

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 one. Sub-headings linked to the assessment criteria can be used to structure the report and each one should include a bibliography at the end.
- Multimedia should be avoided for the IR in favour of a word document so that word counts can be checked and adhered to and candidates can fulfil the assessment criteria within the word limit.
- 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 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 those in the sample.
- The total marks on the ICRCs, the MS1 and the CASF should be the same and if internal moderation takes 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 and of the candidate on the highest mark and a range in between.

General comments

Moderators are once again pleased to report that candidates produced interesting Individual Research reports covering a variety of topics from the 20 topic areas. Popular topics this examination series included: travel and infrastructure, water conservation, global warming and diet and health. These topics all lent themselves well to this task when phrased as questions which prompted research and learning. In some Centres candidates were producing work on the same topic, which it was felt did not always lead to their best work, as some candidates seemed less engaged in the given topic or struggled to 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. Most candidates this series used questions to focus their research and their IRs, but some headings were still too broad, resulting in candidates then struggling to find a focus for their work.

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 advise candidates to produce their work as word documents so this can be checked. Teachers should monitor this situation and advise candidates accordingly. Where work is considerably less than the word count, candidates cannot do justice to the full mark scheme. Where the work exceeds the word count, candidates put themselves at an unfair advantage and this needs to be addressed by the Centre.

Centres will appreciate that the work produced must reflect the assessment criteria and should be written in continuous prose. Some candidates are still providing primary evidence in the form of questionnaires, which is not required. For this component candidates produce and submit two reports. There should also be a completed Individual Candidate Record Card (ICRC) for each candidate in the sample, a Coursework

Summary Assessment Form (CASF) and MS1 containing the marks for all candidates within a Centre that has submitted work for this component.

Centres should ensure that each 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 ICRC. Most Centres are now submitting ICRCs with marks and the titles of the reports in the appropriate place and more are now providing useful comments relating to the assessment criteria.

Comments on specific questions

Teacher assessment

Many Centres are clear about the qualities expected for candidates to be awarded marks in different mark 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 a 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, although it is very rare for a candidate who has produced a study to be given no marks for *any* of the criteria, as there is usually something of value to be credited. Some Centres are still a little severe in their application of the marking criteria and some are a little generous. Candidates should be advised that the work submitted is their own work and this should be checked by the Centre because Moderators have picked up on a number of plagiarism issues. All sources should be referenced and a bibliography added at the end of each IR.

Gather information representing different perspectives

The majority of candidates were able to gather and present a range of information linked to the topic area. Rather than presenting information about different countries, candidates should be advised to look at the issues *within* their question from different perspectives. Candidates should explore what different countries, groups and individuals *think about* the issues under investigation.

Analyse issues within the report

The skill of analysis continues to improve, with causes, effects and current situations generally considered in some detail, although there is still some listing of information, 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 avoid doing this because information within tables does count towards the word count if it is a candidate's own work and in addition tables do not allow for development. More successful reports continue to cover fewer issues in depth rather than simply presenting a lot of unrelated issues. Centres sometimes need to remind candidates that to analyse an issue, candidates should consider the conditions related to the question being discussed, 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

This criterion raises a variety of issues. Some Centres misunderstand what is meant by possible scenarios. Scenarios arise from answering the question, 'What if...?' This can be in relation to whether something continues or not and should be linked to the issue under discussion - not linked to something that has been made up; so becoming superficial to the rest of the work done. For example, when discussing how English is becoming more like a first language in a country, candidates might explore the possible scenario of 'what might happen to the culture and identity of this country if everyone in that country communicated in English?' 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.

It is important to point out that 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. Credit can be given for courses of action that are happening, although it is unlikely that top marks for this criterion will be awarded if this is the case.

Develop evidence-based personal response demonstrating self-awareness

Some Centres are still submitting the self-evaluation form which is no longer needed and generally not very helpful in assessing this criterion. The evidence for this part of the assessment should be embedded within the report, perhaps at the end, as was generally the practice. In this way candidates are able to fully engage with the question posed and the perspectives gathered, and there is potential for 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.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02
Group Project

Key Messages

- A clearly identifiable project plan is an assessment requirement. The plan should include the rationale for, and aims of the project, and should identify a concrete project outcome which can be carried out. There should also be full details of all activities planned, along with time frames and roles and responsibilities of individual group members. Some indication of why responsibilities were assigned in the way they were is also required if candidates are to be placed in the top band for this criterion.
- There must be clear and concrete evidence of cross-cultural collaboration. Ideally, such collaboration will involve interaction with people in another country or countries. However, if this proves to be impossible, then candidates are advised to identify and collaborate with people from another culture or cultures within their own country. This means actually collaborating with people, rather than simply gathering general information from the Internet about the situation in different countries. It is also not advisable for candidates to rely solely on collaborating with candidates from other countries within their own School setting. This is because, on its own, such collaboration is unlikely to provide them with a rich enough experience to engage in an in-depth evaluation of what they have learned from cross-cultural collaboration, which is an essential element of the individual element and assessment.
- Cross-cultural collaboration needs to be undertaken with a purpose. It should be clear in the outcome itself, or in the write-up accompanying it, how the cross-cultural collaboration has been used to inform or support the project outcome. There needs to be evidence of different perspectives, including cross-cultural within the project outcome for marks in Bands 3 and 4 to be awarded.
- It is important that projects culminate in a concrete project outcome which is actually carried out. This is so that individual group members have something to evaluate in their individual work. Groups should think of some means by which the success of their project outcome may be judged in terms of how far it has achieved the aims which are set out in their project plan.
- Individual group members must submit their *own* evaluations of: the project plan and the process of carrying out the project; the project outcome, and an evaluation of their own contribution to and learning from the project. The latter must include some discussion of what they have learned from the group's cross-cultural collaboration, which is why it is essential that there has been concrete cross-cultural collaboration.
- There must be some brief explanatory remarks on the Independent Candidate Record Card (ICRC) to support/justify the marks that teachers have awarded for each of the assessment criteria. The comments should be specific to the performance descriptors, rather than being general. It is essential that the ICRC, and the Coursework Assessment Summary Form (CASF) containing the marks of all candidates, are submitted with the work.

General Comments

Some of the topic areas explored by candidates in this examination series included: conservation, education for all, youth crime in different societies and climate change.

More successful group projects realised the need for a product (outcome) to inform others and be evaluated, but also cross-cultural importance for the evaluations within the individual reports to demonstrate candidate's thinking.

Many groups chose to raise awareness about an issue as their project aim, which allowed them to choose a variety of means by which they could achieve success. Once again, video clips were a popular outcome.

Many of these were of good quality and often demonstrated that the candidates had given consideration as to how different perspectives could best be communicated. A number of candidates also engaged in outcomes which required them to carry out activities within their communities with people of another culture. Candidates are required to individually evaluate the success or otherwise of their outcome in achieving the project aims, and it would be advisable, at the outset, for groups to think of some means through which the success of their project outcome may be judged, for instance through a pre-post activity questionnaire or survey.

Comments on candidate response to assessment criteria

Production of a project plan

(Group assessment)

Many project plans were well done and included the necessary elements as determined by the assessment criteria. The most successful plans contained clearly articulated project aims which made it much easier for individual group members when it came to evaluating the project outcome in light of the aims. Project plans were generally presented either as the initial segment of the group's write-up of their activities and outcome, or in a separate document, and both of these approaches worked well. However, there were some candidate groups who did not submit any form of project plan, or the plan simply took the form of minutes of meetings, which did not give the kind of detailed information required to address the assessment criteria.

Teachers are reminded that the "Project Plan" is marked on a group basis and this means that all candidates in a group should be awarded the same mark for this criterion.

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

(Group assessment)

Cross-cultural collaboration is a key element of the Global Perspectives project component. This means that there must be evidence that candidates have interacted with people from another culture, either overseas, or within their own country, either by means of face-to-face communication or the Internet. Gathering general information via the Internet will not give candidates the opportunity to move out of their comfort zone and confront the issues they are exploring first hand. If little or no cross-cultural collaboration takes place, individual group members have nothing to comment on for this element in their evaluation of individual contribution and learning.

It is important to remind candidates that cross-cultural collaboration is carried out as a means to an end and is not an end in itself. It should be used to *inform and support* the outcome. This means that either in the outcome itself, or the write-up that accompanies it, it should be clear how the cross-cultural collaboration has been of importance in producing or carrying out the project outcome.

Teachers are reminded that "Representation of different viewpoints and perspectives (including cross-cultural)" is marked on a group basis and this means that all candidates in a group should be awarded the same mark for this criterion.

Constructive participation in group work/activities

(Individual assessment)

Assessment of performance in this criterion must be based on concrete evidence recorded during teacher observations of group work in progress. Brief supporting comments should be included on the ICRC.

Evaluation of project plan and process

(Individual assessment)

In the main, candidate evaluations of the plan and process were sound. The strongest evaluations considered both the strengths and weaknesses of the plan and process. This included some consideration of the strength or otherwise of the group's approach to and evaluation of the research. Weaker evaluations tended to focus solely on group dynamics and time management issues. In addition, strong evaluations were usually characterised by the fact that the candidates concerned had used sub-headings addressing each of the individual evaluation assessment criteria within their work. This ensured that they adequately addressed all of the elements within each of these criteria and gave structure to their work.

Evaluation of project outcome

(Individual assessment)

This examination series saw many interesting and very successful project outcomes and it remains the case that strong outcomes generally lead to strong individual evaluations of outcome. The strongest evaluations considered all aspects of the outcome with ongoing reference to the stated project aims. They evaluated both the successes and failures of the outcome; indicating strengths and limitations, and then considered the degree to which the aims of the project had been achieved after taking these strengths and limitations into consideration.

Some candidate groups chose to present case studies as their outcome and sometimes these had been very well researched. However, they were generally not the best choice for a project which should result in an active, 'concrete' outcome. This is because candidates generally find it very difficult to produce a critical evaluation of a case study as an outcome and do so in light of the project aims. Fewer projects this year had several outcomes, but focused on one, as having many has proved to be problematic for individual group members who have struggled in the past to fully evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of all in light of the project aims within the set word limit. Candidates need to be advised that time spent on careful consideration of project outcome at the outset of the project will be time well spent when it comes to individual evaluation at the end of the project.

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

(Individual assessment)

Most candidates were well able to document what they had contributed to the project, in terms of research carried out, or specific activities. However, it remains the case that while candidates are generally very positive about their own contribution, they are less inclined to consider where their own weaknesses lie, or where their contribution could have been improved. Evaluations should be critical in that they consider both strengths and weaknesses of personal contribution, as well as the benefits and challenges of working as a group, as opposed to working individually. As noted previously, it is also a requirement that candidates engage in some discussion of what they have learned from cross-cultural collaboration and this remains the weakest area of consideration for most candidates. They should be advised that besides gaining general factual knowledge, they need to think about what impact cross-cultural collaboration has had on their own perspective and how their opinions have changed or been reinforced.

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 apply key concepts in critical thinking in the evaluation of arguments

General Comments

Interest in the syllabus continues to grow and more Centres throughout the world are entering candidates for the qualification.

It is pleasing to report that the quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be high; candidates and Centres are to be congratulated on their achievements. Many candidates are exploring different perspectives on global issues with real enthusiasm. They are able to describe and explain different perspectives with sensitivity, demonstrating tolerance and respect, whilst appreciating the complexity of global issues. Candidates 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 examination paper was based upon several contrasting pieces of source material related to the global issue of access to education and educational inequality. 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
- find evidence to test claims
- develop reasoning and provide evidence to justify points of view
- evaluate reasons and evidence within arguments
- compare and make judgements about the effectiveness of different arguments and perspectives

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 between levels of response successfully.

Candidates responded enthusiastically to the Source Material, especially for the extended response questions. Candidates generally revealed an appreciation of different perspectives on global issues, particularly in relation to issues surrounding educational inequality. Candidates had clearly undertaken stimulating, well designed courses that were helpful in developing the skills to be assessed.

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 test a claim about expenditure on education and defence. 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. Whilst some candidates

were able to evaluate an argument using a number of criteria, for example in relation to the relevance and quality of the evidence and the 'ability to see' of the person making a claim, others were only able to discuss the degree to which they agreed with or shared similar opinions.

The examination technique of candidates 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 very few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- give clear, relevant reasons and evidence to support a personal opinion, argument or perspective
- avoid simple assertion and anecdotal evidence
- explain answers fully by giving a range of reasons and evidence 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, for example validity, expertise, relevance and reliability.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1a

Candidates were asked to identify from the source material two reasons why some children in developing countries do not go to School. Virtually all candidates correctly identified two reasons from:

- governments do not have enough money to pay for Schools
- countries are still developing
- migration/moving from the country to the city
- there are no Schools in the place where they live
- children have to work or beg
- impact of HIV/AIDS

Candidates are advised to respond using the phrases found in the source material, however describing the reasons in their own words is also acceptable as long as they are clearly the same reasons as those in the Source.

Question 1b

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, which of the reasons in the Source was the most important explanation for not attending School. They were expected to give a full explanation and some evidence for their judgement. Candidates usually gave the following types of reasons to justify their choice:

- possible consequences
- degree of impact/seriousness for individual
- how many people/groups/countries are affected
- increasing cycle of poverty/disadvantage
- how widespread the problem is
- how easy to solve
- impact on human ways of life and culture
- cost issues

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to justify their opinion; this often involved directly comparing the selected reason with one or more other of the reasons. Weaker responses often simply stated the reason or did not link the reason explicitly to not attending School.

Most candidates answered this question very well.

Question 1c

Candidates were expected to explain why not going to School is an important global issue. They were most likely to discuss the following reasons drawing upon the information in Sources 1 and 2:

- the benefits/consequences of going/not going to School for individuals – e.g. cycle of poverty/health/life chances/helps people get a job
- the benefits/consequences of going/not going to School for communities/countries – e.g. less crime and social unrest; more economic growth
- the benefits/consequences of going/not going to School for global society – e.g. interdependence and shared economic growth
- issues of equal opportunities/fairness – helps to address or reduce inequality/poverty
- the need for access to education as a human right for all
- in response to government, United Nations and other NGO humanitarian aims and goals e.g. millenium goals

The strongest answers provided clear, developed reasoning and explanation justifying why not going to School in developing countries is an issue of global importance. Responses at this level were likely to contain a range of reasoned arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed with some developed explanation clearly and explicitly related to the global dimension.

Weaker responses tended to assert an opinion without reason or evidence.

Most candidates answered this question well with clearly reasoned, credible and structured argument that included several developed reasons.

Question 2a

Candidates were expected to evaluate how well the writer supported their opinion by considering the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence in the Source.

Candidates were most likely to discuss the following evaluative points:

- Strengths
 - some factual evidence is used
 - several different types of evidence are used – opinion, factual, anecdotal, etc
 - the evidence is generally relevant
 - the evidence is related clearly and explicitly to the argument
 - the evidence is used forcefully in a strongly worded argument
 - has a balanced argument discussing action at different levels
- Weaknesses
 - evidence is not always cited – the Source and authorship are not clear at times
 - the level of expertise of the writer/journalist is not clear – may have poor knowledge claims
 - there is no evidence from experience or testimony
 - arguments are asserted at times
 - loses focus on countries for individual action
 - too much reliance on opinion
 - evidence may be out of date

The strongest responses were clearly focused upon the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence in the Source. These responses were balanced with a discussion of both strengths and weaknesses and 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 and weaknesses of the statement as evidence. Candidates should be encouraged to discuss both strengths and weaknesses when evaluating a source.

Question 2b

Candidates were expected to consider the types of information, sources of evidence and methods that could be used to test the claim that, 'more money is spent on weapons than School books.'

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 education in general.

The most common responses suggested the following types of information, evidence and methods:

- Types of Information
 - compare statistics/factual information on expenditure for education and defence in individual countries and globally
 - interview or questionnaire data
 - expert testimony
 - material from international NGOs and pressure groups
- Sources of Information
 - national and local governments and their departments
 - international organizations e.g. United Nations; UNESCO
 - educational and defence experts
 - research reports
 - pressure groups, charities and non government organizations
 - media and worldwide web
- Methods
 - review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents
 - research into government budgets for education and defence
 - review of government statistics on expenditure
 - interview relevant experts
 - interview members of the public
 - survey public opinion with questionnaires
 - Internet search

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.

Question 3a

Candidates were expected to identify a fact from the Source and explain their selection. Most candidates correctly identified a fact and understood that a fact is something which can be checked or proven; something that is true and which can be verified from experience and observation; or a piece of information.

The following examples of facts could be found in the Source:

- fewer girls than boys attend School (in most countries, especially developing)
- fewer girls than boys attend secondary School
- female literacy rates are lower than males

Strong responses demonstrated clear understanding of the nature of facts and applied this accurately to a correct example identified from the Source. Weaker responses were only able to identify a fact but could not clearly explain the selection.

Question 3b

Candidates were expected to identify an opinion from the Source and explain their selection. Most candidates correctly identified an opinion and understood that an opinion is a personal view or attitude or perspective; a judgment or belief not founded on certainty or proof.

The following examples of opinions could be found in the source:

- we need local projects targeted on girls and women to get to the heart of the problem
- women need to respect the culture of their countries and past traditions
- we really need is more jobs for men so that they can support their families better
- simply giving girls schooling will not really help - it may cause conflict and disrupt family life in many parts of the world
- government money should be spent on projects to increase job opportunities and improve the economy

Strong responses demonstrated clear understanding of the nature of opinions and applied this accurately to a correct example identified from the Source. Weaker responses were only able to identify an opinion but could not clearly explain the selection.

Question 3c

Candidates were expected to evaluate the reasoning in two statements and compare their effectiveness and come to a supported judgement with explanation about which person has the most effective reasoning.

Candidates mainly considered the following issues:

- quality of the argument
 - clarity
 - tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise
 - language
 - balance
- quality of the evidence
 - relevance
 - sufficiency – sample
 - source – media; radio
 - date – how recent
 - factual, opinion, value, anecdote
 - testimony – from experience and expert
- knowledge claims
- sources of bias
 - gender
 - political
 - personal values
 - experience
- likelihood of solutions working and consequences of their ideas
- acceptability of their 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 each 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. 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 arguments 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

Candidates were expected to discuss which of the following methods is most likely to help more children go to School in developing countries:

- Global - through international aid and charitable organisations
- National - by governments increasing expenditure on building new Schools
- Local - community projects targeting girls' education

Candidates were asked to:

- state their conclusion
- give reasons for their opinion
- use the material in the Sources and their own experience
- show that they have considered different perspectives

In this question, 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 to consider different methods were likely to include:

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

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about each proposed method; 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 education 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 both perspectives before reaching a supported judgement based upon their own argument. Candidates need to describe and explain the reasons and evidence that have helped to shape their own points of view on the issue under consideration.

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 apply key concepts in critical thinking in the evaluation of arguments

General Comments

Interest in the syllabus continues to grow and more Centres throughout the world are entering candidates for the qualification.

It is pleasing to report that the quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be high; candidates and Centres are to be congratulated on their achievements. Many candidates are exploring different perspectives on global issues with real enthusiasm. They are able to describe and explain different perspectives with sensitivity, demonstrating tolerance and respect, whilst appreciating the complexity of global issues. Candidates 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 examination paper was based upon several contrasting pieces of source material related to the global issue of inequality in the workplace. 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
- find evidence to test claims
- develop reasoning and provide evidence to justify points of view
- evaluate reasons and evidence within arguments
- compare and make judgements about the effectiveness of different arguments and perspectives

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 between levels of response successfully.

Candidates responded enthusiastically to the source material, especially for the extended response questions. Candidates generally revealed an appreciation of different perspectives on global issues, particularly in relation to issues surrounding work and inequality. Candidates had clearly undertaken stimulating, well designed courses that were helpful in developing the skills to be assessed.

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 information that would be helpful in making judgements about job applications. 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. Whilst some candidates were able to evaluate an argument using a number of criteria, for example in relation to the relevance and

quality of the evidence and the 'ability to see' of the person making a claim, others were only able to discuss the degree to which they agreed with or shared similar opinions.

The examination technique of candidates 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 very few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- give clear, relevant reasons and evidence to support a personal opinion, argument or perspective
- avoid simple assertion and anecdotal evidence
- explain answers fully by giving a range of reasons and evidence 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, for example validity, expertise, relevance and reliability

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1a

Candidates were asked to identify a factor from the Source that leads to high motivation in the workplace. Virtually all candidates correctly identified one factor from:

- Achievement
- Recognition
- Responsibility
- Type of Work
- Pay

Candidates are advised to respond using the phrases found in the source material, however describing the reasons in their own words is also acceptable as long as they are clearly the same reasons as those in the Source.

Question 1b

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, which of the factors in the Source was the most important in motivating people. They were expected to give a full explanation and some evidence for their judgement. Candidates usually gave the following types of reasons to justify their choice:

- possible consequences
- rewards
- degree of impact/seriousness for individuals and groups
- increasing cycle of motivation
- degree of positive impact on individual, family, community, country and world
- avoiding consequences of low motivation

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to justify their opinion; this often involved directly comparing the selected benefit with one or more other of the factors. Weaker responses often simply stated the benefit.

Most candidates answered this question very well.

Question 1c

Candidates were asked to identify a factor from the Source that leads to low motivation in the workplace. Virtually all candidates correctly identified one factor from:

- How the Business is Run
- Supervision
- Work conditions
- Type of Work
- Pay

Candidates are advised to respond using the phrases found in the source material, however describing the reasons in their own words is also acceptable as long as they are clearly the same reasons as those in the Source.

Question 1d

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, which of the factors in the Source was the most likely to create low motivation. They were expected to give a full explanation and some evidence for their judgement. Candidates usually gave the following types of reasons to justify their choice:

- possible consequences e.g. on health and safety
- degree of impact/seriousness for individuals and groups
- increasing cycle of dissatisfaction and demotivation
- how easy to solve or improve
- not gaining recognition or reward

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to justify their opinion; this often involved directly comparing the selected benefit with one or more other of the factors. Weaker responses often simply stated the benefit.

Most candidates answered this question very well.

Question 1e

Candidates were asked to identify a factor from the Source that might lead to both high and low motivation in the workplace. Virtually all candidates correctly identified one factor from:

- Type of Work
- Pay

Candidates are advised to respond using the phrases found in the source material, however describing the reasons in their own words is also acceptable as long as they are clearly the same reasons as those in the Source.

Question 1f

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, why the factor identified in the response to **Question 1e** might create both high and low motivation in the workplace. They were expected to give a full explanation and some evidence for their judgement. Candidates usually gave the following types of reasons to justify their choice:

- possible consequences
- degree of impact/seriousness for individuals and groups
- increasing cycle of low and high motivation
- degree of recognition or reward
- issues of parity and fairness

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to justify their opinion; this often involved directly comparing the selected benefit with one or more other of the factors. Weaker responses often simply stated the benefit.

Generally candidates answered this question quite 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 apply for a job. 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 applying for a job based upon information that was not already available in the advertisement in the Source; for example

about the pay and type of work. Weaker responses tended to suggest information that was only tangentially related to the issue; for example about the locality.

Candidates were also asked to explain how the information gained from the answer to the question would help them to make the decision about applying or not. The strongest responses tended to clearly describe the way that the information was linked to the application for a job 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:

- the locality of the job
- the pay
- any additional benefits (sick pay, etc.)
- the skills needed
- the type of work
- qualifications required
- experience

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 applying 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 whether or not the statement in the question was a value judgement and/or an opinion and explain their judgement.

Most candidates suggested that the statement was *either* a value judgement *or* an opinion; however few recognised that the statement was *both* a value judgement *and* an opinion.

The statement was a value judgement because it considers equality, which is a value. It was also an opinion as it was an unverifiable belief held by the speaker.

Strong responses demonstrated clear understanding of the nature of the statement and explained why it was both a value judgement and an opinion. Weaker responses only identified one or other of the characteristics of the statement without any clear explanation.

Question 3b

Candidates were expected to evaluate the argument in the statement about big businesses paying large sums of money to some employees and explain their judgements.

Candidates tended to consider how big businesses may wish to pay high wages as they want to attract the best quality and highly skilled workforce and that this may be difficult with a maximum wage policy. They may be in competition with other businesses so cannot afford to let other companies get the most skilled labour so that they become vulnerable. They may want to use more money to pay higher wages to recruit and motivate more skilled workers so that there are opportunities for other workers. The perspective in the statement may therefore be unreasonable as big businesses are not only thinking of themselves but the employees they already have, and their survival. If the business goes bankrupt, then no one will have a job. On the other hand, big businesses might want to make money to fund research and development, or to create more jobs on lower wages, or distribute income from the business more widely and fairly, so the perspective of these businesses may be reasonable. It largely depends on the reasons why big businesses want to make as much money as possible and pay high wages.

Candidates also 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 – sample
 - source
 - date – how recent
 - factual, opinion, value, anecdote
 - testimony – from experience and expert

- knowledge claims
- sources of bias
 - gender
 - political
 - personal values
 - experience

- impact of a maximum wage on individuals, groups and businesses
- acceptability of the values to others
 - how likely other people are to agree with the 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. The 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 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 arguments 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 3c

Candidates were expected to evaluate the reasoning in two statements and compare their effectiveness and come to a supported judgement with explanation about which person has the most effective reasoning.

Candidates mainly considered the following issues:

- quality of the argument
 - clarity
 - tone – emotive; exaggerated; precise
 - language
 - balance
- quality of the evidence
 - relevance
 - sufficiency – sample
 - source – blog post
 - date – how recent
 - factual, opinion, value, anecdote
 - testimony – from experience and expert
- knowledge claims
- sources of bias
 - gender
 - political
 - personal values
 - experience
- likelihood of solutions working and consequences of their ideas
- acceptability of their 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 each 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. 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 arguments 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

Candidates were expected to consider whether or not there should be a maximum wage and in so doing:

- give reasons for their opinion
- use relevant examples to support their opinion
- consider different points of view
- explain why they disagreed with some of these points of view

In this question, 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 to consider the issue were likely to include:

- issues of equality and fairness about the distribution of wealth and income implied by a maximum wage
- issues of fair reward for different levels of qualification, responsibility, skill and endeavor
- the impact on motivation of employees
- reference to scale of potential impact
- how long it takes to make a difference
- the effects of cultural differences and beliefs on opinion about the issue
- barriers to change
- the role of vested interests and power differences
- potential conflict
- cost and access to resources to implement a change to a maximum wage

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about each proposed method; this included coherent, structured argument and evidence, as well as evaluation of alternative perspectives. 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 work 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 both perspectives before reaching a supported judgement based upon their own argument. Candidates need to describe and explain the reasons and evidence that have helped to shape their own points of view on the issue under consideration.

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 apply key concepts in critical thinking in the evaluation of arguments

General Comments

Interest in the syllabus continues to grow and more Centres throughout the world are entering candidates for the qualification.

It is pleasing to report that the quality of work and levels of achievement continue to be high; candidates and Centres are to be congratulated on their achievements. Many candidates are exploring different perspectives on global issues with real enthusiasm. They are able to describe and explain different perspectives with sensitivity, demonstrating tolerance and respect, whilst appreciating the complexity of global issues. Candidates 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 examination paper was based upon several contrasting pieces of source material related to the global issue of access to work and unemployment. 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
- find evidence to test claims
- develop reasoning and provide evidence to justify points of view
- evaluate reasons and evidence within arguments
- compare and make judgements about the effectiveness of different arguments and perspectives

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 between levels of response successfully.

Candidates responded enthusiastically to the source material, especially for the extended response questions. Candidates generally revealed an appreciation of different perspectives on global issues, particularly in relation to issues surrounding work and inequality. Candidates had clearly undertaken stimulating, well designed courses that were helpful in developing the skills to be assessed.

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 test a claim about motivation at work. 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. Whilst some candidates were able to evaluate an

argument using a number of criteria, for example in relation to the relevance and quality of the evidence and the 'ability to see' of the person making a claim, others were only able to discuss the degree to which they agreed with or shared similar opinions.

The examination technique of candidates 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 very few rubric errors.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- give clear, relevant reasons and evidence to support a personal opinion, argument or perspective
- avoid simple assertion and anecdotal evidence
- explain answers fully by giving a range of reasons and evidence 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, for example validity, expertise, relevance and reliability

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1a

Candidates were asked to identify from the source material two benefits of having a job. Virtually all candidates correctly identified two benefits from:

- reduces poverty
- gives people a sense of well-being
- people feel as if they are making a contribution to their family
- people feel as if they are making a contribution to their community
- helps to prevent protests and riots
- helps reduce crime
- promotes development
- improves living standards
- make people more productive
- bring people together in the community

Candidates are advised to respond using the phrases found in the source material, however describing the reasons in their own words is also acceptable as long as they are clearly the same reasons as those in the Source.

Question 1b

Candidates were asked to explain, in their opinion, which of the benefits of having a job in the Source was the most important. They were expected to give a full explanation and some evidence for their judgement. Candidates usually gave the following types of reasons to justify their choice:

- possible additional positive consequences at different levels of society
- the seriousness of the problem that employment solves
- how far it contributes to the goals of local, national and international communities
- degree of positive impact on individual, family, community, country and world
- how many people/groups/countries are affected
- increasing virtuous circle – jobs create more jobs
- degree of poverty/suffering alleviated
- how easy to solve
- avoiding consequences of unemployment

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to justify their opinion; this often involved directly comparing the selected benefit with one or more other of the benefits. Weaker responses often simply stated the benefit.

Most candidates answered this question very well.

Question 1c

Candidates were expected to explain why unemployment is an important global issue. They were most likely to discuss the following reasons drawing upon the information in the Sources:

- the benefits/consequences of having/not having a job for individuals
- the benefits/consequences of having/not having a job for communities/countries
- the benefits/consequences of having/not having a job for global society
- issues of equal opportunities/fairness – helps to address or reduce inequality/poverty
- the need for access to a job as a human right for all
- in response to government, United Nations and other NGO humanitarian aims and goals e.g. millennium goals
- interdependence – we are all affected

The strongest answers provided clear, developed reasoning and explanation justifying why unemployment is an issue of global importance. Responses at this level were likely to contain a range of reasoned arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed with some developed explanation clearly and explicitly related to the global dimension.

Weaker responses tended to assert an opinion without reason or evidence.

Most candidates answered this question well with clearly reasoned, credible and structured argument that included several developed reasons.

Question 2a

Candidates were expected to evaluate how well the writer supported their opinion by considering the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence in the Source.

Candidates were most likely to discuss the following evaluative points:

- Strengths
 - factual evidence is used
 - several different types of evidence are used – opinion, factual, testimony and anecdotal
 - the evidence is generally relevant
 - the evidence is related clearly and explicitly to the argument
 - the evidence is used forcefully in a strongly worded argument
- Weaknesses
 - research evidence is not cited – the source and authorship are not clear
 - level of expertise of the writer/businessman is not clear – may have poor knowledge claims
 - there is no apparent evidence from expertise or statistical/numerical
 - the evidence is not easy to verify/check from the information provided
 - some evidence is only anecdotal using one example
 - too much reliance on opinion
 - evidence may be out of date
 - personal testimony/anecdote may not apply to other businesses/places/countries etc

The strongest responses were clearly focused upon the strengths and weaknesses of the reasons and evidence in the Source. These responses were balanced with a discussion of both strengths and weaknesses and 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 and weaknesses of the statement as evidence. Candidates should be encouraged to discuss both strengths and weaknesses when evaluating a source.

Question 2b

Candidates were expected to consider the types of information, sources of evidence and methods that could be used to test the claim that, 'locally created jobs encourage workers to have greater commitment and increased pride in their work.'

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 work in general.

The most common responses suggested the following types of information, evidence and methods:

- Types of Information
 - compare statistics/information on attitudes of workers in different size businesses – small local and large multinational
 - compare statistics/information on success of businesses locally, nationally and internationally
 - questionnaire and interview data from workers in different types of business
 - expert testimony from business leaders and trade unions
- Sources of Information
 - national and local governments and their departments
 - international organizations e.g. United Nations; International Labour Organisation
 - business experts
 - research reports
 - people at work in different types of organizations – case studies
 - pressure groups, charities and non government organizations working in the sector
 - media and worldwide web
- Methods
 - review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents
 - interview workers
 - observe workers
 - interview relevant experts
 - Internet search
 - case studies of different work places

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.

Question 3a

Candidates were expected to identify a value judgement from the Source and explain their selection. Most candidates correctly identified a value judgement and understood that a value judgement is a subjective assessment based on a code of values concerning what is right and wrong; a decision based on moral principles or beliefs; an opinion based on an individual's beliefs or views of what is desirable, important or highly regarded and not upon facts which can be checked or proved.

The following examples of value judgements were found in the Source:

- it is right to make young people a priority
- it is only fair for those who caused the recession through bad management to pay for new jobs to be created

Strong responses demonstrated clear understanding of the nature of value judgements and applied this accurately to a correct example identified from the Source. Weaker responses were only able to identify a value judgement but could not clearly explain the selection.

Question 3b

Candidates were expected to identify a fact from the Source and explain their selection. Most candidates correctly identified a fact and understood that a fact is something which can be checked or proven; something that is true and which can be verified from experience and observation; or a piece of information.

The following examples of facts could be found in the Source:

- recession has hit young people the hardest in all parts of the world
- young people are nearly three times as likely as adults to be unemployed
- an estimated 6.4 million young people have given up hope of finding a job

Strong responses demonstrated clear understanding of the nature of facts and applied this accurately to a correct example identified from the Source. Weaker responses were only able to identify a fact but could not clearly explain the selection.

Question 3c

Candidates were expected to evaluate the reasoning in two statements and compare their effectiveness and come to a supported judgement with explanation about which person has the most effective reasoning.

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 – sample
 - source – media; radio
 - date – how recent
 - factual, opinion, value, anecdote
 - testimony – from experience and expert
- knowledge claims
- sources of bias
 - gender
 - political
 - personal values
 - experience
- likelihood of solutions working and consequences of their ideas
- acceptability of their 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 each 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. 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 arguments 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

Candidates were expected to discuss which of the following methods is most likely to increase employment for young people:

- Global - through international organisations improving world trade
- National - by governments spending more money on young people and employment
- Local – by training people to start their own businesses

Candidates were asked to:

- state their conclusion
- give reasons for their opinion
- use the material in the Sources and their own experience
- show that they have considered different perspectives

In this question, 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 to consider different methods were likely to include:

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

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about each proposed method; 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 work 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 both perspectives before reaching a supported judgement based upon their own argument. Candidates need to describe and explain the reasons and evidence that have helped to shape their own points of view on the issue under consideration.