GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

> **Paper 0457/01**
>
> **Individual Research**

Key Messages

- Candidates should produce two Individual Research reports with a question as a title for each report.

- Multimedia should be supported by a minimum of 750 words in continuous prose and all work should exemplify the assessment criteria. Sub-headings linked to the assessment criteria can help candidates structure their work. Reports consisting of text only should be between 1500 and 2000 words long.

- For each candidate in the sample Centres need to submit the work and the completed Individual Candidate Record Card (ICRC). The Centre also needs to include the MS1 for the component and the Coursework Assessment Summary Form (CASF).

- Candidates should submit their work as a word document and include the actual word count on each piece submitted.

General comments

There was a change to the requirements for the Individual Research this year in that candidates had to submit two research reports. The reports covered a variety of topics from the syllabus including and all Centres coped well with this change. Individual Research reports covering a variety of topics were submitted for moderation. Topics included: health and disease, water, food and agriculture, education for all, biodiversity, law and criminality and belief systems. The majority of candidates used questions to focus their research and their reports, for example, 'To what extent can water shortages be resolved on an individual level?' and 'How does climate change affect me?'.

Many candidates structured their reports well by using sub-headings linked to the assessment criteria. In the strongest reports candidates produced an individual response to the question/topic chosen and engaged with the issues at a personal level. Engagement is likely to be enhanced if the question has been designed by the candidate themselves.

Some candidates are exceeding the word count of 1500 – 2000 words as specified in the syllabus. Centres are asked to advise candidates to produce their work as word documents so they can monitor the word count themselves, it can be checked and corrective action taken prior to submission.

If other media, such as PowerPoint presentations, are produced, these should be accompanied by a minimum of 750 words as a word document. Both pieces should provide evidence of meeting the assessment criteria. Centres will appreciate that the work produced must reflect the assessment criteria and should be in continuous prose. Some candidates provide primary evidence and class work which is unnecessary. The only requirements for the Individual Research are that candidates produce and submit two Individual Research reports; there is no requirement for the submission of primary data used within the reports.

Centres should ensure that each Individual Research report is clearly labelled with the title of the piece in the form of a question which is the same as the title on the Individual Candidate Record Card (ICRC). Most Centres are now submitting ICRCs with marks and the titles of the reports in the appropriate place. It is also very useful to have the teacher comments related to the assessment criteria and marks awarded in the spaces provided.

Comments on candidate responses to assessment criteria

Gather and present information, representing different perspectives

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

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

Analyse issues within the topic as identified by the question posed for the study

The most successful reports covered fewer issues in-depth rather than presenting a lot of unrelated issues. To analyse an issue, candidates should consider the conditions related to the question being discussed and the possible causes and effects of these conditions, as well as the current situations.

Identify and evaluate possible scenarios and formulate possible courses of action

Candidates generally included scenarios within their reports. Some excellent responses demonstrated creative thinking about possible scenarios. Others needed to develop this area of their work by moving beyond scenarios that already exist to think about 'possible scenarios'. Where candidates had thought about this, they sometimes considered the likelihood of these scenarios, and were awarded marks for evaluation. These skills are among the most challenging for candidates and improvements are likely to be made by encouraging candidates to move beyond thinking about the present/current and into possibility thinking. A meaningful question to be asked to identify possible scenarios could be, 'What would happen if…?' Candidates would then need to evaluate the likelihood of this, and the possible consequences, in order to be awarded marks for evaluation. Furthermore, by doing this, candidates would be able to demonstrate that they have gained a grasp of the research question.

It is important to point out that proposals developed in a logical way are likely to score higher marks than those where the candidate has not structured their study in such a way as to allow for possible courses of action to be formulated.

Develop an evidence-based personal response, demonstrating self-awareness

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

Candidates usually made reference to their life at home, in school or where they lived in relation to the question posed. Such references were also useful when discussing possible scenarios and courses of action, sometimes identifying what they had not realised before they commenced their research or something that they will be doing differently as a result of their research. There is no longer a requirement for candidates to complete the self-evaluation form, so Centres should advise candidates of this.

Teacher assessment

The majority of Centres are clear about the assessment criteria and the difference between the bands. Where an Individual Research report meets the assessment criteria fully, marks within Band 4 were awarded and where there is limited information for one of the criteria, candidates were given marks in Band 1. It is worth pointing out that it is very rare for a candidate who has produced a study to be given no marks for any of the criteria, as there is usually something of value that can be credited.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

<div style="border: 1px solid black; display: inline-block; padding: 10px;">

Paper 0457/02

Group Project

</div>

Key Messages

- Candidate groups must submit a complete project plan. This can either be incorporated into the write-up of the project, or submitted as a separate document. In addition, each group project must result in a concrete, active project outcome which can be carried out. This is so that individual group members have something concrete to evaluate in their evaluation of project outcome.

- A requirement of the project component is that candidates engage in cross-cultural collaboration. Ideally, such collaboration will involve people in another country or countries. However, if this proves to be impossible, then candidates are advised to identify and collaborate with people from another culture or cultures within their own country. It is not advisable for candidates to rely solely on collaborating with students from other countries within their own school setting. This is because, on its own, such collaboration is unlikely to provide them with a rich enough experience to engage in an in-depth evaluation of what they have learned from cross-cultural collaboration. Information gathered from cross-cultural collaboration should be used to actively inform and support the project outcome.

- Individual group members must submit their own individual evaluations of: the project plan and the process of carrying out the project; the project outcome and an evaluation of their own contribution to and learning from the project (including what they have learned from the group's cross-cultural collaboration).

- In any write-up of the project, candidate groups should include some discussion of how their cross-cultural collaboration has informed the project outcome. It is not desirable for candidates to include a group evaluation of the project because this is likely to lead to repetition in individual candidates' evaluations leaving them with little new to say, and therefore unable to do themselves full justice in the individual assessment criteria.

- There must be some brief explanatory remarks on the Independent Candidate Record Cards to support/justify the marks that teachers have awarded for each of the assessment criteria and these record cards must be submitted, along with the Coursework Assessment Summary Form.

General Comments

An interesting range of topics was selected by candidates in this examination session. Some of the areas explored included: the accessibility of water to different socio-economic groups in Kenya; the plight of Hong Kong's cage dwellers; migrant workers; the relationship between education and poverty and issues relating to land reclamation in South East Asia.

There were some very appropriate project outcomes. Video clips were a popular outcome. Many of these were of good quality and demonstrated that the candidates concerned had given a good deal of consideration as to how different perspectives could best be communicated. A number of candidates also engaged in outcomes which required them to carry out active voluntary activities within their communities with people of another culture. Such outcomes generally provided the candidates concerned with a rich and personally satisfying learning experience. Other outcomes included: school assembly presentations; the construction of web sites and the development of educational materials.

UNIVERSITY *of* CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

© 2012

Comments on candidate response to assessment criteria

Production of a project plan
[Group assessment]

In the main, project plans were well done. Most were generally comprehensive and well communicated. Many candidate groups had clearly understood the need to state their project aims and outcomes clearly and this served group members well when it came to evaluating the outcome in light of the project aims. Project plans were generally presented either as the initial segment of the group's write-up of their activities and outcome, or in a separate document, and both of these approaches worked well. In a small number of cases candidate groups did not submit any form of project plan which meant that they could not gain any of the 10 marks available for this element of the assessment. If candidates aspire to achieve a mark in the top band for their project plan, they must give some indication of *why* individual roles and responsibilities were assigned in the way they were.

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]

The most successful projects were characterised by the fact that the candidate groups concerned seemed to have given careful consideration to their choice of partners for cross-cultural collaboration in order to ensure that the information gathered was meaningful. They subsequently used the information in an active way to inform and support their outcome. For instance, the outcome of one project was a video with the promotional aim of encouraging younger members of the school population to carry out voluntary work within the local community. The video itself carried interviews with a cross-section of people from their own and other cultures within the community, identifying and exploring those areas where help was needed and why. Projects that fared less successfully in this criterion did so generally because the candidates concerned appeared to have chosen their collaborative partners without giving due consideration to the nature of the information they needed to gather in order for it to make a concrete contribution to the development of their outcome. In some projects, there was little or no evidence of any cross-cultural collaboration. If little or no cross-cultural collaboration takes place, individual group members have nothing to comment on for this element in their evaluation of individual contribution and learning. In such a situation, even if the rest of their evaluation is very sound, the performance descriptors clearly indicate that the work cannot move beyond Band 1 for this criterion.

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.

Constructive participation in group work/activities
[Individual assessment]

Assessment of performance in this criterion must be based on concrete evidence recorded during teacher observations of group work in progress. Brief supporting comments may either be included on the form provided for this purpose on the CIE teacher support website, or directly on to the Individual Candidate Record Cards.

Evaluation of project plan and process
[Individual assessment]

Most candidates made a conscientious attempt to evaluate their group's project plan and the process of carrying out the project. In the main, comments focused on issues relating to time management, group dynamics and work allocation. While these are clearly important issues, candidates should also take the opportunity afforded by the requirements of this criterion to give some in-depth consideration to the quality and direction of the research undertaken as this would give their responses greater depth. Candidates should also remember that if they are to score well on this criterion, they need to consider the strengths *and* weaknesses of the plan and process, as well as offering suggestions for improvement.

Evaluation of project outcome
[Individual assessment]

The quality of the project outcome evaluations continues to improve. This examination session saw some work which showed a high degree of reflection and maturity of thought. The strongest evaluations were highly systematic in that they evaluated all aspects of the outcome with ongoing reference to the stated project aims. They evaluated the strengths *and* limitations of the outcome and then considered the degree to which the aims of the project had been achieved after taking these strengths and limitations into consideration.

Where candidates had focused solely on the quality of their project in general, rather than specifically on the outcome the responses were less successful. This often resulted from the fact that no real outcome had been identified by the group, leaving the individual group members with little concrete to say about the strengths of their project in terms of the group's teamwork, or the extent of their research (both of which should be covered under evaluation of project plan and process). Candidates should be reminded that in order to score well in this criterion, strengths and limitations of the outcome should be evaluated and this must be done in light of the project aims.

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

Generally, most candidates handled this aspect of the assessment well and were able to comment positively and in some depth on their personal contribution to the progress of the project. In the strongest responses, candidates included some consideration of how their personal contribution could have been improved. Candidates were also able to reflect on the benefits of working as a group, although there was often less consideration of the challenges posed by group work. Some of the strongest responses reflected in-depth on what had been learned from group's cross-cultural collaboration and commented on how their personal viewpoint on the issue had changed or been modified by what had been learned. In essence, such responses were engaging in reflective learning, a skill which is best enhanced throughout the duration of a course. As noted above, where groups had engaged in little or no cross-cultural collaboration, there was limited scope for individual members to comment on it in their evaluation and this restricted the number of marks accessible to them.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

> **Paper 0457/03**
>
> **Written Paper**

Key Messages

- Candidates engaged enthusiastically with the Source materials and in exploring global issues from different perspectives.

- Candidates performed well in analysing and interpreting information and evidence.

- Increased opportunity to develop evaluation skills within courses would be helpful, especially those of reasoning and evidence.

General Comments

Although the length of the written paper had changed from previous years to 1 hour 15 minutes, the general format and range of questions remained the same. The paper was based upon three contrasting pieces of Source material related to the global issue of deforestation.

Primarily, within the context of global perspectives, the paper was designed to test candidates' ability to:

- Identify and explore different perspectives on global issues
- Analyse and interpret information and evidence
- Identify gaps in evidence and suggest lines of enquiry
- Distinguish between different types of statement – fact, opinion, prediction and value judgements
- Develop a line of reasoning and justify their views
- Evaluate evidence and arguments

From the evidence of candidate responses, the Source material and questions were understood and accessible to candidates of all abilities. The vast majority of candidates were able to respond to the questions appropriately and demonstrate positive achievement. The paper also differentiated successfully.

Candidates appeared to enjoy responding to the Source material and engaged with the issues enthusiastically, especially in the more extended essay questions. Through the tasks, candidates generally showed good awareness of different points of view in exploring global issues, particularly distinguishing between personal, local and global perspectives.

In general, the questions were answered very well and there were some excellent responses to all of the questions. In particular, most candidates were able to demonstrate high levels of ability when analysing information and evidence from within the Sources. Similarly, candidates were able to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry to support decision making about how to respond to issues like deforestation. These skills were tested mainly in **Questions 1, 2 3a** and **3b**.

The ability to evaluate evidence and reasoning was more challenging for many candidates and is a skill that would benefit from further development during IGCSE Global Perspectives courses. Marshalling evidence and providing reasons to support an opinion was also challenging for some candidates. These skills were tested mainly in **Questions 3c** and **4**.

In general, candidates seemed to benefit from careful preparation for this examination by Centres. They had clearly undertaken stimulating, well designed courses that were effective in developing the skills to be tested, as well as engaging in the exploration of different perspectives on global issues.

In addition, examination technique was generally very good. Candidates seemed to have sufficient time for the tasks. The vast majority completed all of the questions within the time allocated.

As in previous years, to further improve performance candidates should be encouraged to:

- answer the question set carefully and refer back to the question regularly, particularly in the longer essay questions
- give clear reasons and evidence to support an opinion or argument
- evaluate reasoning and evidence by referring to strengths *and* weaknesses
- avoid simple assertion, opinion and anecdotal evidence.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1a

Candidates were asked to identify three causes of deforestation from the Source material. Candidates usually identified the following:

- Population growth
- Climate change
- Weak government
- Weak/no strong laws protecting forests
- Illegal logging
- More land needed to grow food
- More land is needed to grow bio-fuels
- Trees can not survive in natural habitats
- More people need more food
- People look for alternatives to bio-fuels

Candidates were not awarded marks for causes that were not contained within the Source. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified three of these causes and were awarded maximum marks.

Question 1b

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, which cause of deforestation was the most important. They were expected to give several reasons or some evidence for their choice. Candidates usually gave the following types of reasons to justify their choice:

- Possible consequences
- Urgency or time factors
- Degree of impact/seriousness/magnitude
- How many people/groups/countries are affected
- Increasing cycle of deforestation

The strongest answers provided several clearly reasoned explanations of why one cause is more important than others; this often directly compared the selected cause with one or more other causes. Some candidates needed to further develop their responses by explicitly linking the reasons to the issue of deforestation .

Most candidates answered this question well.

Question 1c

Candidates were asked to identify three consequences of deforestation from the Source material. Candidates usually identified the following:

- Climate change
- Natural disasters e.g. floods; landslides
- Hunger
- Illness
- Loss of animal habitats
- Less rainfall
- Potential medicines lost
- The food chain suffers
- Thirst
- Species extinction
- Soil erosion/loses quality
- Less Oxygen in air
- Less food can grow
- The earth is poorer

Candidates were not awarded marks for consequences that were not contained within the Source. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified three of these consequences and were awarded maximum marks.

Question 1d

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, which consequence of deforestation was the most important. They were expected to give several reasons or some evidence for their choice. Candidates usually gave the following types of reasons to justify their choice:

- Nature of consequence – how severe
- Urgency or time factors
- Degree of impact/seriousness/magnitude
- How many people/groups/countries affected
- Increasing cycle of difficulty

The strongest answers provided several clearly reasoned explanations of why one consequence is more important than others; this often directly compared the selected consequence with one or more other consequences. Weaker responses often stated the consequence or did not link the reasons to deforestation explicitly.

Most candidates answered this question well.

Question 2a

Candidates were expected to suggest a question to ask an expert on deforestation with an economics background that would provide information to enable them to decide the best way to reduce deforestation. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry to support decision making about how to respond to issues like deforestation.

The strongest responses tended to suggest a clearly phrased question which would obtain relevant information related to the reduction of deforestation and the content of the economist's statement in the Source material. For example, '*What evidence do you have that local people lack training in the management of forests and business?'* In some responses the question was related only tangentially to the issue. In such cases the candidates needed to develop a more explicit link to be awarded full marks.

Candidates were also asked to explain how the information gained from the answer to the question would help them to make a decision about the best way to reduce deforestation. The strongest responses tended to clearly describe the way that the information linked to deforestation and how it would help them in the decision-making process. A number of responses needed to move beyond describing alternative ways to reduce deforestation or in some cases describing their own opinion in an asserted way. To be awarded full marks the response needed to link to the question they had identified in question 2a.

Question 2b

Candidates were expected to suggest a question to ask an expert on deforestation with a community development background that would provide information to enable them to decide on the best way to reduce deforestation. This was designed to test candidates' ability to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry to support decision making about how to respond to issues like deforestation.

The strongest responses tended to suggest a clearly phrased question which would obtain relevant information related to the reduction of deforestation and the content of the community development worker's statement in the Source Material. For example, '*How does a system that treats people fairly reduce deforestation?*' Weaker responses tended to suggest a question only tangentially related to the issue. For example, '*What is a fair system?*'

Candidates were also asked to explain how the information gained from the answer to the question would help them to make a decision about the best way to reduce deforestation. The strongest responses tended to clearly describe the way that the information linked to deforestation and how it would help them in the decision-making process. As in question 2b a number of responses needed to move beyond describing alternative ways to reduce deforestation or describing their own opinion in an asserted way. To be awarded full marks the response needed to link to the question they had identified in question 2a.

Question 3a

Candidates were expected to interpret the meaning of a cartoon showing different perspectives on deforestation, particularly contrasting attitudes in more developed and less developed countries.

The cartoon contained two main perspectives – that of the wealthy, developed countries/character and that of the poorer, undeveloped countries/character. Essentially the wealthy character wants to prevent trees from being cut down to protect us from the greenhouse effect, whilst the poorer character needs the wood from the trees for survival and can not understand the view of the rich character, especially as he is also responsible for causing the greenhouse effect through pollution from the use of vehicles. There is a degree of hypocrisy in the attitude of the rich character.

Most candidates were able to describe at least one of the perspectives in at least a simple way. The strongest responses tended to give a clear description of both perspectives on deforestation within the cartoon. Some responses needed to move beyond a description of the cartoon onto explaining the different views and attitudes of the different characters.

Question 3b

Candidates were asked to analyse a statement from the Source material to determine and explain why it was a fact, opinion, value judgement, prediction, or consequence? The question was designed to test candidates' ability to distinguish between fact, opinion, prediction, consequences and value judgments.

The statement could be described as an opinion, value judgement, prediction or consequence, but not a fact.

The majority of candidates were able to identify a feature of the statement and give at least a simple explanation for their judgement. The strongest responses tended to demonstrate understanding of two or more features of the statement with clear, accurate explanation for at least one of these features. Some candidates identified one feature of the statement but did not explain effectively, revealing little or no understanding of the nature of the statement.

Question 3c

The question asked candidates to assess or evaluate the reasoning within a statement about a potential solution to deforestation involving paying local people to stop using forests and to plant additional trees. In order to do so candidates are expected to consider the reliability of evidence, the reasoning behind the argument and the views of other people.

Responses at the highest levels contained very good, well supported judgements about whether the reasoning worked well to justify the solution; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the reasoning worked with a focus on evaluation of issues, with a range of points about knowledge claims, evidence, consequences and values. These responses were usually balanced with a clear assessment or conclusion reached.

At the lower levels of response the discussions needed stronger clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues rather than knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Candidates found this question quite challenging. Centres are encouraged to provide candidates with opportunities to evaluate argument and evidence for a range of purposes during their courses in order to prepare for this type of question. Some key concepts in the evaluation of evidence and argument to consider would be:

- Validity
- Reliability
- Bias
- Authority
- Expertise
- Source of evidence
- Sufficiency of evidence
- Facts
- Opinion
- Assertion
- Values
- Beliefs
- Quality of reasoning/argument

Centres are advised to develop candidates' understanding of such concepts and to use them in analysing and evaluating short statements/passages. One idea would be for the teacher to produce different viewpoints on an issue, ideally representing different perspectives (personal, local, national, global), and then ask the students to evaluative these using some of the concepts stated above. Over time groups of students may be able to write their own scenarios to be used by others in the class.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to compare and assess the effectiveness of different forms of action to reduce deforestation at global, local and individual levels, making a judgment about which level(s) of action are the most likely to succeed. The candidates were expected to use the Source material but go beyond simply repeating or recycling without further development. Other material may also have been introduced but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

The arguments used by candidates to consider different levels of response tended to include:

- reference to scale of impact
- how long it takes to make a difference
- the effects of cultural differences and beliefs
- barriers to change
- the power of collective action
- the difficulties of changing individual behaviour
- the influence of individuals and groups acting locally
- the role of vested interests and power differences
- potential conflict
- difficulties in coordinating globally and across different countries with independence
- cost and access to resources to implement change
- governmental responses and action.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about which type/level of action is most likely to lead to a reduction in deforestation; this included coherent, structured argument and evaluation with at least two levels of action compared. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and focus on issues of deforestation rather than an explanation of *why* a level of action is more likely to reduce deforestation; or provide a list of ways to reduce deforestation without explanation of why these actions are most likely to succeed.