

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/01
Individual Research

Key Messages

- Candidates should produce two Individual Research (IR) reports with a question as a title for each report and sub-headings linked to the assessment criteria to structure the report.
- Each IR must include a reference list at the end of it.
- Word documents are preferred over multimedia for this component so that word counts can be checked and adhered to.
- The questions for each IR should be written in the space provided on the Individual Candidate Record Cards (ICRC) so that is clear which piece has received which marks.
- Assessors should write brief comments linked to the assessment criteria in the space provided on the ICRC to indicate how a particular mark was arrived at.
- For each candidate in the sample, Centres need to submit the work and the completed ICRC with the marks for both pieces of work and annotations. The Centre needs to also include the MS1 for the component and the completed Coursework Assessment Summary Form (CASF) for all candidates entered for the component not just the sample.
- The total marks on the ICRCs, the MS1 and the CASF should be the same and if internal moderation has taken place, the new marks should be added to the ICRCs as well as placed on the MS1 and the CASF.
- Centres should submit the work of the candidate on the lowest non-zero mark, the highest mark, and a range spread evenly between these.

General comments

Most candidates produced interesting reports covering a variety of topics from the 20 topic areas. Popular topics this examination session included: water, food and agriculture, climate change, conflict and peace and diet and health. These topics all lent themselves well to the IR as candidates could identify issues within their question, as well as possible scenarios, their likelihood, and courses of action stemming from analysis of these issues. Candidates from some Centres seem to be producing work on the same topic, which does not always lead to the best work, as candidates are not really interested in the topic given or cannot find relevant information. Better IRs showed candidates' interest in the topic, and it was clear that a free choice of topic was given, and that candidates had formulated their own questions. Some questions are, however, too complicated for candidates to try to answer and this is an area where teachers should give guidance. Most candidates this session did use questions to focus their research and their reports, but some headings are still too broad with candidates struggling to find a focus or losing track of their focus.

Unfortunately, some candidates are still exceeding the word count of 1500–2000 words as specified in the syllabus. Centres are asked to advise candidates to produce their work as word documents so this can be checked and they should monitor this situation and advise candidates accordingly. Similarly, where work is considerably less than the word count, candidates cannot do justice to the assessment criteria.

Centres will appreciate that the work produced must reflect the assessment criteria and should be in continuous prose. For this component, candidates produce and submit two Individual Research reports. There should also be a completed Individual Candidate Record Card for each candidate and a Coursework Summary Assessment Form and MS1 for each candidate within a Centre that has submitted work for this component.

Centres should ensure that each IR report is clearly labelled with the title of the piece in the form of a question which is the same as the title on the Individual Candidate Record Card. Most Centres are now submitting Individual Candidate Record Cards with marks and the titles of the reports in the appropriate place and more are now providing useful comments related to the assessment criteria to reflect the marks awarded.

Comments on Specific Questions

Teacher assessment

Many Centres are clear about what is expected for candidates to be awarded marks in different bands and can identify pieces of work that fall into Band 2 or Band 3. Centres should ensure that there is sufficient evidence to award a mark for a specific criterion. Where an IR report meets the assessment criteria fully, marks within Band 4 were awarded, and where there was limited information for one of the criteria, candidates were given marks in Band 1. 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. Candidates should be advised that the work submitted has to be their own and this should be checked by the Centre as Cambridge detected a number of plagiarism cases and many of these were as a result of copying from sources without adequate referencing. All sources should be referenced and a reference list added at the end of each IR. In particular, any direct quotations need to be clearly referenced as such. Cambridge uses plagiarism detection software and any sections of text copied from other sources will be identified. If substantial, this constitutes plagiarism (whether intentional or not) and is likely to result in candidates losing marks for the component, or in extreme cases, the whole qualification.

Gather information representing different perspectives

The majority of candidates were able to gather and present a range of information linked to the topic area and research question and this usually came from a range of sources. Rather than simply presenting information about different countries, they should be advised to look at the issues within their question from the different perspectives: global, local/national and personal. Candidates may then explore what different countries, groups and individuals think about the issues under investigation.

Analyse issues within the report

Analysis continues to improve, with causes, effects and current situations generally considered in some detail, although there is still some listing, which does not allow candidates to develop their thoughts. Some candidates are putting information into tables to avoid using up their word count. Candidates should be advised to avoid doing this as information within tables still counts towards the word count and is unlikely to allow in-depth analysis. Centres sometimes need to remind candidates that to analyse an issue, they should relate it to the question being discussed and the possible causes and effects, as well as current situations.

Identify and evaluate possible scenarios and formulate possible courses of action

This criterion still causes a variety of issues. Some Centres misunderstand what is meant by possible scenarios and should explain to candidates that scenarios arise from answering the question, 'What if...?' This can be in relation to whether something continues or not and should be related to the issue under discussion rather than an improbable scenario simply suggested (for example, what might happen if everyone decided to become vegetarian?) Where candidates had thought about possible scenarios, they sometimes considered the likelihood of these scenarios, and were awarded marks for evaluation. This continues to improve, but is still not a regular feature of the work moderated.

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 and developed. Courses of action should be in answer to the possible scenarios and should not already be happening, although credit can be given for courses of action that are happening, but it is unlikely that marks in Band 4 will be awarded if this is the case.

Develop evidence-based personal response demonstrating self-awareness

A few Centres are still submitting the self-evaluation form which is no longer required and generally not very helpful in assessing this criterion. The evidence for this part of the assessment should be embedded within the report, and perhaps at the end, as was generally the practice. In this way candidates were able to fully engage with the question posed and the perspectives gathered, and there was meaningful personal involvement linked to the information gathered. Candidates successfully fulfilled this criterion if they could discuss what they had learnt from undertaking the research for the study, pointing to the evidence from their research, that they had perhaps not thought of before, and how what they had learnt had changed their thinking or not about the issue and what they might do as a result. Personal responses should be linked to the research undertaken and not just opinion pieces.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02

Group Project

Key Messages

- Project outcomes must involve action i.e. they need to be actually produced, designed, carried out etc. General reports or case studies that simply present information about the topic are not appropriate outcomes for the group project component.
- Projects must show evidence that cross-cultural collaboration has taken place, either with people overseas, or with people from a different community/culture within the home country.
- In their group projects, candidates should not explore personal, local/national and global perspectives. Rather, awareness of different perspectives should be reflected in meaningful cross-cultural collaboration. In addition, group projects need not involve consideration of future scenarios and courses of action.
- Individual Evaluations need to be divided into three distinct sections: evaluation of project plan **and** process; evaluation of how far the outcome has achieved the aim set out in the project plan and evaluation of individual contribution to the project and what has been learned both from working as a group **and** collaborating cross-culturally. Evaluations which simply describe what was done and how, without considering critically the strengths and weaknesses of the different elements of the work e.g. the approach taken; research methodology; working practices etc., will not score well on the assessment criteria.
- In addition to the candidates' marks, Individual candidate Record Cards must also include some brief comments under each of the assessment criteria explaining where credit has been given/how marks have been awarded.

General Comments

Candidates drew on a wide range of topic areas for their group projects in this session. Some of these included: eco-tourism and its benefit to the environment and local community; the alleviation of world hunger; encouraging participation in sports to promote a healthy lifestyle; the effects of urbanisation on communities; racism and inequality amongst migrant workers and the promotion of national cultural traditions and norms among the young. An increasing number of candidate groups executed projects which culminated in thoughtful and highly effective outcomes which were well-suited to the project aims. Such outcomes included: magazine articles; fundraisers and food drives; videos; promotional songs; posters etc. A most welcome addition to the different types of outcome this session was the inclusion of designs/prototypes for new, environmentally-friendly modes of transport and fuel. In the most successful projects, outcomes were well-supported by both research and cross-cultural collaboration and provided a rich source for candidates to draw on in their individual evaluations. Less successful projects often resulted from a lack of consideration on the part of candidate groups as to what an appropriate outcome might be. Case studies and general reports presenting research findings are not appropriate outcomes for the project component.

Comments on candidate response to assessment criteria

Production of a project plan

(Group assessment)

Generally, project plans were detailed and thorough. More candidates seemed to be guided by the wording in the top mark band for this assessment criterion and consequently made sure that they addressed all the elements they needed to in order to gain top marks. There was a tendency among some candidate groups to produce a retrospective plan which detailed the activities undertaken and the time taken for each. Candidates should be discouraged from taking this approach because one of the elements in the assessment is how realistic planned time-frames are and this kind of approach does not lend itself to addressing this element. An increasing number of candidates seemed to have done their planning and

recording of cross-cultural collaboration sessions through sharing platforms, such as google. While this can be a useful tool, it can make external moderation difficult because such sharing platforms are password protected. Candidates should therefore be advised that if they are using this mode of communication, they need to include the password to access this evidence in the project write-up.

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

(Group assessment)

Effective use of research, including cross-cultural collaboration, to develop and support the project outcome remains inconsistent. It is important that candidates realise that cross-cultural collaboration is not an end in itself and should not be undertaken randomly. Rather, the collaboration should be carefully planned in terms of what information needs to be gathered, how and from whom and how it is to be used to develop the outcome. In well-executed projects, the group's cross-cultural collaboration was not only reflected in the project write-up, but formed an integral part of the outcome itself. For instance, one candidate group filmed themselves conducting a series of interviews with foreign workers to ascertain their views on working overseas and far from home. This was then used to encourage greater understanding of the situation and needs of foreign workers among the local community. Another group collaborated not only with a local Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) involved in hunger relief, but also with two international NGOs, in order to plan and carry out a food drive for the underprivileged in the community, and then produce a video about it to be shown in three different overseas Schools to encourage wider participation. Such projects generally reflected high levels of commitment and engagement on the part of all group members and this in turn tended to generate a high standard of work in response to the assessment criteria.

Teachers are advised that some candidate groups may need additional guidance on the nature of their project outcome, in terms of ensuring that if a sensitive subject is being dealt with, the outcome does not unintentionally cause distress or offence to anyone. Candidates should also be advised to ensure that, if their project outcome is a webpage, a video clip on YouTube, or something similar, they include a working link to it in their project write-up, otherwise it cannot be accessed by the external Moderator.

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 be included on the Individual candidate Record Cards.

Evaluation of project plan and process

(Individual assessment)

Strong evaluations included in-depth discussions of the strengths and weaknesses in the project plan **and** the process of carrying out the project, including the research process and activities undertaken in developing/producing the outcome. Strong, critical consideration was followed by carefully thought-out **suggestions for improvement** to both the plan **and** process. Weak evaluations tended to simply describe what was done, rather than evaluate it and discuss how and why it was undertaken. In the case of those groups who produced a retrospective account of what they had done, rather than a plan at the outset of the project, individual group members often found it very difficult to produce an effective evaluation.

Evaluation of project outcome

(Individual assessment)

In strong evaluations of the project outcome, it was clear that candidates had given some consideration as to how they might judge the success or otherwise of the outcome in achieving the project aim. This sometimes took the form of a pre and post activity survey or interview. Some candidates who had taught a series of lessons to younger candidates designed quizzes to test what had been learnt. Candidates who had organised fundraisers were able to judge success by how much they had collected. In such cases, individual group members were then able to discuss the implications of these in terms of how far their project had achieved its aim. Weaker evaluations tended to be descriptive in nature and lacking in depth, with little reference to the project aims. Candidate groups should be advised that a clear, single and measurable aim will generally make for a much more straightforward and in-depth evaluation. To access marks in the top

band of the mark scheme, there must be clear and consistent reference to the aim in candidates' evaluation of the outcome.

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

(Individual assessment)

All candidates were able to discuss their own contribution to the project, though some focused entirely on positive contribution, with little consideration given to any personal weakness or where personal performance could have been improved. Candidates should be advised that contribution need not be confined solely to the work they carried out, but may also extend to their role as an effective or supportive group member. Candidates should be reminded that they need to consider both the benefits and challenges of working as a group, as opposed to working alone. Very strong evaluations were generally characterised by the quality of reflection on cross-cultural collaboration. This was generally because the cross-cultural collaboration the group had engaged in was meaningful and highly relevant to the project, thus providing individual group members with a rich source from which they could draw their comments on the learning experience. Where candidates had relied solely on the international nature of their School/group setting for their cross-cultural collaboration, they often struggled to produce a thoughtful evaluation.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/31

Written Paper

Key Messages

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

- performed well in the analysis and interpretation of information and evidence
- were able to use reasons and evidence effectively to support their judgements and claims
- need to develop evaluation skills more fully
- should have more experience in the critical comparison of arguments
- should use evidence to justify their opinions.

General Comments

Many candidates clearly enjoy thinking about global issues, appreciate the complexity of social, economic and technological change, and want to respond positively to the challenges posed by globalisation. They are clearly developing a critical awareness of global issues.

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. From the evidence of the examination scripts, the aims of the syllabus are being fulfilled.

The paper was based upon four different pieces of source material related to the issue of decreasing biodiversity and species loss. Within this context, the paper was designed to test the skills of:

- understanding different perspectives on global issues
- analysing and interpreting information and evidence
- identifying gaps in evidence and suggesting new lines of enquiry
- giving reasons and evidence to justify points of view
- evaluating evidence and arguments

Candidates responded enthusiastically to the Source Material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on global issues, particularly in relation to the loss of biodiversity. Candidates had clearly undertaken stimulating and well-designed courses.

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 interpreting and 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 and test claims about public opinion about biodiversity. These skills were tested mainly in **Questions 1** and **2**. However the ability to evaluate other perspectives, evidence and reasoning continues to be more challenging for some candidates.

Examination technique was generally very good. Candidates seemed to have sufficient time for the tasks. The vast majority completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very 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
- apply key concepts in critical thinking and research, for example validity, bias, reliability and expertise

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1(a)

Candidates were asked to identify two species in danger of extinction from the Source material.

Candidates were only awarded marks for identifying species that were contained within the Source. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified two species and were awarded maximum marks.

Question 1(b)

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, which consequence of biodiversity loss was the most important. They were expected to give several reasons and/or some evidence for their opinion.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons why one consequence was more important than others; this often involved comparing the significance of different consequences. Weaker responses often simply stated the consequence without explanation.

Most candidates answered this question very well.

Question 1(c)

Candidates were asked to explain why biodiversity loss was an important global issue

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about biodiversity loss in general rather than its significance as a global issue.

Question 2(a)

Candidates were asked to assess how well the writer of the source supported the argument that, 'all countries need to work together to protect biodiversity and the natural environment.'

The strongest answers provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their judgement; weaker responses often simply stated an opinion but did not explain it fully.

Question 2(b)

Candidates were expected to consider the types of information, sources of evidence and methods that could be used to test the claim that people do not care about biodiversity loss.

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, evidence and sources that were clearly related to the issue. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about biodiversity in general.

Responses at the higher levels of response fully described information, evidence and sources that were clearly relevant to the issue supported by clear, reasoned and developed explanation of how the information may be used to help test the claim. Responses at the lower levels tended to be partial, generalised or lack clarity.

A few candidates simply described their own opinion about loss of biodiversity and did not answer the question directly.

Question 3(a)

Candidates were expected to identify a prediction from Source 4, and explain their selection, saying why it was a prediction.

The strongest responses gave clear explanation of why the selected statement is a prediction showing good understanding of the nature of predictions. Weaker responses tended to identify a prediction from the statement successfully but did not clearly explain the reason why it was a prediction.

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified a prediction; the majority were able to explain their choice effectively to reveal understanding of the nature of predictions.

Question 3(b)

Candidates were expected to identify a value judgement from Source 4 and explain their selection.

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

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified a value judgement; most were able to explain their choice effectively and revealed understanding of the nature of value judgements.

Question 3(c)

Candidates were asked to compare the argument in Professor Fleur or Marcel's statements about biodiversity loss. Candidates were expected to make a supported judgement about the effectiveness of the reasoning and evidence. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to evaluate the reasons and evidence used to support an argument.

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the value of the argument in the statements; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument 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 argument was the most reasonable'. 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.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to consider the following four ways to increase global biodiversity:

- developing an internet and social media campaign to raise public awareness
- funding scientific research into biodiversity loss
- producing resources for schools to educate children about biodiversity loss
- increasing the amount of land that is protected to preserve species

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.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the effectiveness of different actions to reduce global warming; 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 global warming 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

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education
0457 Global Perspectives June 2015
Principal Examiner Report for Teachers

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

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

- performed well in the analysis and interpretation of information and evidence
- were able to use reasons and evidence effectively to support their judgements and claims
- need to develop evaluation skills more fully
- should have more experience in the critical comparison of arguments
- should use evidence to justify their opinions.

General Comments

Many candidates clearly enjoy thinking about global issues, appreciate the complexity of social, economic and technological change, and want to respond positively to the challenges posed by globalisation. They are clearly developing a critical awareness of global issues.

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. From the evidence of the examination scripts, the aims of the syllabus are being fulfilled.

The paper was based upon three different pieces of source material related to the issue of changing gender roles and inequality. Within this context, the paper was designed to test the skills of:

- understanding different perspectives on global issues
- analysing and interpreting information and evidence
- identifying gaps in evidence and suggesting new lines of enquiry
- giving reasons and evidence to justify points of view
- evaluating evidence and arguments.

Candidates responded enthusiastically to the Source Material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on global issues, particularly in relation to changing gender roles and inequality. Candidates had clearly undertaken stimulating and well-designed courses.

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 interpreting and 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 and test claims about gender roles. These skills were tested mainly in **Questions 1 and 2**. However the ability to evaluate other perspectives, evidence and reasoning continues to be more challenging for some candidates.

Examination technique was generally very good. Candidates seemed to have sufficient time for the tasks. The vast majority completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very 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
- apply key concepts in critical thinking and research, for example validity, bias, reliability and expertise.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1(a)

Candidates were asked to identify two differences between the traditional roles of men and women from Source 1.

Candidates were only awarded marks for identifying differences that were contained within the Source. The vast majority of candidates correctly identified two differences and were awarded maximum marks.

Question 1(b)

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, the main reason for differences between the traditional roles of men and women from Source 1. They were expected to give several reasons and/or some evidence for their opinion.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons why one reason was more important than others; this often involved comparing the significance of different reasons. Weaker responses often simply stated the reason without explanation.

Most candidates answered this question well.

Question 1(c)

Candidates were asked to explain why changes in the roles of men and women are an important issue.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about gender roles in general.

Question 2(a)

Candidates were asked to assess how well the writer of the source supported the argument that, 'women and men do not have the same roles in society.'

The strongest answers provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their judgement; weaker responses often simply stated an opinion but did not explain it fully.

Question 2(b)

Candidates were expected to consider the types of information, sources of evidence and methods that could be used to test the claim that women are paid less than men in many jobs.

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, evidence and sources that were clearly related to the issue. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about biodiversity in general.

Responses at the higher levels of response fully described information, evidence and sources that were clearly relevant to the issue supported by clear, reasoned and developed explanation of how the information may be used to help test the claim. Responses at the lower levels tended to be partial, generalised or lack clarity.

A few candidates simply described their own opinion about differences in pay between men and women but did not answer the question directly.

Question 3(a)

Candidates were expected to identify a value judgement from Source 3 and explain their selection.

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

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified a value judgement; most were able to explain their choice effectively and revealed understanding of the nature of value judgements.

Question 3(b)

Candidates were expected to identify a fact from Source 3, and explain their selection, saying why it was a fact.

The strongest responses gave clear explanation of why the selected statement is a fact showing good understanding of the nature of facts. Weaker responses tended to identify a fact from the statement successfully but did not clearly explain the reason why it was a fact.

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified a fact; the majority were able to explain their choice effectively to reveal understanding of the nature of facts.

Question 3(c)

Candidates were asked to compare the argument in Elene and Mulu's statements about change in the roles of men and women. Candidates were expected to make a supported judgement about the effectiveness of the reasoning and evidence. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to evaluate the reasons and evidence used to support an argument.

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the value of the argument in the statements; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument 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 argument was 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.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to consider the following issue:

'Do you think that men and women should have equality in society?'

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.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about gender equality; 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 gender 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

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education
0457 Global Perspectives June 2015
Principal Examiner Report for Teachers

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

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

- performed well in the analysis and interpretation of information and evidence
- were able to use reasons and evidence effectively to support their judgements and claims
- need to develop evaluation skills more fully
- should have more experience in the critical comparison of arguments
- should use evidence to justify their opinions.

General Comments

Many candidates clearly enjoy thinking about global issues, appreciate the complexity of social, economic and technological change, and want to respond positively to the challenges posed by globalisation. They are clearly developing a critical awareness of global issues.

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. From the evidence of the examination scripts, the aims of the syllabus are being fulfilled.

The paper was based upon three different pieces of source material related to the issue of urbanisation. Within this context, the paper was designed to test the skills of:

- understanding different perspectives on global issues
- analysing and interpreting information and evidence
- identifying gaps in evidence and suggesting new lines of enquiry
- giving reasons and evidence to justify points of view
- evaluating evidence and arguments.

Candidates responded enthusiastically to the Source Material, especially in the extended response questions. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on global issues, particularly in relation to urbanisation. Candidates had clearly undertaken stimulating and well-designed courses.

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 interpreting and 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 and test claims about urbanisation. These skills were tested mainly in **Questions 1 and 2**. However the ability to evaluate other perspectives, evidence and reasoning continues to be more challenging for some candidates.

Examination technique was generally very good. Candidates seemed to have sufficient time for the tasks. The vast majority completed all of the questions within the time allocated. There were very 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
- apply key concepts in critical thinking and research, for example validity, bias, reliability and expertise

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1(a)

Candidates were asked to identify two reasons from Source 1 to explain why people are attracted to living in cities.

Candidates were only awarded marks for identifying reasons that were contained within the Source.

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified two reasons and were awarded maximum marks.

Question 1(b)

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, which one of the problems caused by the rapid growth of cities is the most serious from Source 1.

Candidates were expected to give several reasons and/or some evidence for their opinion.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons why one problem was more important than others; this often involved comparing the significance of different problems. Weaker responses often simply stated the problem without explanation.

Most candidates answered this question very well.

Question 1(c)

Candidates were asked to explain why the rapid growth of cities is an important national issue.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide some weak explanation or asserted opinion about the issue in general rather than its significance as a national issue.

Question 2(a)

Candidates were asked to assess how well the writer of the source supported the argument that, 'cities are growing too fast.'

The strongest answers provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their judgement; weaker responses often simply stated an opinion but did not explain it fully.

Question 2(b)

Candidates were expected to consider the types of information, sources of evidence and methods that could be used to test the claim that, 'cities provide more opportunities for leisure and entertainment than small villages.'

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, evidence and sources that were clearly related to the issue. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about biodiversity in general.

Responses at the higher levels of response fully described information, evidence and sources that were clearly relevant to the issue supported by clear, reasoned and developed explanation of how the information may be used to help test the claim. Responses at the lower levels tended to be partial, generalised or lack clarity.

A few candidates simply described their own opinion about the issue and did not answer the question directly.

Question 3(a)

Candidates were expected to identify a value judgement from Source 3 and explain their selection.

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

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified a value judgement; most were able to explain their choice effectively and revealed understanding of the nature of value judgements.

Question 3(b)

Candidates were expected to identify a prediction from Source 3, and explain their selection, saying why it was a prediction.

The strongest responses gave clear explanation of why the selected statement is a prediction showing good understanding of the nature of predictions. Weaker responses tended to identify a prediction from the statement successfully but did not clearly explain the reason why it was a prediction.

The vast majority of candidates correctly identified a prediction; the majority were able to explain their choice effectively to reveal understanding of the nature of predictions.

Question 3(c)

Candidates were asked to compare the argument in Ling's or Shu's statements about the future of urbanisation. Candidates were expected to make a supported judgement about the effectiveness of the reasoning and evidence. The question was designed to test candidates' ability to evaluate the reasons and evidence used to support an argument

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the value of the argument in the statements; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument 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 argument was the most reasonable'. 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.

Question 4

In this question, candidates were expected to consider the following four ways to improve the lives of people in cities.

- reduce air pollution
- provide clean water and sanitation in slum areas and shanty towns
- develop more parks and spaces for leisure
- create more jobs for unskilled people

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.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the effectiveness of different actions to improve city life; 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 urbanisation 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.