

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/01

Portfolio

General comments

A variety of topics from the sixteen areas of study were chosen by candidates. Popular areas of study included: law and criminality, health and disease, education for all, water, climate change, biodiversity, conflict and peace and belief systems. Many candidates identified a question within the topic area, which they answered within the study. This meant that the studies were well focused and had a clear structure. Studies with a narrower focus were generally more successful than those with a broad topic area. Sub-headings linked to the assessment criteria also enhanced the structure of studies.

Candidates should ensure that they write in continuous prose and keep to 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.

Candidates used a variety of media to produce the portfolios, including PowerPoint presentations and video clips. Centres should note that all work submitted should be relevant to the study, included in the word count and referred to when answering the question. Class work or planning is not required for moderation.

Each study needs to be clearly labelled with the title of the study and whether it is a basic or extended study. The title of the study also needs to be in the correct place on the Individual Candidate Record Form, together with the marks awarded. It must be clear how teachers have arrived at their marks for each study. Some Centres included short comments on the Individual Candidate Record Cards, related to the assessment criteria, to show how a mark had been arrived at. This practice is encouraged as it is helpful for moderation, particularly when a low mark has been given due to an over-reliance on sources.

Centres should ensure that they 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 as stated in the instructions to Centres, and Centres should check that the work can be easily accessed. If candidates produce work using publisher, this work should be converted to a Word or .rtf document before submission.

Comments on specific questions

Teacher assessment

It was noted that teachers are generally clear about the assessment criteria and how to relate it to the work and the difference between the mark bands. Where a study met the assessment criteria fully, marks within Band 3 were awarded, and where there was limited information supplied for one of the criteria, candidates were given marks in Band 1.

Gather information representing different perspectives

Most candidates were able to gather and present a range of information representing alternative perspectives from different sources. Perspectives were largely global and national, with stronger candidates looking more closely at personal perspectives; their own and those of others within their school, family and community. These perspectives need to be presented concisely so this information does not take up a disproportionate amount of the word count and candidates should avoid relying too heavily on source material.

Analyse issues within the study

More successful studies covered fewer issues in depth rather than simply describing the issues. When analysing an issue, candidates need to consider the causes, effects and current situations related to the question being discussed and the consequences related to the causes, effects and conditions.

Identify and evaluate possible scenarios

Creative thinking about possible scenarios is encouraged. To a large extent, scenarios discussed were already happening. When candidates identified possible scenarios, considered the likelihood of these scenarios and suggested possible courses of action, they were awarded marks for evaluation.

A meaningful question to ask in order 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.

Formulate possible courses of action

Studies that were well structured mostly managed to present solutions to the problems they had identified earlier in the study. Candidates should try to formulate and develop their own ideas for solutions to the possible scenarios they present rather than list possible solutions to the problems.

Develop evidence-based personal response demonstrating self-awareness

The evidence for this part of the assessment was either embedded within the study, or included in the self-evaluation form.

Stronger candidates referred 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 the study or something that they will be doing differently as a result of the work undertaken for the study.

As the candidates' self-evaluation form for the portfolio is also taken into account for this criterion, Centres need to advise candidates to complete the form with reference to the two extended studies. There is no need for candidates to submit a separate form for each study. Candidates should provide justification for their comments.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02

Project

Key Messages

- The work submitted by the candidates, both as a group and individually, must show documentary and/or other evidence that reflects each of the assessment criteria.
- The carrying out of research and gathering of different viewpoints and perspectives, whether local, national or international, is to help identify, develop and support an outcome to the project which fulfils the stated aim(s) of the project.
- A concrete project outcome must be identified so that candidates have a focus for their individual evaluation.

General Comments

This session saw a wide range of project topic choices. Some of the areas explored were: improvements to education systems; problems facing migrant workers; threats to the natural habitats of particular species; the trade in blood diamonds; making traditional cultural/religious festivals eco-friendly and Sharia Law.

It is important that candidates produce appropriate evidence for assessment so that when teachers mark their candidates' work, they are able to place the work in the appropriate mark band for each of the assessment criteria in the mark scheme. In order to ensure that candidates produce appropriate evidence, teachers and candidates should pay close attention to the wording of the assessment criteria and the performance descriptors within each of the mark bands. The performance descriptors indicate both the extent of coverage and quality expected at each level of performance, from Band 1 to Band 4. In deciding on the mark to be awarded for each of the criteria, teachers need to ensure that the work submitted by the candidates matches the description given.

The quality of work submitted for assessment continues to improve. More candidate groups took care to specify concrete and active outcomes to their projects, the choice of which often showed careful consideration. Examples of concrete outcomes included: video clips; information brochures/leaflets; web pages and blogs; photo journals and classroom/school activities. The identification of a clear project outcome provided plenty of scope and opportunity for group members to evaluate the outcome in their individual submissions. Those groups which did not specify a concrete outcome tended to present the findings of their research as an outcome in itself and individual group members were subsequently unable to find very much to discuss in their evaluation, other than what they had learned from their part of the research.

Comments on candidate response to assessment criteria

Constructive participation in discussions

(Group assessment)

Participation in group work/activities

(Individual assessment)

There was an increase in the number of Centres using the form provided in the teacher support website for the recording of evidence gathered during observations of candidates in discussion and carrying out their work. Teachers who recorded the evidence observed were clearly able to arrive at fair and well-supported marks for their candidates in these two criteria. The recording of such evidence is helpful to the teacher and the Moderator and is sound assessment practice. The full mark range should be used in order to discriminate between the performance of both individual candidates and different candidate groups.

Teachers are 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)

The best project plans provided a strong rationale for the choice of topic; realistic and well articulated aims which included a clearly identified concrete outcome to the project which, in the candidates’ view, would achieve the project aims. In addition, full details of individual group members’ roles and responsibilities were given, so that it was clear who had done what, in terms of both information gathering and other activities. Many sound plans also provided time-frames for activities, including cross-cultural collaboration. Candidates need to be aware of the importance of clear articulation of project aims so that when, individually, they come to evaluate the successes and limitations of the project outcome, this is done with reference to the project aims, as indicated by the wording of the Band 2 and Band 3 performance descriptors for this criterion. If a project outcome is not identified at all, or is vague, this will have an adverse impact on the nature and quality of outcome evaluation that can be carried out.

Teachers are reminded that the “Project Plan” is marked on a group basis and therefore all candidates in a group should be awarded the same mark for this criterion.

Representation of different viewpoints and perspectives (including cross-cultural)

(Group assessment)

Most candidate groups were able to provide some evidence of cross-cultural collaboration, although the extent and purposefulness of this varied considerably. In the strongest projects, candidates had given a good deal of careful thought to the kind of information they needed to gain from cross-cultural collaboration in order to develop and support the outcome to their project. The outcome clearly incorporated elements of what they had learned from collaboration and in some way represented the different viewpoints and perspectives of the people that they had gathered their information from. Weaker projects were often characterised by the fact that even though the candidates had gathered different people’s opinions on their chosen topic at both the domestic and international level, what they had learned did not influence the development of the outcome, nor did the outcome reflect what they had learned. Rather, the information gathering exercise was treated as an end in itself and the candidates generally presented what they had learned as a report of their findings without actually using these in a meaningful way. Candidates should also be aware that cross-cultural collaboration is only part of the bigger “representation of different viewpoints and perspectives”. This means that with any issue that is being investigated, different people and/or different organisations will inevitably have different viewpoints and ways of looking at the problem or issue, depending on their own circumstances, or the particular way in which the problem or issue affects them. For instance, if a group were investigating the compulsory clearance of a group of people’s homes in order to make way for the construction of a luxury hotel, they might want to gather views and perspectives from some of the following: the hotel developer who stands to make money from the venture; a resident who will lose his/her home; a young person who expects that the hotel will provide employment and a way out of poverty; an overseas tourist who might stay in the hotel and spend money thereby helping to improve the local economy etc. Having found out how all these different people feel about the issue, the group would then set about developing a suitable outcome that not only highlights the plight of the people who will lose their homes, but in some way also addresses/represents the views of the other stakeholders that they have gathered their information from.

Teachers are reminded that “Representation of different viewpoints and perspectives (including cross-cultural)” is marked on a group basis and therefore all candidates in a group should be awarded the same mark for this criterion. The information gathered and discussion on how the information was used should be covered in the group submission.

Evaluation of Project Outcome

(Individual assessment)

The increase in the number of candidate groups identifying concrete project outcomes this session was accompanied by an improvement in the quality of evaluation of project outcome. The best of such evaluations showed that the candidates concerned had paid close attention to the wording of the performance descriptors and ensured that their evaluations paid careful consideration to both the successes and failures of the project outcome in light of the project aims. The candidates revisited the aims that the group had identified for their project at its outset, and then considered how far the outcome of the project had achieved those aims and where it fell short in achieving the aims. Some candidates were also able to recognise where the aims had perhaps been unrealistic or overambitious and suggested how the wording of their aims could have been improved in light of the outcome. The work of such candidates represented the very highest level of performance. In addition to evaluating the successes and failures of the outcome, candidates must be reminded that if they aspire to a mark in the top band for this criterion, they must also suggest how the outcome or its development could have been improved.

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

(Individual assessment)

Most candidates were quite thorough in evaluating their own contribution, although there were some candidates who tended to focus almost entirely on their strengths, giving little consideration to their weaknesses, or how they could have improved their contribution to the project. Candidates are reminded that if their evaluation focuses only on their contribution to the project and their personal strengths/weaknesses, without reflecting on “the value and challenges of collaboration in a group **and** across cultures”, they can only achieve a mark in the Band 1 range. In the very best evaluations, candidates’ comments on their strengths and weaknesses indicated that they had engaged in very deep and honest personal reflection and their evaluation of both the group’s teamwork and their learning from cross-cultural collaboration showed maturity and an ability to empathise with others. Candidates should be aware that in order to be awarded a mark in the top band for this criterion, there must also be some evidence of their ability to rethink their own initial position or viewpoint by explaining in what way(s) the project has changed the way they think about the issue.

Teacher Assessment

This session, fewer Centres saw their marks reduced because marking had been overgenerous, while several Centres saw their marks increased because they had been rather too severe. There was also evidence of sound moderation in some Centres where there was more than one teacher assessor. Most importantly, more teacher assessors included brief comments on the Individual Candidate Record Cards to support the marks they had awarded. This is not only sound assessment practice but is indeed a requirement. The Individual Candidate Record Cards should carry the candidate’s details, a brief outline of the project and supporting comments for marks awarded for each of the assessment criteria. It is important that comments are recorded so that the Moderator (whether at the school or external level) is able to understand why a teacher assessor has awarded a particular mark.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/03

Written Paper

Key messages

- Candidates engaged with the sources.
- Good answers included a thorough evaluation of the quality of reasoning in the sources.
- Successful answers were fully supported by evidence from the Resource Booklet.
- Good answers included a discussion of an issue from different perspectives.

General Comments

Overall, candidates responded with enthusiasm and interest to the two topics, family relations and industrial relations. Candidates engaged with the sources and considered information and viewpoints carefully. The strongest answers analysed knowledge claims, value judgements and the effectiveness of arguments successfully. Candidates expressed their own opinions and the strongest candidates gave reasons for their opinions and discussed alternative views.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates gained full marks, identifying two ways in which the child's life had changed.
- (b) Most candidates gained the mark for explaining why the changes to the child's life had occurred.
- (c) Most candidates gained the mark for suggesting Internet, social networking, mobile phones or video games.
- (d) Candidates were generally able to identify two changes in family life. The strongest answers included an explanation of these changes supported by evidence from the Resource Booklet. Successful candidates structured their answers using 'because' and 'this is why' and 'therefore' to ensure that they were explaining the changes.

Question 2

- (a) Strong answers were well-focused and contained a consideration of the information needed about the C-Zen, such as speed and safety features. Candidates explained how this information would help them to make a decision about whether the car should be legal on the roads for 16 year olds – for example, if the car had a high maximum speed it would be inappropriate for young people who tended to be reckless and who had not been trained to drive. However, if the C-Zen had a very low maximum speed, it would be less dangerous to the teenage drivers and those around them, and could possibly be legal. Less successful answers focused on the drivers rather than the car, or on irrelevant aspects of the car, and the decision making was not focused on whether to make the car legal for 16 year olds on public roads. Some candidates focused on whether or not to buy the car.
- (b) The strongest candidates answered this question with focus, considering what kind of company Amala was planning, whether there was a realistic, thought out plan, whether funding was in place and what the competition might be. These candidates considered that if she had a strong, original idea and a realistic plan including funding, Amala had a reasonable chance of success and it might be worth advising her parents to let her try to set up a company – after all, she could always go to university later, richer in experience. On the other hand, they felt that if the idea was weak, the planning poor and the funding not even considered, then Amala might be undergoing a teenage fad, and should be discouraged from opening the company. Less successful responses focused

on how much money Amala would earn, however, this amount was not fixed and could not yet be known.

Question 3

- (a) Many candidates were able to pick out a value judgement from Grandpa Joe's contribution. Candidates were also required to explain why this was a value judgement. Candidates referred to it being a value about good or bad, not supported by evidence but a judgement based on opinion.
- (b) The strongest answers evaluated the quality of the reasoning in Grandpa Joe's and Aunt Rashida's contributions to decide whether their reasoning was rationally convincing. When candidates attempted to evaluate the reasoning by talking about sweeping statements, they needed to back up their points by giving an example of a sweeping statement, or an explanation of why it was a sweeping statement. Candidates tended to refer to Grandpa Joe's claims being reliable because he was speaking from experience, and making claims mostly about himself, for which he was the best source of information. These candidates argued that Aunt Rashida was less convincing, even where they partly agreed with her, because she made sweeping, unsupported statements such as 'Everybody knows teenagers are immature', so she was generalising unreasonably. Candidates argued that Aunt Rashida was making baseless, unfounded predictions, such as that Grandpa Joe would have lived a life of poverty and immoral excess if he had become a singer, but she would have needed to know how talented and determined Grandpa Joe was to know whether he would have been poor. Strong candidates made the link between Aunt Rashida's reference to Grandpa Joe's career and her intention to persuade Papa Nelson that Amala should not be allowed to set up her own computer company. These candidates argued that, whilst singing – or music generally – was an uncertain career, a computer company might very well be a more reliable way of earning money. Some candidates stated that Grandpa Joe would definitely have been rich as they mistakenly maintained all singers are rich

Question 4

Candidates responded well to the question about whether freedom is bad for young people and expressed thoughtful opinions. Most candidates felt that freedom itself was not bad, but excessive freedom without guidance might lead to negative consequences for young people. The strongest candidates gave reasons for their opinions and explained why they disagreed with alternative views. The inclusion of words such as 'because', 'so', 'therefore' or 'this means that' helped candidates to justify and give reasons for their opinions.

An area for improvement is the way in which candidates express their disagreement with alternative viewpoints. In some instances, candidates stated an alternative view and expressed their disagreement without saying why they disagree or what is wrong with the alternative view. For example:

A: Freedom is good for young people because it gives them the opportunity to grow up and mature. Some people say that freedom is bad for young people because they will smoke and drink, but I disagree because freedom helps young people grow up instead.

In this answer, the disagreement with the alternative view repeats the reason given why freedom is good, it does not show that freedom isn't bad for young people because they will smoke and drink.

B: Freedom is good for young people because it gives them the opportunity to grow up and mature. This is because they get used to making decisions and taking consequences – for example, I have freedom about how to spend my money. I have to decide what is the best way to spend my money, budgeting and taking information into consideration, and weighing up whether I want to download music or go out with my friends. If I spend all my money, I have to take the consequence that there are other things I can't do. I don't have so much freedom that my mistakes can cause disasters for me, but I am learning about managing my money, which will be useful when I have to leave home and manage for myself. Some people say that freedom is bad for young people because they will smoke and drink and do illegal things. Perhaps this is true if people are allowed to do whatever they want with no guidance – but freedom is not being allowed to do whatever you want, freedom is learning to make your own decisions and take responsibility for them. So I don't think it's freedom that leads young people to do bad things. Sometimes even it can be too little freedom that causes young people to rebel.

In this answer, the candidate justifies opinions more than in answer A. Firstly, there is some very subtle thinking about what freedom is, showing that the alternative view is wrong. Secondly, there is an

undeveloped second idea why it is not freedom – but too little freedom – that causes young people to do bad things.

Question 5

- (a) Most candidates were able to give two reasons in support of the strike.
- (b) Most candidates were able to give two reasons against the strike. Candidates should ensure that the two reasons given are different. Some candidates thought that the staff wanted an increase in their pay, when actually they wanted to avoid a decrease.
- (c) The strongest candidates saw that the dispute is local to the company, but has international consequences in terms of international air travel and the effects on passengers, tourism and economies.

Question 6

Most candidates were able to ask a question which would elicit useful information – either more facts or more information about the motivation of the key players. Most candidates were able to give some explanation of how the information would be useful to them in deciding whether or not to support the strike. Successful questions included:

- Ellie, have you tried negotiating before striking?
- Ellie, how much is your pay being reduced and your workload increased?
- Hosni, are there other ways in which costs could be reduced rather than by cutting wages and increasing workloads?

A number of candidates directed their questions to the wrong person – for example asking Ellie Turnbull about the overall finances of the company, or asking Hosni Mahmoud about the exact effect of cuts on cabin crew. Some candidates asked for information which was given in the stimulus material, and others provided imaginary answers from Ellie Turnbull or Hosni Mahmoud rather than explaining how an answer to the question might help to make a decision about whether to go on strike. A few candidates expressed their opinions about the strikers or the management. None of these approaches was entirely successful.

Question 7

- (a) Many candidates thought that the man in the audience was a typical passenger because he was travelling to see relatives like many other people at this time of year, or because he was willing to spend more money on a ticket, making him seem typical of an Airways to the World customer rather than a budget airline customer. Some candidates noticed that although he was flying home to see his family in December he was less typical because most passengers would not be visiting a sick relative.
- (b) Candidates were divided about whether Ellie Turnbull's reasoning was rationally convincing or not. Many candidates picked up on the figure of 95% of the crew voted for a strike, and said that this showed there was a real problem. A few strong candidates argued that this figure was less convincing than it seemed because the woman in the audience, who had voted, said that she hadn't voted for two weeks over Christmas, so it was a vote based on partial information, and didn't show that striking was right. Candidates referred to Ellie's predicted consequence that managers would realise they would need them and treat them as people. Strong candidates said that managers would realise that they needed cabin crew, but not necessarily these individuals, and they might find a way of replacing them, and that managers were as likely to be frustrated and angry with cabin crew as to treat them better.

A number of strong candidates remarked that, whilst everything Ellie said was possible, it was one-sided and overstated, and not really likely. They argued that it seemed to come more from her passion than logical arguments. Some candidates agreed or disagreed with parts of the reasoning rather than evaluating it, and some gave their opinions on Ellie, the cabin crew and the strike generally.

- (c) Many candidates were able to see that the consequences suggested by Hosni Mahmoud were possible but probably exaggerated as a threat to the cabin crew. They justified this by arguing that, although a long strike in an important part of the year would affect the airline's income, and the company might go bankrupt, it was likely that an international, established airline with a good reputation would have some form of financial cushion (some candidates gave examples of airlines in their home countries which had, or had not, gone bankrupt in similar situations). Some candidates argued that even if Airways to the World did go bankrupt, the high quality staff would be able to get jobs with other airlines or in other industries, so the 'no jobs' consequence was overstated.

Question 8

Candidates were generally very responsive to this question, demonstrating a strong awareness of local strikes which they were able to use as examples. Most candidates felt that striking was sometimes right, but not always, and many were able to justify this view with reasons and examples, and thoughtful consideration of the different circumstances – such as dangerous working environments or not getting paid for months being good reasons for a strike, but trying to improve an already positive situation not being a good reason for a strike. The strongest candidates considered the situation from the perspectives of the workers, the companies and the consumers. A very strong response argued that workers did have the right to strike to ensure that their basic rights are met, and answered objections on the grounds of inconvenience to consumers by pointing out that inconvenience to consumers is temporary in most cases, whereas unfairness in the workplace can be permanent unless a strike takes place.