognised that opinions should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of opinion is generally not sufficient in responses to most questions. Whilst most candidates are using material from the sources to support their arguments, for example through summary or quotation, some would benefit from guidance on how to plan and organise an argument to support a claim or opinion. Careful planning of lines of argument and essay structure would help in this process. Evidence and reasons should be clearly and explicitly used to justify the argument clearly. Longer responses should be carefully structured.

CAMBRIDGE
International Education

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

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

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- Describe the main elements of a perspective.
- Explain the strengths and weaknesses of research and evidence.
- Explain the reasons for a research design to test a claim.
- 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 from Source 1 that the number of cities that monitor air pollution is 6000, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.

(b)   Almost all candidates were able to identify two advantages of using electric vehicles from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks. Most candidates identified not producing exhaust gas pollution and being less noisy.

(c)   Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying, and justifying which advantage of using electric vehicles was the most significant, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss not producing exhaust gas pollution and being less noisy.

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

- the number of people affected
- the effect of pollution on health and the environment
- employment opportunities and economic impact.

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

(d)   Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why the problems created by pollution from transport are an important local issue, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concept of 'local'.

The reasons given by candidates related mainly to those given within the Sources, including the impact of education on human rights, employment, economic development, crime, and health. There was some attempt to explain why these impacts were important to the government 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 assert personal opinion about transport pollution in general, or describe pollution, without reference to the 'local' element of the question.

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences of pollution taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'local' 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 the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'we need less polluting forms of transport for the future'.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- use of the television programme as evidence
- statistics and data were included as included
- use of rhetorical questions – appeal to emotion
- use of professional expertise in evidence and to support the claim
- use of photographic evidence
- suggests alternative transport and action.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- does not give specific information or citation for the television programme
- little information or citation about the expert
- lack of evidence to support the increase in cycling and walking
- appeals to emotion reduce confidence in the argument
- lack of balance
- little consideration of counterarguments.

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, 'cycling and walking are becoming more popular in cities'. 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 organisations in the local area. Surveys of local people about their changing use of different modes of transport 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. Police, local government transport officials and transport retailers 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.

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 an opinion from Bina's statement and explained that opinions are statements which are subjective points of view or beliefs which cannot be verified and may not be shared by others.

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

(ii) Most candidates were able to relate the identified fact to Ahram's argument that we should find less polluting ways to travel. However, this question was challenging for some candidates who did not evaluate the use of the fact as reasoning or evidence within the argument.

The most effective responses explained how the fact related to the argument and explained a strength and/or a weakness of the fact within 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 value judgement, bias, opinion, vested interest, claim and prediction.

(c) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, Bina's and Ahram's, and discussed issues relating to evidence, language, knowledge claims and expertise. Some candidates also addressed the reasons and values within each statement. Most candidates suggested that Ahram's statement was more convincing than Bina's statement.

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the value of each statement; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a 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 assess and recommend different proposed actions designed to reduce pollution in cities. 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 transport pollution.

Most candidates recommended encouraging more walking and cycling.

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 reducing transport pollution.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the option or pollution in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to reduce pollution rather than explaining why one method/action was likely to be more effective, have greater impact and other positive consequences, 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 and data relevant to an issue.
- Analyse sources to identify reasons and evidence.

Candidates would benefit from further guidance in:

- Describing the main elements of a perspective.
- Explaining the strengths and weaknesses of research and evidence.
- Explaining the reasons for a research design to test 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 November 2024, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Fuel and Energy. The impact of renewable energy projects on the environment was the issue explored.

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

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be good. Candidates understood the source material in the Insert Booklet 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 generally understood and explained.

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

Candidates should explain research designs and choice of research methods, explicitly relating their research strategy to the claim to be tested. Candidates should also explain how the research method will gather evidence that will enable them to test the claim or answer a research question. Linking the method and source of evidence to the issue in the claim is vital to reach the higher levels of response.

Candidates generally recognised that opinions should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of opinion is generally not sufficient in responses to most questions. Whilst most candidates are using some material from the sources as evidence to support their arguments, for example through summary or quotation, some would benefit from guidance on how to plan and organise an argument to support a claim or opinion. Careful planning of lines of argument and essay structure would help in this process. Evidence and reasons should be clearly and explicitly used to justify the argument clearly. Longer responses should be carefully structured.

CAMBRIDGE
International Education

© 2024

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

Most candidates showed real interest in the energy topic and discussed the issues with enthusiasm. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to increase the use of renewable energy sources. However, candidates should explain and assess the potential impact and consequences of the proposals in detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgement within the conclusion.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- Describe the main elements of a perspective.
- Explain the strengths and weaknesses of research and evidence.
- Explain the reasons for a research design to test a claim.
- 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 from Source 1 that the percentage of the total energy supply that comes from hydroelectric power in Norway was 45 per cent, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.

(b)   Almost all candidates were able to identify two advantages of hydroelectric power from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks. Most candidates identified being waste free without polluting emissions and clean drinking water.

(c)   Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying, and justifying which advantage of hydroelectric power was the most important, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss being waste free without polluting emissions and sustainability of energy supply.

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

- the number of people affected
- the effect on the environment, animal life and health of local people
- employment opportunities and economic impact.

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

(d)   Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why the development of hydroelectric power is an important local issue, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concept of 'local'.

The reasons given by candidates related mainly to those given within the Sources, including the impact of the development of hydroelectric power on sustainability, employment, economic development, the environment and health. There was some attempt to explain why these impacts were important at a local level.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to assert personal opinion about

hydroelectric or sustainable energy in general, without reference to the 'local' element of the question.

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences of hydroelectric power taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'local' 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 the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'using renewable energy has improved his business'.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- uses personal experience as evidence
- has ability to know
- gives examples to illustrate points
- passionate and enthusiastic tone
- refers to research evidence.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- lacks details on experience and where business is
- only one business therefore a small sample and may not be representative
- no statistical details or data about costs or bills – assertion
- generalises about jobs
- appeals to emotion reduces confidence in the argument
- lack of balance and little consideration of counterarguments
- potential for bias due to vested interest.

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, 'employees are happier in a sustainable workplace'. 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 organisations in the local area. Surveys of local workers and the general public about their experience of sustainable workplaces and preferences 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. Business leaders and managers, local government officials and trade unions were also mentioned by some candidates.

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.

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 Paolo's statemen 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) Most candidates were able to identify aspects of bias in Adriana's statement. These candidates showed understanding of bias as a tendency or prejudice for or against something, or an unbalanced approach to an issue, and being not prepared to consider counter arguments or other points of view.

Most candidates explained that Adriana's experience of living in the area near the proposed hydroelectric dam and her vested interest may influence her viewpoint about the project, shape her perspective on employment opportunities and the environment locally, and encourage her not to consider other perspectives.

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

- Unbalanced argument – very little consideration of other perspectives or counterarguments.
- Use of exaggerated language and phrases e.g. 'The dam will be a disaster for us!'.
- Only referring to negative aspects of the project.
- Not much evidence.
- Mainly opinion.

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates about bias 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, vested interest, claim and opinion.

(c) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, Paolo's and Adriana'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 assess and recommend different proposed actions designed to increase the use of renewable energy sources. 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 the use of renewable energy.

Most candidates recommended building more renewable energy sources.

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 increasing use of renewable energy sources.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the option or renewable energy in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to increase renewable energy usage rather than explaining why one method/action was likely to be more effective, have greater impact and other positive consequences, 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 and data relevant to an issue.
- Analyse sources to identify reasons and evidence.

Candidates would benefit from further guidance in:

- Describing the main elements of a perspective.
- Explaining the strengths and weaknesses of research and evidence.
- Explaining the reasons for a research design to test 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 November 2024, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Migration. The changing pattern of migration was the issue explored.

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

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be good. Candidates understood the source material in the Insert Booklet 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 generally understood and explained.

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

Candidates should explain research designs and choice of research methods, explicitly relating their research strategy to the claim to be tested. Candidates should also explain how the research method will gather evidence that will enable them to test the claim or answer a research question. Linking the method and source of evidence to the issue in the claim is vital to reach the higher levels of response.

Candidates generally recognised that opinions should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of opinion is generally not sufficient in responses to most questions. Whilst most candidates are using some material from the sources as evidence to support their arguments, for example through summary or quotation, some would benefit from guidance on how to plan and organise an argument to support a claim or opinion. Careful planning of lines of argument and essay structure would help in this process. Evidence and reasons should be clearly and explicitly used to justify the argument clearly. Longer responses should be carefully structured.

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

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

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- Describe the main elements of a perspective.
- Explain the strengths and weaknesses of research and evidence.
- Explain the reasons for a research design to test a claim.
- 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 from Source 1 that the trend in the number of migrants worldwide was increasing, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.

(b)   Almost all candidates were able to identify two advantages of global migration from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks. Most candidates identified filling labour shortages, cultural diversity and money being sent home by migrants.

(c)   Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying, and justifying which advantage of global migration was the most important, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss filling labour shortages, cultural diversity and money being sent home by migrants.

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

- the number of people affected
- the effect on the economy at home and abroad
- employment opportunities
- multiple positive consequences for migrants and their families in relation to lifestyle and life chances.

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

(d)   Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain why migration is an important national issue, thereby demonstrating a clear understanding of the concept of 'national'.

The reasons given by candidates related mainly to those given within the Sources, including the impact of migration on sustainability, employment, economic development, the environment, and local amenities and social services. 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 assert personal opinion about migration in general, without reference to the 'national' element of the question.

Some candidates simply listed a range of consequences of migration taken directly from the sources without any explanation or linking to the 'national' 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 the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'migration is changing'.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- uses expert testimony as evidence
- clear structure
- gives examples to illustrate points
- reasonable tone
- refers to research evidence and examples.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- incomplete citation that leaves evidence uncheckable
- no statistical details or data about migration to show extent of issue
- generalises which creates inaccuracy
- some assertion
- appeals to emotion reduces confidence in the argument.

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, 'migrants bring economic benefits to their host country'. 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 organisations in the local area. National surveys of local people and the general public about their experience of migration 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. Business leaders and managers, local government officials and immigration authorities were also mentioned by some candidates.

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.

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 an opinion from Harry's statement and could explain why the statement was an opinion. An opinion is a subjective point of view or beliefs which cannot be verified, and may not be shared by others.

(b) Most candidates correctly identified a prediction from Erin's statemen and could explain why the statement was a prediction. A prediction is a statement suggesting something is likely to happen in the future.

(c) Most candidates were able to identify aspects of bias in Erin's statement. These candidates showed understanding of bias as a tendency or prejudice for or against something, or an unbalanced approach to an issue, and being not prepared to consider counter arguments or other points of view.

Most candidates explained that Erin's experience of living in a small community impacted by migration and her vested interest in maintaining access to education, health care and employment opportunities may influence her viewpoint about migration and encourage her to be negative, unbalanced and not to consider other perspectives.

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

- unbalanced argument – little consideration of other perspectives or counterarguments
- use of exaggerated/emotive language and phrases e.g. 'Politicians around the world' …; and 'More and more migrants …'
- only referring to negative aspects of the project
- mainly opinion that provides weak evidence and may be challenged by others
- some assertion without evidence to justify.

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates about bias 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, vested interest and opinion.

(d) Most candidates compared both statements explicitly, Harry's and Erin'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 assess and recommend different proposed actions to a government designed to encourage migrants to come and work in their country. 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 the use of renewable energy.

Most candidates recommended giving financial support for businesses to employ migrants, mainly discussing the benefits to the economy, the businesses and migrants.

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 encouraging migration for work.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the option or migration in general. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to increase migration rather than explaining why one method/action was likely to be more effective, have greater impact and other positive consequences, and should therefore be recommended.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

| Paper 0457/02 |
| Individual Report |

Key messages

- Candidates should formulate a question that focusses on **one global issue.**
- The candidate's response must present **different perspectives** on their chosen issue.
- Candidates should analyse the **causes and consequences** of their chosen issue.
- Candidates should **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 focused 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.

Clear, 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:
- *Is AI beneficial for education?*
- *Is it ethical to continue the development of AI technology?*
- *Should capital punishment be abolished?*
- *Can fast fashion be truly sustainable?*
- *Does foreign aid help or hinder the development of countries?*
- *Is the gender pay gap in sports justified?*
- *Should transgender people be allowed to compete in sports in their preferred gender category?*

Some candidates formulated work without a clear research question, where there was no identifiable issue 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. the perfume industry, but did not explain why there might be a problem.

There were several 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 because 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:

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

Similarly, **a national perspective** is a national viewpoint on the issue presented, or an opinion/feeling about/attitude to the national situation. 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:

'…As of 2012, 41 per cent of Uruguayans believed that elders should be taken care of by their families and only 26 per cent believed that support must be provided by relatives with State support. In 2015, Uruguay declared care a human right and implemented a national integrated care system aiming to help elders build healthy emotional attachments… '

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

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.

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

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. Candidates should consider why their evaluation is relevant and explain how they come to a conclusion about their source and what the impact is on the evidence, perspective or the candidate's view.

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

Some 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.

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. Candidates at this level have clearly done some research, but they write very general essays without providing evidence of the specific skills required for Global Perspectives Individual Report.

Some candidates simply present information they have gained from primary and secondary research and do not process or discuss it at all. Some candidates only present their own opinion on a general issue with no evidence of research or others' perspectives.

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 plagiarism. Where candidates 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.

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.

Please note that there is no requirement for the candidate to evaluate their own work or to suggest possible improvements for future research. As the candidates have only 2000 words to cover a wide range of criteria in some depth, this should be discouraged. There is no credit for self-evaluation, describing skills learnt, or for outlining further research.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/03
Team Project

Key messages

- Teachers are encouraged to steer candidates away from topics/issues that could be sensitive locally.
- Teams need to identify an aim that can be met e.g. raising awareness about the issue.
- The outcome should demonstrate how the Team met their aim.
- The Reflective Paper requires candidates to present their own research findings and cite their sources.
- Candidates should use examples from their team project when they are reflecting on the strengths, weaknesses, benefits and challenges of the different aspects of the marking criteria.
- All members of a team must be awarded the same mark for the team elements (Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration).

General comments

Team Projects:

The most successful projects involved a focus on an issue of local concern and changing the behaviour or perception of others in relation to the issue. Candidates chose a variety of issues on which to focus their projects. Under the topic of *disease and health*, some teams focused on raising awareness about mental health issues.

Outcomes were varied and included school assemblies, fundraising events, leaflets and posters. Some teams 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. Those who handled this most successfully used the process of adapting their plans as part of their evaluation.

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, or perspectives in different parts of the world on the issue. The evaluations of these team projects sometimes made it clear that candidates had been but little involved in choice of topic or team members.

Some Team Projects for this November series showed an Explanation that fit the new 2025 syllabus requirements for Explanation of Research and Planning. These tended to be organised thus:

Teams stated a topic they want to focus on, and the **local issue** they wished to improve.

Which aspect of the issue each team member researched: perspectives on it, what other places/people were doing about that issue. In the Explanation of Research and Planning teams said what they had found from research that explains the value of their Action.

After discussing research findings, teams gave some reflection on this learning about an Action and how it helped with the local issue. They gave detailed planning of that Action, including individual roles and responsibilities. They described how they planned to gather evidence about how successful they have been. After the Action was completed, candidates recorded any changes that had to be made.

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 their reflections and evaluations of the different criteria.

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

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 the beginning of an Explanation of Research and Planning:

'In this project, our goal is to let more people know the benefits of exercise and encourage them to exercise. In today's society, electronic products have become one of the indispensable necessities for people, thus causing them to ignore the daily needs of the real world and keep themselves healthy. So we hope that more people will take up more exercise. In this project, we chose to use PPT to make it happen.'

The Team has learned from research into perspectives and the issue. The aim is clear. The Outcome gives evidence of the activity that has been developed to help the team to meet their aim. The Outcome must be fit for purpose. If it meant to raise awareness of an issue, then a presentation or a poster is appropriate.

This team goes on to give details of the plan.

'The team's plan is that D will provide evidence of perspectives from interviews and photographs of activities, while B who is good with tech will turn it into an appealing PP. D has to have completed his work by the 14th so that B can have the PP ready for a trial run by the 21st. L getting approval for us to present to our year, and he is organising the room. We need the smart board and microphone.'.

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.

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

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. 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.

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 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 had been well organized and worked together well, but actually done too much research and had to cut our findings down. This was difficult as we had the pressure of finishing all this by the deadline. We had a meeting and made another plan, for how to finish this and any other tasks on time. Everyone in the team actively participated and we soon made great progress. We would not have finished this task on time if we did not unite. None of us had taken of the role of leader, we were all equals, and all wanted to complete a successful project. Everyone participated equally. But sometimes this meant things like planning meetings took longer as everyone had their voice and was equally heard, and it could be difficult to reach decisions and conclusions. It made us slow at times and less efficient.'

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.

AO3 Communication

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:

'From my own research, sports around the world vary in importance. Some countries like China and Japan do not prioritize sports but more on academic education. While most of the western countries see the importance of a healthy body and healthy mind, some focus on sports like the USA. Many people in the USA prefer to do sports over their education and as they want to follow their passion. They can get into university on sports scholarships. While China and Japan prefer to mainly focus on the education that boosts economic activity such as business, science, engineering and ICT. I believe however there should be a balance between sports and education as sports benefits your physical health and helps your mind to work effectively.'

'From my team's research findings, there are different perspectives on the issue, and these did change what we were planning on saying. It seems that gym workouts are becoming unpopular because they can damage some muscle groups while not strengthening others. We were careful to only showcase exercise that had small, repetitive activities to prevent this. Another thing we learned was that it is not always the children who do not like sport, but they are made to do extra study at home and they have no time left to enjoy sport. Out presentation was planned to be telling people off for being lazy, but this made us change our approach so that we could show how you can do small exercises while you are working.'

Notice how this candidate has used learning and research findings to develop the project.

This assessment objective requires reflective reports to flow meaningfully with signposting and linking to make clear the aspects of the criteria being evaluated or reflected upon, their benefits/strengths and challenges/weaknesses/limitations. For instance, it should not be difficult to follow which paragraphs are evaluating the Action and which are reflecting on the candidate's role in the project.

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

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