GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/01
Portfolio

Key Messages

- Candidates should produce four pieces of work; two assessed at basic level and two at extended level.
- Multimedia should be supported by written commentary and all work should exemplify the assessment criteria.
- Titles of candidates' work should be written in the space provided on the Individual Candidate Record Cards (ICRC) so that is clear which piece has received which marks.
- For each candidate, Centres need to submit the work and the completed ICRC. The Centre needs to also include the MS1 for the component and the Coursework Assessment Summary Form (CASF).
- The total marks on the ICRCs, the MS1 and the CASF should be the same.
- Each study should have a question to focus the piece of work.
- Candidates should adhere to the word counts as stated in the syllabus.
- Sub-headings linked to the assessment criteria can help candidates structure the pieces.

General Comments

Candidates produced pieces of work covering a variety of topics from the fifteen areas of study. Areas of study included: law and criminality, health and disease, education for all, biodiversity, conflict and peace and belief systems. Many candidates identified a question within the area of study, which they then went on to answer within their work. This gave the studies a clear focus and candidates generally found the piece of work easier to structure. This was also true where candidates used sub-headings linked to the assessment criteria.

Candidates used a variety of media to produce the portfolios. The more successful studies contained embedded media and included extended writing.

Candidates should keep to the word count specified in the syllabus of 1000-1500 words each for the two basic studies and 1500-2500 words each for the two extended studies. Centres are asked to monitor this and advise candidates accordingly. It is important that candidates' work reflects the assessment criteria and is in continuous prose. Candidates should avoid submitting irrelevant material, which includes marked class work and pictures that are not referred to.

Centres should also ensure that each study is clearly labelled with the title of the study, indicating also whether it is basic or extended. The title of the study also needs to be in the correct place on the Individual Candidate Record Form, together with the marks awarded. Some Centres included short comments on the Individual Candidate Record Cards, which related to the assessment criteria, to show how a mark had been awarded. This practice is encouraged as it is helpful for moderation. 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 and Centres should check that the work can be easily accessed.

Comments on Specific Questions

Teacher assessment

Teachers are generally clear about the assessment criteria and how to relate it to the work. Studies with a question that the candidate went on to answer were generally more successful than those that had used a broad topic area.

Gather information representing different perspectives

Most candidates were able to gather and present more than a limited range of information representing different perspectives and this usually came from a variety of sources. Candidates should present this information concisely so that it does not take up a disproportionate amount of the word count.

Analyse issues within the study

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

Identify and evaluate possible scenarios

Some candidates included fairly creative scenarios within their studies. Where candidates did think about possible scenarios, they sometimes considered the likelihood and impact of these scenarios and suggested possible courses of action and were therefore awarded marks for evaluation. Unfortunately, this was not a regular feature of the work moderated. Candidates still need further guidance in evaluation.

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.

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. Many candidates demonstrated that they were fully engaged with the study.

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 working upon 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 should advise candidates to complete the form with reference to the two extended studies. There is no need for candidates to submit one form for each study; only one per candidate is required.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02
Project

Key Messages

- In carrying out the project, all candidate groups must engage in some form of cross-cultural collaboration.
- Each project must have a concrete, achievable project outcome that can be evaluated; for instance, an information pamphlet, advertisement, video clip, web page, event.
- The outcome must demonstrate in some way that the group has taken into account different viewpoints and perspectives (including cross-cultural).
- A clear project plan must be included as part of each group's submission.
- Each candidate within the group must submit an evaluation of the outcome, as well as an evaluation of their individual contribution and learning (including their learning from cross-cultural collaboration).
- In addition to their candidates' work, Centres must submit an MS1, a Coursework Assessment Summary Form (CASF) and a completed Individual candidate Record Card (ICRC) for each individual candidate.
- The ICRC must carry the candidate's name and number, a brief outline of the project and its intended outcome and brief comments under each of the assessment criteria headings indicating why a particular mark has been awarded.

General Comments

Once again candidates chose a wide variety of project topics. Some of the areas explored were: the protection of endangered species; water conservation; cyber bullying; education in disadvantaged communities and the use of the death penalty internationally.

The number of candidate groups specifying concrete and active outcomes to their projects continued to grow and the choice of these outcomes showed a good deal of thought. Examples of concrete outcomes included: video clips; information brochures/leaflets; web pages and blogs; and classroom or whole School/year group activities. The identification of a clear project outcome allowed individual group members to do themselves justice when it came to evaluating the outcome in their own submissions. Groups which did not specify a concrete outcome tended to simply present the findings of their research and individual group members were unable to find very much to discuss in their own 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 on 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 making the assessment 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]

Most candidate groups submitted comprehensive project plans which provided full details of the roles and responsibilities of individual group members, as well as the group's intended activities. Many groups ensured that the rationale for their project, the project aims and intended outcome(s) were also clearly articulated in the plan.

Teachers are reminded that the "Project Plan" is marked on a group basis and this means that 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]

Many candidate groups had clearly engaged in both meaningful and enjoyable cross-cultural collaboration in carrying out their projects. Such collaboration took a variety of forms; from communication via social networking sites and e-mail correspondence, to international exchange visits and in-country community service within disadvantaged ethnic communities. The latter of these is important because if international collaboration with another Centre has proved to be impossible, candidates should remember that it is possible to find different cultural groups within their own country, although this should not be taken to mean that it is sufficient to simply gain opinions from overseas candidates within the School community. The performance descriptor for Band 3 of this criterion reads: "*Outcome demonstrates considerable awareness of different perspectives. Shows clear understanding and appreciation of different viewpoint(s) from other culture(s)*". In order to achieve marks in this band, the group needs to demonstrate awareness of different perspectives in their outcome. Many groups had clearly engaged in a considerable amount of cross-cultural dialogue, but their outcome did not always reflect the results of that dialogue in terms of showing that the group understood and appreciated the viewpoints of those they had collaborated with.

Teachers are reminded that "Representation of different viewpoints and perspectives (including cross-cultural)" is marked on a group basis and this means that all candidates in a group should be awarded the same mark for this criterion.

Evaluation of Project Outcome
[Individual assessment]

This session saw an increase in the number of projects culminating in active and practical outcomes. The most successful projects were generally those ending in outcomes which the candidates were able to carry out and were meaningful to them, their School and often the local community. Where outcomes had actually been carried out by the group, the individual group members were then able to provide a thorough and often insightful evaluation of how far the outcome had succeeded in achieving the aims the group had articulated in their project plan, as well as where the outcome had fallen short in achieving the aims. In order to do well in this criterion, candidates must evaluate the successes and failures of their outcomes in light of achievement or otherwise of the project aims. Strong individual evaluations tended to occur when aims had been clearly stated at the outset in the project plan and those aims were concrete, realistic and achievable. Less successful projects treated the write-up of their research findings as their outcome and this meant that individual group members had nothing concrete to evaluate. This resulted in evaluations that made no mention of project outcome, but rather discussed what the individual had learnt from the information gathering process and areas of group weakness such as poor time management, neither of which is an area of focus in this assessment criterion.

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

There were some very strong and insightful evaluations of individual contribution and learning. Many candidates explored the strengths and weaknesses of their own contribution in depth and were able to identify some specific and valuable lessons learnt from the experience of working in a team. Weaker evaluations lacked depth in terms of any real critical consideration of either the strengths and weaknesses of individual contribution or the benefits and drawbacks of working in a team. Most candidates need to improve the quality of their evaluation of what they have learnt from cross-cultural collaboration. This is a key element in the assessment of this criterion. Superficial and/or generalised comments should be avoided, for instance, "I learnt a lot from cross-cultural collaboration", or "It was interesting to find out what people in other countries think about the issue". Candidates who provided meaningful and insightful comments on this area

tended to have been in groups which had treated the cross-cultural element as an integral part of the project which informed its development throughout. The importance of this assessment criterion is reflected in the fact that it is worth a total mark of 8. In order to achieve a mark in the top band, an evaluation must show: "*perceptive self-awareness in identifying strengths and weaknesses*" and the candidate must show: "*insight into own learning from cross-cultural collaboration and demonstrate the ability to rethink his/her own initial position(s)*".

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

| Paper 0457/03 |
| Written Paper |

Key Messages

- Candidates are expected to demonstrate thinking, reasoning, planning and research skills rather than remembered knowledge.
- Strong candidates make good use of the material provided in the Resource Booklet.
- Strong candidates think about the quality of the sources, evidence and reasoning provided in the Resource Booklet.
- Strong candidates think about and reflect on the issues in the Resource Booklet, going beyond the information provided to consider, for example, implications, consequences, alternative perspectives, different opinions and other values.
- Strong candidates develop logical, coherent and structured reasoning.

General Comments

Candidates responded well to the topics of disease management and conflict diamonds. A significant proportion of candidates performed at a very high level, demonstrating strong skills in all areas tested. These candidates were able to:

- identify key issues and assign relative importance to different aspects of an issue;
- consider whether an issue is local or global in terms of its causes, consequences and impact;
- suggest information they need to know, and explain how the information might help them to make a decision;
- evaluate sources, evidence and reasoning;
- consider values and their application to an issue – for example whether health, education or the economy is most important, or whether it matters that a bride in the US wears a conflict diamond;
- develop a persuasive, coherent line of reasoning;
- think clearly and logically about the issues in the source materials, going beyond information provided.

Areas that still need improvement are the evaluation of sources, evidence and reasoning and the development of reasoning. A significant number of candidates provided strong, thoughtful answers to **Questions 1, 2, 5** and **6**, but did not maintain the quality of answer in **Questions 3, 4, 7** and **8**, which test evaluation of sources, evidence and reasoning and development of reasoning. Candidates tended to agree or disagree with the reasoning rather than evaluating in **Questions 3** and **7**. In **Questions 4** and **8** they tended to either write extended opinions without giving reasons or offering alternative viewpoints, or to convey a great deal of information without organising it to support an opinion.

Centres are asked to remind candidates to keep all answers within the given margins on the question paper. Blank pages at the end of the question paper are available if necessary – for example if a candidate crosses out an answer and wishes to re-write it. Substitute answers written in the Resource Booklet, cannot be marked as the Resource Booklets are retained in Centres.

Candidates should also consider the length of response required to access the marks. Candidates are expected to think first, and write short, focused responses. A significant proportion of the candidates are writing far more than is necessary, going beyond the lines provided, often into margins or into the space for the next question. The space provided is deliberately limited to encourage candidates to think, to select and to write only what will best answer the question.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

Question 1 tests how well candidates can identify key issues in the resource material, whether they can assign relative importance to issues and whether they can manipulate this information.

(a)   Most candidates were able to suggest one way in which stopping air travel can prevent the spread of disease, by referring to stopping ill people travelling abroad and taking the sickness to new countries. A number of candidates also referred to the problems of limited air circulating in a small plane with lots of passengers. Some candidates only said how air travel could spread a disease, without referring to how stopping air travel could prevent the spread of the disease.

(b)   This question proved challenging for candidates in two ways. First, most candidates confused 'becoming very ill with Dog Disease' with 'catching the illness'. Secondly, most candidates took Ms Palin's youth as a guarantee that she would not catch Dog Disease. Very few candidates realised that Ms Palin had a serious risk of becoming very ill because she fell into one of the 'at risk' categories, i.e. having asthma.

(c)   Most candidates were able to express an opinion on whether the government has a more important role than individuals in preventing the spread of illness, and to explain their reasons. Most candidates were able to say that the government must provide information about the disease and precautions, and that only governments have the power to take measures such as closing shopping malls. Only individuals, however, could actually carry out the measures, because the government cannot force every individual to do so. A few strong candidates mentioned the government's role in providing vaccinations. It was acceptable to argue either way or, indeed, to argue that government and individuals are of equal importance.

Question 2

Question 2 tests whether candidates can identify information which they need, but do not have, in order to make a decision. It also tests whether candidates can explain how such information might be useful to their decisions, taking into consideration the different possible results of their inquiries. As such, the necessary information is not to be found in the resource material.

(a)   The strongest candidates asked the simple question, 'What are your symptoms, Mr Singh' and explained that you judge whether a person is ill and what their illness is by their symptoms. Some candidates mentioned the need for further tests to confirm the opinion. Other strong candidates asked what countries Mr Singh had visited or whether he had been in contact with anyone with Dog Disease, explaining that he needed to have been in a situation in which he might plausibly have contracted Dog Disease if they were to make that diagnosis. However, the majority of candidates asked questions such as 'How old are you?' or 'Do you have asthma?' or 'Do you chew on bones?' and explained their decision making with reference to risk categories. There is an important difference between diagnosing whether someone does have a disease and considering whether someone is in a risk category for becoming seriously ill if they do contract the disease. Candidates should be aware that they need to find information that they do not yet have.

(b)   Strong candidates considered that they needed to know whether it was possible for people to shop online – they asked whether most people had internet connections or the skills to use online retailers, explaining that closing shopping malls would not be a good policy if many people were unable to buy the necessities, even if it did slow the spread of the disease. Other strong candidates explained their decision making in economic terms, with the strongest explaining that they would need to weigh up the negative economic consequences with any possible slowing of the spread of the disease. Many candidates wanted to know about whether the disease could be transmitted by delivery staff or through parcels. Some explained this well, but many considered only that delivery staff might transmit the disease, without considering whether this would be better or worse than the disease transmission that could occur in a shopping mall, and thus lost focus on the question.

Question 3

Question 3 tests how well candidates can evaluate sources, evidence and reasoning. They need to understand the difference between fact and opinion, look at the reliability of knowledge claims and evaluate a passage of reasoning.

(a) Most candidates were able to identify that 'I caught the disease' was probably a fact (subject to medical verification). Many candidates were able to argue that 'from a colleague' could be either fact or opinion. Strong candidates explained their answers with reference to constant contact with a sick colleague as a plausible means of disease transmission, or to alternative ways of catching the disease – e.g. from someone on the subway. Most candidates identified that 'he thought he was too important to stay at home' was Belen's opinion, and suggested alternative reasons why her colleague might have been at work whilst ill, such as financial pressure. Strong candidates argued that any of these parts of the statement could have been facts if suitably verified, but that most of it was probably opinion, demonstrating a very strong understanding that facts and opinions are not always clearly separate categories.

(b) Many candidates answered this question well, using a variety of different strategies to test the reliability of Belen Perez's claim, 'I am lucky to be alive.' Many used corroborating evidence from the Resource Booklet to show that the claim is at least partly reliable, for example referring to Belen's own claim that she was in hospital for two weeks (which indicates that the illness was quite serious), or to the Daily Megaphone's claim that this was a deadly flu, indicating again, that Belen might have been lucky. Others referred to a natural tendency to exaggerate an illness to make it sound worse, which would suggest that Belen's claim was not fully reliable, and other candidates said they wanted to have extra evidence from a doctor to back up Belen's claim before they regarded it as reliable. All of these were acceptable ways of answering the question.

(c) Many candidates were able to evaluate Zhou's reasoning with some success. They pointed out, for example, that Zhou's knowledge claim that the disease does not affect children conflicts with the statement from the Ministry of Health. They discussed the implications of shutting schools, for example the ways in which children could transmit the disease to teachers and parents. Others used values to assess Zhou's reasoning, weighing up the effect on children's education with the need to protect people's lives. Strong candidates noted that closing shopping malls and restricting air travel would have an effect on the economy, providing their own justifications, and often weighing up the effects of a short versus a long closure.

Question 4

This question tests candidates' ability to develop their own line of reasoning to support their own point of view. Candidates need to provide logical, thoughtful answers, giving reasons, examples and considering and answering alternative points of view.

Strong candidates provided very well structured, logical and thoughtful lines of reasoning. Many of these candidates felt that the Daily Megaphone's campaign was perhaps extreme, and that the consequences and implications of each measure needed to be weighed up. Most of these candidates accepted measures such as working from home, but were unwilling to close shopping malls, schools or airlines and take the consequences until Dog Disease was proven to be more than a scare story. Many candidates were able to draw on their own experiences of avian and swine flu, whether as a hyped illness which did not become an epidemic, or as a deeply unpleasant illness which cut class sizes from thirty to ten.

Section B

Question 5

This question tests candidates' understanding of which parts of an issue are specifically local and which are international. It gives candidates the opportunity to look at causes, consequences and implications from the local and global perspectives.

(a) Most candidates were able to discuss the local African aspects of conflict diamonds, referring to local sources of diamonds, local conflicts, attacks on local people and local governments, and the recruitment of local children to the rebel armies. The strongest candidates were able to explain why these things were local – i.e. being caused by and having consequences for people in a specific area. Some candidates tried to answer this question as 'local to me' rather than local in Africa. Although a small number of candidates successfully moved from this beginning to a concept of 'local in Africa', most wrote answers which overlapped with **5(b)**.

(b) Most candidates were able to discuss how international funding worsens the local conflicts, mentioning an obligation on everyone globally to consider the consequences of their actions even if these consequences take place elsewhere. They noted how the involvement of international organisations such as the UN made this an international issue. Most candidates also saw that income from conflict diamonds was a source of funds for international terrorism.

Question 6

This question tests whether candidates can identify information that they need to know in order to make a decision, and how this information will help to make that decision.

The strongest candidates identified relevant information about the Diamond Empowerment Fund and its work that they did not already know, such as what exactly are the projects run by the DEF and how effective the DEF has been in the past, and explained this by saying that they wanted to donate to effective, well run projects which are genuinely helpful. Other strong candidates picked up on the link between the DEF and the diamond industry, and said they wanted to know whether the DEF's partners in the diamond industry took all due precautions to avoid conflict diamonds.

A number of candidates approached this question rather generally, discussing information about charities, and sometimes making sweeping statements. Some candidates identified information which could be useful, but did not explain how it might help them make a decision.

Question 7

This question tests whether candidates can evaluate sources and reasoning. In this case candidates needed to combine information from different sources to test whether the claim in Source 6 'We only sell ethical diamonds' is likely to be reliable. They also needed to look at the implications and consequences of the sources to answer the value-based question, 'how much does it matter if a bride has a conflict diamond?'

(a) Many candidates answered this question well. The strongest candidates noted that it was unlikely that this shop knowingly sold conflict diamonds, because it provided certificates and requested guarantees, and put some effort into complying with the Kimberley Process. Conflict diamonds, however, might unknowingly be sold by the shop if its own suppliers were less rigorous, or if such diamonds had been smuggled. They also considered whether the company might be making overstated claims for marketing purposes, but generally felt that the source was passionate enough to discount this possibility.

(b) Most candidates were able to express a value judgement and to justify this judgement. Strong candidates argued that materially it might not matter to the bride, but morally it mattered, partly because any romantic notions about the ring would be tainted by its source, partly because her demand, and the demand of brides like her, was driving the supply of such diamonds and the abuses associated with them. There was some discussion about whether it was morally worse for the bride to knowingly or unknowingly fund atrocities. Candidates considered whether ignorance is an excuse, or whether the ignorance itself was a lapse of moral duty, as we all have an obligation to understand the consequences of our actions.

Question 8

This question tests whether candidates can develop a coherent, thoughtful line of reasoning, responding to alternative points of view.

Strong candidates produced thoughtful, logical, well structured lines of reasoning. They felt that we should not stop buying diamonds because, as Source 7 indicates, there are benefits which come from the diamond industry. These candidates suggested that better regulation and international action to control rebel armies might be a better solution to the problem of conflict diamonds, because this would allow the legal miners and suppliers to earn a living. It would be unethical to punish the legal along with the illegal. It was also felt that rebel armies might simply grow and sell drugs or engage in slave trading if the diamond market was closed to them.