

HL challenges and interventions

International Baccalaureate · IB Diploma · Digital Society · HL

IB Diploma Programme Digital Society HL (first assessment 2024; 2021 guide). This topic equips the HL EXTENSION (5.1 global well-being, 5.2 governance and human rights, 5.3 sustainable development) and Paper 3 (25% HL): questions on an intervention related to an HL extension challenge, outlined in a pre-released brief. This handout teaches the three challenges, the intervention read and the evaluation craft. All worked examples are original classroom cases.

Must-know for hl challenges and interventions:

Family	Content
well-being	5.1: digital life and flourishing: whose welfare, which harms
governance	5.2: who rules the digital: rights, states, platforms
sustainable development	5.3: digital futures that can be sustained: energy, materials, access
intervention	a deliberate act on a challenge: policy, design, campaign
evaluation	effectiveness judged: equity and acceptability, evidence weighed

The three challenges

The HL extension names three contemporary **challenges** . GLOBAL WELL-BEING (5.1): digital life against flourishing (attention economies, connection and loneliness, the measured self). GOVERNANCE AND HUMAN RIGHTS (5.2): who rules the digital (content moderation as private law; surveillance and its limits; rights asserted against platforms and states). SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (5.3): digital futures that can be sustained (energy and mining for the machines; e-waste; access as a development question). Each challenge is a field of contest, not a topic to summarize.

Worked case. The school's phone-locker policy read as all three: well-being (attention returned to the classroom?), governance (who decided, and by what right?), sustainability (lockers built, phones still made).

Reading an intervention

Paper 3 gives a pre-released brief outlining an **intervention** : a deliberate act on a challenge (a policy, a design change, a campaign). The read: WHAT it intervenes on (the mechanism, not the mission statement), WHO acts and who is acted on (the

school locks, the students are locked), and WHAT CHANGE it claims (the outcome the brief predicts). The intervention is a case with perspectives like any source: the designer's, the target's, the regulator's.

Worked case, continued. The brief's intervention: a focus-mode feature that hides notifications for six hours. Mechanism: the notification layer silenced; actors: the company designs, the user opts in, the group-chat waits; claimed change: attention reclaimed at meals.

Evaluating effectiveness

Effectiveness is judged on two axes named in the course: **equity** (who gains, who loses, who was never asked: focus mode helps the disciplined and hides the caregiver who must answer) and **acceptability** (do the affected accept the means: silence chosen differs from silence imposed). The evaluation weighs evidence (trials, testimony, data) and reaches a verdict that names its limits: a good Paper 3 answer is an argued judgement, not a summary of the brief.

Worked case, concluded. The verdict on focus mode: effective for self-chosen attention (evidence: usage trials), weak on equity (the always-reachable lose most), acceptable where chosen and not where imposed: the limits named (one platform, one term, self-reported attention).

Checklist

- The three challenges as fields of contest (well-being).
- Governance: who rules, by what right, against which rights (governance).
- Sustainability: energy, materials, access (sustainable development).
- The intervention read: mechanism, actors, claimed change (intervention).
- Equity and acceptability weighed to a verdict with limits (evaluation). Boundary notes: the examiner must see the inquiry working: concepts named, sources diverse and evaluated, real-world examples real. All worked examples are original classroom cases.