

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

---

**Paper 0457/01**

**Portfolio**

## **General comments**

The Moderator is pleased to report that candidates produced portfolios covering a range of areas of study on this, the first year of the examination. Areas of study included: climate change; biodiversity; employment; education; war and conflict; demographic changes; life expectancy; fuel and energy; trade and aid; health and disease; law and criminality and cultural issues.

Some Centres had clearly guided their candidates to consider similar areas of study while others had allowed freedom of individual choice. In all cases the responses were obviously those of the individual candidates concerned and represented a range of approaches to the area chosen. In other cases Centres had encouraged their candidates to consider similar areas of study but within different contexts chosen by the individual candidates. Whichever approach is adopted, it is important that candidates do not repeat similar content and therefore create overlap across the four studies.

Unfortunately, some candidates went beyond the word count specified in the syllabus of 1000–1500 words for the two basic studies and 1500–2000 words for the two extended studies. Centres are asked to monitor this situation carefully for future examinations and to complete the assessment of work when the respective limits have been reached.

Centres will appreciate that candidates must produce work reflecting the assessment criteria for each of the two types of study. The syllabus sets out a recommended structure for the studies but explains that these need not necessarily be used as formal headings within the studies. However, it would be fair to point out that candidates generally responded more successfully when they had been given some form of structure or set of headings that reflected the requirements for assessment. Some candidates even included a brief outline plan for each of their proposed studies and this approach seemed to lead to appropriate and successful outcomes.

Centres are reminded of the requirement to label accurately all electronic files so that the Moderator can access these without difficulty. All files for any particular candidate should be together under the correct identification information as set out in CIE's guidance notes.

## **Comments on specific assessment criteria**

### ***Gather information representing different perspectives***

The majority of candidates were able to gather and present a wide range of information linked to the area under investigation and this often came from a variety of sources. Candidates need to be concise in presenting information in this section of their studies in order not to take a disproportionate share of the overall word count.

It is important for the reader to be able to access the substance of each study as quickly as possible so candidates are advised to include an identification of the area to be investigated with reasons for the choice and the intended purpose or outcome, at the start.

Candidates generally realised that they needed to include global, local and personal perspectives when presenting information.

***Analyse issues within the areas of study***

This is one area of the assessment that would be expected to discriminate well between candidates. Unfortunately some candidates tended to restrict the analysis of information to a rather descriptive style rather than being creative and casting a genuinely individual look at the issues raised. It is hoped this will develop with time but Centres need to encourage their candidates to cover fewer issues in depth rather than attempting to consider too many. It is not only the in-depth consideration of conditions that is required but also the considered possible causes of these.

***Identify and evaluate possible scenarios***

Candidates were generally able to identify a few scenarios linked to the area under study and based on evidence collected but these tended to be those already existing and they were not always evaluated in an objective way.

For the award of high marks under this criterion, candidates do need to look beyond the current situation and identify or predict possible future scenarios. The meaningful question to be asked is: 'What would happen if.....?' In answering questions of this type candidates can show that they have really gained a grasp of the chosen area of study.

***Formulate possible courses of action***

As might be expected, there was a wide range of responses to this requirement of the extended studies. It is not necessary for proposals to be 'successful' in order for candidates to have access to high marks here so long as they have been well developed in a logical way. It is anticipated that the courses of action are likely to be suggestions for the removal or improvement of problems that have been identified elsewhere in the study.

***Develop evidence-based personal response demonstrating self-awareness***

Evidence for this part of the assessment was either embedded in the body of the study or included mainly in a separate section or a final conclusion. Consideration was also given to a candidate's self evaluation form.

A significant number of candidates achieved reasonably high marks as they were able to show evidence of meaningful personal involvement in the consideration of evidence presented throughout their work. The reference points for these responses were generally linked to life at home, in school or in their own country or community, often including cultural issues.

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

---

Paper 0457/02

Project

## General comments

Candidate projects covered a range of topics, including the conservation of water, fuel and energy conservation, urbanisation, healthcare, belief systems and their impact on societies, as well as unemployment and the current global economic crisis. 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. Centres are advised that if a whole class is engaged in discussion and research on a single broad topic area, for instance, issues relating to conservation, then the class should be divided up into small groups to work on projects, with each group of candidates working on different aspects of the broad topic (e.g. water conservation, fuel conservation, heritage conservation etc.). This is to ensure that the work of each group of candidates is different and not repetitive of other groups' work, thus providing candidates sufficient opportunity to fully demonstrate the skills required in their response to the assessment criteria.

Centres must ensure that all candidate work submitted for external moderation is clearly identified and can be easily accessed by the Moderator. This applies to both the labelling of compact discs as well as the naming of files on the disks. Some Centres had clearly given some consideration to the identification and accessibility of their candidates' work and this was much appreciated. These Centres generally submitted one disk per candidate group, with the Centre number and the candidates' index numbers clearly labelled on the outside of the disc. The files within each disc were then each clearly identified as being either a group submission (e.g. a project report, or PowerPoint presentation etc.) or an individual submission (i.e. each individual's evaluation of the project outcome and their evaluation of their own contribution). Unfortunately, in the case of work submitted by some Centres, it was very difficult to identify individual submissions. There were also cases of what appeared to be duplicate files on the same disc for some candidates and it was not clear which file was intended as the final submission. It is a Centre's responsibility to ensure that all its candidates' electronic submissions, whether group or individual, are clearly identified, both in terms of the identity of the candidate and the nature of the submission, and that all files can be accessed by the Moderator.

## Comments on candidate response to assessment criteria

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

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

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 Centres with a larger number of candidate groups, very little difference in the range of group marks awarded for *constructive participation in discussion*. Centres are therefore reminded that they should use the full mark range as appropriate to discriminate between the performance of both individual candidates and 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 were vague or very general in nature, for instance; "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 really need to go one step further and explain what they want to achieve by doing this, i.e. to specify the 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, then candidates still need to explain their aim in producing that report and/or their target audience. This means that candidates must begin with the end in mind and think carefully, not only about the area(s) they want to research for their project, but also the use they intend to make of the information gathered. Candidates are reminded that one of the assessment criteria requires them to evaluate the outcome of their project and they will not be able to provide evidence for that criterion if they have no outcome in mind.

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

The quality of candidates' response to this criterion varied considerably. It was clear from the work of many candidate groups that they had taken pains to communicate with people in other cultures and elicit their opinions on a variety of issues, or to gain information from them about particular situations or problems in their countries. However, it was mostly the case that the information gathered was not put to any concrete use, but was simply mentioned as having been obtained. Often, candidates simply stated that their own country faced a particular problem and that this same problem was also faced by countries X, Y and Z. This kind of approach lacks depth and does not allow candidates to provide sufficient evidence to reach the upper ranges of the mark scheme, which in the case of this criterion, can provide a maximum of eight marks. 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", 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)", 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 the fact that most candidates did not specify what their project outcome was and were consequently unable to evaluate the 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 the report was meant to achieve or highlight. The result of this was that they were then unable to discuss how far their project outcome (i.e. their report) had been successful in terms of achieving their aims, or what the areas of weakness were. Many candidates simply confined themselves to commenting on the success of their teamwork and very few engaged in any critical consideration of the successes and failures of their project. Only a small minority of candidates considered improvements that could have been made. Candidates would be well advised to articulate the aims of their project and specify the outcome of the project at the outset of their group submission; 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 considering possible areas for improvement.

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

Most candidates did engage in some evaluation of their individual contribution and were able to identify their own strengths and weaknesses, although the level of critical evaluation in their comments varied considerably. Many candidates simply confined themselves to stating what ideas they had suggested in group discussion, or commented that they had learned important skills, but did not elaborate on what these might be. Better evaluations showed 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, though there was evidence of considerable over-marking in some Centres. This largely arose when candidates had not produced the appropriate evidence to which the marking criteria could be applied. Teachers must be guided by the wording of the descriptors in each of the bands to ensure that their candidates produce the evidence necessary for the application of the descriptors.

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

---

**Paper 0457/03**

**Written Paper**

Overall, performance was pleasing in this first session. The cohort was small, but candidates appeared to have participated in and benefited from a relevant course of study.

## 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, although some resorted to generic answers such as 'on the internet'. Most candidate 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. For example, some candidates answered, 'I need to know whether there are enough teachers to teach English. If there are not, I would not be able to have lessons in English.' However, the scenario specified that lessons already took place in English, so this suggestion was not appropriate.

Better answers included:

'I need to know whether candidates want to learn Chinese. I will find out by conducting a survey in the school. This will help me to make a decision because, if candidates are going to be uncooperative, learning will slow down and candidates will be at a disadvantage. So I probably would not hold all lessons in Chinese if the candidates did not want to learn through Chinese.'

'I need to know whether parents would support a change to holding all lessons in Chinese. I would find out by asking the parents' committee. If parents opposed their children learning through Chinese they might withdraw their children from school, so I would not be able to introduce Chinese as the main language of learning.'

## Question 3

- (a) Most candidates were able to find and write down one opinion and two facts accurately.
- (b) Most candidates made a reasonable attempt at this question. However, many candidates expressed agreement or disagreement with Mr L's opinions rather than considering how rationally convincing his argument was in terms of the knowledge claims he made and the likeliness of the possible consequences coming about.

The strongest candidates said that Mr L had used facts well to support the claim that China was a growing economic power but that he had not shown that China would become more important than America, or that the importance of the Chinese economy meant that the Chinese language would replace English as *the* global language. These candidates said that Mr L predicted some extreme and unlikely consequences of not learning through Chinese. They suggested that, although it might be important to learn Chinese to benefit from trade with China, it was unlikely that the country would return to poverty just because they did not learn other subjects through the medium of Chinese, because Chinese people use English in trade, because English is spoken by half the world's population, and because there are other forms of international business as well as trade. These candidates felt that Mr L was arguing to a large extent from opinion which was not backed up by fact and that he was selecting facts that suited him and ignoring facts that did not suit him.

**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.

The majority of candidates spent too long describing the scenario, explaining why a decision had to be made and talking about the consultative processes they had been through – sometimes as much as half the available space – before stating the conclusion they had come to or explaining their reasoning.

A number of candidates wrote a rather jumbled descriptive account of some of the advantages and disadvantages of learning through English, Chinese or a local language which were in the stimulus material. These candidates were generally rather vague about which alternative points of view they had considered.

For example, stronger responses included:

‘Dear Parents,

After much discussion I have decided that City School will continue to hold lessons in English because this will be in the best interests of students. English is still the most important global language, spoken by half the world and used in business and on the internet. So your children will be able to communicate with most people and do business with most people, as well as researching information online. Another important reason is that your children already speak English, so they can continue learning other subjects through English without a break.

*[Here the decision is clearly stated, followed by a general reason why, followed by more supporting reasons taken from the stimulus material, followed by likely consequences of this and a conclusion drawn from information in the stimulus material].*

Some of you wanted us to hold lessons in Chinese because China’s economy is growing so fast *[alternative view and reason why people hold this view]*. I agree that it may be important for your children to speak Chinese *[partial acknowledgement of alternative view]*, but there are a number of disadvantages with this option *[general reason for disagreement with alternative view]*. Chinese is very difficult to learn, and your children would have to interrupt their other studies to learn Chinese. It is not certain that Chinese will become more important than English in international business. I also found that there are not enough Chinese teachers so this option is not realistic *[supporting reasons for disadvantages of learning through Chinese with consequences/conclusions drawn]*. However, I have decided to introduce Chinese as an additional course of study for those who are interested *[compromise position stated]*.

One other alternative opinion was that we should hold lessons in a local language to ensure that local languages and culture are properly valued *[second alternative view and reason why people hold this view]*. This is a very important point *[partial acknowledgement of view]*, but there are four local languages, and we want all the candidates to communicate with each other and feel that they are part of one school *[reasons not to accept this view]*.

Yours,

Head Teacher.’

*[Overall, this view is logical, rational and clearly stated].*

Weaker candidates tended to write as follows:

‘Dear Parents,

We have been engaging in lots of discussions to try to decide which language to have lessons in. I have listened to many different points of view and taken them all seriously. We have considered the options of lessons in Chinese, lessons in English or lessons in a local language. Some of you supported one of these options, whilst others supported different options. I have listened to you all and finally, after weighing many views, I have made my decision.

Business meetings take place in English. 80% of the internet is in English. Candidates already speak English. Chinese is too difficult to learn and candidates are protesting. China exports \$180 billion of electronic goods each year and it is overtaking Germany to become the third largest economy in the world. The case for learning Chinese is very strong. There are thousands of symbols in Chinese but only 26 letters in English. Local languages should be valued.

I hope you understand that we have thought very carefully about this decision and that you will agree with us.

Head Teacher.'

*[This candidate has not clearly stated the decision taken. The first paragraph uses many words to say very little. The second paragraph is a jumble of ideas taken from the stimulus material, juxtaposed as if the candidate is trying to put forward a view and then counter it, but with limited success].*

### Question 5

Many candidates performed well on this question, providing explanation and using the information from the source materials. Weaker candidates were able to access some marks by selecting and copying relevant facts from the stimulus material.

### Question 6

As with **Question 2**, candidates performed fairly well on this question, but some needed to remain focused on the decision. Some seemed to forget that they were working for the World Bank and making a decision about whether to fund the dam.

### Question 7

In part **(a)**, candidates were able to identify some fairly secure predictions as facts, and were credited for doing so. However, very few candidates identified the two clear facts, 'I already store rain water,' and 'lakes around the world are shrinking'.

A very small minority of candidates knew that a value judgement is to do with the values we place on things, such as right and wrong, and identified, 'It's not right flooding people's homes.'

Parts **(b)** and **(c)** posed a problem for some candidates who otherwise produced a high standard of answer, because they did not understand 'is this a likely consequence?' Many candidates answered by talking about whether attracting tourists or having enough water was a good reason for building a dam. The strongest candidates talked about how likely these consequences were, using the stimulus material, their own ideas and drawing conclusions.

For example, in response to part **(b)**, strong candidates produced responses such as:

'Whether tourists are attracted to the dam depends on many things. If it is in a developing country, they may not be attracted, as tourists like things like sailing, which does not happen on dams in developing countries according to source 2. Also, it is in a region with small farms and a growing city. This does not sound like a place many tourists would want to visit. But it is possible that the city could advertise the dam, or that the dam will help the city to grow and develop other things that will attract tourists. It also depends on how big the dam is, and how beautifully it is kept. If the tourists do come, they are likely to spend money in the region on food and hotels and things.'

In response to part **(c)**, a strong response was:

'It is a likely consequence that some farmers will have enough water to keep their crops growing, because dams store water so that it can be used when there is not enough rainfall. In developing countries most dam water is used for agriculture. But it may get diverted into the cities for drinking water. Also, farmers below the dam may not have enough water, because the river would not flow as well as it used to below the dam. Also, dams do not create water – in a really severe drought even dams can dry up.'

**Question 8**

This question also discriminated well. The best candidates kept their focus on the question, 'are dams a good way of managing water?' They gave rationally persuasive reasons to support their opinion, offered alternative points of view and really responded to these.

Weaker candidates tended to talk more generally about the advantages and disadvantages of dams, or about whether a dam should be built in this situation, lifting stimulus material without really using it. Some candidates made contradictory statements.