



# Cambridge Pre-U

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES**

**9777/03**

Paper 3 Presentation

**May/June 2023**

PRE-RELEASE MATERIAL



**To be given to candidates**

## **INSTRUCTIONS FOR TEACHERS**

- This material contains stimulus material to be used by candidates preparing their presentation for 9777/03. Give one copy to each candidate.
- Presentations must be prepared in a four-week period. This may take place at any point before 31 May 2023, by which date all presentations must have been submitted to Cambridge International through Submit for Assessment.
- The presentation is worth 40 marks.

## **INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES**

- You should use the enclosed stimulus material to help you identify the subject for your presentation.
- Your presentation should attempt to answer a question.
- Your presentation must address alternative perspectives on the question you select and must engage directly with an issue, an assumption, evidence and/or a line of reasoning in one or more of the documents within this material (i.e. you should not just pick an individual word or phrase which is not central to the reasoning of or the issues covered by the documents).
- You are expected to reflect on these perspectives using your own research.
- Your presentation should be designed for a non-specialist audience.
- Originality in interpretation is welcomed.
- Your presentation may be prepared in a variety of formats and should normally include an oral commentary.
- The speaking or running time of your presentation should be a maximum of 15 minutes.
- Whether presented or not, the submission must include a verbatim transcript of the presentation.

This syllabus is regulated for use in England, Wales and Northern Ireland as a Cambridge International Level 3 Pre-U Certificate.

This document has **12** pages.

**Document 1****Zooming into the future: Why Zoom will be a useful tool post-pandemic**

**Adapted from an article in *The Wesleyan Argus*, a US newspaper, April 2021.**

**Hannah Docter-Loeb was the Managing Editor of the newspaper.**

Throughout the past year of Zooming, there has been a lot of Zoom slander, for lack of a better word. And while I agree that online classes are nothing compared to a real-life lecture hall and that sitting through virtual meetings for hours can be draining, there are some significant benefits to the video-conferencing platform.

First and foremost, Zoom and similar platforms have completely changed the work environment. The days of commuting to work, or even flying across the country for meetings, are long gone. The world has now seen that remote work is indeed possible, and it will likely continue in the future. In fact, a survey from Enterprise Technology Research found that the percentage of people permanently working from home is expected to double in 2021.

Zoom has also revolutionized other aspects of everyday life. No longer required to make it all the way to town hall, community members can Zoom into city government meetings to have their voices heard. Zoom has also allowed people to join religious services or events they may not have been able to otherwise attend due to time or travel constraints.

As with most things, there are some issues with the platform. Pretty soon after Zoom climbed – or should I say zoomed – to the top, people were exposed to the phenomenon of Zoombombing, which instantly prompted questions about the app's security and privacy. Additionally, while the app has made certain facets of everyday life more accessible, especially given that it's free, it is entirely dependent on a strong internet connection. It's also entirely possible that my personal appreciation for the app is a result of not taking any classes this semester and thus not suffering from extreme Zoom fatigue.

But despite its shortcomings, Zoom is undeniably useful. And while we're all looking forward to packing away our masks when this is all over, this video conferencing platform isn't going anywhere.

**Document 2****Zoom can never replace the benefits of face-to-face meetings**

**Adapted from an article in *The Globe and Mail*, a Canadian newspaper, November 2020.**

**The author was Marcus Gee.**

I went to a meeting recently. Not a Zoom meeting, a real meeting, in person, face-to-face. A group of Toronto developers and architects, all women, had invited me to hear about a new project, Reina, on the Queensway. Dismayed that the condo building game is so dominated by men, they have put together what they call 'Canada's first condominium designed and developed by an all-women team.' Properly masked and distanced, we sat around a sprawling conference table for about an hour. It was delightful, an altogether different and far better experience than meeting online. By the end, everyone was smiling under their masks at the sheer fun of it. It is easy to forget what we gain from meeting other people in the flesh instead of on a screen.

Zoom works remarkably well for most purposes. The transition to online work has been smoother than anyone expected. Many businesses are talking about shifting to remote working for good. Employees can avoid the cost and annoyance of daily commuting, and companies the expense of renting pricey city office space. Everyone wins. Or so it seems. Zoom can be an efficient and often pleasant way to meet. I go on a Zoom call with colleagues most days and enjoy the chance to see their faces and meet their cats. But it doesn't hold a candle to gathering in person. So much is lost online. Eye contact, for one thing. When we talked to each other around that big conference table, we met each other's gaze. That made a huge difference. Body language, for another. We knew when someone around the table wanted to speak. We could just tell. No need to click on the raised hand symbol to try and break in.

Those may seem like little things. They're not. Humans read each other through the face and the eyes. Even when the face is masked, the exchange among us is far richer in person than otherwise. We get a sense of those we are meeting that we could never gain from seeing them on screen. If that were not true, then people would have given up meeting in person long ago. The invention of the telephone removed the strict necessity of face-to-face contact. E-mails, texts, DMs and all the rest made exchanging views childishly simple. Even video chatting and conferencing are hardly new. People continued to gather in boardrooms, living rooms and coffee shops to size each other up. If we stopped doing that, or did much less of it, we would be poorer for it. It would mean losing the random interactions that produce some of the best ideas: the hallway chat, the premeeting gripe session.

It would mean giving up the separation of work and home life that keeps us sane and gets us out of those sweatpants with the old mustard stain. Travelling to work and to school isn't just a hassle, though it can surely be that. It opens up our eyes to the world around us. Commuting, like travel, can broaden the mind. What happens to the exhilarating buzz of a big-city downtown when everyone is noodling away on their laptops at home? What happens to college life without the floods of students circulating on campus? Ask a university student today how much she enjoys watching lectures on her computer or her phone. Somehow the chance to see a prof droning away in a real lecture theatre seems precious.

We can work remotely, and that's a good thing as far as it goes. It gives employees more flexibility, especially if they have kids to raise. Many are telling their companies they don't ever want to return to work nine to five, five days a week. Now they can come in when they're needed and work from a distance otherwise. Whether we should is another question. We truly are social animals. We still need to meet each other, see each other, look each other in the eye. It's part of being human.

**Document 3**

**Zoom burnout is real, and it's worse for women**

**Adapted from an article in *The New York Times*, April 2021.**

**Alisha Haridasani Gupta was a reporter on gender issues.**

In March 2021, Jane Fraser, the chief executive of Citigroup, made a new workplace rule: no video calls on Fridays. "Zoom-free Fridays," she called it in a companywide blog post.

**Content removed due to copyright restrictions.**

**Content removed due to copyright restrictions.**

'Video fatigue is real,' he said.

## Document 4

### The benefits of small talk

**Adapted from an article in MINT, an Indian magazine, April 2021.**

While some people may prefer highly focused virtual meetings, the more social and outgoing among us miss the casual chit-chat of the physical office, whether it was sharing anecdotes over lunch, catching up on personal stuff while waiting for everyone to show up for a meeting, or the quick catch-up in the corridor.

A study published in the *Academy of Management Journal* by researchers Jessica R. Methot, Emily H Rosado-Solomon, Patrick Downes and Allison S Gabriel looked at the effects of casual work chatter. The paper, *Office Chit-Chat as a Social Ritual: The Uplifting Yet Distracting Effects of Daily Small Talk at Work*, reported the results of the study conducted over a 15-day period on 151 workers. 'Although small talk comprises one-third of adults' speech, its effects at work have been discounted. Results showed that, on one hand, small talk enhanced employees' daily positive social emotions at work, which translated into heightened organizational citizenship behaviours and well-being at the end of the workday; on the other hand, small talk disrupted employees' ability to cognitively engage in their work ... Combined, results suggest that the polite, ritualistic, and formulaic nature of small talk is often uplifting yet distracting,' the authors say in the abstract of the paper.

We all know that work chatter can sometimes be annoying – for instance, when you're trying to focus on a deadline and a verbose colleague chooses that moment to walk up to your work-station to air his views on politics or the weather. But at other times, small talk can be comforting; it helps us see each other as human beings with strengths and weaknesses and our own share of burdens beyond those at work. The Zoom call, in that sense, is deeply dehumanising – you see only a small sliver of the person and not the whole.

'Small talk helps build trust, particularly between managers and their teams,' says organisational psychologist Dr Aditi Raghuram. 'It allows for social cohesion, which is the basis for cooperation. Sometimes it is the only means of social connection for people. Research shows that having even a single friend at work reduces the chances of quitting, even if the job itself is unsatisfactory.'

In remote working situations, it might be a good idea for managers to encourage casual catch-ups at least once a week. 'When we choose efficiency over connection in Zoom calls, we turn people into task-bots, as opposed to humans who need connection and relationships to work together effectively,' says Dr Raghuram. 'Several studies have shown that a quick connection exercise at the start of each call helps reduce the fatigue people feel with Zoom calls. Small talk serves as such an exercise,' she says.

For those who feel this will become yet another HR-mandated corporate construct, it doesn't have to be quite so structured – just open channels of communication from time to time during work calls, and don't see them as unproductive and a waste of time.

## Document 5

### 5 reasons why Zoom meetings are so exhausting

Adapted from an article in *The Conversation*, a UK and Australian website, May 2020.

**Libby Sander was Assistant Professor of Organisational Behaviour, Bond Business School, Bond University.**

Meetings in person are not only about the exchange of knowledge, they are also important rituals in the office. Rituals provide comfort, put us at ease, and are essential in building and maintaining rapport. Face to face meetings are also important mechanisms for the communication of attitudes and feelings among business partners and colleagues. Emotions precede and follow all our behaviours, and influence management decision-making. Sensitive topics are often canvassed, requiring us to notice subtleties and display empathy.

How are Zoom meetings different?

Our brains can only do so many things consciously at once, because we have limited working memory. In contrast, we can process much more information unconsciously, as we do with body language. Meeting online increases our cognitive load because several of its features take up a lot of conscious capacity.

#### 1. *We miss out on a lot of non-verbal communication*

Our feelings and attitudes are largely conveyed by non-verbal signals such as facial expressions, the tone and pitch of the voice, gestures, posture, and the distance between the communicators. In a face-to-face meeting we process these cues largely automatically, and can still listen to the speaker at the same time. But on a video chat, we need to work harder to process non-verbal cues. Paying more attention to these consumes a lot of energy. Our minds are together when our bodies feel we're not. That dissonance, which causes people to have conflicting feelings, is exhausting. Also, in face-to-face meetings we rely heavily on non-verbal cues to make emotional judgements, such as assessing whether a statement is credible. We automatically take in information such as whether the person is fidgeting, and use this to more easily make a judgement on how the conversation is going. Predominantly relying on verbal information to infer emotions is tiring.

#### 2. *What if the kids run in?*

We feel anxious about our remote workspace and controlling events that might make us look bad to our colleagues. Will my Zoom background suddenly fail leaving my hoarding tendencies on full display?

#### 3. *No water-cooler catch-ups*

In person, we often meet people on the way to a meeting to catch up on issues or discuss our views before going in. We get coffee, and the simple act of relocating to a different room is energising. But at home, we might be just working on a task and then we get on to Zoom, often without taking breaks. Also, walking is known to improve creativity, highlighting the importance of discussions while walking to meetings, moving around during the meeting, and holding the now popular stand-up meetings. But we can't walk on Zoom calls.

#### 4. *Looking at our own face is stressful*

The heightened emphasis on facial cues and the ability to see oneself, can also act as a stressor. Viewing our own negative facial expressions (like anger and disgust) can lead to more intense emotions than when viewing similar facial expressions in others.

5. *Are you listening or are you frozen?*

Silence in real life conversation is important and creates a natural rhythm. But in a video call, silence makes you anxious about the technology. Even a 1.2 second delay in responding online made people perceive the person talking as less friendly or focused. In addition, frustration with people turning their microphones on and off, lagging connections and background noise mean the meeting rarely flows as smoothly.

It's not all Zoom and doom.

On the upside, social anxiety is positively correlated with feelings of comfort online. So for people who dread physical meetings, meeting online might be a welcome respite. And even though the increased focus on verbal information in video meetings can be mentally more draining, it might also have some potential positive side effects by reducing biases due to social and emotional signals.



## Document 6

### The science of hugging

Adapted from an article in *The Guardian*, a UK newspaper, April 2021.

**Susannah Walker was a Reader in Behavioural Neuroscience at Liverpool John Moores University.**

To understand why we crave hugs and the touch of other humans, we need to look to our evolutionary and social history – and our skin. Humans are born helpless; from birth we are reliant on others to feed us, keep us warm and comfort us when we are distressed. Like all mammals, we are innately predisposed to seek physical contact to ensure our own survival. Touch plays a major role in early nurturing interactions. Skin-to-skin contact between a mother and her infant helps regulate the infant's heart and breathing rate, reduces levels of stress hormones, promotes growth and shapes the developing brain.

The more reliable and sensitive this early care-giving is, the stronger the benefit will be to a child's health and wellbeing later in life. Touch sends a signal to babies that support is available and they are safe. As we grow older, touch plays an important role in the formation and maintenance of adult social relationships. When distressed, we revert to our earlier experiences of touch, relying on non-verbal support such as handholding, hugs and caresses. The comforting, rewarding benefits of touch are rooted in our skin, which is innervated with a variety of sensory receptors that inform us about what is happening on the surface of our body. A fly lands on our nose and we get an itch. We stub a toe and feel pain. We feel the warmth from the sun. Someone squeezes our hand. These signals are combined in our brains alongside contextual information, such as how we feel and who we are hugging, to generate the rewarding, pleasurable sensations that many of us currently crave.

Until relatively recently, neurobiologists studying our sense of touch have focused on the sensory nerves that allow us to detect and explore surfaces, textures and objects. These sensory receptors, found most densely in the skin of our hands and fingers, rapidly send signals to regions of the brain that process this aspect of touch. But researchers are now becoming increasingly interested in a subset of touch-sensitive nerves in core regions of the body, such as the back, which have only recently been discovered. This second type of sensory nerves send signals to areas of our brains that deal with emotional processing. They are most responsive to skin temperature and gentle, stroking touch. Observational studies find that when people are asked to caress their infant, or their romantic partner, they spontaneously use the slow stroking speeds that these nerve fibres prefer. This touch is subjectively perceived as pleasant; it calms and soothes us physiologically, reducing heart rate and buffering against the effects of stress.

When stimulated, these nerves send signals via the spinal cord to the brain where they release a cascade of neurochemicals. One of the most notable chemicals among these is oxytocin, a hormone released by low-intensity skin stimulation such as hugs. Oxytocin is known to play important roles in social bonding, and can reduce stress and increase our tolerance to pain. The release of oxytocin during social interactions is context-dependent: only when a hug is wanted will the comforting and rewarding effects be felt. When touch is desired, the benefits are shared by both partners in the exchange. Notably, these partners don't have to be human. Oxytocin levels increase in both a dog and their owner when the animal is stroked and petted.

Social distancing restrictions have had a significant negative impact on many people's wellbeing, causing loneliness and distress. At the same time, we had to inhibit our natural instincts, programmed over millions of years of evolution, to use touch to calm, soothe and show we care. Released from lockdown restrictions, we'll rapidly start displaying the behaviours that we're predisposed to share. Though perhaps we will now appreciate them a little bit more.

## Document 7

### India and the coming global talent race

Adapted from an article in the *Financial Express*, an Indian newspaper, March 2021.

**Ejaz Ghani previously worked for the World Bank, WTO, and ILO, and taught economics at university level.**

More than 3% of all people live outside the country of their birth. The share of high-skilled migrants relative to low-skilled migrants has grown dramatically, owing to the globalisation of demand for talent. And this development has a clear geographic dimension. Over 70% of software engineers in Silicon Valley in the US are foreign-born, and nearly 75% of all high-skilled migrants reside in the US, the UK, Canada, and Australia.

The early literature on global migration focused on the “brain drain” hypothesis, with the migration of talented individuals to developed countries draining the developing countries. However, the role of diaspora has changed, with globally-connected migrants promoting economic exchanges that promote trade, foreign direct investment, technology and knowledge diffusion with the developing countries. This has shifted the literature on global migration from “brain drain” to “brain gain”. This global talent race has the potential to make today’s laggards become tomorrow’s leaders.

Empirical estimates suggest that the knowledge diffusion from the Indian diaspora in the US has helped development of major advances in India more than domestic inventors there. High-skilled Indian migrants have enabled their US employers to conduct R&D-based work abroad. High-skilled Indian migrants have also played a key role in the growth of India’s outsourcing industry, by providing information about economic opportunities to their home countries, and serving as reputational intermediaries.

What is driving the global talent race, and the shift in the composition of global migration flows? A key driver in this global talent race is the Fourth Industrial Revolution, along with declining transportation and communication costs (high-skilled migrants tend to travel farther to their destination countries than do less-skilled migrants). Limited educational opportunities in source countries have also promoted talents to seek education abroad.

The main cause behind the “war for talent” is the growing recognition that human capital plays a key role in today’s knowledge economy. Enterprises that manage their global talent pool well are marching ahead. Most multinational corporations now insist that high-potential executives gain global experience by working in other countries, and they have made international mobility a prerequisite for senior leadership positions. Some of the global economy’s most familiar players – including Google, Microsoft, Alcoa, Clorox, Coca-Cola, McDonald’s, Pepsi, and Pfizer – have immigrant CEOs.

Changes in global demographics will continue to accelerate the global migration flows during the coming decade. Whereas most of the developed world is ageing, developing countries have a growing share of young people. India will continue to benefit from its demographic dividend in the global talent race. In India, there are four 20-year-olds for every 65-year-old; in Western Europe, that ratio is one to one. At the same time, average earnings in developed countries are 70 times higher than in India. Combined, these demographic and wage differentials have become a strong impetus for global migration.

## Document 8

### The potential environmental impacts of EU immigration policy

Adapted from an article on the website of *The Overpopulation Project*, an international research project, January 2020.

**Phil Cafaro was Professor of Philosophy at Colorado State University. Cafaro was co-editor of *Life on the Brink: Environmentalists Confront Overpopulation* and author of *How Many Is Too Many? The Progressive Argument for Reducing Immigration into the United States*. Frank Götmark was Professor of Animal Ecology and Conservation Biology at the University of Gothenburg. Along with Cafaro he was co-Principal Investigator of The Overpopulation Project.**

This article explores the impacts of alternative immigration policies on two important EU environmental goals: reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and improved biodiversity conservation. We find that in both cases, less immigration, leading to smaller populations, will make success more likely. Realizing the environmental benefits of smaller populations, however, will depend on putting in place the right policies and management strategies to maximize the gains made possible by fewer people.

Europeans suffer from demographic complacency. Despite living in some of the world's most densely populated countries in a time of obvious global ecological overshoot, they are more likely to worry about low birthrates and falling national populations than overpopulation. For the EU as a whole, current immigration levels will lead to a 10% percent population decrease by 2100, reducing net immigration to zero will accelerate that decrease (to 38%), while doubling immigration levels will instead increase the population by 10%.

Clearly, EU immigration levels will make a substantial difference to population numbers in the future. But how important are those differences in terms of environmental impacts and achieving EU environmental policy goals? We are seeking to quantify these impacts specifically regarding greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and biodiversity conservation.

#### *Greenhouse gas emissions*

Since we don't know how successful the nations of the EU will be in decreasing their per capita carbon emissions, we considered how five plausible immigration scenarios (zero net migration, ½ status quo net migration, status quo net migration, 2X status quo net migration, and 4X status quo net migration) would influence the total reductions achieved this century under three plausible emissions reduction scenarios (50%, 70%, and 90% per capita GHG reductions). In every case, higher immigration leads to substantially higher population numbers, which in turn lead to substantially greater cumulative GHG emissions.

These results suggest that population size will play an important role in the efforts of individual EU nations and the EU as a whole to meet their GHG emissions reduction goals, and that immigration policy could play an important role in facilitating or undermining such efforts.

#### *Biodiversity preservation*

As with climate change, population growth has been identified as a main factor causing biodiversity loss in many nations. Conservation biologists agree that habitat loss and degradation is by far the leading cause of biodiversity loss, and a recent study found that population increases contributed significantly to urbanization and habitat loss in western Europe in recent years. Increased human numbers have also been shown to amplify other important factors driving biodiversity loss, including agricultural intensification and conversion of natural forests to production forests.

While quantifying loss of biodiversity and species populations in relation to human population changes cannot be done as easily as for GHG emissions, the evidence suggests that future EU population numbers could greatly influence the success of efforts to protect biodiversity in the EU.

Just as every extra individual, now and in the future, will generate some GHGs and thus help heat Earth's climate, with more individuals generating greater climate change; so every extra individual, now and in the future, will take some habitat and resources away from other species, with more individuals generating greater loss of biodiversity. While the complexity of the phenomena prevents us from affirming a strict 1:1 inverse relationship, the overall trend is clear: greater human numbers reduce biodiversity.

### *Conclusion*

In the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, what holds true for climate change and biodiversity loss can be presumed to hold true more generally. Population size will play an important role in the efforts of EU nations to meet their future environmental challenges. Reducing immigration, and thus overall population numbers, can help create ecologically sustainable societies that share the landscape generously with other species, while increasing immigration will raise population numbers and tend to move EU nations further away from these goals.

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

To avoid the issue of disclosure of answer-related information to candidates, all copyright acknowledgements are reproduced online in the Cambridge Assessment International Education Copyright Acknowledgements Booklet. This is produced for each series of examinations and is freely available to download at [www.cambridgeinternational.org](http://www.cambridgeinternational.org) after the live examination series.

Cambridge Assessment International Education is part of Cambridge Assessment. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is a department of the University of Cambridge.