

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

| |
|--|
| <p>Paper 0457/01 Individual Research</p> |
|--|

Key messages

- Candidates should produce two Individual Research reports. Each report should have a question as its title. Each report should be word processed in an essay format and no more than 2000 words in length with a reference list at the end of each.
- Sub-headings, linked to the assessment criteria, can be used to help candidates to structure their work.
- Each Individual Research report should have a full reference list at the end and accurate citations in the body of the work. Quotations should only be used to support points made and these should be short and cited.
- Comments, linked to the assessment criteria, should be added to the Individual Candidate Record Cards (ICRCs). These comments should correspond to the correct band in the assessment criteria.
- The Individual Research reports and completed ICRCs need to be submitted for each candidate in the sample. A Coursework Assessment Summary Form (CASF) also needs to be submitted showing the marks for all candidates entered. A report showing the marks submitted to Cambridge must also be included in your coursework submission. This may be either a copy of your CIE Direct internal marks report or a copy of your Internal Assessment Mark Sheet (MS1). Teachers should ensure that all documentation shows the same mark for each candidate.

General comments

Most Centres this series demonstrated a good understanding of the requirements for the assessment of this component. However, a small number of Centres are confusing the requirements for this component with those for the Group Project (Component 02). Teachers should make use of the documentation available to support this component including the guidance in the syllabus document and the 'Submitting Cambridge Global Perspectives work' administrative guide (both available from www.cie.org.uk).

Most candidates used questions to focus their research and their reports. Where candidates did not, the reports were often less focussed. Centres should advise candidates that they need one question as the title of their report, which they should then answer in their report through considering different perspectives. Their conclusion should directly answer their question and also offer a personal response. Teachers can help candidates formulate their questions and give general verbal feedback once first drafts have been reviewed.

This series, some Centres covered a range of topics, suggesting that candidates had been given freedom to choose the topics for their Individual Research reports. Teachers should guide candidates to ensure they choose an appropriate topic and question for each report. For example, the assessment criteria require candidates to give a personal perspective on the research and topic chosen. Teachers should advise candidates to avoid topics of which they have no personal experience as it will be difficult for them to give a personal perspective on the topic.

Candidates should produce their work as word processed documents so that word counts can be verified. Candidates should also only include pictures and diagrams if they refer to them in the body of their work. Candidates should be advised to submit this component in essay format. Candidates who submit work as MS Power Point presentations are rarely able analyse issues in enough depth to achieve a high mark.

Administration was good for most Centres this session. However, Centres should note that the totals given on the MS1, CASF and ICRC should all be the same. If marks are different for any of these, the Centre will be contacted to provide further information. If internal moderation takes place, this should be for all candidates and not just for those in the sample.

Comments on specific tasks

Teacher assessment

On the whole, the internal assessment of this component was appropriate, with most Centres marking in accordance with the assessment criteria. Teachers should include a comment on the ICRC to justify the mark given, and this should relate directly to the assessment criteria. It is very rare for candidates to be awarded marks in Band 1 if they have attempted to produce a research report as there is usually something of credit if candidates have been given the assessment criteria. If teachers suspect that any work has been plagiarised they should follow the guidance in the Cambridge Handbook, available at www.cie.org.uk.

Where an Individual Research report meets the assessment criteria in a band fully, marks at the top of that band should be awarded. To fully achieve the criteria for Band 4, there should be thorough analysis of the issues and the possible scenarios identified should stem from this analysis. The issues should also be explored from different perspectives (global, local/national and personal) and these perspectives should be evaluated before courses of action are proposed. Courses of action also need to be developed and not simply identified in order to fully meet the criteria for Band 4. For the personal response mark, it is not enough that candidates give their opinion, they should explain their response with reference to the research they have conducted and the different perspectives they have explored. Assessors should decide on the most appropriate band for each criterion and then decide whether the work meets the band fully, in which case the top mark in the band should be awarded, or whether there is something missing and the work only meets the band partially, in which case lower marks within that band should be awarded.

Gather information representing different perspectives

The majority of candidates were able to gather and present some information linked to the topic area in order to answer their research question. This usually came from a range of sources, and in the most successful reports, these sources were well-referenced. The most successful reports also clearly explored different perspectives on the issue(s), outlining evidence of different views and opinions on the issue(s), broadly related to a place, country, organisation or institution. Less successful reports often simply gave information relating to the issue (though not specifically views or opinions on the issue) from different countries. Only the very best candidates were able to successfully explore global perspectives on an issue. A global perspective may come from a specific country, organisation, institution, or even an individual, but it will have influence that spreads beyond any one country. The very best reports not only explain and give evidence for global perspectives, but also some justification for why they are global.

All work must be in the candidate's own words. If quotations are included they should be shown as quotations with the source directly cited. Teachers should advise candidates to use quotes sparingly and only as support to points that the candidate has explained in their own words. Candidates need help to write a complete reference list, including the author, date and title of the publication on the website and the date the candidate accessed it, rather than just giving the web link URL. For marks in Band 4, a broad range of relevant information should be presented and a range of highly appropriate sources used. Websites such as Wikipedia are not considered highly appropriate so please advise candidates against using these, although they can be a useful starting point to find other, more credible sources.

Analyse issues within the report

This session saw a wide range of levels of analysis, from simply listing causes, effects and current situations, to exploring these in more depth. The most successful reports tend to cover fewer issues but explore them in more depth. Less successful reports tend to outline lots of unrelated issues. The key to this criterion is that candidates formulate a focused question (with guidance from their Teacher) which leads the candidate to explore one or two issues in depth; the reasons for them/causes of them, consequences/effects of them and the possible scenarios if the issue(s) should continue and whether these scenarios are likely or not and why. Explanation will always attract more marks than identification and candidates need to be aware of this and use words like 'because', 'due to', 'as such', 'therefore' to develop their points.

Identify and evaluate possible scenarios and formulate possible courses of action

Many candidates found this criterion challenging and possible scenarios were on the whole fairly simple with candidates unsure about how they should be generated. This may be because candidates are being asked to think beyond the research they have conducted and they are less confident of their own ability to create/develop possible scenarios and courses of action. The scenarios presented generally already existed and there remains an overall lack of creative thinking about possible scenarios. Even among those who were able to develop possible future scenarios, only the very best reports considered how likely the scenarios were and why. Courses of action generally need to be further developed, including how they might work to solve/prevent or reduce the chances of the possible scenario presented.

In order to identify possible scenarios, candidates should ask themselves 'what might happen in the future if this situation continues?' Candidates can then evaluate how likely this is to happen and what the consequences might be if it does happen. This will allow candidates to demonstrate a real grasp of the issues relating to their research question.

Develop evidence-based personal response demonstrating self-awareness

Often this was left until the end and lacked evidence from the rest of the report. Candidates can make reference to their life at home, in school or where they live in relation to the question posed. They should identify and explain, referring directly to the evidence in the report, how their thinking on the topic has changed or developed as a result of conducting the research and things they will be doing differently as a result of their research. Some reports very successfully provided a personal response throughout the report, offering a considered personal response directly after presenting the evidence. Less successful reports were more likely to add a paragraph at the end which often offered a simple statement of opinion.

2018 Syllabus

Centres are advised that this syllabus changes for first assessment in 2018. Under the new syllabus, candidates only produce one Individual Report (IR), which sets out to answer a question formulated by the candidate (with guidance from the teacher). The assessment criteria have changed and can be found on the Teacher Support website as the 0457/02 Mark Scheme. The Mark Scheme is not in the syllabus because from 2018 the component will be externally marked by Cambridge

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02
Group Project

Key messages

- Project plans should provide evidence of advance planning and should not be a retrospective log of events. Retrospective logs can prove challenging for candidates to fully evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of their project planning and suggest well-considered improvements.
- Representation of different perspectives should concentrate on cross-cultural collaboration in the project component and not on exploration of global, national/local and personal perspectives, as is the case with Component 01 (Individual Research). The cross-cultural collaboration should be used to inform or support the project outcome. Research reports or case studies, however informative, are not appropriate outcomes for the Group Project. Outcomes should be concrete and active, such as video clips, posters, information leaflets, fundraising events etc.
- Individual evaluations need to show critical consideration of strengths and weaknesses if they are to score well. Description is not the same as evaluation.
- Teachers are reminded that they need to include brief supporting comments for each of the assessment criteria on the Individual Candidate Record Cards to explain the basis on which they have awarded their marks.

General comments

Topic choices in this session covered a variety of issues, such as the effects of cybercrime; effective waste management; loss of folk culture; the digital divide; and problems caused by stray animals. There were also some highly creative and effective outcomes intended to achieve project aims. These included video clips; blogs; websites and posters to raise awareness; school presentations and the training of school support staff in the use of basic IT skills.

Comments on specific tasks

Production of a project plan

[Group assessment]

Most group project plans were detailed and comprehensive which meant that many candidate groups were able to access marks in the top band. Plans should be developed at the outset of the project and should show details of the project aim; the intended outcome; all planned activities with time frames, as well as the allocation of roles and responsibilities. If candidates are to achieve the maximum mark of 10 marks for this criterion, they must provide some reasoning behind the allocation of roles and responsibilities. Some candidate groups provided a very thoughtful rationale for their allocation of responsibilities but others missed this element out completely. Retrospective logs of activities are not an appropriate substitute for a plan. It is acceptable to amend the plan as the project progresses, should this be necessary and this might be something that individual candidates might choose to comment on in their evaluation of the plan, if amendment has been necessary.

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

[Group assessment]

The exploration of global, national/local and personal perspectives is emphasised in the Individual Research component of this qualification. This is not required for the Group Project component. Cross-cultural collaboration should be the focus for representing or appreciating different perspectives in this component. Cross-cultural collaboration should be meaningful and purposeful. It should be carried out with the intention of helping to develop and support the project outcome and it should form an integral part of the project. The project outcome and/or any accompanying write-up should reflect the cross-cultural collaboration that has taken place. This session, there was evidence of some very effective cross-cultural collaboration having taken place.

Constructive participation in group work/activities

[Individual assessment]

Assessment of performance in this criterion should be based on evidence gathered during teacher observations of group work in progress. Brief supporting comments may be included on the Individual Candidate Record Cards.

Evaluation of project plan and process

[Individual assessment]

There were some strong individual evaluations of the project plan and process. These were characterised by the critical nature of their evaluation in considering the strengths and weaknesses of the plan and the strengths and weaknesses of the processes involved in carrying out the project (e.g. the research carried out, time management issues etc.), as well as providing well-thought out suggestions as to how both could have been improved. Weaker evaluations tended not to score well because they focused on what the group had done and were largely descriptive in nature. Candidates often found it difficult to do well on this criterion when they had substituted retrospective logs in place of plans.

Candidates often find it helpful to structure their evaluations of the plan and process, the project outcome and individual contribution and learning using sub-headings that are aligned to the wording of the description for performance in the top mark bands.

Evaluation of project outcome

[Individual assessment]

The strongest evaluations of outcomes generally came from groups who had identified a single, clear aim, such as raising awareness about a specific issue, or trying to solve a particular problem in their local area, and had produced or carried out an active outcome, such as designing and making an item, producing a video, organising and hosting a fundraising event or making a school presentation etc. Individual group members were then able to critically evaluate the success or otherwise of the outcome in achieving the project aim. Where the aim was general (e.g. 'we want to find out more about...') and the outcome was essentially a group research report, candidates found it very difficult to make any meaningful evaluation of how far the outcome had achieved the project aim.

Evaluation of individual contribution (including what was learnt from cross-cultural collaboration)

[Individual assessment]

Most candidates were able to reflect on what they had contributed to their group's project. However, it is not sufficient for candidates to simply list what they did. They should be advised that they need to critically examine the strengths and weaknesses of their contribution. Those candidates who looked at both strengths and weaknesses in depth generally scored well. Some candidates did not score well because they forgot that for this criterion, they also needed to discuss the benefits and challenges of working together as a team. Candidates need to be reminded that they also need to reflect on what they have learned from cross-cultural collaboration. This is why it is very important that candidates do engage in meaningful cross-cultural collaboration so that they are able to critically reflect on their learning from it and its impact on their own perspective on the issue.

If candidates are to score well across the assessment criteria, it is most important that they are very familiar with the wording of the top band of performance so that they are able to focus their responses accordingly.

Important changes to the requirements for the Project component of the 0457 syllabus in March 2018

There are a number of important changes to the existing project component of the 0457 syllabus in the revised version to be implemented in March 2018. In the revised syllabus, this component will become Component 03 and will be called the Team Project. The maximum mark will be 70, rather than the current 60.

Candidates taking the revised syllabus should be made clearly aware of the following changes to the requirements for the project component:

Group

- There are **eight specified topics** on which the team project must be based. Any projects on topics outside of these eight must be awarded zero marks.
- Teachers will be required to award a group mark (with the same mark awarded to each team member) on the basis of the group's collaboration throughout the process of carrying out the project.
- Teams will no longer submit a project plan for assessment. The **team submission** will comprise **two** elements: a project **Outcome** and an **Explanation**.
- Direct cross-cultural collaboration will **no** longer be a compulsory element of the project. However, as part of their research, candidates will still be required to explore **different cultural perspectives** on the issue they have chosen to investigate and teams will need to take this into consideration when planning their projects. Research into different cultural perspectives may encompass some primary research and data collection from different cultures, if the team so chooses, as well as secondary research via the internet and/or other sources of information. The different cultural perspectives explored should be reflected in the Outcome itself and the Explanation.
- The project **Outcome** is what the team produces collaboratively in order to achieve the project aim and it **must involve the team addressing an issue**; for example, raising public awareness about an issue; or solving a problem etc. The Outcome could take a variety of forms, such as: a poster; information leaflet or brochure; a song; a video, or a series of photographs possibly depicting an event such as a fundraiser, lessons; or cartoons with captions; a model or design; a webpage etc. An essay such a group research report or case study must **not** be accepted as an Outcome.
- The **Explanation(200–300 words)** accompanying the Outcome should include the following information: the project **aim**; a brief description of the Outcome and an explanation of how the team's exploration of **different cultural perspectives** has informed or supported the Outcome. If the Explanation exceeds the word limit, teachers must **not** give credit beyond the first **300** words.

Individual

- Individual marks will no longer be awarded for each group member's participation in group work and activities.
- Individual work will be made up of a single **Reflective Paper(750–1000 words)** in which candidates will individually reflect on:
 - their **personal research** findings and their own **work processes**
 - the **effectiveness** of the **Outcome** in **achieving the project aim**
 - what they have learned about **different cultural perspectives** of the issue
 - what they have learned about **teamwork overall** and their **own performance as a team member**
 - what they have learned **overall** from carrying out the project

If the Reflective Paper exceeds the word limit, teachers must **not** give credit beyond the first **1000** words.

Teachers are strongly urged to thoroughly familiarise themselves with the revised requirements of the 2018 syllabus well before candidates embark on the project component. The Teacher Support website and the Teachers' Guide for this qualification provide some examples of possible Team Project responses for teacher guidance. In assessing this component in March 2018, teachers should, as previously, be closely guided by the wording of the performance descriptors in the assessment criteria, included in the syllabus document.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/32
Written Paper

Key messages

The key messages from this series of examination papers are that candidates:

- have demonstrated confidence in supporting judgements using reasons and evidence
- should have more experience in designing research strategies to test claims
- should develop evaluation skills more fully
- should use evidence from sources to justify their opinions by quoting from or referring to the sources more frequently.

General comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions related to a range of sources linked by a common theme or issue. The sources represent different perspectives on a global issue, which is drawn from the syllabus. In March 2017, the paper was based upon four sources related to extended families and care for the elderly.

Overall, the quality of work and levels of achievement were good. Many candidates clearly have an excellent understanding of global issues and an ability to argue effectively using evidence to support an opinion or claim. They are able to interpret evidence, in a variety of different forms, with some confidence and insight. However, candidates need to develop research and evaluation skills to higher levels.

Many candidates responded very well to the sources presented, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates explored different perspectives on the issues raised by the sources, particularly in relation to the need for care of the elderly.

Examination technique was generally very good. The vast majority of candidates completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were hardly any rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn from the sources
- design and justify research strategies for different purposes
- evaluate sources and arguments using key concepts in critical thinking.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) (i) Most candidates correctly identified that the trend from Source 1 was that the number of extended families in America is increasing.

Some candidates simply stated the number of extended families, either in 2007 or 2015, without identifying the trend explicitly. This type of response was not rewarded as the trend was not stated.

- (ii) Virtually all candidates correctly identified, from Source 1, that the main reason for the increase in the number of extended families in America was unemployment.

- (b) Most candidates identified a disadvantage of living in an extended family and simply explained why this might have a significant impact of a teenager's life. Candidates usually gave one reason for their judgement, simply stated.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why the identified disadvantage was more significant than others; this occasionally involved comparing the significance of different disadvantages. Weaker responses often simply stated the disadvantage without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion.

To do well in this type of question candidates should state the identified characteristic and give two explained reasons for their judgement.

- (c) Candidates generally found this question quite straightforward. Most candidates identified parents or grandparents as benefiting the most from living in extended families. A few discussed children and teenagers. Most of the reasons discussed related to improved relationships and practical support, suggesting that life in extended families was often more stimulating and caring, as well as economically better.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their judgement. Several clear reasons were given and often supported with some evidence in justification.

Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation of asserted opinion about benefits of extended families in general, often without reference to the identified member of the family.

Question 2

- (a) Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, 'care facilities for the elderly in our community are good'. These were carefully explained and clearly related to the aim of the research.

Candidates tended to describe surveys of the standards or quality of community care using questionnaires and interviews with the elderly themselves, their families and various health professionals. Some candidates suggested observation and 'inspection' of facilities. Other methods included consultation with experts, local authorities and providers of community care. Most suggested secondary research using sources from the internet.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestions; weaker responses often simply stated a method or source of evidence but did not explain it fully or make the link to the claim being tested.

A few candidates responded to the question by describing their personal opinion about 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.

- (b) Many candidates presented a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation of different ways to persuade people about the need to improve care facilities for the elderly. This included consideration of who needed to be persuaded, the justification for improvement, often in terms of benefits to both the elderly and wider community, and the methods to be used; for example via meetings, advertising, social media and television.

There were some very good responses in which candidates justified targeting particular groups due to their ability to create real change through access to political power, resources or status. Politicians, celebrities and experts in the field were often cited. Some candidates referred to ethical reasons, whilst others appealed to self-interest – 'we are likely to be old one day!'

The question remained challenging for some candidates. Less successful responses tended to list a few suggestions without explanation or explicit link to the issue being promoted.

Question 3

- (a) Many candidates correctly identified a value judgement and were able to explain the selection as an example of a view or belief about what is important or ethical.

This question was challenging for some candidates who did not understand the concept of value judgement.

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates about value judgements and provide experience of using the term in the analysis of sources, alongside other critical thinking concepts like fact, opinion and prediction.

- (b) Most candidates performed well on this question, explaining why the statement was both an opinion and a fact. This analysis was usually related to the statement being about what Meena *thinks* is her mother's opinion, and that this is what her mother *actually* thinks, which is verifiable.
- (c) Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the arguments and reasoning in Meena's letter with a clear assessment of the value of her responses to Nathalia's arguments.

This review 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 in Meena's letter were also explicitly quoted and used directly in the response.

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 relating to the elderly and family life rather than the quality of the reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences and values embedded in Meena's letter.

There was very little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Candidates found this question quite challenging. Centres are encouraged to give candidates frequent opportunity to evaluate sources during their courses. This should involve a consideration of the reasons and evidence used to support the argument or perspective in the source. Candidates should also be encouraged to quote and refer directly to material within sources.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to consider whether caring for the elderly should be the government's or the family's responsibility.

The arguments used by the candidates mainly related to the costs of providing care, taxation issues, space, relationships within families, ethical matters and access to expert medical care.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about who was responsible, sometimes providing a balanced assessment of the potential role of both parties. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and describe personal opinion. Arguments tended to be mainly unsupported and asserted.

In preparation for this type of question, Centres are encouraged to give candidates regular opportunity to write extended essays in which they contrast and compare different perspectives or potential actions in response to an issue. In doing so, candidates need to analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence for the perspective or action. Candidates also need to be able to describe and explain the reasons and evidence that have helped to shape their own points of view on global issues.