

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/01
Portfolio

General comments

Candidates produced portfolios covering a range of areas of study in this first October/November session of the examination. The areas of study included: technology and the economic divide, climate change, biodiversity and ecosystem loss, disease and health, law and criminality, traditions, culture and language, conflicts and peace and belief systems.

Some Centres allowed their candidates to choose their own topics for the portfolio, whereas others had clearly guided their candidates so that the work produced was from the same areas of study. In the majority of cases, the work produced was an individual response to the area of study investigated. It is important to note that any preparatory work done for the portfolio and for Global Perspectives in general need not be included with the final portfolio. Further, it is essential that the Moderator can see clearly and straight away that there are four pieces of work from four different areas of study and that there is no overlap across the four studies.

Centres are also reminded that the specified word count is 1000-1500 words for each of the two basic studies and 1500-2000 words for each of the two extended studies. Some candidates went beyond this while some candidates fell short of this amount. Teachers need to ensure that their candidates understand the need to stick to these limits and to enforce them when marking the submitted work. Work beyond the limits must not be included in the assessment and Moderators will look for evidence of this, if relevant.

Centres will appreciate that candidates need to produce work that reflects the assessment criteria for the portfolio as stated in the syllabus. Whilst not prescriptive, it might be helpful to some Centres if they were to provide guidelines to their students as to how the studies should be set out. Including sub-headings, which match the assessment criteria, might be useful to Centres and candidates during this early stage of the syllabus. Those candidates who set out their work with sub-headings related to the assessment criteria seemed to respond more successfully than those whose studies seemed to have little structure and were less focused and, therefore, were less successful in producing effective responses.

Some candidates failed to complete the required self-evaluation form (Appendix B of the syllabus). This is an important element to provide evidence for the assessment of a candidate's evidence-based personal response demonstrating self-awareness. The majority of candidates included a bibliography, which is good practice and shows that candidates are able to gather information from a variety of sources.

Centres are reminded of the requirement to label all electronic files and ensure that the Moderator can access files without difficulty; saving in 'rich text format' would be very useful. It is important that Centres check that all the files can be accessed so that moderation can take place at the required time and there is no delay in the issuing of results. Further guidance is available in CIE's guidance notes on the submitting of electronic files. As soon as possible, CIE intends to move across to submission of all files via CIE Direct, which will solve these problems.

Specific comments

Gather information representing different perspectives

Most candidates were able to gather and present information related to the areas of study. This seemed easier for those candidates who had clearly focused titles for their studies. Where the area chosen was large and the title of the study was less focused, candidates had more difficulty presenting the information they had gathered in a logical way. Some candidates had too much information so that this section of their studies took up a disproportionate amount of the overall word count.

Candidates should try to identify what they have investigated and the reasons for their choice at the start of the study. Most candidates presented a range of relevant information that represented several perspectives, but some did not always include a broad range of perspectives, including global, local and personal. Others were less successful because they favoured disproportionately the global or the personal.

Analyse issues within the areas of study

The majority of candidates identified some of the issues they discovered whilst conducting their research, although a thorough in-depth analysis of these issues was uncommon. Centres are asked to advise candidates to select fewer issues and look at them in more depth than to identify many issues. As well as considering the conditions of the issues in-depth, they also need to consider the possible causes of these conditions.

Identify and evaluate possible scenarios

Most candidates were able to identify some scenarios linked to their area of study, but these tended to be scenarios that already existed and evaluation tended to be limited. To access band 3 of this criterion, candidates need to identify a broad range of possible scenarios based on the evidence they have gathered, predicting what might happen if and/ or when, for example. This draws on their creative skills, allowing them to consider future possibilities and show that they have a real understanding of their chosen area of study.

Formulate possible courses of action

Better candidates were able to suggest possible courses of action, which were well-developed in a logical way even though they might not have been totally successful. Most of the possible courses of action given were solutions to problems that had already been identified in the study. The most successful studies were those where the title of the study was a question which the candidates then attempted to answer, identifying specific and relevant possible courses of action and evaluating whether and how these might or might not work.

Develop evidence-based personal response demonstrating self-awareness

The evidence for this part of the assessment can be within the study itself or included in a separate section or a final conclusion. Self-evaluation forms are also used to assess this criterion so it's important that Centres advise candidates to include well- completed self-evaluation forms relevant to the work submitted for the portfolio only.

Those candidates who could show meaningful personal involvement with their study scored well in this section. They were able to link their area of study to their life at home, at school or in their own community or country. Unfortunately, there were many candidates who failed to do this and focused their studies purely on the global information gathered, making them more descriptive and factual rather than personal to candidates.

Teacher assessment

In the main, marking was consistent, although there was significant evidence of over-marking. Further, it was unclear at times how some candidates had achieved the given marks. This mostly occurred where candidates had not produced sufficient evidence linked to the assessment criteria. It was also, at times, unclear as to how candidates had been advised to organise their work.

The most accessible work was submitted as a pdf portfolio containing four clearly focused titles and four pieces of work, each one with a word count, a bibliography and a self-evaluation form. Teachers are asked to take care over this. Several Centres had to be asked by CIE to submit supplementary material for files that were incomplete or missing – which jeopardises the issues of their results on time. Further guidance on doing this is available in CIE's Global Perspectives Portfolio Guide.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02

Project

General comments

Projects covered a range of topics, including: fuel and energy, conflict and peace, the alleviation of poverty, increasing awareness of the dangers of malaria and pneumonia, and the importance of good sanitation in relation to improving healthcare. Most projects represented the work of small groups of four or five candidates from within a class, with each group taking on a topic that was of particular interest to them. Many were also successful in communicating effectively what they have learned from their research.

There were, however, several instances where all candidate groups within a Centre had chosen the same topic area to research. These groups did not specify a particular outcome for their individual projects, but simply submitted the write-up of their research as the outcome in itself. Since all the groups had researched the same topic area, this led to a good deal of repetitive content across the groups' write-ups. If several groups are engaged in discussion and research on the same topic area, they need to avoid duplication of research. To that end, Centres should split up such a group so that different sub-groups explore separate aspects of the topic.

It was pleasing to note that this examination session saw an improvement in the presentation of candidates' work. In the main, individual candidate submissions were easily identifiable. However, there were still problems with accessibility of some candidates' work in that submissions had been made in files that could not be opened. Centres must ensure that all candidate work submitted for external moderation is not only clearly identified but can also be easily accessed by the Moderator – files saved as 'rich text' would be enormously helpful. As soon as possible, we intend to move across to submission of all files via CIE Direct, which will solve these problems. Candidates in some Centres submitted both the group submission and their individual evaluations in a single .pdf file, with clear headings on each page indicating which candidate had submitted the work on the page. This was very helpful and made accessing the work very easy.

Comments on candidate response to assessment criteria

Constructive participation in discussions **[Group assessment]**

Participation in group work/activities **[Individual assessment]**

Given the ephemeral nature of the evidence for assessment, it would not be useful to comment on the two assessment criteria above. However, it is worth noting that in most Centres, there was very little difference in the range of marks awarded to individual candidates for their Participation in group work/activities and in the range of group marks awarded for Constructive participation in discussion. Centres are reminded that they need to use the full mark range as appropriate in order to distinguish between the performances of individual candidates and of different candidate groups.

Project Plan **[Group assessment]**

The Project Plan was generally a criterion that all candidates managed to respond to reasonably well. In most plans, candidates explained the topic the group had chosen to work on and the rationale for their choice, how they planned to gather information and/or carry out the project and what each group member's role was.

Where most plans fell short was in the articulation of the aims and the intended outcome or outcomes of the project. Often the aims as explained were vague or very general in nature, for instance stating simply "We

want to know more about ...”, or “We want to research on ...”. While there is nothing wrong with candidates stating that they want to learn more about a particular area or issue, they need to go one step further and explain what they want to achieve by doing this, i.e. they need to specify their intended outcome. For instance, a group could decide that an appropriate outcome of their research might be to produce an information leaflet to raise awareness about an issue, or to make a presentation to persuade people of the need to change attitudes or behaviour, or to describe an action plan to help bring about change. If the intended outcome of the project is the production of a report or a write-up, then candidates still need to explain their aim in producing that report and/or their target audience. This means that when candidates start they must already have the end in mind and think carefully not only about the area(s) they want to research for their projects, but also the use they intend to make of the information gathered.

To reiterate the point made in the first paragraph of this report, candidates should ask themselves what the most effective means is of communicating what they have found out from their research and their cross-cultural collaboration. Candidates are reminded that one of the assessment criteria requires them to evaluate the outcome of their project. They will not be able to provide evidence for that criterion if they have not specified an outcome in the first place.

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

The quality of candidates' response to this criterion varied considerably. In some group submissions, there was little or no evidence of any cross-cultural collaboration having taken place. Candidates are reminded that in their *Evaluation of individual contribution*, they are required to evaluate what they have learned from cross-cultural collaboration and that if no such collaboration has taken place, or it has been minimal, they will be unable to evaluate adequately what they have gained from it. It was clear from the work of some candidate groups that they had communicated with people in other countries in order to gain information or to elicit different viewpoints on their area of investigation. Unfortunately, it was often the case that the information gathered was not put to any real use, but was simply mentioned as having been obtained. Some submissions contained transcripts of interviews, or e-mail documentation resulting from cross-cultural collaboration in an appendix to the main report. While it is sensible to keep the outcomes of surveys and research in an appendix, what has been learned from these must form an integral part of the report if the collaboration is to have been of any value at all. Candidates must consider what they have learned about their topic from people in other countries/cultures and then use what they have learned to draw conclusions and to move their project forward.

Many candidates also seemed reluctant to consider alternative viewpoints and, more often than not, confined themselves to examining their chosen topic from their own perspective only, or from their own perspective and the perspective of the group of people their project aimed to help. Candidates' attention needs to be drawn to the wording of the descriptor for this criterion in the top band. Firstly, “*Outcome demonstrates considerable awareness of different perspectives*”, which means that an issue needs to be considered from very different angles, depending on the viewpoints and needs of the various parties involved. Secondly, “*Shows clear understanding and appreciation of different viewpoint(s) from other culture(s)*”, which means that candidates need to go further than simply identifying or explaining the situation or issue in other cultures as compared with their own.

Evaluation of Project Outcome ***[Individual assessment]***

Very few candidates performed well on this criterion and, as stated earlier in this report, the main reason for this was that most did not specify what their project outcome was and so were unable to evaluate that outcome. Most candidates seemed to be under the impression that producing a report detailing their research was the obvious outcome of their project and therefore they need not articulate what they wanted to achieve or highlight by carrying out the research and writing up their findings. The result of this was that they were subsequently unable to discuss how far their project outcome (i.e. their research and report) had been successful in terms of achieving what they set out to achieve, or comment on what some of the weaknesses of the research and report were. Many candidates confined themselves to commenting on the success of their teamwork. Very few engaged in any critical consideration of the successes and failures of their project overall. Only a small minority considered improvements that could have been made to the project and/or alternative approaches that could have been taken.

The most successful individual evaluations generally came from candidates whose group submission had specified a specific/tangible outcome, such as advertisement posters, with some explanation of why they had been designed in the way they had and what had been taken into consideration, or an information stall at a

fete, with some explanation of the items on sale or for distribution and the rationale for selection. Such specific outcomes gave the individual group members ample opportunity to demonstrate their evaluative skills in commenting on the successes and failures of these outcomes in light of the stated aims of their projects. Candidates would be well advised to articulate the aims of their project and specify an outcome for their project at the outset of their group submission and then subsequently revisit those aims in their individual submissions to critically evaluate the success or otherwise of the outcome in achieving those aims, as well as consider possible areas of improvement.

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

Generally, candidates' evaluation of their individual contribution was thorough and they were able to identify their own strengths and weaknesses, although the depth of their comments varied considerably. In weaker submissions, candidates commented that they had learned important skills, but did not elaborate on what these might be, or why they might be important. Better evaluations were characterised by their honesty and insight in their consideration of both the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates concerned. Disappointingly, very few candidates engaged with the second element in this assessment criterion and examined what they had learned from cross-cultural collaboration. Given that this subject is "Global Perspectives", cross-cultural collaboration and reflection on what has been learned from that collaboration are key elements and should not be overlooked.

Teacher Assessment

In general, marking was consistent, although there was evidence of over-marking in some Centres. This largely arose when candidates had not actually produced the appropriate evidence to which the marking criteria could be applied. Would teachers please (a) check carefully the wording of the descriptors in each of the bands; (b) ensure that their candidates know clearly what is required by the descriptors; (c) apply the criteria rigorously so that marks are not awarded for qualities that are not actually present in the work.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/03

Written Paper

Overall, performance was pleasing in this second session of the pilot, with southern hemisphere Centres entering candidates for the first time. Examiners were also pleased to see a larger entry, and that candidates appeared to have participated in and benefited from a relevant and enjoyable course of study. A sizeable minority of candidates performed unevenly across the two sections. This did not appear to be consistent across whole Centres, and therefore did not seem to indicate that one area had been studied whereas the other had not. In some cases, this difference was clearly due to candidates spending too long on one section of the paper.

Section A

Candidates responded generally well to the scenario of a planning committee considering whether to allow a multinational corporation to build a Leisure Park.

Question 1

This question was well done. Most candidates were able to access high marks. Some candidates wrote more than was necessary to access the marks.

Question 2

This question was largely well done. Most candidates could think of two relevant things they needed to know, and most were able to say fairly precisely where they might find the information. It was pleasing that few candidates resorted to generic answers such as 'the Internet', although weaker candidates tended to name inappropriate people as the source of their information. There were two common weaknesses in answering this question: one was to paraphrase the example, and the other was to say that we need to find out information which had already been given in the stimulus material. Most candidates were able to say how this information would help them make a decision, although some candidates lost focus on the decision, and therefore did not access full marks.

Question 3

- (a) Most candidates were able to give some justification for their view on whether this was a fact or an opinion. Either answer could have gained full marks if well supported.
- (b) Most candidates made a reasonable attempt at this question. However, many candidates expressed agreement or disagreement with Miss T's opinions rather than considering how rationally convincing her argument was in terms of the knowledge claims she made and the likelihood of the possible consequences coming about. A number of candidates focused on the quality of her language rather than the quality of her argument.

The strongest candidates argued that Miss T might have a point about opposition to the Leisure Park being based in fear and misunderstanding, using the other sources to support this view. They then said that Miss T herself was inclined to the opposite extreme of unfounded optimism, making unlikely predictions. For example, they said that it was unlikely that a single ice rink would lead to winning medals, without dedication, training and funding. Some also pointed out that there was a possible contradiction between the aims of luring the disaffected youth away from the railways and training elite individuals for high level competitions. The best candidates accepted that there was some merit in Miss T's argument, but disagreed with the extreme conclusions she drew from her basic reasons. For example, they felt that it was likely that the Leisure Park would provide jobs for some people, but they questioned whether this was enough to support the Leisure Park without taking into consideration the effect of such a park on the local economy.

Question 4

This question differentiated very well. The strongest candidates wrote rationally persuasive reasoning to support their decision, chose relevant and apt alternative points of view and answered them clearly. They used ideas from the stimulus material together with their own thinking in an organised, structured way.

Weaker candidates rearranged – or even jumbled – information from the stimulus material, engaging in a cutting and pasting activity without any real critical engagement with this material.

Candidates were fairly split about whether to allow the building of the Leisure Park or not. Some of the strongest answers included consideration of relevant issues which were not developed in the stimulus material, such as the environmental impact of such a Leisure Park, or its economic effect of bringing tourists / visitors from other local towns.

Section B

Question 5

- (a) Most candidates performed very well in this question. The main difficulty was candidates writing down information from the stimulus material which was a consequence of people living in poverty or a long term reason for poverty rather than a reason for more people living in poverty *now*.
- (b) This was well answered.
- (c) Candidates who answered the question about how the World Bank can help poor people during the food, fuel and financial crisis tended to write strong answers. A large proportion of candidates, however, answered in general terms about how the World Bank can help people, often simply copying material from the stimulus.

Question 6

Candidates generally responded well to the changed format of this question. The more open ended question allowed the most able to show what they could do. The strongest candidates really responded to the challenge of this question, considering precise areas in which they needed information, developing these and showing clearly how this would affect the decision. For example, 'They also need to know is this a country that heavily relies on rainfall and its crops because if it does not rely on these and their failing is really of little consequence to the country, for example if it manufactures toys, then the World Bank would be unlikely to make this decision and would have to look into the country's ulterior motives in asking for that amount of money.'

Weaker candidates tended to be vague, ask for information that had effectively been given, and forget to say how the information would affect the World Bank's decision. For example, 'We need to know the effect of the failed rains,' or 'The World Bank needs to know what the problem is.'

Question 7

- (a) Most candidates were able to identify an example of a World Bank project which has had problems.
- (b) Most candidates were able to give an opinion and explain why it was an opinion, although some candidates selected facts or examples instead of an opinion.
- (c) This question was done very much better than the similar question in June, which was pleasing. Most candidates performed the right task of considering how likely this consequence was. The strongest candidates answered with some subtlety, really considering *how* likely. For example, they argued, 'It is very likely that some of the money will go to greedy government officials, partly because we have seen examples of this in the past (Chittagong and Armenia) and partly because it is human nature to try to gain a little bit for yourself. However, it is unlikely that all of the money in all of the cases will go to corrupt officials...' Most candidates tended to be more extreme or more certain, 'Yes, it is likely. People can't be trusted,' or, 'No, it is not likely.'

- (d) There was a mixed response to this question about value judgements. Some candidates talked about the consequences of money going to corrupt officials rather than the poor without considering whether this mattered. Other candidates expressed a very strong moral response without fully justifying it. Some able candidates answered very fluently about long term economic consequences without really hitting the heart of the moral issue. The strongest candidates considered the moral and economic issues, and justified their answers. Some candidates argued that, although it mattered because it was bad to steal money from those who needed it, it did not matter that much because most of the money was still going to those in need.

Question 8

Again, this question discriminated well. The best candidates kept their focus on the question 'Is the World Bank the **best** way of getting help to the poorest people in the world?', gave rationally persuasive reasons to support their opinion, offered alternative points of view and really answered these. These candidates tended to consider other ways of helping the poor, such as smaller projects organised by charities like World Vision (a charity mentioned by at least one candidate from each Centre). These candidates considered the merits of large amounts of money and international organisation versus small, targeted projects. These candidates considered the speed with which the World Bank could respond to crisis and the weight of support behind it, as it is funded by 185 member countries. They also considered that the World Bank gives money to the poorest countries, which include many of the poorest people, so that they are not burdened by debt. Many of these candidates concluded that the World Bank is the best way of getting money to the poorest people in some circumstances, but that it is a good thing that there are other charities too, and that perhaps some changes could be made to improve the World Bank.

Weaker candidates tended to talk more generally about the advantages and disadvantages of the World Bank. For many of these candidates, corruption made the World Bank worthless – indeed some attributed the corruption to the World Bank rather than to recipient governments. There was little consideration that corruption might affect donations coming from other charities. Weaker candidates tended to give and expand on their opinions rather than supporting those opinions with reasons. They generally did not consider and answer different views. Assertions will not score many marks.

