4.1 HL challenges and interventions

Name: _____ Class: _____ Date: _____ **Total: 23 marks**

KEY WORDS intervention • equity

HL challenges and interventions

Objective

Supported preparation: Read an intervention's mechanism, actors and claimed change; Evaluate effectiveness on equity and acceptability to an argued verdict. This is original rehearsal, not completion of the assessed task.

1 Key knowledge and worked examples

Extension toolkit. Three challenges as fields of contest: global well-being (digital life against flourishing), governance and human rights (who rules the digital, against which rights), sustainable development (energy, materials, access). The intervention read: mechanism (not the mission statement), actors (who acts, who is acted on), claimed change. Evaluation: equity (who gains, who loses, who was never asked) and acceptability (chosen vs imposed), evidence weighed to a verdict with limits. Worked: the phone-locker policy; the focus-mode brief.

2 Practice

2.1 Name the three HL extension challenges. [3]

2.2 What does each challenge ask, in one phrase each? [3]

2.3 Name the three parts of the intervention read. [3]

2.4 Name the two axes of the effectiveness evaluation. [2]

2.5 What must a verdict name, besides its judgement? [1]

3 Exam-style questions

3.1 *(Challenge style.)* The phone-locker policy is proposed for well-being reasons. Show how all three challenges appear in the one case. [3]

3.2 *(Read style.)* A brief claims focus mode returns attention to meals. Draft the intervention read. [4]

3.3 *(Verdict style.)* Weigh focus mode on both axes and deliver the verdict with its limits. [4]

Solutions

2.1 Global well-being (1); governance and human rights (1); sustainable development (1).

2.2 Well-being: digital life against flourishing (1); governance: who rules the digital, against which rights (1); sustainability: can the digital future be sustained (energy, materials, access) (1).

2.3 The mechanism it intervenes on (1); the actors (who acts, who is acted on) (1); the claimed change (1).

2.4 Equity (1); acceptability (1).

2.5 Its limits (1).

3.1 Well-being: attention returned to the classroom is the policy's claim (1); governance: who decided, and by what right (the school rules the device the student owns) (1); sustainable development: lockers built while the phones still are (the challenge shifts, not shrinks) (1).

3.2 Mechanism: the notification layer silenced for six opted-in hours (2); actors: the company designs, the user opts in, the group-chat waits (the affected beyond the user) (1); claimed change: attention reclaimed at meals (the brief's prediction, not yet evidence) (1).

3.3 Equity: gains concentrate on the disciplined; the always-reachable (caregivers, on-call staff) lose most, and were never asked (2); acceptability: chosen silence accepted, imposed silence resisted (2); verdict with limits: effective for self-chosen attention on one platform for one term, self-reported (any verdict naming the judgement and the limits).

Local review guidance: (R1) 3.1 shows the contest in one case; 3.2 reads mechanism, not mission; 3.3 names the limits with the verdict. Authored guidance.