

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/01

Portfolio

General comments

Examiners are pleased to report that candidates produced portfolios covering a variety of topics from the sixteen defined areas of study in the syllabus: health and disease, trade and aid, water, education for all, biodiversity, law and criminality and belief systems.

Some Centres had clearly allowed their candidates to choose their own questions within an area of study, whilst in other Centres the process was clearly more prescribed. Examiners were pleased to see that the titles of the portfolios were more clearly focused, using a question that the candidate then went on to answer, rather than just a broad topic area. This more clearly focused approach makes it much more likely that a portfolio will be effective. If there is no question, there can be no focused answer.

Some Centres had covered a range of topics and candidates were given freedom of choice as to which they chose for their basic and extended studies, and it was very pleasing to see an individual response to the question or topic chosen. Identifying a question to be answered at the start of the topic enables candidates to structure their work more successfully, and any overlap across the four studies can be avoided.

Unfortunately, some candidates again went beyond the word count specified in the syllabus of 1000-1500 words each for the two basic studies and 1500-2000 words each for the two extended studies. Centres are asked to monitor this situation and advise candidates accordingly.

There was more of a variety of media successfully used to produce the portfolios and, where this occurred, candidates backed up their productions with explanatory notes and reflections, which were also used as evidence for assessing the portfolios.

Centres will appreciate that the work produced must reflect the assessment criteria and should be in continuous prose. Some candidates are providing numerous unrelated documents for a study without clearly identifying which study the documents are for. This makes moderation difficult. The syllabus sets out a clear structure that a portfolio should take, but explains that it is not necessary to use sub-headings. However, it would be fair to point out that, in general, candidates responded more successfully when they used sub-headings that were linked clearly to the assessment criteria.

Centres must submit the Coursework Summary Assessment Form, the MS1 and a fully completed Individual Candidate Record Form for each candidate. All files should be clearly labelled and Centres should check that the work can be easily accessed. Centres should also ensure that each study is clearly labelled with its title, whether it is a basic or extended study and clear identification as to which number study it is. All of this information also needs to be on the Individual Candidate Record Form, together with the marks awarded.

Teacher assessment

Overall it is pleasing to see that Centres are clearer about the assessment criteria and the difference between the bands. Where a study meets the assessment criteria fully, marks within Band 3 were awarded and where there is limited information for one of the criteria, candidates were given marks in Band 1. It is worth pointing out that it is very rare for a candidate who has produced a study to be given no marks for any of the criteria, as there is usually something of value that can be credited. Studies with a clear focus, e.g. a question that the candidate goes on to answer, were also more successful than those that had not identified the focus of the study but used a broad topic area.



Gather information representing different perspectives

The majority of candidates were able to gather and present more than a limited range of information linked to the area of study and this usually came from a range of sources. Candidates still need to be concise in presenting this information so that it does not take up a disproportionate amount of the word count.

Centres should advise candidates that, as well as mentioning other countries in their studies, they should also be considering the perspectives of individuals or groups related to the study. It is not enough for candidates to simply name countries, there should also be an indication of what these countries, groups and individuals think about the issue under investigation.

Analyse issues within the study

Candidates still tended to restrict their analysis to the descriptive style rather than being creative and casting a genuinely individual look at the issues raised. More successful studies covered fewer issues in depth rather than simply presenting the issues. To analyse an issue, candidates should consider the conditions related to the question being discussed and the possible causes of these conditions.

Identify and evaluate possible scenarios

Candidates generally included scenarios within their studies. However, these were largely scenarios that already existed and overall there was a lack of creative thinking about possible scenarios. Where candidates had thought about possible scenarios, they sometimes considered the impact of these scenarios, and were awarded marks for evaluation. Unfortunately, this was not a regular feature of the work moderated.

A meaningful question to be asked to identify possible scenarios could be, 'What would happen if?' Candidates then need to evaluate the likelihood of this and the possible consequences in order to be awarded marks for evaluation. By doing this, candidates can demonstrate that they have really gained a grasp of the chosen area of study.

Formulate possible courses of action

A wide range of marks were awarded for this within the extended studies. Those studies that were well structured mostly managed to come up with possible ways forward or solutions to the problems they had identified earlier in the study. It is important to point out that any proposals that are developed in a logical way will score better marks than those listed randomly at the end of a study because the candidate has run out of time or words or has not structured their study in such a way as to allow for possible courses of action to be formulated.

Develop evidence-based personal response demonstrating self-awareness

The evidence for this part of the assessment was either embedded within the study, or included as a separate section at the end of the study, which was regular practice. In this way candidates were able to fully engage with the study and there was meaningful personal involvement linked to the information gathered.

Candidates usually made reference to their life at home, in School or where they lived in relation to the study, sometimes identifying what they had not realised before they commenced working upon the study or something that they will be doing differently as a result of the work undertaken for the study.

The candidates' self-evaluation form for the portfolio was also taken into account. As such, when compiling the self-evaluation form, Centres are advised to guide candidates to complete the form with reference to the two extended studies.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02

Project

General comments

This examination session saw an interesting mix of topics drawn from the curriculum matrix, including trade and aid (loans v donations), climate change (global warming), disease and health (obesity), biodiversity and ecosystem loss (tourism v preservation) and urbanisation (water pollution due to rubbish disposal). This session also saw improvement in the quality of work submitted, in that more candidate groups specified concrete outcomes to their projects and some of these were active and dynamic outcomes which were highly appropriate to the nature of the work the candidates had been engaged in. Such outcomes often reflected the candidates' enthusiasm for and engagement with their projects, and this was particularly the case when the outcome was something which was intended to provide aid to the community, or raise awareness of an issue. Such projects also tended to be a reflection of the true intent and spirit of the Global Perspectives syllabus. Unfortunately, a disappointing number of candidates still treated their information gathering and research as outcomes in themselves. The result of this was a rather sterile group essay detailing everything the candidates had found out. This rarely allowed a candidate to demonstrate their skills.

Comments on candidate response to assessment criteria

Constructive participation in discussions [Group assessment] and Participation in group work/activities [Individual assessment]

More use was made of the form on CIE's Teacher Support website to record evidence gathered during observations of candidates in discussion and carrying out their work. This made it easier to award well-supported marks for these two criteria and is good assessment practice. It is important to use the full mark range as appropriate to discriminate between the performance of individual candidates and different candidate groups. Teachers are also reminded that the criterion "Constructive participation in discussions" carries a group mark and therefore all candidates in a group should receive the same mark for this criterion.

Project Plan [Group assessment]

Most candidate groups produced well-formulated plans, which often gave a detailed breakdown of the individual group members' responsibilities, as well as the expected timeframe for the various activities. For this reason, most plans scored well, although some did not score well because the aims were too vague or generalised, with no concrete outcome identified. Teachers are reminded that the "Project Plan" is marked on a group basis which means all candidates in that group should receive the same mark for this criterion.

Representation of different viewpoints and perspectives (including cross-cultural) [Group assessment]

The amount and quality of cross-cultural collaboration that took place during the course of projects varied considerably across Centres. Since they cater to an international candidate body, there are a number of Centres offering the Global Perspectives syllabus that have a diverse mix of candidates from very different cultural backgrounds. In some of these Centres, the candidates clearly felt that they need look no further than their own schoolmates for cross-cultural collaboration. This was a pity because while it is perfectly possible to obtain a variety of perspectives, including global, in such a situation, candidates who do so lose out on the opportunity to move out of their comfort zone and interact with others across the world. In their individual evaluation of their contribution to the project, candidates are required to give some consideration to what they have learned from cross-cultural collaboration. They will have a far wider fund of experience to draw on for this if they have not only collaborated with candidates from other countries in their own school, but also people living in other countries. It was heartening to find some Centres where candidates had established strong and very meaningful links with other 0457 candidates overseas, in one case with

candidates and local villagers in Thailand and in the other case with candidates in China and Finland. It is also important to remind candidates that information gathered through cross-cultural collaboration needs to be put to be used, not just obtained. Candidates need to consider what they have learned about their topic from people in other countries/cultures and then use what they have learned to draw conclusions and move their project forward. To score well here, the concrete outcome to the project that candidates come up with must “*demonstrate considerable awareness of different perspectives*”, which means that an issue needs to be considered from very different angles, depending on the viewpoints and needs of all the people it affects positively and negatively. The outcome must also “*show clear understanding and appreciation of different viewpoint(s) from other culture(s)*”, which means that candidates need to go further than just identifying or explaining the situation or issue in other cultures as compared with their own. Teachers are reminded that “Representation of different viewpoints and perspectives (including cross-cultural)” is marked on a group basis – which means all candidates in a group should be awarded the same mark for this criterion.

Evaluation of Project Outcome [Individual assessment]

As stated above, it was pleasing to find more candidates identifying concrete outcomes to their projects that were both meaningful and active. For instance, one group produced a television advertisement (in the form of a video clip) urging people not to pollute the water supply. As part of their advertisement, the group had also written a song that took its inspiration from a popular song. Another group produced a video clip of their investigations into ecosystem loss in their country, with the clip aiming to raise awareness of the problems among junior pupils in their school. A third group produced a highly informative website on aspects of water conservation as their outcome, while another had as their outcome an ‘Awareness Day’ on the problem of obesity and the importance of healthy eating, inspired by the work of a TV chef. It is important to emphasise that where groups identified concrete outcomes such as these, the candidates generally tended to produce successful individual submissions in which they were able to do full justice to their ability in evaluating those concrete outcomes. Weak submissions generally tended to come from candidates whose projects did not have a concrete outcome but, rather, the group had treated the write-up of information gathered and conclusions drawn as an outcome in itself. This left the individual group members with little or nothing concrete to evaluate in their submissions. The Project is not intended to be a pen and paper exercise in which candidates simply find out and then write about an issue ‘from a distance’. Rather, candidates should be actively engaged in and enthused by their projects and take pride in what they have achieved. Any report or that candidates produce (if they do produce such a document) should have at its heart details of what they have done, what they have learned from their investigations and how this reflects what they have learned from cross-cultural collaboration about the viewpoints of others.

Evaluation of Individual contribution and learning (including what was learnt from cross-cultural collaboration) [Individual assessment]

Generally, candidates’ identification of their own contributions to the project was detailed and most attempted some consideration of their own strengths and weaknesses. They were also able to comment on some of the benefits and challenges of working as a team. However, a major weakness in the vast majority of submissions was the complete absence of any discussion of what had been learned from cross-cultural collaboration. Without such discussion, candidates could not move beyond the lower end of band 2 at best.

Teacher Assessment

Much marking was consistent, although there was over-marking in a few Centres. This largely arose when candidates had not produced the appropriate evidence to which the marking criteria could be applied. Teachers must be guided by the wording of the descriptors in each of the bands to ensure that their candidates produce the evidence necessary for the application of the descriptors. Centres are reminded that if more than one teacher is assessing the work, assessors must clarify their understanding of the assessment criteria and standardise their marking before they begin the marking exercise. Following marking, teachers should compare their marking to check whether any internal moderation is required, in the event of a marker being too strict or too lenient. If internal moderation is carried out, Centres must ensure that it is the internally moderated mark that is recorded on the MS1 form and not the original mark.

Teachers are requested to include brief notes under each of the criterion headings on the Individual Candidate Record Cards to indicate why they have awarded a particular mark, e.g. what specific evidence do they see in the work that justifies that mark, as opposed to a higher or lower mark. This helps teachers to focus on the criteria and the nature of the evidence a candidate has provided. It also helps the Moderator to understand why a teacher has awarded a particular mark, and whether there has been a misapplication of the criteria or a misunderstanding of the nature of evidence that candidates need to produce.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/03

Written Paper

Candidates generally responded well to the challenges and topics of the paper. There is clear evidence of candidates engaging with and enjoying the thinking skills and interaction with global issues. Some candidates are rather overwhelmed by their desire to express their opinions rather than answering the questions. At the lower end of performance, there was some evidence of candidates who were not thinking issues through, and some evidence of candidates whose command of the English language was not strong enough for them to communicate their thoughts clearly.

Section A

The topic of patriotism seemed to appeal to candidates and gave them opportunities to apply some of the thinking they had done. Most candidates were broadly in favour of patriotism – some with more self-awareness than others.

- 1 Most candidates were able to summarise the key reasons for and against patriotism, mostly using their own words, and selecting key issues to discuss. Some candidates added their own ideas and these were rewarded if relevant (although they were not required). Weaker candidates tended to copy parts of the stimulus material without showing their own understanding of the issues. These candidates were credited for selecting the most relevant quotations but could not access higher marks without using their own words. A number of candidates quoted Leppe's words about children being small without linking them to why patriotism might be a good thing, which did not gain them many marks.
- 2 Candidates generally proposed a rather vague trawl through history as a research project that would help you to find out whether patriotism is more likely to lead to war or bring peace. Better candidates narrowed their field somewhat – perhaps suggesting ten wars. Most of these candidates were aware of various difficulties with the project, including the difficulty of knowing whether the war was caused by patriotism or other factors, or people misinterpreting their own feelings about their country or underestimating what they might do. Candidates were generally unaware of how the project might help and rephrased the question rather than explaining how the project might help. Some very strong candidates suggested much more defined projects with an understanding of what the outcomes might be and how these would indicate what the effects of patriotism are.
- 3 Most candidates were able to identify an opinion in **(a)**. The majority of candidates picked, 'I think most conflicts and atrocities have their roots in patriotism.' Most were able to explain why they thought this was an opinion, with reference to the possibility of other holding different views, and the use of '*I think*'.

Some candidates identified, 'People are cruel and unkind to one another just because they belong to different countries,' as an opinion. This was more problematic, as it cannot be debated that there are people who are racist and xenophobic, and who are cruel to others just because of their origins.

Some found **3(b)** more difficult because they tended to agree with Leppe and did not have the ability to express their agreement as evaluation of the quality of her reasoning. There was a lack of awareness of what a value is, and many candidates simply wrote down a value that Leppe held rather than discussing how convincing that value was.

The strongest answers agreed that children need to learn about their families first, often developing this idea with reference to children's capabilities, but then went on to say that this does not mean that they cannot progress to feeling a sense of belonging to the whole world. Effective answers discussed the value that children must learn to be proud of the history of their country rather than just accepting it or quoting it.

In (c), many candidates answered the question, 'should we teach history to children?' which is not the question that was asked. This question focuses on the skill of evaluating the likelihood of a possible consequence. The best answers answered the question with some subtlety, arguing that the effect of teaching history to children depended on how the history was taught.

- 4 A number of candidates produced very strong, controlled reasoning to support their opinion, generally that children should be taught to be proud of their country. The best distinguished between being proud of their country, loving their country and being aggressively nationalistic, often using this distinction to answer the alternative view that patriotism leads to violence.

Another strong response was that it is good for people to be proud of their country but they should not be taught to be proud because a genuine pride must arise from mature, personal reflection on the merits of the country.

Many candidates felt that people must love their country in order to contribute to it and make it a success, and that love of a country made it possible for people to pull together in difficult times.

A significant proportion of candidates tended to assert rather than giving reasons. Very few candidates used their own experiences to support their opinion. Some did not consider or answer different points of view. All of these limited their marks.

Section B

Candidates generally responded well to the topic of the Internet and poverty, and clearly had some general knowledge about the Internet which they were able to use to inform their answers.

- 5 Almost all candidates were able to identify two ways in which the Internet could reduce poverty and give two reasons why the Internet is unlikely to reduce poverty.

For (c), most candidates developed the distinction between people who have nothing and people who do not have enough, but very few related this to the discussion between yachi 38 and einar_norseman about whether Internet technology could help poor people.

- 6 Most candidates were able to answer the question about whether Dembe's example was useful with some success, although again they tended not to relate it fully to the issue of reducing poverty. The second part of the question, which required candidates to suggest what else you would need to know, was completed with less success, almost as if some candidates had forgotten about it.

Most candidates were a bit vague about what they would need to know to help them decide whether India is likely to succeed in reducing poverty by ensuring that one young person in each village is able to use the Internet. Many candidates said that they would need to know whether that person could use the Internet, or how old the person was. More successful answers included knowing whether India had the resources to support the programme, whether there were reliable electricity supplies, whether the young person was able to teach others.

- 7 This question discriminated very well. The most able answers evaluated the convincingness of kwame 77 and dave_sunlord's arguments with reference to the rational strength of the argument rather than whether the candidate agreed. These answers tended to recognise that dave_sunlord was making exaggerated claims and predicting consequences which were unlikely in a very speculative way – for example, they realised that it was highly unlikely that the decrease in price of old technology would make it free to poor people, as it's just too big a leap. These candidates felt that kwame 77 was not necessarily convincing because he had not shown that improvements gained by the Internet would lead to people making more money, but that his reasoning was more grounded in reality than dave_sunlord's wild predictions.

A large number of candidates thought that dave_sunlord was convincing because he covered more areas than kwame 77 and because his ideas would be beneficial to more people. This rather misses the point of deciding whether the argument is, in itself, rationally strong and convincing, but these candidates were able to gain some marks for justified agreement or disagreement with the reasoning. The weakest answers paraphrased the two arguments, occasionally inserting an opinion about the facts.

8 Again, this question discriminated well. The strongest answers generally considered what 'a lot of money' might mean to a poor country, and generally concluded that poor countries should begin to invest in the Internet but not to the extent that basic needs could not be met. These answers considered advantages and disadvantages with some subtlety, weighing up possible risk with possible gain.

More normally, candidates formed an opinion about whether poor countries should or should not invest in the Internet, with no consideration of the extent. They generally felt that basic needs were more important, and did not consider how an increase in economic activity due to the Internet / greater education might help to meet basic needs.

One common view was that people would waste time on the Internet playing games and using chat rooms, as *suhita_peacelover* said in the stimulus material. This tended to be used uncritically, although some candidates commented that people in desperate need were more likely to use the Internet to help them survive. Very few considered that it is possible to use Internet networking to improve business, or that it is possible to enjoy the Internet and also use it for education and business.

Weaker answers tended to express their opinions without supporting them and repeat information from the stimulus material without using it in any way.