Teacher Guide Section 4

13 Employment

General
The chapters in Section 4 differ from those in earlier sections. They contain suggestions for individual research and group projects, as in previous sections. However, instead of structured activities to support these, each chapter contains a practice written examination.

Encourage students to use their responses to the activities in chapters 13, 14 and 15 to help them to work independently on individual research and group projects.

Encourage students to refer to Skills Sections 3 and 4 to remind themselves of the skills they need to apply and the processes they have learned for planning a line of inquiry and planning a project.

Always download and use the most recent mark scheme to help students to assess their practice written examinations.

Guidance to practice written examination

Skills not knowledge
Remember that the written examination is testing Global Perspectives skills, not knowledge of the topic content. To date, the questions have always followed the pattern below.

Question 1: Identify and analyse issues, considering problems, solutions, causes, consequences, perspectives and opinions. This can include identifying reasons, specific bits of evidence, perspectives and so on, as well as making suggestions and giving explanations.

Question 2: Plan a line of inquiry. This is usually about identifying gaps in knowledge or things students need to know, and working out how to find this information. This can be by framing questions to particular people, designing a small survey or suggesting an experiment or research project. It often requires students to identify specific information that they need to know for a particular purpose, and explain how this information will help. This question could address the project planning process.

Question 3: Question information and reasoning. This section can include questions about the reliability of sources, about the difference between facts, opinions and value judgments and about the quality of reasoning.

Question 4: Develop a line of reasoning. There is usually one long question, which may be a standard essay-type question. Other kinds of question may appear, such as a debate in which students have to make a case for one proposal, one use of energy and so on. Students may use, develop or argue against material from the resource booklet. They may also use any knowledge they have or opinions and perspectives of their own. No specific knowledge is required.
Note that the questions more or less follow the Global Perspectives learning process of: collect; question; reflect and plan; present and act. The skill of reflecting is rarely tested specifically but students who reflect on the issues tend to develop better reasoning in question 4.

**Vocabulary and concepts**

No specific knowledge, vocabulary or concepts are required for the written paper. In fact, specific knowledge can lead a student to write down what they know rather than responding to the questions. However, students may be more within their comfort zones if some subject-specific vocabulary and concepts are familiar to them. For this reason, it may be useful to do skills development exercises from a variety of topics that haven’t otherwise been used in the course. Another possible activity would be to organise debates and discussions on topics that haven’t been formally studied, in order to familiarise students with key concepts and vocabulary. Students can evaluate each others’ reasoning (using red cards for a weakness, perhaps), and the activity leads nicely into development of written reasoning.

**Mark schemes**

Always download and use the most recent CIE Global Perspectives mark scheme to help prepare students for assessment. Most of the questions are marked by levels, so you can adapt the marking grids to the questions in this chapter. For instance, quite a number of question parts, especially in questions 1, 2 and 3 in 2012 were marked according to levels which can be summarised as:

- **Level 3**: Strong and supported reasoning, directly relevant to the question.
- **Level 2**: Some description generally relevant to the question.
- **Level 1**: Simple description, general and not specific to the question.

This general guide can be adapted to each question. Students can use this to learn what counts as simple description, what counts as relevant to the question and so on. Even weaker students, given the tools to understand how their answers are marked, can often identify what they need to do to achieve the next level.

Question papers and mark schemes evolve over time, and it is in students’ interests to use the most recent versions. For instance, in June 2011, the top level of the mark scheme for question 4 looked like this:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>13–15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question answered precisely and logically, supported by some or all of the following characteristics:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Logically linked, coherent structure to the reasoning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Candidates have made effective use of relevant ideas in the resource booklet as reasons to support their view and/or added their own relevant ideas. These ideas may be completely new, or they may be expansion of or response to existing material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Relevant different point/s of view from candidate’s own ideas or selected from resource booklet.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Thoughtful consideration of different point/s of view AND strong explanation of why disagreed which really answers the different point of view OR possibly a suggestion of a compromise position between different points of view.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, in November 2012 the top level of the mark scheme for question 4 looked like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 5</th>
<th>16–18 marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good, well supported and logical reasoning and judgments about the effects of the internet. Coherent, structured argument and evaluation of a range of internet effects on thinking – usually 4 or more. The response is likely to contain a range of clearly reasoned arguments and/or evidence to support the views expressed, with at least 4 developed points, and some undeveloped points. The response is balanced. A clear, balanced assessment or conclusion is reached.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that there is now a quantitative element: “usually 4 or more”. This works down through the levels. Note also that the specific detail on how students deal with different points of view has been replaced with “the response is balanced”.

Look out for further developments, and make sure that your students are as prepared as possible.

**Indicative content**

This section provides indicative content for the practice paper. Accept other reasonable responses (and allow students to discuss what a reasonable response might be and why). Accept a variety of levels of sophistication, and encourage students to find the level on the most recent mark scheme that matches their performance.

**Question 1**

(a) Issues to do with youth unemployment; mismatch of attitude and expectations between young people seeking employment and older people seeking employees; young people not dressing or behaving appropriately; older people seeing only the appearance and not the person; applying for the right type of job.

(b) The teenager’s perspective is likely to be one of frustration at constant rejection and lack of understanding why this is happening, and perhaps frustration with the system. This might be combined with a determination to be themselves, to look shocking and a need to be accepted even while rejecting the acceptance of the establishment. The employment adviser’s perspective is likely to be one of a combined desire to help young people
meet a complex system after an education that doesn’t meet their needs and frustration at young people for not meeting the expectations of the establishment – “why can’t you just take the piercings out and wear a suit?” It might be partly disdain for half-educated youth who don’t even know that they shouldn’t put their boots on the table.

(c) “Try having a wash, turning up on time and doing your fair share of the work” [1]; “Try having a calm chat with your boss … explaining … ask for advice” [1]; “Treat your colleague just exactly the way he treats you” [1]; “Explain your perspective to your boss” [1].

(d) If there are different perspectives, they would be different personal perspectives. Some of the issues could be explained by the different perceptions and beliefs that each person has. For instance, it may be that John doesn’t realise that he is upsetting @sadandunhappy. He may think that he is making jokes or being friendly, or he may be insecure and trying to make himself look better. @sadandunhappy may not realise that their deodorant is failing, and may not realise how much work John actually does do. Or there may be deeper perspectives – @sadandunhappy might be from a minority community or female, and John may be racist or sexist (possibly without even realising it). In this case, his beliefs and perspective would play an important part in this dispute but it may also be that John is unpleasant, or that @sadandunhappy is smelly and lazy. In this case, the dispute would be less about perspectives and more about sorting out difficult behaviour.

Question 2

(a) The boss’s opinion in their own words; reports written by the boss about @sadandunhappy; possibly accept second-hand evidence from a reliable witness who has overheard the boss talking about @sadandunhappy (but this could be troublemaking); evidence about John getting the next promotion. (For four marks look for directly relevant information. Be wary of “we need to know whether @sadandunhappy is lazy” because people have different perceptions; the boss might believe that @sadandunhappy was lazy even if he or she wasn’t.)

(b) Ask the boss; ask for written reports; talk to people the boss talks to; spend a week in the office observing John, the boss and @sadandunhappy.

(c) We would need to know whether @sadandunhappy does have a personal hygiene problem. This would be best observed by personal observation or talking to people who regularly work with him or her. We would need evidence about how much work @sadandunhappy does. Does he or she leave work undone? Does he or she do necessary work or unnecessary work? Evidence for this could be found in reports, client comments, e-mails, getting John and @sadandunhappy to keep work logs to record what they are doing and so on.

(d) If we have evidence that @sadandunhappy does have a personal hygiene problem, from our own evidence or from objective witnesses, then we would be able to decide that @sadandunhappy should address the personal hygiene problem, by washing more often, using a better deodorant, washing clothes, or perhaps by bringing a spare shirt to work
if he or she walks or cycles a long way. However, if we can verify that @sadandunhappy does not have a personal hygiene problem, then the appropriate action would be to discuss John’s attitude and behaviour. We might then want to find out if John was reacting to the different smells of people who have different diets, and educate him. If there is evidence from reports, clients, e-mails, work logs and so on that @sadandunhappy is not getting enough work done, then we can decide that the proper action is to get @sadandunhappy to do more work. Or if the evidence suggests that @sadandunhappy is working hard but not achieving targets, then we could look at helping him or her to work smarter.

Question 3

(a) @teeniusgenius is only young (presumably, on the basis of the name and the references to school and summer jobs) and doesn’t have much experience in work, but what he or she says about teachers can be cross checked with our own experiences of teachers, and beyond that they are giving opinions, and they do have relevant experience to base the opinions on. So @teeniusgenius is reliable enough here.

(b) @juniperberry’s reasoning is very bad. He or she assumes that John is right about @sadandunhappy being lazy without any evidence, and jumps from this to talking about layabouts and a decline in productivity with no logic. The reasoning is emotive, jumps from one consequence to further, unrelated or extreme consequences without justification (slippery slope or disaster reasoning). Even if there are a few people who don’t do enough work, that isn’t enough to lead to a recession and a huge rise in the crime rate. It might be true to say that “if you were actually doing your share of work your boss would notice”, however, it may be that @sadandunhappy’s boss has noticed, and that @sadandunhappy is mistaken. Or it may be that the boss does accept John’s view (because he is loud, because he is friends with the boss, because he is the same type of person as the boss) so there are alternative possibilities that shouldn’t be ignored. Doing some work might help @sadandunhappy, but if he or she actually already does too much work, that might not be the right solution. The real issue here is that @juniperberry is forming fairly extreme (and offensive) opinions without facts.

(c) @juniperberry predicts the consequence that a decline in productivity “is going to lead to economic recession and unemployment”. This is possible but together with the belief that the cause is “layabouts”, it becomes less likely. It seems as if @juniperberry is just using scare tactics and sensationalism. He or she also predicts the consequence that recession and unemployment “will cause a huge rise in the crime rate”. It is plausible that an increase in unemployment will lead to an increase in theft and robbery, as people steal to get things they used to earn but a “huge” rise seems extreme. You would need to look at crime rate statistics from past recessions to see if there was a significant effect on other kinds of crime.

@teeniusgenius predicts the consequence that asking for advice rather than getting personal is more likely to get results. This seems to be a likely consequence, because it’s not confrontational. It can defuse the situation, clarify perspectives and make sure that people are paying attention to the facts.
@hairyjumper predicts the consequence that stopping doing John’s work will make him and the boss realise how much @sadandunhappy is actually doing. This depends on the psychology of the case. It may be that John would point to the things that @sadandunhappy has stopped doing as evidence that @sadandunhappy really is lazy. Or it may really become evident that @sadandunhappy is working hard. @hairyjumper implies the consequence that being rude to John and telling the boss what a loser John is will help the situation. This seems less likely – they might decide he or she was lazy and rude!

Question 4

Some ideas that students may consider include the following.

- Subjects are not relevant. It would be better to learn computer skills, business writing, enterprise skills, more about modern finance, and more about teamwork.
- An exam system based on knowledge recall in isolated exam situations is nothing like the skills you will need at work.
- School is often about individual effort and achievement, whereas work is often about teamwork.
- School is about individuals being the best and competing. Work is about working together within the firm, but about beating other firms so this goes both ways.
- In many countries not enough languages are studied for a global workforce.
- In many countries the focus is on that country and national needs, rather than on how countries and nations can work together (for the global good).
- However, education is developing to meet modern needs, for example, the availability of courses like the IGCSE Global Perspectives course.
- Some education is better than no education.
- You need to start with subjects like chemistry and geography at school to discover whether you want to work in a petrochemicals plant, devise new cosmetics, become a cartographer or get involved in aid and development.
- Even in teamwork individuals need to put in their own effort.
- Schools do use project and teamwork, and do have connections with local business communities.