Skills Section 4

General

The skills in this section build on those in Skills Sections 1, 2 and 3. They are aimed at students who are working well independently and are confident enough to undertake assessed work on complex topics. This section also addresses how to apply Global Perspectives skills in the written examination.

Chapters 13, 14, 15 and 16 suggest research questions and project outcomes, and these are suitable for assessment, but instead of activities to support the research and project, they contain full-length practice written papers.

Students should be confidently relating to the teacher as a guide and mentor by this stage, and the teacher should be managing the learning environment and enabling students to work independently.

Many students may now be working at or near the highest assessment levels. Improved performance will still come through small incremental increases by applying the Global Perspectives skills effectively and by thinking one step more deeply every time.

Some students may benefit from additional practice from Skills Sections 2 or 3. Others might be better off working through Skills Sections 4 and 5 together, before moving on to writing a full-length research report and carrying out a full-scale project to ensure that they have time to extend themselves in Skills Section 5. It goes without saying that the more independently students are working, the easier it is at this stage to allow them to find their own routes through the course to best meet their needs.

All students should work through Skills Section 4 because it offers valuable practice for the written examination.

Difficult issues

The Global Perspectives approach to difficult issues is to find ways to deal with them, to overcome emotive responses and to foster thoughtful, respectful debate. By Section 4 the difficult issues are mostly quite broad. Having dealt with smaller, more personal difficult issues in earlier topics, students should now be ready to handle the emotive aspects of such topics as immigration, human trafficking, slavery and abuse.

Encourage students to notice for themselves when they are emoting rather than reasoning, or to set up monitoring systems among themselves, with a caution that empathy and using emotions to inform reasoning are acceptable.

Guidance to activities

Activity 1

Expect students to get started as independently as possible, and encourage them to go beyond the questions that are provided; these represent a
starting point but should not limit students who have their own ideas. Discuss with students how thoroughly each of the four possible topics should be covered. Some students may already have clear ideas about a relevant research topic; should they concentrate on this, or explore all the possibilities? (The answer will depend on your group.)

Students should be able to think about internet searches, skim reading, identifying what they need to know (on a small scale), references, making notes, asking questions, looking at facts, issues, causes, consequences and perspectives.

**Activity 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Develop reasoning</th>
<th>Meet assessment criteria</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How can we create more jobs in my region?</strong></td>
<td>Yes, could gain more focus and structure by considering what different groups could do: government, local people, multinationals.</td>
<td>You can develop reasoning to support a specific proposal about creating jobs.</td>
<td>This question can be made to work. It might be better to ask “What is the best way of creating more jobs in my local region?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What were the causes of the economic crisis in 2008?</strong></td>
<td>This is quite a broad issue, and it doesn't focus on real Global Perspectives issues.</td>
<td>Not really, the question currently asks for a list of causes. At best this leads to explanation, but not really to a line of reasoning to support an opinion or proposal.</td>
<td>This is not a good question, and would require a lot of rethinking to make it a good Global Perspectives question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes, can analyse issues, causes and consequences, different perspectives, possible solutions to a problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should people in developed countries give their old computers to people in developing countries?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the best way to help struggling communities in my region/ in developing countries?</td>
<td>More focus needed. What sort of struggling? Economically struggling? Struggling in terms of healthcare/ education? Struggling after a disaster? This could be specified as part of the analysis of a problem. It might be better to specify a community and to look at its specific problems.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should we punish criminals?</td>
<td>No, this is a very general, philosophical question.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>Partly. You could talk about causes and consequences, but global perspectives are hard to assess, and there isn’t a specific problem to analyse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the best ways to deal with international crimes such as smuggling? | Yes. It might be better to limit the question to one or two specific crimes. This question is rather open and you could talk about many different crimes, which could become a little vague. | Yes. | Yes. | Could be done well.

What are the benefits of trade and aid? | Too vague and general. | No. This is looking for a list. | The question does not require a discussion of causes and consequences, different perspectives or possible solutions to a problem. | This question needs significant reworking.

In times of economic recession, should governments reduce the amount of aid they give to foreign countries? | Yes, there is a focus on an issue. Could be refined to specify which governments. | Yes. | Yes. | Could be a good question.

What sorts of aid are there? | No, very vague. | No, requires a list. | No. | This would be a useful question to start the thinking process. It is not a research question, however.

Should murder be punishable by death? | Too general and philosophical. | Yes. | Global perspectives would be difficult. Even national perspectives would be difficult. | This is a fairly philosophical question, not fully rooted in specific real-world issues.

## Activity 3

This activity focuses on successful strategies for answering questions, and on the skill of recognising what a strong answer looks like in Global Perspectives. Marks are not mentioned because they can distract from the skills.

Encourage students to put the answers into rank order, and explain why they chose the order they did. They should think in terms of:

- Does it answer the question? That is, does it explain, summarise, justify as required?
How well does it answer the question? Is it thoughtful?

(a) This question wants an explanation of the difference between two things.

Answer 3 is the strongest while Answer 1 is the weakest.

Answer 3 is the strongest response to the question. The candidate has used their own words, understood what human trafficking and smuggling are, and really focused on the difference between human trafficking and people smuggling. There is a thoughtful personal response about the difference in terms of degree of crime. (This may not be necessary in a 2-mark question, but it doesn’t hurt here.)

Answer 2 is alright, but not as good as Answer 3. This student has explained what people smuggling and human trafficking are, and has shown a good understanding of them, but has not focused on the difference.

Answer 1 is weak because it quotes from the document instead of using the student’s own words.

(b)(i) As the question requires the student to “give three factors” it requires short answers, which can be summarised or taken from the stimulus material. It does not ask for explanation, personal response or description.

Answer 1 is short, to the point and accurate, citing three factors. It is the strongest answer.

Answer 2 is confused. The student seems to struggle with English to the point at which communication is impeded. The first point made, that “discrimination make vulnerable” is acceptable. The second point, “economic opportunities a factor for trafficking”, is a misunderstanding from Document 2 which says “lack of social and economic opportunities … are among the factors making individuals vulnerable to human trafficking”. As the student has quoted it, it is wrong. The last point, “wealthy nations responsible human trafficking”, is not a factor that makes people vulnerable.

(b)(ii) This question requires an explanation.

Answer 1 is stronger than Answer 2

Answer 1 really explains why unemployment can make you vulnerable, showing how you might get so desperate that you put yourself in the power of someone who might deceive you.

Answer 2 states that unemployment makes you vulnerable, and quotes from Document 1 to show what can happen to you if you are trafficked. But it does not explain why unemployment makes you more vulnerable.

(c) This question requires students to think about the personal, national and global perspectives, aspects and consequences. “To what extent” indicates that there isn’t an easy answer or clear boundaries.

Answer 2 is stronger than Answer 1
Answer 2 is an exceptionally thoughtful and insightful answer, which demonstrates that the student has analysed and reflected on issues, causes, consequences, possible solutions and perspectives. There is real understanding of the extent to which this is personal, national and global. It also goes right to the heart of the issue without wasting words.

Answer 1 is rather one dimensional. It deals only with the global aspect of the problem. It does select (mostly) appropriate quotations from the documents to support the view, but the student seems to have quoted other sources instead of thinking for themselves. This is not a disastrous answer, but the student could improve by showing some of their own thinking, and by also considering the personal and national aspects.

**Activity 4**

(a) Encourage students to focus on what will be useful in helping to find the information they want. Ask “how will that help?”

(i) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Are you a legal migrant?” If she says yes, then I’ll know she is legal.</td>
<td>![Green icon] The woman has already claimed to be a legal migrant. Asking the question again is unlikely to provide new information that will help to check her status. If she lied before, she may well lie again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Where and when were your visa documents issued?” If the woman can give this information, it will be easier to check with the authorities whether documents were issued to her, and so whether she is a legal migrant. They should have a photo or biometric data so that we can check it is her.</td>
<td>![Green icon] This question asks for additional and useful information, which will really help to establish whether or not she is a legal migrant. It explains thoroughly how this will help.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(ii) Questions could focus on documents such as pay slips or legal documents relating to the employment and registration of migrant workers.

(iii) Useful people might include the employer’s friends, family or neighbours, other staff at the house (if there are any), the young woman’s friends, local tradespeople or delivery people who may have seen what is happening at the house, the young woman’s doctor (if she has one). Questions could relate to the relationship between the young woman and her employer, the presence of bruises on the young woman, evidence of shouting and so on.
(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I need to know if Darius took the jewellery.</th>
<th>☺ This is simply a restatement of the question of whether Darius was a thief. It doesn't help us to answer the question. Encourage the student to think of a specific piece of information.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I need to know whether the man in the shop's scarf was the same colour as Darius's scarf. I need to know whether it was a cold evening. I need to know where Darius could have got a shotgun between 16.25 when he was seen on CCTV (and it didn't mention a shotgun then) and 16.30. I need to know whether a ring like the one Darius gave to his girlfriend was stolen. I need to know whether Darius has a receipt for the ring he gave to his girlfriend.</td>
<td>☺ This student has provided an excellent list of really focused things that they need to know. These questions will really help to move the inquiry on by providing relevant information. But there is no explanation of how these things will help to decide whether Darius is a thief. Ask why it matters whether the scarf was the same colour, what difference a receipt would make and so on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to know whether a ring like the one Darius gave to his girlfriend was stolen. If it wasn't, then there doesn't seem much reason to believe that Darius was the thief. It such a ring was stolen, then it is possible that Darius was the thief. I need to know whether Darius has a receipt for the ring he gave to his girlfriend. If he has a genuine receipt, especially if it has a date from last week or last month, then we can be sure at least that he didn't steal that ring.</td>
<td>☺ This are relevant questions focused on whether the evidence that Darius gave his girlfriend a ring from Treasure on the same day as the robbery really is evidence that he was the thief. The explanations are strong. Encourage this student now also to think about questions regarding the physical evidence, that Darius was in the area wearing a scarf.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Encourage students to focus on helpful information/measures and how they would help. It might be worth encouraging students to discuss this in groups. In each group appoint someone to ask “how will that help?”

(i) Useful information might include: Are faked and forged passports one of the main ways that trafficked people are passed through borders? Or are they taken in without documents under lorries, in containers, through mountainous back roads, on small yachts to small ports without passport control? The training will only be successful if it is aimed at the key problems relating to trafficking. How big a problem is human trafficking for body parts in that part of the world? Is the training well planned and focused on the needs of the delegates? Is the training backed up with funds for implementing new ideas and relevant computer systems? Are these two countries which share a trafficking problem? Is cooperation between these two countries vital?

(ii) Other measures might include raising awareness of the problem, providing support to vulnerable people, using sniffer dogs at ports to detect people who are coming in without documents under lorries or in containers and so on.

(d) Encourage students to be focused and thorough. If it can be organised in your class, one-to-one meetings with individuals to discuss their progress and talk about the relevance of their research materials and the gaps in their knowledge would be useful.
Activity 5

(a) There are no fixed, absolute answers here. Encourage students to think carefully, and to go beyond the simplistic. This can involve weighing up reputation and reason to lie, for example, or thinking about access to accurate data, and how that data might be collected.

(i) These organisations collect data and try to be accurate about it. They are limited by weaknesses in the data collection systems in the countries they work with. They are likely to present the data as accurately as they can. The weakness here is in the way they select and determine which data to collect; they tend to be run by influential members of HEDCs and to have their interests at heart. Fairly reliable but only part of the picture.

(ii) This depends on the government. In HEDCs the governments tend to have high quality data collection systems and laws to ensure that they publish accurate and true data. But they get to choose which data to collect and publish so they can distort the public’s perceptions or they can change the way that data is collected to obscure issues. In LEDCs there can be problems with data collection at all. In some countries governments allegedly publish what they want the public to hear, regardless of whether it is true.

(iii) These large charities have access to sophisticated data collection systems, and fund their own data collection and research. As above, they are limited by the data collection systems in some countries. They tend to ask questions that interest them as charities, and to be truthful in their presentation of data. Of course, their agendas as charities affect the questions and the data that interests them. Therefore they are fairly reliable but only part of the picture. Information from them can usefully be combined with government and supranational agency information to get a bigger picture.

(iv) Small charities have much less access to sophisticated data collection systems, and may be much more swayed by their desire to help a cause or to portray the data in a particular light. Generally they are less reliable than big charities but not completely unreliable (although there is clearly great variability between small charities). Check that the charity exists, and cross check facts as far as possible.

(v) Anyone can post on social media pages and some people enjoy deception so anything written on social media should be treated as unreliable (although clearly some of it is true). Check that the charity even exists. Don’t accept anything without cross checking.

(vi) Data and statistics are likely to be accurate as far as they go – multinationals have teams of people writing websites who have expertise, and they have access to experts and lawyers who will make sure that they are not infringing any laws. But they are likely to be highly selective in support of their own interests and to favour interpretations that suit them. Some reliability, but always look for other possibilities and the evidence that they haven’t mentioned.

(vii) Small local companies may write their websites themselves without access to data collection, experts or lawyers. These may be excellent, or they may contain mistakes and opinions written as facts. Like small charities, these should be cross checked very carefully.
(viii) Blogs can be written by anyone. Check who the author is – if it’s a leading expert, and if you can find references to them elsewhere, then their facts are likely to be accurate, although they may be selective in support of their own views. If it’s just someone writing their own opinion with no expertise and no access to data, then treat it as unreliable.

(ix) Serious newspapers in most countries will present and analyse facts as accurately as possible. They should employ investigative journalists and experts in their field to find the most accurate information. The facts they choose and the way they interpret them will vary according to the general political stance of the paper. It’s worth cross checking, because mistakes are made, but serious newspapers are fairly reliable.

(x) Cross check everything you find in a sensationalist newspaper. Their facts ought to be accurate, but sensationalist newspapers are very good at making suggestions, inferences, using questions and other strategies to make you believe things that aren’t supported by facts.

(b) Encourage students to research independently and think carefully.

(c)(i) In some countries, there may be suspicion about the reliability of Iranian TV, as it may be thought to be biased. On some issues this may be reasonable (just as American or British TV may take a stance against Iran having nuclear weapons, for example, without fully taking the Iranian perspective into consideration). But on the issue of what Iran’s Deputy Ambassador to the UN said there is little reason to think that Press TV will be unreliable. They are likely to simply report what he said.

(ii) antislavery.org is likely to select examples which support their agenda, but this does not mean that the examples are not true.

Activity 6
Encourage students to think carefully about:

- plausibility, types of claim and reasons to be untruthful
- perspectives, agendas and bias: too often students dismiss a source they disagree with as biased because the source has a particular perspective or agenda, yet they then accept the source they agree with, while ignoring (or not even noticing) its agenda or perspective. Encourage students to think through the difference between a bias that might make you lie (for example, if your friend is in trouble and you want to help them by telling a lie or only part of the truth) and an opinion, agenda or perspective (where facts might be selected to support a view, or seen in a certain light, but the person believes what they say).
The knowledge claims in Document 1 come from a reliable source, a serious, politically independent British newspaper. The claims in Document 3 come from a charity which is biased because it wants to take your money so it might lie.

This student is looking at the source rather than at the knowledge claims. Ask whether a reliable newspaper might make a mistake. What questions need to be asked about the research? Is the charity “just” trying to take your money, or does it have other aims? What does it want the money for? Is the charity really likely to lie? Is there an important difference between lying, being mistaken and seeing a different side of the truth?

Document 2 is giving opinions as if they were facts. They are plausible opinions, but I’d need more information to support them, for instance, an example of an aspirational but impractical project, or evidence that millions of dollars have been wasted on ill-conceived projects. At present, it would be difficult to cross check, because it’s just opinion.

This student has noticed that the knowledge claims here are not actually facts, which is good. They have also thought about plausibility and cross checking. Discuss with this student how you would find examples and evidence to support or oppose this opinion.

(b) Encourage students to be thorough and realistic. Almost every source has an opinion, agenda or perspective, so you can’t really assume that their knowledge claims are inaccurate for this reason, but if they are totally biased and not even trying to be objective, that’s different. If a source has expertise but may have a reason to lie, does this mean they will definitely lie and that their knowledge claims are all inaccurate? Should this source/these knowledge claims be discarded or just cross checked?

Encourage students also to think through the implications of what they have said about knowledge claims. If they identify a knowledge claim as unreliable, are they still going to use it? If they identify a knowledge claim as an opinion rather than a fact, what does this mean for how they use it?

(Ideally students will only use reliable facts which they have cross checked, and will use opinions in arguments and counter-arguments with various facts and examples to support them.)

**Activity 7**

Expect students to set up their own working groups and processes or to work individually if they are ready for that. Encourage them to think carefully, and to consider:

- alternatives
- how likely or realistic these are
- exaggeration, oversimplification or ignoring other possibilities.
This is not likely. It’s an exaggeration. ☹☹ This is a generic answer that could refer to any claim. Ask the student to explain what is an exaggeration (and why).

Saying if everyone has broadband, the economy will improve is unlikely. ☹ This is just an assertion without explanation or development. Is it really unlikely? Why is it unlikely? What difference does the word “significantly” make?

The economy could improve if everyone had broadband, but it is an exaggeration to say that it will improve significantly. This is too definite. There are other things necessary for economic improvement: computers, businesses that can use broadband, infrastructure for transporting goods to market etc. ☎ This is a thoughtful response. For the purposes of the written examination, it is probably worth encouraging the student to refer back to the question and answer it directly, by saying, “so, this predicted consequence is not completely reasonable”.

(b) Again, encourage students to be thorough, realistic and to think through what their evaluations mean for their own research and presentation of the report. Students can tend to identify a consequence as unrealistic, and then go on to treat it as if it were certain, which is frustrating.

Activity 8

Students should be able to set up their own working groups. Encourage them to focus clearly on an evaluation of the values, and think of circumstances in which they do or don’t apply, rather than getting into protracted, heated discussions.

Students may need to be reminded of the rules about class debates and discussion.

Activity 9

The answers given are samples, indicating some of what is wrong (and right) with the reasoning. Mistakes students make in exams include:

● just copying parts of the passage (and agreeing or disagreeing)
● agreeing or disagreeing with the reasoning and justifying this, that is arguing for or against the points instead of focusing on the quality of the reasoning (remind them that you can see that an argument is bad even if you agree with the main points)
● making generic, vague comments which could refer to any bit of reasoning.

(a) The conclusion that “this shows that countries have recognised that aid isn’t needed any more” doesn’t follow logically from the evidence and ignores other possibilities. It is more likely that countries have less money available because of the global recession.

(b) This is an extreme, emotional argument. It characterises aid in an unfavourable way. Perhaps not all aid is “pouring billions of dollars into the pockets of foreign dictators who don’t respect human rights”, or “just giving it to corrupt governments”. There may be a case for using money to get our national companies investing in infrastructure in developing
countries, but it hasn’t been made here. This argument does not consider the values involved in aid, such as giving to those less fortunate than ourselves, but is rooted solely in self-interest. It also doesn’t consider the possible negative consequences of the proposal to invest in infrastructure in developing countries (in terms of drain on investment at home, or in terms of dependency for the developing country).

(c) This isn’t really an argument. It’s more of a description of a desperate situation that many people find themselves in. It is using one example to show that new technology doesn’t create employment, which isn’t good reasoning; you need to know how typical this person’s situation is. There may be many other instances where new technology does create employment, and these may outweigh the instances in which technology replaces people. Of course, they may not, but giving just one example is insufficient.

**Activities 10 and 11**

Encourage students to go over strategies they have used for reflection in previous sections, and to consider which worked well for them. Again, encourage real links and deep thinking.

**Activity 12**

Keep asking questions and provide possible problems or pitfalls, asking students how they will deal with them.

Note that no one knows which 25 per cent of the people taken will catch the local disease, so students have to take into consideration that it could be them.

The questions are all based on an empty world. What changes if there are intelligent beings already living on the planet? Students need to think about values here. They also need to think about possible consequences (do they need to plan for defence?). It might be useful to reverse the thought experiment, and consider how we would react if a group of beings from another planet came to colonise Earth.

**Activity 13**

Encourage students to reflect on these questions about learning honestly and thoroughly. All students should be able to use this activity to improve their learning and their performance in at least some respects.

**Activity 14**

Expect students to set up their own working groups and processes. The thinking they do in this exercise should enable them to improve their own projects.

**Activity 15**

Students should have completed a short evaluation after each mini project. Now is the time to reflect on performance, taking evidence into consideration, and use this thinking to improve a project that will be submitted for assessment.
Encourage students to focus on:

- realistic assessments – is there evidence to support their belief that they were wonderful/awful/an amazing leader?
- how they will improve – “I will be better tomorrow” is a fine aspiration but to really become better tomorrow we all need to work out how we will be better, and what steps we will take to accomplish this. “I will listen to my team mates when they tell me I am being unrealistic, and I will work hard even if we don’t use my ideas” is more specific.

**Activity 16**

Get students to respond to some of these in timed conditions.

Encourage students to give reasons that really move the argument on, to use evidence and examples that are realistic and relevant, and to present different perspectives and opinions thoughtfully.

Download the most recent CIE mark schemes, and encourage students to use these mark schemes to assess and improve their own work.