

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/12
Written Examination

Key messages

The key messages from this series are that candidates:

- appreciate different perspectives on global issues
- demonstrate very good skills of interpretation and analysis
- should explain critical evaluation of sources using critical thinking concepts
- need to explain and relate research designs explicitly to the purpose of the research
- should use material from sources as evidence to justify their opinions.

General comments

The Written Paper consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In March 2021, the Written Paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Demographic Change. The Paper explored issues relating to the growth in the number of young people in the global population identified by the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO).

Overall, the levels of achievement were very good. Many candidates appear to be deeply interested in the challenges facing young people in the world today. Candidates engaged in perceptive discussion of issues relating to the creation of sustainable futures, political representation, the environment, and access to education and training.

Candidates clearly appreciate that there are different perspectives on these issues and use credible, well-supported argument to support their own opinions. Whilst candidates were generally able to state their views about issues, it is important for them to provide reasons and evidence to support their explanations. These should be drawn from the source material provided in the Insert as well as their own experience.

Candidates were able to interpret and analyse sources and data presented in a variety of different ways. However, candidates need to explain their critical evaluation of arguments within sources using critical thinking concepts like fact, opinion, bias, vested interest, prediction and value judgement.

Generally, candidates were able to identify a wide range of different methods and sources of data for research and to test claims. However, candidates should carefully explain their research designs and choice of research methods in greater detail, explicitly relating their research strategy to the claim to be tested.

Some candidates were able to justify recommended actions for governments to improve the lives of young people. However, candidates should explain recommended actions in more detail and assess the potential impact and consequences for the intended outcome.

Centres are encouraged to teach candidates about the use of evidence to support arguments and provide experience of evaluating the effectiveness of evidence in the analysis of sources, alongside other critical thinking concepts like bias, vested interest, fact, opinion and prediction.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- justify and explain their opinions with reasons and evidence drawn from the Sources, including through quotation and citation of sources
- use the concepts of critical thinking to support evaluation of sources and perspectives
- fully explain research strategies and relate them explicitly to the claim being tested

- evaluate alternative actions in greater detail, explaining and assessing potential impact and consequences more fully.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified the percentage of the world's population under the age of 25 as 42 per cent, from Source 1, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark.
- (b) Almost all candidates were able to identify two challenges for young people from Source 2, and therefore gained the maximum of two marks.
- (c) Most candidates responded very well to this question, identifying and justifying a challenge for young people which, in their opinion, is the most significant. Most candidates chose to discuss the challenges of employment, political representation, living with conflict, and access to education.

The most common justifications given by candidates related to issues of impact, including:

- The number of people affected.
- The long-term positive implications and consequences.
- Impact on other aspects of social, political and economic life.

Many candidates showed awareness of the link between cause and consequence in this context, as well as the 'virtuous circle' effect of a consequence or cause leading to another. Some discussed a possible 'vicious circle'.

The strongest answers provided several clear reasons to explain why one challenge was more important than others. Weaker responses often simply stated the benefit without explanation and tended to rely upon assertion without evidence or careful reasoning.

- (d) Many candidates responded very well to this question and could explain and justify why young people should be a priority for governments, drawing upon and interpreting the material within the sources with some skill.

Candidates tended to discuss the importance of preparing young people for the future as well as deploying them in responding to national and global challenges. Many candidates also discussed the importance of young people to economic prosperity and their ability to respond flexibly and positively to innovation and change, often in contrast to older people.

Candidates achieving at higher levels provided a clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation. Candidates achieving at the lower levels tended to provide simple explanation or asserted opinion about young people being the future and being a high proportion of the world's population.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the argument in Source 3 and assess how well the author supported the view that, 'young people are about the future.'

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- Uses a range of sources as evidence.
- Uses expert sources from reputable organisations.
- Acknowledges counter arguments.
- Reports positively about young people.
- Reasonable tone.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- Some assertion.

- Little factual/statistical evidence.
- Potential media bias.
- Lack of complete citation.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their opinions, usually discussing four or more distinct evaluative points, including strengths and weaknesses. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted an opinion.

Some weaker responses described the reasons and evidence within the source but did not evaluate or explain why the identified reason or type of evidence was a strength or weakness.

Candidates should be encouraged to make a clear and explicit statement about the quality of the reasons and evidence in the Source and justify their opinion using the material in the source as evidence. This means quoting from or summarising elements of the source. In addition, the concepts of critical thinking should be used to support the evaluation. For example, bias, reliability, vested interest, fact, opinion, value judgement and prediction. In addition, other concepts might have been used, for example ability to know, expertise, relevance, accuracy and datedness.

- (b) Candidates who performed well in this question described several methods, sources of information and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, ‘Many older people think that young people are badly behaved. The methods of testing the claim suggested were carefully explained and clearly related to the claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, surveys and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example with elderly people, young people and various professional groups that work with different age groups. Surveys of local people were also suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts, local government and teachers. Nearly all candidates suggested secondary research using sources from the internet. Many described the type of source that was likely to be reliable and free from bias or vested interest, for example from governments, NGOs and United Nations organisations.

The strongest responses provided clearly reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestions *clearly and explicitly linked to the claim being tested*; weaker responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence but did not explain them fully or make the link between the evidence being gathered and how it could be used to evaluate the claim being tested.

An example of part of a strong response linking to the claim was ‘*I could give a questionnaire to a large group of older people, possibly in an old people’s home. The questions would be designed to get their opinion on the behaviour of young people. A question might be, “Do you think young people cause too much trouble? Why?”*’

An example of part of a weak response was, ‘*a survey of people could be done to see what different ages think*’.

A few candidates responded to the question by describing their opinion on the issue rather than describing how it could be researched. This did not answer the question satisfactorily.

Candidates should be given regular opportunity to design research strategies to test claims or answer research questions as a regular part of their courses. In addition, evaluating research strategies for specific purposes would be helpful to help candidates understand the link between research question and method.

Question 3

- (a) Many candidates correctly identified an example of a value judgement from Hana’s statement, revealing an understanding that a value judgement is a view or decision about what is right, wrong or important, based on a particular set of standards, principles, or values.

Most candidates were able to justify and explain their judgement convincingly.

- (b)(i) Nearly all candidates correctly identified a fact from Kaito’s statement.

(b)(ii) Many candidates were able to describe the link between the identified fact and the argument in Kaito's statement. However, fewer candidates explicitly evaluated 'how well' the fact supported the statement. Those candidates who directly addressed the question tended briefly to explore the following evaluative points:

- Good support as the fact is based on evidence or research.
- Some support as the fact is relevant to the argument.
- Not much support as the fact is out-of-date.
- Limited support as it is not relevant to the argument.
- A lot of support because the fact is related to the argument.

(c) Nearly all candidates compared both statements explicitly, Kaito's and Hana's, and discussed issues relating to evidence, language, knowledge claims and expertise. Some candidates also addressed the reasons, arguments and values within each statement.

Responses at the highest levels presented well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the value of each statement; this included coherent, structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a focus on reasons and evidence, with a range of points about knowledge claims, consequences and values for both statements. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion. The statements were also quoted explicitly and material from the statements was used directly in the response as evidence to support the candidate's opinion. These responses overtly evaluated the statements.

At the lower levels of response, the discussion lacked support and tended to be mainly asserted with little clarity of argument. Many responses at the lower levels of response just described the content of the statements. These answers tended to focus on issues rather than reasons, knowledge claims, evidence, consequences or values. There was very little or no overt evaluation at the lowest levels of response.

Question 4

In this question candidates were asked to assess different proposals to improve the lives of young people and recommend one of the proposed actions to the government. They were expected to justify their views using material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

There were many very thoughtful discussions of each proposal or option. Some candidates chose to compare all options, which was a more challenging way to structure the argument. Most candidates recommended providing more education and training or involving young people in decision-making about local issues. However, some candidates tended to describe or assert their opinions about each proposal without exploring the potential impact on the lives of young people.

Candidates tended to discuss the following criteria in reviewing the different proposals:

- The scale of impact on young people.
- Different consequences and implications for young people or the government.
- How long it might take to make a difference.
- Barriers to change; e.g. power of the elderly or politicians with vested interests.
- Potential conflicts of interest.
- Difficulties in planning and coordinating improvements.
- Cost and access to resources to implement change.

Responses at the highest levels tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the issue. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion was also reached. These responses linked the argument explicitly and frequently back to the issue of improving the lives of young people.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the issue and simply describe their own opinion about the place of young people in society generally, or the proposals. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to improve the lives of young people. These responses did not use the material in the sources to support their answers.

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 or potential actions in response to an issue. In so doing candidates need to analyse and evaluate the potential effectiveness and impact of the action.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

<p>Paper 0457/02 Individual Report</p>

Key messages

- Candidates should be aware that **perspectives** are the main focus of the Global Perspectives Individual Report (IR).
- Teachers and candidates should understand the requirements of the IR as indicated by the **assessment criteria**. These are clearly set out in the mark scheme.
- Candidates should formulate a question that focuses on **one issue**.
- The candidate's response must focus on **different perspectives** on their chosen issue.

General comments

For this component, candidates choose a topic from the list provided in the syllabus. They ask a question about a relevant issue. They research different perspectives (global and national/local) on their issue and present these perspectives with relevant supporting information.

They analyse and compare the causes and consequences of their issue.

They propose and develop a course of action to help resolve their chosen issue.

They evaluate the sources of information they have used to support their argument.

Finally, they reflect on their personal perspective and how this has been impacted by their research and the perspectives explored.

Candidates cite all material they use and provide references for all the sources used in their report. They present their report in essay form (continuous prose), in a Word document and should write between 1500 and 2000 words.

General observations on March 2021 cohort

In this March session, more candidates addressed a specific issue and fewer wrote descriptive essays about a general topic.

More candidates included evaluation of sources than previous cohorts. Many candidates cited their sources and provided accurate references.

The strongest work showed a clear understanding of all the requirements for this component. It was clear about the issue at hand; was well-structured and logical, and explicitly presented several different well-supported perspectives, including at least one global and one national perspective on the issue identified in their question.

This work gave a full explanation of the causes and consequences of the issue, comparing the different causes and/or the impacts in different places or on different groups of people. Any courses of action proposed included full details of how they would be carried out, by whom and what their impact would be. The course of action proposed was directly relevant to the issue, and or the main cause or the worst consequence of the issue.

The candidate reflected on their own perspective and how it had been formed or changed by the findings of their research, other people's perspectives, different causes and consequences and the sources they had found to back up the different perspectives. The candidate answered their own question and did not lose focus on the central issue.

Comments on specific assessment criteria

Assessment Objective 1: Research, Analysis and Evaluation:

Information from different perspectives:

The strongest work responds to a **clear question** about a **single global issue**. This enables candidates to present clear global perspectives, national perspectives, and their own perspective on this issue. Simple questions such as:

'Do fast-changing fashion trends affect waste?' or

'Do the advantages of voice assistants outweigh the issues related to breach of privacy?'

'Are the drawbacks of sport dividing people more damaging than the benefits of it bringing people together?' allow candidates to be clear about their topic and issue and to focus on that throughout.

Philosophical questions or those asking *How? Or 'to what extent'* often led to opinionated, limited, or descriptive responses.

Questions with very wide topics such as: *'Is Belief System the root cause of all divisions and dominance'* encouraged very generalised and vague response.

Questions such as *'Explain how racial and gender discrimination happen in the workplace and how it affects employment'* encouraged a descriptive approach.

Questions such as *'What has been the impact of the loss of biodiversity on the human population?'* tended to encourage candidates to write about several issues in little detail, rather than concentrating on one issue. This limited the quality and depth of their analysis and explanation. In these cases, candidates tended to present their own perspective in their conclusion, with no other perspectives at all.

The strongest work shows a clear understanding of perspectives.

For this component, a **global perspective** addresses a **global** issue raised in the question. It should be clear whose perspective this is – a quote from the relevant person or organisation should be attributed to them. Information should be presented to explain the perspective and support it. Two different approaches can be seen below: (both also include supporting explanations and information)

1. Global perspective

Light pollution is recognised by the UN environment programme as an issue that must be addressed. At the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals thirteenth meeting of the Conference of Parties (CMS COP13) in Gandhinagar, India, light pollution was considered for the first time after the European Union and Australia submitted independent draft resolutions each. The Government of Australia has proposed guidelines that can allow us to use artificial light in a better way. 'The guidelines recognize the potential of conflicting requirements for wildlife conservation and human safety and the need for a balance between the two.'

2. Global Perspective

In a survey taken by the American Psychological Association in 2017,⁶ it was found that 20% of Americans said that they 'constantly' check their social media feeds, and this at times exposed them to the latest headlines, which they were not even seeking. A psychology professor at Sussex University, United Kingdom, Graham Davey claimed that as times continue changing so does the type of news. It is 'increasingly visual and shocking,' he said. Negative news on television worsens personal worries, along with symptoms like change in sleep patterns, acute stress, and mood swings. Given the current situation today, there is hardly any positive news, and constantly watching negative reports, impacts the brain⁷ Here are two important, yet similar views on this topic, from India and Austria.

Parul Ghosh, an Indian entrepreneur says, 'It's so easy to get lost on the internet...it totally consumed me at one point, and I had to stop.' It was very worrying as she was concerned about travelling back home and the health of her loved ones. On the other hand, Kris Clancy, from Victoria, Austria, a news addict before this virus, said 'Mentally it has been quite overwhelming.' Earlier, he always kept up with current affairs and followed journalists on Twitter but during the virus had to slow it down.⁸ Thus, wherever people are in the world, they are all responding to the glut of information and updates in a situation that is yet developing which no one has full knowledge of. This has the impact of making many feel so overwhelmed as to stop looking at the news completely.

Similarly, a **national perspective** is a national viewpoint on the issue presented, or an opinion, or a feeling about, or an attitude to the national situation. Again, it should be clear whose perspective is being presented, either by paraphrasing or quoting the person or organisation with clear attribution. There should be evidence of the perspective and supporting information to explain it.

National perspective

With 60% of the Amazonian rainforest in Brazil, it is no doubt that the country's management of the Amazon will have the most significant effect. The government has an economic development centred perspective and is exploiting the Amazon to reach their goals. Brazil's President vetoed all non-hydro power alternatives in January 2016 for the five-year development plan (Yale environment journal, 2017). Similarly, the president has indicated a willingness to fast-track the development of a Canadian company's large-scale gold-mining operation that was earlier halted for its environmental impact (The Washington Post, 2019). The fines for environmental crimes have dropped to allow for unrestricted development as the President claims the Amazon rainforest as Brazil's wealth. His agenda is backed by a majority of Brazilian farmers who argue that economic growth is a constitutional right (BBC, 2019).

Some **weaker work did not present different perspectives** on the issue, but instead presented information about different places, and / or unsupported viewpoints and opinions. In some cases the candidate started with a general opinion that technology has negative impacts on teenagers and simply presented 1500 words of illustration and description, with no evidence of research of others' perspectives.

In some **weak work** candidates simply presented a range of information from two or three countries and labelled this as Global Perspective.

Some **weak work** presented a **general topic with 2 or 3 sub-topics** (often labelled Issue 1, Issue 2, Issue 3). This work did not present perspectives explicitly and (because it was dealing with multiple topics) did not deal with the required criteria in any depth or detail.

Analysis and comparison of causes and consequences:

Most candidates were able to detail and explain the consequences of their chosen issue. However some struggled to explain the causes of the issue. Where candidates had not identified a global issue, or where they wrote descriptive essays, they found it difficult to identify or explain any causes or consequences.

Stronger candidates were able to compare different causes of (or reasons for) their central issue. They explained which were the more important, or main causes and/or they explained how and why there were different causes in different countries or regions. They also compared the consequences (sometimes labelled impacts or effects) explaining which consequences were the most serious, and/or why there were different consequences for different groups of people, or different places or different situations.

Weaker candidates struggled to compare causes and consequences explicitly, though some identified the main or most important cause or consequence.

Course(s) of Action:

The strongest work had one developed and focused course of action. The candidate explained the course of action: its implementation (e.g. who would do it and details of how it would be done) and gave a clear explanation of the likely impact of the course of action.

In some cases, candidates successfully outlined a course of action already in place in another part of the world and suggested how it could be adapted to be carried out in their own country, again giving details of who could do it and how it could be implemented and what the impact might be.

Weaker work described solutions already in place but did not explain how these solutions might be applied to their specific issue or in other countries. Some candidates either explained how the course of action might be implemented **or** what its impact might be – but not both.

The weakest work provided a list of actions that might be taken, but with no further details.

Some candidates did not identify an issue – they presented general information about a topic. Without a problem, they could not suggest a course of action to address it.

Evaluation of sources:

The **strongest work** showed clear evaluation of sources used. Candidates evaluated the sources using different criteria and with an explanation of the impact of the quality of sources on the candidate's thinking, or work.

Note: The candidate needs to provide at least 3 **different** points of evaluation on more than one source used in order to fully achieve this criterion.

Evaluation

A source that was significant to my investigation was the article in the publication by the American Psychological Association, 'Too Much Coronavirus Media Exposure may be bad for health'. This is a well-researched source, with information from expert psychologists.

However, it applies past information to today's situation, which make it possibly unreliable. The situation today may not have the same health impacts as in the past. However, gives a good point of view on mental health, supported by well researched claims. The article identifies the problems caused by media and also gives well thought out solutions.

On completing my preliminary research, I came across a Ted Talk 'Four reasons you should stop watching the news' by Rolf Dobelli, that inspired me to get ideas on further research for this topic. It helped me get a better understanding of the negative effects of news. It is a true story and speaks of an individual's personal experience with news and how he quit watching and reading it. However, it talked about news in general, not as just online information, which is why it did not provide the objective information.¹⁷

I conducted an interview with a practising [sic] psychologist, working in the field for the past 30 years. It was an extremely reliable source and well analysed information was provided. Mostly it was fact-based but could also be opinion-based when experiential knowledge was used. This source helped me develop a major part of my local perspective and enabled me to get first-hand information on the effect of digital media on mental health.

Some weaker work mentioned evaluative criteria such as expertise or bias but did not explain these or link them to the issue or consider their impact on the research findings or conclusions.

Weak work presented a section labelled 'Evaluation of Sources' but actually only described the sources in general terms and did not evaluate them – or evaluated their own research rather than their sources.

Some candidates did not attempt to evaluate any of their sources at all.

Assessment Objective 2: Reflection:

The strongest work had a clear section of reflection on the candidate's own perspective, on their research findings and on the perspectives they had explored. The candidate clearly explained how their own perspective had developed, been changed, or impacted by others' perspectives and by the information they had gained about the issue. It included a clear conclusion/answer to their question based on research findings and other perspectives.

Weaker work explained what the candidate thought and why and mentioned their research but did not explain how the research had impacted their own conclusions or their perspective.

Weak work stated the candidate's opinion without any explanation or justification.

The weakest work did not show evidence of reflection at all: did not mention the candidate's own opinion, perspective, or attitude to the question they asked.

Assessment Objective 3: Communication:

Structure of the report:

Candidates are required to write their report in essay form. Their argument should be planned and logical and follow a clear structure to answer their question. They should include all required criteria.

The strongest work was easy to follow with a clear argument. It progressed from an introduction, through all the required criteria to a reflective conclusion. It used the full available word count. This work started with different perspectives on the issue and kept those focused throughout. The candidate kept control of their argument and did not lose contact with their question, the central issue, or their research findings.

Weaker work did not focus on one issue or the required perspectives. It tended to select several separate issues and present general information about those, making it difficult to follow any central argument. It sometimes included information that was not relevant to the question. It tended to move around from one topic to another instead of developing the argument from an introduction, through all the required criteria, to a reflective conclusion.

The weakest work often provided a series of headings with some facts and figures on the topic area, with no clear flow of any argument and sometimes with no reflection or conclusion.

Some work showed little evidence of any research, with the candidate's opinions and views presented as a philosophical argument rather than a structured essay on their research.

Clarity of arguments, perspectives, and evidence:

The **strongest work** clearly identifies the required criteria and presents them in separate paragraphs, or by using sub-headings. It is clear that the candidate understands what they are doing and presents the required elements explicitly.

The **weakest work** shows little awareness of the requirements for this component: information is presented in a generalised way. In this work they may simply discuss their question without presenting any perspectives, causes and consequences. There may be no clear issue and so no course of action with no reflection on their research findings or evaluation of sources.

Some candidates simply present information they have gained from primary and secondary research and do not process or discuss it at all.

Some candidates write general philosophical essays on their topic. Others present their own thoughts on their question without any evidence of research.

Citation and referencing:

The main referencing concern is identification of material used by the candidate.

All candidates should understand the need for **complete in-text attribution**. They should be aware that if they present material as their own when they have found it in other sources, this is plagiarism.

There is no one fixed method of citation or referencing for this component. **Any clear and consistent method is acceptable.**

In-text attribution: Candidates may use bracketed citations, or numbering, or in-text referencing, to indicate where they have used sources. They must include complete references somewhere in their work, either footnotes, endnotes, or in-text references. (For ease of reading and control of word count, numbers or brackets are more manageable).

References: Their references should include author, date, and title of publication for books or magazines, and online materials should include **at least** the full URL (leading to the document, not just to a website) and date of access.

The full reference list/footnotes/endnotes should be clearly linked in one clear, consistent, and logical way to the in-text attribution (one set of numbers, or alphabetical order). They should be clearly organised and easy to find.

Note: Primary research: Some candidates carry out primary research, particularly to explore different perspectives. Where they do so, they should mention this in text; so that it is clear where/how the information has been gained. They may wish to put a note at the end of their reference list or in a footnote, to give details such as date of interview. If candidates wish to include evidence of their primary research, such as statistics, they can append this to the reference list. (This should not be included as part of the essay, unless it is to be read and counted in the words allowed for the essay).

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/03
Team Project

Key messages

- All members of a team must be awarded the same mark for the team elements (Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration).
- Teams that aim to: 'raise awareness about perspectives on...' a topic are guided to look for perspectives and share their findings through the Outcome with an appropriate audience.
- Candidates should choose an issue to focus on, carry out research into different cultural perspectives on the issue, and then use their findings to decide on an Outcome to achieve the aim.
- The Reflective Paper requires candidates to present their own research findings which means that although the team may work collectively for much of the time, it is expected that each individual team member will each carry out some individual research into the issue and cite their sources.
- Candidates should keep an ongoing reflective log of their own ways of working and their work as a part of the team.
- Teachers should steer candidates away from topics/issues that could be sensitive locally.
- Schools should note that there is a Guidance Document for Team Project on the School Support Hub, listed under planning your teaching (ref: The Cambridge Assessment International Education School Support Hub).

General comments

Team Projects:

The most successful projects involved raising awareness of different cultural perspectives on an issue of local concern and changing the behaviour or perception of others in relation to the issue. Candidates chose a variety of issues on which to focus their projects. Under the topic of *water, food and agriculture*, some candidates focused on the problem of food shortages in the local area and developed activities to show farmers and landowners how better seeds and water saving measures could increase crops that could be grown, using visits where technology was used to communicate their messages. Under the topic of *disease and health*, some teams focused on raising awareness about the increase in support available to teenagers with a mental illness, while others looked at how the pandemic was causing harm to the elderly and produced a leaflet for the community offering activities that could be carried out. Under the topic of *sport and recreation*, some teams focused on exercise programmes to encourage students to exercise more regularly at home during the pandemic.

Outcomes were varied and included videos, school seminars, leaflets, fundraising events and posters. As was to be expected, there were teams who were unable to carry out their plans as fully as they wished. Those who handled this most successfully used the process of adapting their plans as part of their evaluation.

Less successful projects tended to give general information about a topic or an issue, without explicitly referring to different cultural perspectives on the issue. The evaluations of these team projects usually made it clear that learners had not been involved in choice of topic or team members.

Comments on specific questions

Team Elements: Outcome, Explanation and Collaboration

AO3 Communication: Outcome and Explanation

In the most successful projects, the Outcome clearly demonstrated an action taken by the team to achieve their aim. The Outcome also clearly communicated different cultural perspectives on the issue; that is to say, different views or opinions on the issue from people in different countries, or from different groups within one country such as young/old, urban/rural, wealthy/poor, etc.

In less successful projects, the Outcome was often not an action taken to achieve the aim but instead an information gathering activity (e.g. a video of interviews being undertaken) or a description of other activities relating to the project process (e.g. a video of candidates talking about what they have done). In other projects, the Outcome was a PowerPoint Presentation or video that was developed to achieve their aim but did not include different cultural perspectives on the issue (e.g. an information leaflet simply giving facts about the issue or subject (e.g. an illness) to inform or raise awareness).

Guidance: Interviews carried out to gather views/perspectives cannot be an Outcome in themselves. The Outcome should be a product developed to achieve the team's aim and show the perspectives on the issue that each individual has researched. The process of how initial research led to identification of the aim and the development of the Outcome should be made clear in the Explanation. There should be communication of different cultural perspectives in the Outcome, and some discussion of how the research into these different perspectives has informed the Outcome should be part of the Explanation. Candidates find it helpful to plan ways of assessing how far their Outcome met their aim, maybe a survey or just collecting what the audience said as they were leaving. This should be indicated in the Explanation.

Example:

The following is from a team's Explanation:

'Due to COVID-19 outbreak, our school organized a virtual learning platform for all the students, but some of us felt stressed because of the excessive screen time, boundless assignments, internet connectivity issues and the unsuitable timings of these online classes. We ourselves being students realized that the others might also be facing such complications and that would lead them to lack in studies and cause stress. Most people think that they never get stressed and sometimes don't even recognize the symptoms or the cause. We decided to act and raise awareness about stress and make a better approach not only for us but for every other student as well. Our group carried out primary research through the method of a questionnaire to collect primary data from students from different countries to ascertain different cultural perspectives on stress in education. Our group also carried out secondary research that allowed us to find secondary data related to three different cultural perspectives on stress in education: South Korea, Sweden and Denmark.

We decided to hold a webinar in our school to inform students about stress and increase their awareness. We had limited options to choose for our outcome due to the Covid-19 outbreak. We believed that webinar would be the most interactive and effective method to use. We used PowerPoint to show our information as it was easy to present and simple to understand.

Lastly, we delivered the presentation, through a webinar. It informed the students about what stress is, stress in adolescence, causes and symptoms and how to deal with it. The webinar was followed up with the same questionnaire again. We were able to analyse the data to show how effective we had been. We uploaded the Webinar on YouTube for those who could not attend it. This allowed us to achieve our aim further by educating a larger audience.'

AO3 Collaboration

Teachers must award a mark for how well the team have worked together to complete the project. All members of the team must be given the same mark and teachers should consider how well team members have worked together over the course of the project, including how well they have communicated with each other, solved problems, resolved conflict and divided work fairly between the team. This mark should be informed by teacher observation of teamwork and questioning of team members individually and collectively. We do not need explanations of how this mark was arrived at.

Personal Element: Reflective Paper

AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation

The most successful candidates provided direct evidence of the impact of their work, of how far the Outcome had achieved the project aim. For instance, in the project on student stress, a survey was conducted to assess the extent to which the webinar had improved understanding and would change behaviour. They had a percentage success rate and feedback about why others would make no changes to their behaviour. Analysis led to them being able to discuss their effectiveness in different age groups and countries. Where the aim is to raise awareness about an issue, a survey of the target audience before and after the awareness-raising session was often used successfully to show how far the Outcome was successful in achieving the aim. The very best responses also then made suggestions of ways in which the Outcome could be improved, drawing on the weaknesses identified.

Less successful responses often simply described the Outcome and the process by which it was produced. Where there was evaluation, these responses explained only weaknesses or strengths. Suggestions for improvement were not linked to any of the weaknesses that had been identified.

Only the very best responses were successful in evaluating their own work processes. It has been found that the individual research is the easiest part of the process to consider when evaluating own work processes. Successful responses evaluated their time management; for example, giving reasons why they failed to keep to their research schedule. Other successful responses evaluated their research technique: *'I was researching into Human Rights and I made use of a few websites about atrocities. However, later I found that the United Nations has a website that would have suited our needs much better'*. The most successful responses included examples to illustrate and develop their points of evaluation; for example, an illustration of something that they were unable to achieve due to their failure to better manage time, such as: *'I missed some meeting and was not able to share my research findings with my team. As a result, they got on with the PowerPoint presentation and my work was not on it'*. The most successful suggestions for improvement to both the Outcome and own work processes also drew on evaluation of weaknesses in these areas, as in here where the candidate wrote: *'From this I have learned to keep notes of a plan and of the work I need to do before we meet as a team'*.

More commonly, candidates were unclear on the difference between 'strengths/limitations of own work processes' and 'strengths/weaknesses of own performance as a team member'. They should look at the latter with the question: How well did I support the team in its work towards the Outcome? This would lead to help and support that they gave others, and occasions where they themselves needed help or support.

Other candidates who were able to reflect did not do this in a balanced way, focusing on just strengths or just weaknesses of their work processes. **Candidates would do well to believe that no work is so good that it cannot be improved, or so weak that it has no strengths.**

Guidance: Rather than give candidates headings from the assessment criteria, give them questions that encourage evaluation. For example: 'How did your work processes/ time management affect the project?', 'How effective was your research in satisfying the aims of the Outcome?', 'How well did your Outcome meet your aim?', 'Which elements of the Outcome were more or less successful?', 'How could you improve the Outcome to better meet the aim', 'How would you improve your work processes if you had to complete the project again?'

An example: *'I enjoy research and found medical perspectives on the use of fluoride in drinking water easily from medical websites. There were no opposing perspectives. There were a few mistakes that I personally had also made and I hope I wouldn't have. Having a total of 8 subjects and I had to give a lot of time towards practicing mathematics and science, so sometimes I couldn't complete my work. This impacted the team as a whole because when others used to complete their portion, the further work used to stop because I hadn't done my part. This used to make me feel guilty; however, it made me realise that I need to devote time towards the project. It made me understand how important time management is in life and how things don't go very well if time management is not done properly.'*

AO2 Reflection

This assessment objective requires candidates to reflect on the overall benefits and challenges of working in a group situation, as opposed to working alone. They need to provide specific examples drawn from their experience to illustrate their reflections. In the best responses, candidates commented that sharing work allowed the team to achieve more in a shorter space of time; or that it provided a greater pool of skills to draw on (giving examples from their project). Challenges of working in a team that were commonly mentioned include difficulties of communicating with other team members, organising meetings, dividing work equally and keeping all members on task. Some candidates began by knowing that they worked best alone, only to find that it was more effective to have different ideas to listen to. Others were looking forward to working with friends, only to find that either they wasted time or that they would have preferred to do the work alone as they were never satisfied with what their team-mates did. In the very best responses, candidates explained how these benefits and challenges impacted upon their project, i.e. insightful evaluation.

Less successful responses simply listed who did what in the team, or, often, which team members failed to do tasks that were assigned to them.

Reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of own performance as a team member is concerned with those things the individual does that either move the team forward or hold it back. It is about the individual's impact on the team as a whole. Paragraphs that show what they did to support the team, and how they needed support from the team, and how either of these impacted on the team's performance would indicate a mark at Level 4. There were candidates who produced effective reflections. As a weakness, a candidate reflected that: *'I took on the task of filming. I knew that I could use a system I had at home. I did not check that the school system was not compatible, so I had to do it all again'*. Giving balance, another candidate reflected that: *'I am really interested in making videos and am familiar with many different types of software, so I was able to make the video quickly. This meant that we could edit the content and make sure it met our aim clearly'*.

Less successful work focused only on identifying a role in the team, such as what work had been done, or what prevented work from being completed.

Guidance: Candidates could be given a reflective log to record examples while they are completing the project or be asked to take notes. This could include examples of when working as a team helped them to achieve something positive; when working as a team was difficult, and why; when they did something positive to help the team achieve their goal; when their performance had a negative effect on the team. Some centres have indicated that they are giving classes time to write sections of the Reflective Paper as they progress through Team Project, e.g. to evaluate the Outcome soon after the event at which it was shared.

In reflecting on what they have learned about different cultural perspectives, candidates should not just consider what they have learned, but should think about whether and how their learning has made them think differently about those cultures or has changed what they do or how they behave. In other words, what impact this learning has had on them. For instance, from the research into the effect of parental ambition on learner health, learners found that achievement often fell when too much pressure was put onto learners and rose when learners were trusted to want to achieve and invited to share their academic progress with parents, giving them a need to take the message home.

There are two elements to reflecting on overall personal learning. Candidates should consider what they have learned about the issue or topic, as well as what personal or practical skills they have developed through completing the project. For instance, having investigated the issue of food poverty in their country, a candidate might conclude that while there is sufficient food for in the country for everyone to avoid hunger, food wastage is a major issue and there are several ways that this could be improved. On learning of personal or practical skills, a candidate might say, *'I worked with a team that gave a presentation to a year group of 100 children and I learned to overcome my fear of public speaking because I knew the team were relying on me'*; or *'I learned how to use video editing software to help my team produce an effective Outcome and I will be able to use this skill in future projects'*.

Guidance: The Team Project is a piece of work that spans several weeks. It would help candidates reflect and record notes throughout the process on what they have learned about different perspectives, the topic/issue, working as a team and their own skills and abilities.

Example: *'My role in our group project has had major effects on my everyday life. The project has helped me realise that when we take an initiative and work towards it everything is possible. Before the interview had started, I was too nervous to talk to an expert whom we had just contacted via Email. Gradually as the interview came to an end, I had developed a new level of confidence which I believe will stay with me forever'. Another wrote: 'The project made us work in a team which helped me develop my collaborative skills and helped me understand that not everything can be done alone.'*

AO3 Communication

This assessment objective requires reflective reports to flow meaningfully with signposting and linking making sense of the flow of ideas. For instance, it should not be difficult to follow which paragraphs are about own work processes and which are about strengths and limitations of working as a team member.

It is expected that each member of the team will have been involved in some personal research towards the work overall. These personal research findings need to be clearly flagged up in the Reflective Paper. For instance, through a combination of primary and secondary research, one team member might have found out what methods are used to deal with refuse in their area by talking to the office concerned; while other team members investigated the situation internationally by exploring what is happening in Germany and Sweden so that they could make comparisons and draw conclusions. The Outcome in this case might be a letter or a presentation to local government officials and poster for the local population. The candidate who had researched the situation locally would then explain in their Reflective Paper what they had found out about their local situation and how this was reflected in the letter/poster.

Where this individual research has involved secondary research, candidates must include citation and referencing. This referencing should be included in the Reflective Paper and detail the author, date, title, URL and date accessed for all sources used, in a consistent format.

Teacher Assessment

In schools where there are several teaching groups led by different teachers, it is helpful if the teachers share an understanding of the mark scheme applied to Team Project before teaching begins. Learners benefit from understanding the mark scheme as well.

The Individual Candidate Record Cards (ICRC) must be completed by teachers. Teachers are requested to comment on the ICRC. Teachers are reminded that they must include comments on the ICRC to support/explain the marks awarded and they should use the wording from the assessment criteria level descriptors when formulating these supporting comments. Changes made through internal moderation should be explained through the wording on the ICRC. Any internal moderation should be completed before these final marks are submitted, so that marks on the ICRCs, the CASF and the MS1 all match.

Assessment decisions are more frequently falling in line with the agreed standard. Where differences are found it is often where there are missing elements in the work that have not been taken into account. Missing elements should be awarded a zero and marks for that assessment criterion adjusted downwards as appropriate. Evidence of personal research, evaluation of own working practices and suggested improvements to the Outcome and working practices are the elements most likely to be missing.

Centres and candidates are thanked for managing the Team Project process effectively during this difficult time.