

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. The reports need to be word documents to check word counts. The use of appropriate multimedia should be carefully considered in this component as it really a task particularly suited to the use of continuous prose.
- If using multimedia, it 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 within the reports help candidates structure their reports.
- Assessors should add notes linked to the assessment criteria to the Individual Candidate Record Cards (ICRCs) as this helps when marking and moderating.
- Titles of candidates' work should be written in the space provided on the ICRC so that it is clear which piece of work has received which marks.
- For each candidate, Centres need to submit the work and the completed ICRC. The Centre also needs to also include the MS1 form for the component and the Coursework Assessment Summary Form (CASF) with the marks for all candidates on it. All files should be clearly labelled as indicated in the document *Submitting Global Perspectives work to Cambridge*. This is available on the Teacher Support Site and on CIEDirect.
- The total marks on the ICRCs, the MS1 and the CASF should be the same.
- Centres should include the highest mark and the lowest non-zero mark in the sample and further candidates' work from across the range.

General comments

Centres are becoming more familiar with the expectations for this component, although there are still some misunderstandings which have been addressed in the Moderator's report to each individual Centre. Please ensure that all teachers responsible for teaching this component have access to the Centre report so that they can act on any advice given and guide their learners appropriately. Moderators are pleased to report that candidates produced interesting Individual Research reports covering a variety of topics from the 20 topic areas. Topics included: conflict and peace, water, food and agriculture, education for all, biodiversity and law and criminality.

The majority of candidates used questions to focus their research and their reports. It was clear that some Centres allowed candidates to choose their own questions to focus their reports on, whilst others were more prescribed. Many candidates also structured their reports well by using sub-headings linked to the assessment criteria. This made marking and moderation more straightforward.

Some Centres had covered a range of topics and candidates were given freedom of choice as to which they chose for their Individual Research reports. It was pleasing to see that many candidates chose a topic of interest to them. This meant that they were in a stronger position to evaluate any possible scenarios, give courses of action and respond personally to what they had found out and explain how their thinking about an issue had changed and the behaviour and action they would take as a result of their research in the future.

Unfortunately, it is still evident that some candidates are exceeding the word count of 1500 – 2000 words as specified in the syllabus. Centres are asked to direct candidates to produce their work as word documents so this can be checked and they should monitor this situation and advise candidates accordingly. Please also ask candidates to only include pictures and diagrams if they refer to them in the body of their work. Some candidates appear to be spending a long time on the presentation of their work for which there are no marks.

If media, such as PowerPoint presentations, are produced, there should also be a minimum of 750 as a word document and both should provide evidence of the assessment criteria so it is clear where marks have come from. Centres are advised to steer candidates away from using other media to present their research as the Individual Research report lends itself to an essay unlike the Group Project where outcomes lend themselves to the use of multimedia.

Centres will appreciate that the work produced must reflect the assessment criteria and should be in continuous prose. Some candidates are still providing primary evidence and class work which is unnecessary and adds to confusion when moderating a centre's work. The only requirements for the Individual Research are that candidates produce and submit two Individual Research reports. There should also be a completed Individual Candidate Record Card (ICRC) for each candidate submitting work for this component. One copy of a Coursework Summary Assessment Form (CASF) and MS1 form should also be submitted as these contain the marks for all candidates in the Centre. It is helpful if each question is written in the space provided on the ICRC and that there are comments linked to the assessment criteria to help with marking and moderation.

Comments on specific questions

Teacher assessment

Overall it is pleasing to see that Centres are clearer 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 research report to be given no marks for any of the criteria, as there is usually something of value that can be credited. 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 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 can be awarded.

Gather 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 to answer their research question and this usually came from a range of sources, which were usually well referenced. 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 research. 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. All work must be in the candidate's own words or quoted directly and all sources *must* be acknowledged to avoid any suspicion of plagiarism.

Analyse issues within the report

Analysis, this session, was on the whole better than in previous sessions. More successful reports covered fewer issues in depth rather than simply 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. However, these are still largely scenarios that already exist and there remains an overall lack of creative thinking about possible scenarios. Where candidates had thought about possible scenarios, they sometimes considered the likelihood of these

scenarios, and were awarded marks for evaluation. This is getting better, but is still not a regular feature of the work moderated.

A meaningful question to be asked to identify possible scenarios could be, 'What would happen if?' Candidates then need to evaluate the likelihood of this and the possible consequences in order to be awarded marks for evaluation. By doing this, candidates can demonstrate that they have really gained a grasp of the research question.

It is important to point out that any proposals that are developed in a logical way will score better marks than those listed randomly at the end of a study because the candidate has run out of time or words or has not structured their study in such a way as to allow for possible courses of action to be formulated. To be awarded marks in Band 4, candidates must give possible scenarios and evaluate their likelihood as well as giving well developed courses of action.

Develop 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, which was regular practice, although some candidates are still submitting self-evaluation forms which add little to the overall quality of the work. If candidates comment as they go through their piece, they can show self-awareness, understanding and empathy and are more likely to link their personal response to their research.

Candidates can make reference to their life at home, in School or where they live in relation to the question posed, 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. Better research reports explained how a candidate's thinking and behaviour would alter as a result of something they had found out whilst doing their research. Often, they mentioned changes in their actions and influencing others to also make a change in their behaviour.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02
Project

Key Messages

- Each project must result in a clearly identified active project outcome. It is not appropriate for candidate groups to present case studies or research reports as outcomes as these are already the focus of Component 1. The project should focus on group action on an issue.
- Each group of candidates must submit a detailed project plan and a write-up of their project which explains the activities they carried out in coming up with their project outcome; evidence of their cross-cultural collaboration and an explanation of how it informed/supported their outcome, and evidence of the outcome itself, in the form of a description, or photographs/videos etc. The plan and the write-up can be combined into one document or they can be kept separate.
- Each individual group member must submit one individual piece of work divided into 3 sections: evaluation of project plan and process, evaluation of project outcome (with consistent reference to the project aims) and evaluation of individual contribution and learning (including what has been learnt from cross-cultural collaboration).
- Since they need to evaluate the success or otherwise of their outcome in achieving the project aims, candidates would be well-advised to consider how they might measure that success at the beginning of the project when they are deciding on the outcome. In addition, it is important that they articulate their aims clearly so that they can refer to them when evaluating the outcome.
- While guiding questions or templates can help to provide scaffolding for candidates' responses in their individual evaluations, such questions or templates must be aligned to the assessment criteria and be informed by the wording of the performance descriptors in each of the mark bands. If they are not aligned, candidates will not produce the appropriate evidence for assessment and therefore be disadvantaged.
- Genuine and purposeful cross-cultural collaboration is a compulsory element of the project component. It is not appropriate for candidates to rely solely on interviewing peers from other countries in their School. Nor is it appropriate for candidates to simply rely on Internet research into the situation/issue across different countries and then present that information in different formats. Candidates are required to interact with people from another country/culture/community either actually or virtually and use the experience to develop/support their project outcome in some way.
- Teachers are strongly urged to provide some brief supporting comments justifying their award of marks for each of the assessment criteria on each of the Individual Candidate Record Cards as this will greatly assist the process of moderation.

General Comments

There were some very interesting and well-executed projects in this examination session. Topics covered included: increased access to education for the underprivileged; education of the young on the problems of bullying and cyberbullying and the negative and positive impacts of peer pressure on young people; healthy eating and issues around buying locally produced food rather than building up food travel miles; education of the young on respect for other cultures and issues surrounding stereotypes and cultural identity and the provision of affordable and flood-proof housing using bamboo.

Some highly appropriate active and imaginative outcomes included: a pop-up book; a comic strip storyboard; a play script; a cookbook; fundraising events; lessons and activities for children; photographs of housing models; posters and movies.

Comments on candidate response to assessment criteria

Production of a project plan

(Group assessment)

Project plans were generally detailed and well-formulated. The best plans included a thoughtful explanation of the rationale for topic choice; well-articulated achievable aims, and a clearly identified intended project outcome which was active in nature and which the group was clearly enthusiastic about. In addition, all the required project activities were detailed, with timeframes and some clear consideration had been given at the outset as to what the nature of the cross-cultural collaboration was going to be and what its role would be in informing and supporting the outcome. Many plans also gained marks in the top band because they provided a thoughtful commentary on why each group member had been tasked with certain activities. Candidates should be advised that time spent on detailed planning of the project is time well spent. Weak plans did not score well generally because there were key elements missing, such as clear aims, or timeframes, or outcomes were vague. Candidates must be made aware of what is required by careful reading of the performance descriptors within the mark bands for the production of the project plan.

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

(Group assessment)

It was clear from the work of some candidate groups that cross-cultural collaboration had been thoughtfully and purposefully planned and executed and it had clearly been used to underpin the project outcome. However, it remains the case that in some Centres, either cross-cultural collaboration is entirely absent from candidates' projects, or it is paid lip-service only. The element that sets the project component apart from the other components of the IGCSE Global Perspectives syllabus is its requirement for candidates' to engage in meaningful cross-cultural collaboration. Teachers may need to help candidates explore possible avenues for such collaboration at the project planning stage. If there are difficulties in interacting with Schools/people overseas, then candidates should be advised to consider different cultures within their own country, but they should not rely solely on peers in their School for views and information.

Teachers are reminded that "Production of a project plan" and "Representation of different viewpoints and perspectives (including cross-cultural)" are both marked on a group basis and this means that all candidates in a group should be awarded the same mark for these two criteria.

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 teacher support website, or directly on to the Individual Candidate Record Cards.

Evaluation of project plan and process

(Individual assessment)

There were many detailed and thoughtful individual evaluations. However, candidates need to be reminded that in order to do well in this assessment criterion, they must evaluate both the project plan **and** the process. In addition, their evaluation must be in-depth and critical, considering strengths and weaknesses in and offering suggestions for improvement in **both the project plan and process**. While many candidates did comment at length on weaknesses in areas such as time management or lack of group cohesion, they should also be encouraged to consider strengths and weaknesses in other areas, such as the research process.

Evaluation of project outcome

(Individual assessment)

This series has seen some improvement in the quality of outcome evaluations. More candidates are recognising that they do need to make explicit and consistent reference to the project aims when evaluating the outcome. Strong evaluations invariably reflected the fact that the candidates concerned had clearly given considerable thought as to how the success of their projects could be measured in concrete terms, either by use of surveys, interviews or questionnaires. Candidates should be encouraged to consider how they will measure their outcome's success or otherwise in terms of achieving the project's aims, at the outset of the project. Weak evaluations made little or no reference to the project aims but simply commented on

whether the outcome was finished on time and whether the group was pleased with the result. Such responses lacked any kind of in-depth critical consideration.

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

Candidates were generally well able to identify the elements they had contributed to the project process, both in terms of research and activities. However, rather than simply providing an itemised list of what they did, candidates should be encouraged to also consider other, less tangible areas and skills, such as their ability to promote group cohesion, or the positivity of their attitude and their commitment to the project. Such considerations would make for a richer and more in-depth evaluation. Reflection on what had been learnt including learning from the experience of cross-cultural collaboration was an area that was less well done. Those candidates who had not engaged in any cross-collaboration had nothing to reflect on and so could say little about it. In this case, the candidates concerned could not access marks much above the bottom of Band 2 for this assessment criterion. Candidates who scored well in this part of the evaluation generally did so because they not only considered what they had brought to the project in terms of concrete contribution, they also considered what they had brought to it in terms of their interpersonal skills. They also considered how they might have improved their contribution and what they could take away from this experience of group work. In addition, they reflected in some depth on what they had learned from their cross-cultural collaboration in terms of what impact the collaboration and their own research had had on their views on the issue the group had investigated.

In their approach to guiding candidates in producing individual evaluations, teachers are advised to treat the use of templates and forms with caution. If a template or form is not properly aligned to the assessment criteria and the wording of the performance descriptors in the mark bands, it will not surface the appropriate evidence for assessment which may mean that candidates are disadvantaged as a result. In addition, while a template may assist candidates who are struggling with their evaluations, it may also restrict candidates who have lots of ideas and points they want to make. Candidates should also be reminded that while a certain amount of idea replication is bound to occur in individual evaluations since all the group members have been engaged in the same project, their individual evaluations must be entirely their own work; completed on their own, and *written entirely* in their own words.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/31

Written Paper

Key Messages

- Candidates performed well in the analysis and interpretation of information and evidence
- Many candidates were able to use reasons and evidence to justify their own views and opinions
- Evaluation skills are improving
- Candidates should develop skills of evaluation further
- Increased opportunity to develop evaluation skills within courses would be helpful, especially of reasoning and evidence
- Overall, candidates' performance continues to improve

General Comments

It is pleasing to report that the quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be very good; candidates and Centres are to be congratulated on their achievements. Many candidates appeared to enjoy exploring different perspectives and to appreciate the complexity of global issues. They are clearly developing a critical awareness of the world in which they live. Similarly, many candidates are also learning to reflect upon their own perspectives and to consider the implications of global issues for their personal beliefs, values and lifestyle.

The paper was based upon several contrasting pieces of Source material related to the global issue of child labour. Within this context, 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 new lines of enquiry
- develop reasoning and provide evidence to justify points of view
- evaluate evidence and arguments

From the evidence of candidate responses, the Source material and questions were easily 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 responded enthusiastically to the Source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates generally revealed an appreciation of different perspectives on global issues, particularly in relation to issues surrounding child labour. Candidates had clearly undertaken stimulating, well designed courses that were helpful in developing the skills to be tested.

In general, the questions were answered 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 the sale of products to new markets. These skills were tested mainly in **Questions 1, 2, 3a** and **3b**. However the ability to evaluate other perspectives, evidence and reasoning continues to be more challenging for some candidates.

Examination technique was generally good. Candidates seemed to have sufficient time for the tasks. The vast majority completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- give clear reasons and evidence to support an opinion or argument
- avoid simple assertion, opinion and anecdotal evidence

- explain their answers fully by giving a range of reasons for their point of view
- evaluate reasoning and evidence by referring to both strengths and weaknesses
- practice the analysis and evaluation of Sources on a regular basis
- explain the meaning of key concepts in critical thinking and research

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1a

Candidates were asked to identify which country ate the most chocolate per person in 2007 from the Source material. Virtually all candidates correctly identified the country as Ireland.

Question 1b

Candidates were asked to identify which country produced the most cocoa beans in 2009 from the Source material. Virtually all candidates correctly identified the country as Ivory Coast.

Question 1c

Candidates were asked to describe the trend in cocoa prices between 1980 and 2010 shown in the Source material. Most candidates correctly described the following aspects of the trend:

- the prices of cocoa went dramatically down and then back up over this period as a whole
- that there is much short term variation within these general trends

A large majority of candidates correctly identified the main trend; a majority of candidates also described the short term variations. Some candidates only identified one of these aspects of the trend.

Some candidates attempted to explain the reasons for the trend; however candidates were not awarded marks for this material in their responses as the task did not require an explanation.

Question 1d

Candidates were asked to explain why political problems in Ivory Coast had such a big effect on the cost of cocoa.

Candidates usually gave the following reasons:

- disruption to normal patterns of work
- strikes
- shortage of raw materials
- damage to crops due to conflict
- transportation disrupted
- political uncertainty affecting prices in the market
- working to rule or 'go slow'
- lack of investment by the government
- lack of oversight and attention by the government
- shortages causing price rises
- government intervention in the price to raise revenue

The strongest answers provided several clearly reasoned explanations of how disruption or interference in the market due to political problems could lead to price rises for cocoa. Weaker responses often simply stated the consequence of disruption as being a price rise without explanation or did not link the rise directly to political problems.

Most candidates answered this question well with clearly reasoned, credible and structured argument that included two developed reasons for the rise in the cost of cocoa clearly linked to the issue of political problems.

Question 1e

Candidates were expected to discuss the extent to which child labour in chocolate production is mostly a personal, local or global issue. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to develop an argument supported by reasons and evidence.

The main reasons and evidenced discussed tended to be:

Personal

- people must decide individually what action to take
- personal freedom and responsibility
- everyone has a responsibility to respond in situations of injustice

Local

- local laws can affect behaviour
- local laws are being broken
- governments can educate people about the issue

Global

- sale of chocolate is worldwide
- many places produce chocolate
- interdependence of countries

Stronger responses were supported by clear reasoning and explanation justifying the candidate's opinion. These responses usually contained three or four reasoned arguments and evidence to support the views expressed, clearly and explicitly related to the level of responsibility being supported.

Weaker responses tended to give asserted statements about the level of the issue and did not consider alternative perspectives. Arguments were often partial or generalised, or simply repeated Source material.

Question 2a

Candidates were expected to suggest information a company would need to know about people in China before it decides to sell chocolate to the country and explain how this information might help them to make the decision. This question was designed to test candidates' ability to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry about global issues.

The strongest responses tended to suggest information that was clearly related to the issue. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about current ways of life rather than about the potential market for chocolate.

The most common responses suggested the following types of information:

- what proportion of people had enough money to buy chocolate if it was available
- if there were any cultural barriers to eating chocolate
- whether people in China want to eat chocolate
- was there any significant competition
- how much profit could be made
- about the logistics of manufacture and transportation - could the chocolate be produced in China, making it cheaper, or would it have to be transported?

Responses at the higher levels fully described information that was clearly relevant to the issue supported by clear, reasoned and developed explanation of how the information may be used to help make a decision about whether or not to support the proposed project to sell chocolate to China. Responses at the lower levels tended to be partial, generalised or lack clarity.

Candidates should be encouraged to express their answers in terms of 'what if' statements, for example, 'if this information is given ... then ... I could decide to ... because ...'

Question 2b

Candidates were expected to suggest information an employment inspector would need to find out to be sure that there is no child exploitation on a farm where children were working. This question was designed to test candidates' ability to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry about global issues.

The strongest responses tended to suggest information that was clearly related to the issue. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about employment laws in general.

The most common responses suggested the following types of information:

- how many children there were working on the farm – there may be so many that they could not possibly be his own and might therefore be more likely to be exploited children
- what hours the children worked – a couple of hours in the evening every so often, or eighteen hours a day. A couple of hours worked at weekends might be acceptable, but very long days would be exploitation.
- whether the children went to School – if not they may be denied their human rights
- whether the children were well treated, received meals and had breaks
- if the children were paid and how much
- the children's attitude to the work and whether or not they chose to work at the farm

Responses at the higher levels of response fully described information that was clearly relevant to the issue supported by clear, reasoned and developed explanation of how the information may be used to help the inspector make a decision about whether or not the children were being exploited. Responses at the lower levels tended to be partial, generalised or lack clarity.

Candidates should be encouraged to express their answers in terms of 'what if' statements, for example, 'if this information is given ... then ... I could decide to ... because ...'

Question 3a

Candidates were asked to evaluate the reliability of the chairman of a company involved in cocoa production as a source of information about child exploitation in cocoa production. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to evaluate arguments or claims.

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the reliability of the chairman:

- he may have good information as an insider
- he may have reliable information as he is an expert with experience
- he has authority
- he is a successful professional and will want to maintain a reputation for honesty and integrity

Candidates tended to make the following arguments against the reliability of the chairman:

- he may be defensive as he has been accused of wrong doing
- he has a vested interest as he wants to make money from his role in the company
- he may minimize the scale and extent of the problem to ensure good public relations
- the source may not be accurate
- the evidence for the statement within the source is not clear and based on an unfair/unreasonable comparison

The strongest responses tended to be clearly focused upon the issue of the reliability of the statement, and its possible strengths and weaknesses. These responses were balanced with a convincing overall assessment or conclusion reached. Weaker responses tended to have limited discussion and assert an opinion without reason or explanation.

The majority of candidates were able to identify at least one or two strengths or weaknesses of the chairman's statement as evidence.

Question 3b

Candidates were asked to evaluate a comparison between children in some European countries having a week's holiday from School to help with the wine harvest and children in developing countries working on cocoa farms. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to make judgments about arguments or claims.

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the claim in the Source being reasonable:

- children work to some extent in most countries therefore the comparison is reasonable
- based on his experience so has some value
- countries have different levels of wealth so expectations of children and work may be different
- the need to work in all countries to earn a living is recognised
- children should work to learn skills and the right attitudes to work in all countries so the comparison is reasonable

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the claim in the Source being unreasonable:

- not a large sample so not very representative and can not be generalised
- anecdotal evidence so not strong
- the evidence for the statement within the Source is not clear
- based on an unfair/unreasonable comparison of different cultures
- different age groups and amount of work are being compared
- access to Schooling and other care may be much greater in some countries than others
- child labour is always wrong as it denies human rights and so the comparison is unreasonable

The strongest responses tended to clearly discuss the reasonableness of the claim, often referring to values as well as pragmatic issues. Coherent, structured evaluation of the perspective was offered with several developed evaluative points. These responses were usually balanced with a clear assessment and conclusion reached.

Weaker responses tended to give limited discussion and assert an opinion without reason or explanation.

The majority of candidates were able to identify some evaluative points. Candidates should be encouraged to evaluate in a balanced way and to discuss both strengths and weaknesses in arguments.

Question 3c

Candidates were asked to evaluate the reasoning in the Get_real's statement about child labour being 'ethically not a problem'. Candidates were expected to make a supported judgement with reasoned explanation about the effectiveness of the reasoning. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to evaluate the reasons and evidence used to support an argument. In responding candidates were encouraged to support their answers with the words and phrases in Get_real's statement and consider:

- how well Get_real responds to comments by the chairman and No_slavery;
- the relevance of child labour in Canada;
- how reasonable Get_real's opinions are;
- whether they accepted any values Get_real uses and why.

Candidates tended to consider the following types of issue:

- quality of the argument
 - clarity
 - tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise
 - language
 - balance
- quality of the evidence
 - relevance
 - sufficiency – range/type/depth/detail
 - source
 - date – how recent
 - factual, opinion, value, anecdote

- testimony – from experience and expert
- knowledge claims
- sources of bias
- likelihood of claims and consequences of their ideas
- acceptability of the values to others
 - how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the reasoning with a clear assessment of the value of the argument in the statement. This included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the reasoning worked with a focus on evaluation of issues, reasons and evidence, with a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences and values. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion. Get_real's statement was also explicitly quoted and used directly in the response.

At the lower levels of response the discussion was unlikely to be supported and mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues rather than reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response. The statement from Get_real was rarely used directly or quoted in these responses.

Candidates found this question quite challenging. Centres are encouraged to give candidates opportunities to evaluate reasons and evidence in argument 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
- Use and tone of language

Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to discuss whether or not it is acceptable for children to work. Candidates were expected to use the material found in the Sources, but go beyond simply repeating or recycling this material without further development. Other material may also be introduced but it was not necessary to gain full marks.

The arguments used by candidates to consider issues related to children working for income tended to include:

- reference to scale of impact on individual/groups/local economy/global trade
- the effects of cultural differences and beliefs
- the type and amount of work – dangerous; impact on health; hours; conditions
- levels of income - exploitation
- circumstances in which children may work – poverty; high levels of unemployment; location; potential abuse
- the type of children who may work – age; class; gender; ethnicity
- tradition, custom and practice – cultural variation in expectations
- issues of consent
- impact upon and access to other human rights e.g. education; health care; security
- positive benefits of work for income, improving skills and attitudes to work for the future
- health issues
- examples and evidence from personal experience

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the acceptability of work in different circumstances; this included coherent, structured argument and evaluation. 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 labour in general rather than an examination of circumstances in which children working might be acceptable or not. Arguments tended to be 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 on an issue. In so doing candidates need to analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence for the perspective. 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.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/32

Written Paper

Key Messages

- Candidates performed well in the analysis and interpretation of information and evidence
- Many candidates were able to use reasons and evidence to justify their own views and opinions
- Evaluation skills are improving
- Candidates should develop skills of evaluation further
- Increased opportunity to develop evaluation skills within courses would be helpful, especially of reasoning and evidence
- Overall, candidates' performance continues to improve

General Comments

It is pleasing to report that the quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be very good; candidates and Centres are to be congratulated on their achievements. Many candidates appeared to enjoy exploring different perspectives and to appreciate the complexity of global issues. They are clearly developing a critical awareness of the world in which they live. Similarly, many candidates are also learning to reflect upon their own perspectives and to consider the implications of global issues for their personal beliefs, values and lifestyle.

The paper was based upon several contrasting pieces of Source material related to the global issue of child labour. Within this context, 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 new lines of enquiry
- develop reasoning and provide evidence to justify points of view
- evaluate evidence and arguments

From the evidence of candidate responses, the Source material and questions were easily 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 responded enthusiastically to the Source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates generally revealed an appreciation of different perspectives on global issues, particularly in relation to issues surrounding child labour. Candidates had clearly undertaken stimulating, well designed courses that were helpful in developing the skills to be tested.

In general, the questions were answered 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 the sale of products to new markets. These skills were tested mainly in **Questions 1, 2, 3a** and **3b**. However the ability to evaluate other perspectives, evidence and reasoning continues to be more challenging for some candidates.

Examination technique was generally good. Candidates seemed to have sufficient time for the tasks. The vast majority completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- give clear reasons and evidence to support an opinion or argument
- avoid simple assertion, opinion and anecdotal evidence

- explain their answers fully by giving a range of reasons for their point of view
- evaluate reasoning and evidence by referring to both strengths and weaknesses
- practice the analysis and evaluation of Sources on a regular basis
- explain the meaning of key concepts in critical thinking and research

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1a

Candidates were asked to identify which country ate the most chocolate per person in 2007 from the Source material. Virtually all candidates correctly identified the country as Ireland.

Question 1b

Candidates were asked to identify which country produced the most cocoa beans in 2009 from the Source material. Virtually all candidates correctly identified the country as Ivory Coast.

Question 1c

Candidates were asked to describe the trend in cocoa prices between 1980 and 2010 shown in the Source material. Most candidates correctly described the following aspects of the trend:

- the prices of cocoa went dramatically down and then back up over this period as a whole
- that there is much short term variation within these general trends

A large majority of candidates correctly identified the main trend; a majority of candidates also described the short term variations. Some candidates only identified one of these aspects of the trend.

Some candidates attempted to explain the reasons for the trend; however candidates were not awarded marks for this material in their responses as the task did not require an explanation.

Question 1d

Candidates were asked to explain why political problems in Ivory Coast had such a big effect on the cost of cocoa.

Candidates usually gave the following reasons:

- disruption to normal patterns of work
- strikes
- shortage of raw materials
- damage to crops due to conflict
- transportation disrupted
- political uncertainty affecting prices in the market
- working to rule or 'go slow'
- lack of investment by the government
- lack of oversight and attention by the government
- shortages causing price rises
- government intervention in the price to raise revenue

The strongest answers provided several clearly reasoned explanations of how disruption or interference in the market due to political problems could lead to price rises for cocoa. Weaker responses often simply stated the consequence of disruption as being a price rise without explanation or did not link the rise directly to political problems.

Most candidates answered this question well with clearly reasoned, credible and structured argument that included two developed reasons for the rise in the cost of cocoa clearly linked to the issue of political problems.

Question 1e

Candidates were expected to discuss the extent to which child labour in chocolate production is mostly a personal, local or global issue. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to develop an argument supported by reasons and evidence.

The main reasons and evidenced discussed tended to be:

Personal

- people must decide individually what action to take
- personal freedom and responsibility
- everyone has a responsibility to respond in situations of injustice

Local

- local laws can affect behaviour
- local laws are being broken
- governments can educate people about the issue

Global

- sale of chocolate is worldwide
- many places produce chocolate
- interdependence of countries

Stronger responses were supported by clear reasoning and explanation justifying the candidate's opinion. These responses usually contained three or four reasoned arguments and evidence to support the views expressed, clearly and explicitly related to the level of responsibility being supported.

Weaker responses tended to give asserted statements about the level of the issue and did not consider alternative perspectives. Arguments were often partial or generalised, or simply repeated Source material.

Question 2a

Candidates were expected to suggest information a company would need to know about people in China before it decides to sell chocolate to the country and explain how this information might help them to make the decision. This question was designed to test candidates' ability to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry about global issues.

The strongest responses tended to suggest information that was clearly related to the issue. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about current ways of life rather than about the potential market for chocolate.

The most common responses suggested the following types of information:

- what proportion of people had enough money to buy chocolate if it was available
- if there were any cultural barriers to eating chocolate
- whether people in China want to eat chocolate
- was there any significant competition
- how much profit could be made
- about the logistics of manufacture and transportation - could the chocolate be produced in China, making it cheaper, or would it have to be transported?

Responses at the higher levels fully described information that was clearly relevant to the issue supported by clear, reasoned and developed explanation of how the information may be used to help make a decision about whether or not to support the proposed project to sell chocolate to China. Responses at the lower levels tended to be partial, generalised or lack clarity.

Candidates should be encouraged to express their answers in terms of 'what if' statements, for example, 'if this information is given ... then ... I could decide to ... because ...'

Question 2b

Candidates were expected to suggest information an employment inspector would need to find out to be sure that there is no child exploitation on a farm where children were working. This question was designed to test candidates' ability to identify evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry about global issues.

The strongest responses tended to suggest information that was clearly related to the issue. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about employment laws in general.

The most common responses suggested the following types of information:

- how many children there were working on the farm – there may be so many that they could not possibly be his own and might therefore be more likely to be exploited children
- what hours the children worked – a couple of hours in the evening every so often, or eighteen hours a day. A couple of hours worked at weekends might be acceptable, but very long days would be exploitation.
- whether the children went to School – if not they may be denied their human rights
- whether the children were well treated, received meals and had breaks
- if the children were paid and how much
- the children's attitude to the work and whether or not they chose to work at the farm

Responses at the higher levels of response fully described information that was clearly relevant to the issue supported by clear, reasoned and developed explanation of how the information may be used to help the inspector make a decision about whether or not the children were being exploited. Responses at the lower levels tended to be partial, generalised or lack clarity.

Candidates should be encouraged to express their answers in terms of 'what if' statements, for example, 'if this information is given ... then ... I could decide to ... because ...'

Question 3a

Candidates were asked to evaluate the reliability of the chairman of a company involved in cocoa production as a source of information about child exploitation in cocoa production. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to evaluate arguments or claims.

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the reliability of the chairman:

- he may have good information as an insider
- he may have reliable information as he is an expert with experience
- he has authority
- he is a successful professional and will want to maintain a reputation for honesty and integrity

Candidates tended to make the following arguments against the reliability of the chairman:

- he may be defensive as he has been accused of wrong doing
- he has a vested interest as he wants to make money from his role in the company
- he may minimize the scale and extent of the problem to ensure good public relations
- the source may not be accurate
- the evidence for the statement within the source is not clear and based on an unfair/unreasonable comparison

The strongest responses tended to be clearly focused upon the issue of the reliability of the statement, and its possible strengths and weaknesses. These responses were balanced with a convincing overall assessment or conclusion reached. Weaker responses tended to have limited discussion and assert an opinion without reason or explanation.

The majority of candidates were able to identify at least one or two strengths or weaknesses of the chairman's statement as evidence.

Question 3b

Candidates were asked to evaluate a comparison between children in some European countries having a week's holiday from School to help with the wine harvest and children in developing countries working on cocoa farms. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to make judgments about arguments or claims.

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the claim in the Source being reasonable:

- children work to some extent in most countries therefore the comparison is reasonable
- based on his experience so has some value
- countries have different levels of wealth so expectations of children and work may be different
- the need to work in all countries to earn a living is recognised
- children should work to learn skills and the right attitudes to work in all countries so the comparison is reasonable

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the claim in the Source being unreasonable:

- not a large sample so not very representative and can not be generalised
- anecdotal evidence so not strong
- the evidence for the statement within the Source is not clear
- based on an unfair/unreasonable comparison of different cultures
- different age groups and amount of work are being compared
- access to Schooling and other care may be much greater in some countries than others
- child labour is always wrong as it denies human rights and so the comparison is unreasonable

The strongest responses tended to clearly discuss the reasonableness of the claim, often referring to values as well as pragmatic issues. Coherent, structured evaluation of the perspective was offered with several developed evaluative points. These responses were usually balanced with a clear assessment and conclusion reached.

Weaker responses tended to give limited discussion and assert an opinion without reason or explanation.

The majority of candidates were able to identify some evaluative points. Candidates should be encouraged to evaluate in a balanced way and to discuss both strengths and weaknesses in arguments.

Question 3c

Candidates were asked to evaluate the reasoning in the Get_real's statement about child labour being 'ethically not a problem'. Candidates were expected to make a supported judgement with reasoned explanation about the effectiveness of the reasoning. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to evaluate the reasons and evidence used to support an argument. In responding candidates were encouraged to support their answers with the words and phrases in Get_real's statement and consider:

- how well Get_real responds to comments by the chairman and No_slavery;
- the relevance of child labour in Canada;
- how reasonable Get_real's opinions are;
- whether they accepted any values Get_real uses and why.

Candidates tended to consider the following types of issue:

- quality of the argument
 - clarity
 - tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise
 - language
 - balance
- quality of the evidence
 - relevance
 - sufficiency – range/type/depth/detail
 - source
 - date – how recent
 - factual, opinion, value, anecdote

- testimony – from experience and expert
- knowledge claims
- sources of bias
- likelihood of claims and consequences of their ideas
- acceptability of the values to others
 - how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the reasoning with a clear assessment of the value of the argument in the statement. This included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the reasoning worked with a focus on evaluation of issues, reasons and evidence, with a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences and values. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion. Get_real's statement was also explicitly quoted and used directly in the response.

At the lower levels of response the discussion was unlikely to be supported and mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues rather than reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response. The statement from Get_real was rarely used directly or quoted in these responses.

Candidates found this question quite challenging. Centres are encouraged to give candidates opportunities to evaluate reasons and evidence in argument 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
- Use and tone of language

Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to discuss whether or not it is acceptable for children to work. Candidates were expected to use the material found in the Sources, but go beyond simply repeating or recycling this material without further development. Other material may also be introduced but it was not necessary to gain full marks.

The arguments used by candidates to consider issues related to children working for income tended to include:

- reference to scale of impact on individual/groups/local economy/global trade
- the effects of cultural differences and beliefs
- the type and amount of work – dangerous; impact on health; hours; conditions
- levels of income - exploitation
- circumstances in which children may work – poverty; high levels of unemployment; location; potential abuse
- the type of children who may work – age; class; gender; ethnicity
- tradition, custom and practice – cultural variation in expectations
- issues of consent
- impact upon and access to other human rights e.g. education; health care; security
- positive benefits of work for income, improving skills and attitudes to work for the future
- health issues
- examples and evidence from personal experience

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the acceptability of work in different circumstances; this included coherent, structured argument and evaluation. 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 labour in general rather than an examination of circumstances in which children working might be acceptable or not. Arguments tended to be 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 on an issue. In so doing candidates need to analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence for the perspective. 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.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/33

Written Paper

Key Messages

- Candidates performed well in the analysis and interpretation of information and evidence
- Many candidates were able to use reasons and evidence to justify their own views and opinions
- Evaluation skills are improving
- Candidates should develop skills of evaluation further
- Increased opportunity to develop evaluation skills within courses would be helpful, especially of reasoning and evidence
- Overall, candidates' performance continues to improve

General Comments

It is pleasing to report that the quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be very good; candidates and Centres are to be congratulated on their achievements. Many candidates appeared to enjoy exploring different perspectives and to appreciate the complexity of global issues. They are clearly developing a critical awareness of the world in which they live. Similarly, many candidates are also learning to reflect upon their own perspectives and to consider the implications of global issues for their personal beliefs, values and lifestyle.

The paper was based upon several contrasting pieces of Source material related to the global issue of growing water shortages. Within this context, 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 new lines of enquiry
- develop reasoning and provide evidence to justify points of view
- evaluate evidence and arguments

From the evidence of candidate responses, the Source material and questions were easily 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 responded enthusiastically to the Source material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates generally revealed an appreciation of different perspectives on global issues, particularly in relation to issues surrounding water shortages. Candidates had clearly undertaken stimulating, well designed courses that were helpful in developing the skills to be tested.

In general, the questions were answered 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 the sale of products to new markets. These skills were tested mainly in **Questions 1, 2, 3a and 3b**. However the ability to evaluate other perspectives, evidence and reasoning continues to be more challenging for some candidates.

Examination technique was generally good. Candidates seemed to have sufficient time for the tasks. The vast majority completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were few rubric errors. To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- give clear reasons and evidence to support an opinion or argument
- avoid simple assertion, opinion and anecdotal evidence
- explain their answers fully by giving a range of reasons for their point of view

- evaluate reasoning and evidence by referring to both strengths and weaknesses
- practice the analysis and evaluation of Sources on a regular basis
- explain the meaning of key concepts in critical thinking and research

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1a

Candidates were asked to identify two uses of water from the Source material. Candidates usually identified the following:

- Domestic - washing, cooking, drinking, showering and baths
- Industrial - manufacturing, cooling/power stations, mining,
- Agricultural - growing crops, for food, gardening
- Tourism - swimming pools, fountains, golf courses, fishing, boating
- Other – for animals to drink, fire fighting

Candidates were not awarded marks for uses that were not linked in some way to the Source. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified two uses and were awarded maximum marks.

Question 1b

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, which use of water was most likely to contribute to a shortage of water. They were expected to give several reasons or some evidence for their opinion. Candidates usually gave the following types of reasons to justify their choice:

- Possible further consequences or effects
- Degree of impact/seriousness for individuals/countries/world
- How many people/groups/countries are affected
- Increasing cycle of decline/shortage
- How widespread the problem is
- How easy to solve
- Effects on natural world
- Impact on human ways of life and culture

The strongest answers provided several clearly reasoned explanations of why one use is more likely to contribute to water shortages than others; this often involved directly comparing the selected use with one or more other uses. Weaker responses often simply stated the use or did not link the reasons explicitly to water shortages.

Most candidates answered this question very well.

Question 1c

Candidates were asked to identify two consequences of water shortages from the Source material. Candidates usually identified the following:

- Drought
- Failed Crops
- Cracked Reservoirs
- Dirty Water/puddles
- Animals drink from dirty puddles
- Bush/forest fires
- Thirst
- Hunger/Starvation
- Arid land/dry riverbeds, lakes
- Civil unrest
- Disease
- Dead trees/plants

Candidates were not awarded marks for consequences that were not linked in some way to the Source. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified two of these consequences and were awarded maximum marks.

Question 1d

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

- Possible further consequences or effects
- Degree of impact/seriousness for individuals/countries/world
- How many people/groups/countries are affected
- Increasing cycle of decline
- How widespread the problem is
- How easy to solve
- Effects on natural world
- Impact on human ways of life and culture

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 simply stated the consequence or did not link the reasons explicitly to water shortage.

Most candidates answered this question very well.

Question 2a and 2b

Candidates were expected to make suggestions about what type of additional information they would need to help them to make a decision about whether or not to invest in the installation of a PlayPump in their community. This is designed to test candidates' ability to identify information and evidence and suggest further lines of enquiry to gather background material to support decision making about an issue.

The strongest responses tended to suggest information that was clearly related to the issue of whether or not to invest in the installation of a PlayPump; for example about the costs and accessibility to local people. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about the maintenance of the PlayPump.

Candidates were also asked to explain how the information gained from the answer to the question would help them to make a decision about supporting the proposed development. The strongest responses tended to clearly describe the way that the information was linked to the provision of water for the community by the PlayPump and how it would help them in the decision-making process. Weaker responses tended to simply describe the type of information in more detail and not link the information to decision-making, or simply to describe their own opinion in an asserted way.

The most common responses suggested the following types of information:

- viability of the project – access to water underground e.g. depth; amount
- size and plan – to help assess impact on the locality/people in the area
- effectiveness of the technology/pump
- distance from community – access issues
- cost – how expensive to build and who will pay
- availability of children to play enough to pump water
- incentives - is there going to be any encouragement to the children to play
- public views - the opinion of other local people about this type of project
- impact of the building project - possible disruption that creating the pump is going to cause and for how long
- benefits/dangers to the environment - possible positive impact on the environment in general due to increased availability of water for wildlife and negative to a lowering of the water table
- likelihood of boredom of children who might stop playing
- maintenance and repair issues – can local people cope with the technology?

The most effective form of argument took the form of, 'If we have this information ... then it would help us to make a decision about investing in the PlayPump because ...'

The vast majority of candidates were able to identify one or two types of information or evidence that were relevant to the decision making issue. Most candidates were able to describe the general relevance of the information; however fewer candidates explicitly linked the information to the decision making process.

Question 3a

Candidates were expected to identify an opinion in Jakob's blog, and explain their selection, saying why it was an opinion.

Examples of opinions in Jakob's blog post are:

- I believe we need to reduce water pollution (to avoid a water shortage)
- The main problem we face is not a shortage of water but a shortage of clean drinking water

An opinion is usually defined as a personal view, attitude, perspective or belief which is not based on evidence and is not proven.

The strongest responses gave clear explanation of why the statement is an opinion showing good understanding of the nature of opinions. Weaker responses tended to identify an opinion from the blog successfully but did not explain clearly the reason why it was an opinion.

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified an opinion; the majority were able to explain their choice effectively to reveal understanding of the nature of opinions.

Question 3b

Candidates were asked to evaluate a statement made by Natalia's father from the Source material to assess the reliability of some information contained in the statement. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to evaluate evidence.

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the information being reliable:

- There is some link to the argument/issue
- Some evidence provided even if weak or tenuous
- Her father is probably a reliable person
- Her father did find the information

Candidates tended to make the following arguments in support of the information being unreliable:

- Source is not cited
- The statement is vague and lacks clarity
- Source may not be accurate
- The evidence for the statement within the Source is not clear
- Dad may have misinterpreted the Source
- There is no evidence to support the claim

The strongest responses tended to discuss clearly the reliability of the information, often referring to the Source and evidence for the statement. Coherent, structured evaluation of the perspective was offered with several developed evaluative points. These responses were usually balanced with a clear assessment and conclusion reached. Weaker responses tended to give limited discussion and assert an opinion without reason or explanation.

The majority of candidates were able to identify some evaluative points. Candidates should be encouraged to evaluate in a balanced way and to discuss both strengths and weaknesses in arguments.

Question 3c

Candidates were asked to compare and evaluate the reasoning in Heba's and Samuel's statements about water shortages. Candidates were expected to make a supported judgement with reasoned explanation about the effectiveness of the reasoning. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to evaluate the reasons and evidence used to support an argument. In responding candidates were encouraged to support their answers with the words and phrases in Heba's and Samuel's statements and consider:

- the reliability of their knowledge claims;
- how reasonable their opinions are;
- the likeliness of any consequences they predict;
- whether candidates accept their values and why.

Candidates tended to consider the following types of issue:

- quality of the argument
 - clarity
 - tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise
 - language
 - balance
- quality of the evidence
 - relevance
 - sufficiency – range/type/depth/detail
 - source
 - date – how recent
 - factual, opinion, value, anecdote
 - testimony – from experience and expert
- knowledge claims
- sources of bias
- likelihood of claims and consequences of their ideas
- acceptability of the values to others
 - how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the reasoning with a clear assessment of the value of the argument in the statements; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the reasoning worked with a focus on evaluation of issues, reasons and evidence, with a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences and values. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion about 'whose reasoning worked better'. The statements were also explicitly quoted and used directly in the response.

At the lower levels of response the discussion was unlikely to be supported and mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. These answers tended to focus on issues rather than reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was little overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response. The statements were rarely used directly or quoted in these responses.

Candidates found this question quite challenging. Centres are encouraged to give candidates opportunities to evaluate reasons and evidence in argument 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

- Use and tone of language

Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to discuss whether or not global or individual action was most likely to make a difference to water shortages. Candidates were expected to use the material found in the Sources, but go beyond simply repeating or recycling this material without further development. Other material may also be used but it was not necessary to gain full marks.

The arguments used by candidates to consider issues related to reducing water shortages tended to include:

- reference to scale of impact on individual/group/governmental/global behaviour and actions
- 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
- examples and evidence from personal experience

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the effectiveness of different levels and types of action to reduce water shortages; this included coherent, structured argument and evaluation. 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 water in general. Arguments tended to be 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 on an issue. In so doing candidates need to analyse and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence for the perspective. 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.