GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

| Paper 9239/11 |
| Written Examination |

Key messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, in order to answer the questions set. This applied in all questions, for example in **Question 1:** 'different improvements (by Child Labor Unions)', **Question 2:** 'evidence' and **Question 3:** 'convincing'.

Some candidates spent too long on **Question 1** and so left less time for **Question 2** and **Question 3** which had higher total marks. There was evidence to show a lack of balance of the quantity and quality of answer in **Question 2** and **Question 3** despite the fact they were worth the same number of marks.

To gain higher marks in **Questions 2** and **3** there should be clear development of the points made. For example, making a point, explaining it in the context of the document and illustrating using information or quotes from the text. So, not just stating **what** a strength or weakness may be, but also **how** or **why** it is a strength or weakness. There should also be explicit reference to the documents in **Question 3** and reflection on the impact of the evidence in **Question 2**.

So, candidates should provide brief and relevant references from the documents to support their evaluation of evidence and argument otherwise the answer is generalised, containing only assertions or claims. They should also explain what impact this has on the argument or chosen evidence which goes beyond a generic statement like 'weakens/strengthens'. They need to explain how the assessment does this.

Question 3 required candidates to consider both documents and go beyond a simple comparison and description of the content. The candidates need to focus on an evaluation of the provenance, perspectives, evidence and argument to reach an overall judgement as to whether one of the documents was more convincing than the other.

Candidates will not gain credit for using material from their own knowledge that is not mentioned in the documents. Equally, copying sections from the documents without reference, except when providing a simple explanation in **Question 1,** will not gain credit.

General comments

There was little evidence of candidates misunderstanding the documents and most showed a good understanding of the demands of the questions. Some candidates did not pay careful enough attention to the key words in the questions. For example, 'evidence' in **Question 2**.

Most candidates organised their time well. However, a sizeable minority spent too long on **Question 1** and spent unequal time on **Questions 2** and **3** when they were worth the same number of marks. It is important to recognise the value of each question and to write an appropriate amount. There was little clear evidence of planning for the longer questions. If it had been included, the key words may have been addressed more fully and the assessment and judgement better structured.

Some answers to **Question 3** were not fully developed or supported by precise references to the documents. Stronger responses selected relevant and appropriate quotes from the documents and evaluated their significance and impact on the argument. This demonstrated that they had a secure grasp of the arguments being presented.

The rubric of the paper requires candidates to write in continuous prose. While concise answers in **Question 1** are acceptable, in **Questions 2** and **3** full paragraphing in an essay format, rather than bullet points, should be used.

Many candidates appeared to be well-prepared with clear understanding of the aspects of evidence and argument that they were looking for in the documents.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Question 1 provides an encouragement for the candidate to fully read and understand the detail of Document 1. The key words in the question refer to the role of the child labor unions and the improvements they have achieved. As the question required explanation of three different improvements higher scoring candidates created their own structure by writing a paragraph on each one. Lower scoring candidates tended to mix ideas and frequently only provided simple explanations.

Candidates scored one mark for a simple explanation and one mark for a developed explanation. Simple explanations could be copied directly from the text. A development point required using the text rather than just quoting it. This involved correct paraphrase, correct precis or correct synthesis of parts of the text. There is a need to reflect the author's thoughts and meaning without introducing the candidate's own knowledge.

The following example shows where three improvements have been explained simply with two being more developed.

'Three different improvements that are given in Document 2 are, unions require members to stay in school, set up projects to improve working conditions and provided better paid jobs for children.'

This shows the simple explanation of three improvements. The candidate then continues:

'Kids like Noemi usually work without legal protection making them a vulnerable labor force. Unions are working to improve these conditions. Moreover, unions in Venezuela have established agreements with buyers to pay fair prices for agricultural products picked by children. In that way, young workers will receive better pay.'

These points are made separately from the initial simple statements and synthesise information from different parts of the text while using some paraphrasing. (In this case there was no explanation related to education)

Several candidates only completed the first part of the example here and so only scored up to half the marks for some simple explanation.

Question 2

This question was generally well answered with most candidates correctly assessing the evidence rather than simply the argument. It was pleasing to see in **Question 2** that candidates had generally read the requirements of the question carefully. The question required an assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author to support her claims.

The highest achieving candidates recognised that the author used a range of supported primary data and quantitative data including specific statistics. Higher scoring candidates recognised this, named suitable examples and explained why they showed this evidence to be a strength. This, three stage approach tends to lead to higher marks.

Higher scoring candidates also recognised that the author was suitably qualified to access and select appropriate information and therefore justify her evidence. This was highlighted by her location in Bolivia and possible first-hand access to, and empathy with, local evidence. In an 'evidence' question the provenance of the document and the credibility of the author is particularly relevant when it shows the author's ability to research and select appropriate evidence.

For weaknesses, higher scoring candidates saw that the supporting statistics were generally vague (e.g., 'more than 100,000 children') and that evidence was largely unsourced. Again, higher scoring candidates explained how both these limitations had a negative impact on the reliability of the evidence.

The difference between higher and moderately scoring candidates was usually defined by the appropriate explanation of the strengths and weaknesses, rather than just identifying them, or not referencing the document. Several candidates made basic statements without explaining or developing them.

For strengths of the evidence the highest achieving candidates used examples such as:

'A strength is that the author uses statistics from credible organisations. This is shown as 'According to the Switzerland-based International Labour Organisation, there are currently 215 million child workers Worldwide with 14 million in Latin America.' This is a credible organisation backing up accurate and understandable statistics.'

'Using examples from Chipani and Gutierrez the author shows first-hand experiences of working in child labour. Using quotes from leaders and child presidents of the union makes the argument stronger as it is coming first-hand from the child labour workers which makes it primary evidence. This means no-one can twist or alter anyone else's words.'

For weaknesses of the evidence the highest achieving candidates used examples such as:

'One weakness in Document 1 is that the evidence is not credited. For example, 'Hundreds of millions of children worldwide are working without legal protection'. There was no source given before or after the quote so making this statement appear to be invalid.'

Both of these show the idea of: point made, point illustrated from the document and point explained in the context of the argument.

Question 3

The most frequent approach is to directly compare the relative strengths and weaknesses of the two documents throughout the answer looking at their different perspectives. The strongest candidates achieved this well with analysis and clear evaluation of the relative strengths of each document and were able to make a judgement as to which was more convincing. There was no correct answer and candidates were free to argue that Document 2 was more convincing than Document 1 or the opposite. It was also possible to argue that both were equally convincing. In all cases justification for the final judgement was required.

Some candidates tended to directly compare the content of the documents without evaluating their relative strengths. This simplistic/undeveloped approach which describes a few points comparing the two documents was rarely marked higher than Level 1.

Many candidates were able to pick out the aspects that reflect a strong argument e.g., the credibility of the authors and the amount of supporting evidence provided. Candidates achieving the highest marks gave clear examples from the documents and their impact on the overall assessment, while lower scoring answers simply relied on a formulaic approach of what should constitute a strong argument without using supporting examples. Such answers were consequently superficial and relied, at best, on undeveloped quotes from the text.

The strongest responses adopted a structured response to answering the question: methodically evaluating the relative strengths of the argument (with intermediate judgements), using appropriate examples and analysis of impact, before coming to a reasoned judgment at the end.

Examples of strong evaluation of the arguments are:

'In Document 2 the writer states that 'the conviction rate in laughably low' and describes the Ministry of Labour as 'ill-equipped'. This strong informal language makes the writer seem unprofessional making the argument less convincing. This also is shown when the writer makes extreme claims with no acknowledgement of exceptions. For example, the writer states 'There is no country in the world where sustained high-quality mass education has not led to improvements. The writer makes this claim by generalising it to all countries without exceptions. This generalisation has not source or evidence to support which makes it an assertion which decreases the credibility of the claim.'.

Judgement – this example gives a good final supported judgement relating to the relative strength of the two arguments. When reading this example, it is important to recognise that this is a summary, providing a judgement based on points raised in detail throughout the answer. There were intermediate conclusions throughout the answer of which this is a summary.

'The author in Document 1 uses more emotive language, which can be a weakness since emotion is the main method used to support her claim. However, Document 2 uses more affirmative language which helps the reader to see the urgency of the issue and is therefore more persuasive. Overall, the argument of Document 2 is more convincing than Document 1 because it has more quantitative data, focuses on a particular solution, uses extensive evidence to support the solution and refers to reliable sources.'

Some candidates followed a formulaic approach to the answer by looking for particular aspects of the argument to consider. Generally, this was well done with higher scoring candidates linking aspects to examples in the text and with explanation of why this supported the argument. A small number made assumptions based on preconceived ideas about what makes a good argument, rather than reading and evaluating the documents clearly. Candidates are required to engage critically with the documents, rather than make generalised comments that could apply to any document.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Key messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, in order to answer the questions set. This applied in all questions, for example in **Question 1(a): '**problems with producing', **Question 1(b): '**advantages that Indonesia has', **Question 2:** 'evidence' and **Question 3:** 'convincing'.

There was mostly a good balance between the time taken on each of the questions reflecting the number of marks available, but a significant minority seemed to spend more time on **Question 2** or **Question 3** despite them having the same mark allocation. Some wrote extensively for **Question 1** where concise answers are acceptable and encouraged. There was no clear evidence of candidates running out of time.

To gain higher marks in **Questions 2** and **3** there should be clear development of the points made. This may relate to the impact of material in the documents on the arguments. It may also show consideration of, not just **what** a strength or weakness may be, but also **how** or **why** it is a strength or weakness. There should also be explicit reference to the documents in **Question 3** and reflection on the impact of the evidence in **Question 2**.

So, candidates should provide brief and relevant references from the documents to support their evaluation of evidence and argument otherwise the answer is generalised, containing only assertions or claims. They should also explain what impact this has on the argument or chosen evidence which goes beyond a generic statement like 'weakens/strengthens'. They need to explain how the assessment does this.

Question 3 required candidates to consider both documents and go beyond a simple comparison and description of the content. The candidates need to focus on an evaluation of the provenance, perspectives, evidence and argument to reach an overall judgement as to whether one of the documents was more convincing than the other.

Candidates will not gain credit for using material from their own knowledge that is not mentioned in the documents. Equally, copying sections from the documents, without reference, except when asked to identify in **Question 1 (a)** or give simple explanation in **Question 1 (b)** will not gain credit.

General comments

There was little evidence of candidates misunderstanding the documents and most showed a good understanding of the demands of the questions. Some candidates did not pay careful enough attention to the key words in the questions. For example, 'evidence' in **Question 2**.

There was little clear evidence of planning for the longer questions. If it had been included, the key words may have been addressed more fully and the assessment and judgement better structured.

Some answers to **Question 3** were not fully developed or supported by precise references to the documents. Stronger responses selected relevant and appropriate quotes from the documents and evaluated their significance and impact on the argument. This demonstrated that they had a secure grasp of the arguments being presented.

The rubric of the paper requires candidates to write in continuous prose. While concise answers in **Question 1** are acceptable, in **Questions 2 and 3** full paragraphing in an essay format, rather than bullet points, should be used.

Many candidates appeared to be well-prepared with clear understanding of the aspects of evidence and argument that they were looking for in the documents.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a)   As an 'identify' question the best answers simply and concisely stated the words of the author without paraphrasing or expanding. **Question 1** provides an encouragement for the candidate to fully read and understand the detail of Document 1. The key words in the question refer to the problems with producing bioplastics (so, not the use or impact of bioplastics)

Many candidates scored full marks.

For example, listing:

1.   'Huge financial investment in land…'
2.   'Can lead to food shortages…'

Reference to negative impacts of bioplastic use, like damaging the environment were not relevant to the question.

(b)   The question required candidates to explain different advantages that Indonesia has for producing bioplastics.

Candidates scored one mark for a correct simple explanation (which could be taken directly from the text) and one mark for a correct explanation. There is a need to reflect the author's thoughts and meaning without introducing the candidate's own knowledge. For the explanation it is also expected that the answer should be in the candidate's own words or a paraphrase of those of the author – not direct copying from the document. Synthesising separate sections of the document showing that the candidate has worked with the author's words is also acceptable and encouraged.

The following examples show information taken from the document and then interpreted and rephrased by the candidate.

'Indonesia is one of the World's largest seaweed producers, accounting for a third of global seaweed production. This is an advantage as seaweed is supposedly the best candidate for bioplastic production.

Indonesia is also at the front line for developing bioplastics through a start-up called Evoware which sells cups and food containers made from seaweed instead of (traditional) plastic. This means Indonesia is more equipped than other countries to produce bioplastics.'

The following example gained 1 mark as it has a correct simple explanation, but the detailed explanation is entirely taken, unaltered from the document. There was no attempt to use own words, paraphrase or synthesise.

'An advantage for Indonesia is that it is also the world's largest producer of red seaweed whose carbohydrate element is the key ingredient for bioplastics.'

Question 2

This question was generally well answered with most candidates correctly assessing the evidence rather than simply the argument. It was pleasing to see in **Question 2** that candidates had generally read the requirements of the question carefully. The question required an assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author to support his argument.

The highest achieving candidates recognised that the author used a range of supporting secondary and quantitative data including specific statistics. Higher scoring candidates recognised this, named suitable examples and explained why they showed this evidence to be a strength. This three stage approach tends to lead to higher marks.

Higher scoring candidates also recognised that the author was suitably qualified to access and select appropriate information and therefore justify his evidence. The author was also seen as a credible source as he had experience in the topic and the geographical area.

For weaknesses, higher scoring candidates saw that the supporting statistics were vague (e.g., 'exports valued at around USD 200 million'). It was also recognised that the author had spent 13 years linked to the Indonesian Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries. That may have led to a biased approach in favour of a global role for Indonesia. Again, higher scoring candidates explained how both these limitations had a negative impact on the reliability of the evidence.

For strengths of the evidence the highest achieving candidates used examples such as:

'A strength is how the author presents expert sources to support the claim made. 'A recent report from the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation suggests that Indonesia is a place for red seaweed farming due to its climate, nutrients and geographical conditions' having a source back up claims raises its reliability. Especially a source that is highly reputable, people will more likely trust what is presented in the article.'

'The author uses statistical and numerical data to support his claims, '9 billion tonnes of plastic', 'with production increasing at about 30 per cent per year'. Quantitative data is objective and scientific, so the author's opinions don't interfere with the claims made, The use of statistical and numerical data increases the reliability of the article.'

Question 3

The most frequent approach is to directly compare the relative strengths and weaknesses of the two documents throughout the answer looking at their different perspectives. The strongest candidates achieved this well with analysis and clear evaluation of the relative strengths of each document. There was no correct answer and candidates were free to argue that Document 2 was more convincing than Document 1 or the opposite. It was possible to argue that one was neither more nor less convincing. In all cases justification for the final judgement was required.

Some candidates tended to directly compare the content of the documents without evaluating their relative strengths. This simplistic/undeveloped approach which describes a few points comparing the two documents was rarely marked higher than Level 1.

Many candidates were able to pick out the aspects that reflect a strong argument e.g., the credibility of the authors and the amount of supporting evidence provided. Candidates achieving the highest marks gave clear examples from the documents and their impact on the overall assessment, while lower scoring answers simply relied on a formulaic approach of what should constitute a strong argument without using supporting examples. Such answers were consequently superficial and relied, at best, on undeveloped quotes from the text.

The strongest responses adopted a structured response to answering the question: methodically evaluating the relative strengths of the argument (with intermediate judgements), using appropriate examples and analysis of impact, before coming to a reasoned judgment at the end.

Examples of strong evaluation of the arguments are:

Judgement – although not entirely accurate, this gives a good final judgement relating to the equal strength of the two arguments. When reading this example, it is important to recognise that this is a summary, providing a judgement based on points raised in detail throughout the answer.

'*The second author has less expertise and provides no solutions, just mentioning that the bioplastic industry has a long way to go. However, despite less expertise he makes very valid points and does not talk about seaweed bioplastic and is more captivating and realistic. The first author is more convincing as due to his provenance had has a better understanding of the matter. He talks about bioplastics in depth showing it to be a viable option.'.*

Comparison of authors

'Sophie (author of Document 2) gives alternatives that can be used to produce bioplastics. She states that 'Biofase' uses avocados to make straws and cutlery. Because of this, it shows that Sophia's argument is

open-minded as it doesn't restrict the development of bioplastics to just one product (raw material) like that in Document 1 (seaweed). This persuades the readers to view her argument as reasonable.'

'A potential weakness of Sophie's argument is her expertise. Sophie is a journalist who has 20 years' experience in international news. Sophie therefore may not have relevant or enough knowledge in bioplastics as Bakti has (a researcher in biodegradable plastics). The fact that she may not have expertise and that she doesn't source where she gets most of her information from weakens Sophie's argument. Readers are not persuaded enough to consider her argument as valid.'

Some candidates followed a formulaic approach to the answer by looking for particular aspects of the argument to consider. Generally, this was well done with higher scoring candidates linking aspects to examples in the text and with explanation of why this supported the argument. A small number made assumptions based on preconceived ideas about what makes a good argument, rather than reading and evaluating the documents clearly. Candidates are required to engage critically with the documents, rather than make generalised comments that could apply to any document.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

```
Paper 9239/13
Written Examination
```

Key messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, in order to answer the question set. This applied in all questions, for example in **Question 1: '**negative effects', **Question 2: '**argument' and **Question 3:** 'evidence' and 'stronger'.

A few candidates spent too long on **Question 1** and so left less time for **Question 2** and **Question 3,** which had higher total marks. There was evidence to show a lack of balance of the quantity and quality of answer in **Question 2** and **Question 3** despite the fact they were worth the same number of marks.

To gain higher marks in **Questions 2** and **3** there should be clear development of the points made. For example, making a point, explaining it in the context of the document and illustrating using information or quotes from the text. So, not just stating **what** a strength or weakness may be, but also **how** or **why** it is a strength or weakness. There should also be explicit reference to the evidence in the documents in **Question 3** and reflection on the impact of the argument in **Question 2**.

So, candidates should provide brief and relevant references from the documents to support their evaluation of evidence and argument otherwise the answer is generalised, containing only assertions or claims. They should also explain what impact this has on the argument or chosen evidence which goes beyond a generic statement like 'weakens/strengthens'. They need to explain how the assessment does this.

Question 3 required candidates to consider both documents and go beyond a simple comparison and description of the content. The candidates need to focus on an evaluation of the evidence to reach an overall judgement as to whether one of the documents was more convincing than the other.

Candidates will not gain credit for using material from their own knowledge that is not mentioned in the documents. Equally, copying sections from the documents, without reference, except when providing identification in **Question 1** will not gain credit.

General comments

There was little evidence of candidates misunderstanding the documents and most showed a good understanding of the demands of the questions. Some candidates did not pay careful enough attention to the key words in the questions. For example, 'evidence' in **Question 3**.

Most candidates organised their time well. However, a minority spent too long on **Question 1** and spent unequal time on **Questions 2** and **3,** when they were worth the same number of marks. It is important to recognise the value of each question and to write an appropriate amount. There was little clear evidence of planning for the longer questions. If it had been included, the key words may have been addressed more fully and the assessment and judgement better structured.

Some answers to **Question 3** were not fully developed or supported by precise references to the documents. Stronger responses selected relevant and appropriate quotes, relating to evidence, from the documents and evaluated their significance and impact on the argument. This demonstrated that they had a secure grasp of the evidence used to support the author's argument.

The rubric of the paper requires candidates to write in continuous prose. While concise answers in **Question 1** are acceptable, in **Questions 2** and **3** full paragraphing in an essay format, rather than bullet points, should be used.

Many candidates appeared to be well-prepared with clear understanding of the aspects of evidence and argument that they were looking for in the documents.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Question 1 provides an encouragement for the candidate to fully read and understand the detail of Document 1. The key words in the question refer to the negative effects on patients of doctors receiving gifts from pharmaceutical companies. As the question required identification and explanation of three negative effects, higher scoring candidates created their own structure by writing a paragraph for each one.

Candidates scored one mark for correct identification and one mark for an appropriate explanation. Identification of negative effects could be copied directly from the text. A development point required using the text rather than just quoting it. This involved correct paraphrase, correct precis or correct synthesis of parts of the text. There is a need to reflect the author's thoughts and meaning without introducing the candidate's own knowledge.

The following example shows where three improvements have been explained simply with two being more developed.

'Doctors are more likely to use newer expensive drugs. They can get more financial gain and unashamedly disregard their patients' welfare. Doctors will lose their patients' trust.'

This shows the identification of three negative effects on patients without explanation.

'1. Patient welfare could be unashamedly disregarded by doctors receiving gifts from PCMSs. Once the doctor think this is beneficial for their own financial gain, they would want to suggest these types of medicine to patients for the benefit of the company who is their 'benefit giver'.

2. In some countries, patients have a strong belief in doctors. So, they will not doubt doctors, instead listen to their suggestions and waste unnecessarily high expenses in these medicines. And they could be poor so there is a huge financial burden for patients.

'3. Once the patient finds the trades between doctor and pharmaceutical companies there would not be any belief. They lose the trust and confidence in the doctor…'

This example shows how each negative effect is treated separately and includes an identification and an explanation. All explanations are paraphrased or written in the candidate's own words.

Question 2

This question was generally well answered with most candidates correctly assessing different aspects of the argument.

The highest achieving candidates recognised that the author used a range of aspects of the argument, including the provenance of the authors (including their medical backgrounds), the use of authoritative sources and having a positive vested interest to give accurate information. Higher scoring candidates recognised this, named suitable examples and explained why they showed this to be a strength. This, three stage approach tends to lead to higher marks.

For weaknesses, higher scoring candidates saw that the authors used vague citations and vague terms rather than precise statistics. For example, the use of 'many doctors', 'a growing agreement among doctors', 'some doctors argue'…

The difference between higher and moderately scoring candidates was usually defined by the amount of appropriate explanation of the strengths and weaknesses, rather than just identifying them. Low scoring candidates made basic statements without explaining or developing them and did not reach beyond Level 1.

For strengths of the argument the highest achieving candidates used examples such as:

'The authority in this article is really strong. Both of the two authors are professors who 'work in the Department of Forensic Medicine and Toxicology'. So, they are likely to have access to the accurate data related to this medical issue. Also, their high position, which is 'professor', motivates them to tell the (give) true and accurate information.'

For weaknesses of the evidence the highest achieving candidates used examples such as:

'The authors have used many unclear and unnamed evidence such as 'Many doctors…', 'Some doctors believe…', 'One study found that…'. There are no names of the doctors mentioned, nor their professional background. Also, the details of the survey are not included making the evidence not believable.'

'The authors' work in India and the publisher is the Journal of the Indian Academy of Forensic Medicine which makes the authors not typical, and the document is therefore not globalised enough. What they report may not be typical of other countries.'

Both show the idea of: point made, point illustrated from the document and point explained in the context of the argument.

Question 3

The most frequent approach is to directly compare the relative strengths and weaknesses of the two documents throughout the answer looking at the different evidence used. The strongest candidates achieved this well with analysis and clear evaluation of the relative strengths of each document and were able to make a judgement as to which was stronger overall. There was no correct answer and candidates were free to argue that Document 2 was stronger than Document 1 or the opposite. It was also possible to argue that both were equally strong. In all cases justification for the final judgement was required and this was key to the final mark.

Some candidates tended to directly compare the evidence without evaluating their relative strengths. This simplistic/undeveloped approach which describes a few points comparing the two documents was rarely marked higher than Level 1.

Many candidates were able to pick out the aspects that made strong evidence e.g., the credibility of the sources and whether they provided first-hand or second-hand evidence and the relative use of quantitative and qualitative evidence provided. Candidates achieving the highest marks gave clear examples from the documents and their impact on the overall assessment, while lower scoring answers simply relied on a formulaic approach of what evidence could be used without using supporting examples. Such answers were consequently superficial and relied, at best, on undeveloped quotes from the text.

Some did not appreciate that this question was focused on evidence, not argument and therefore concentrated on the latter and so were unable to access higher marks.

The strongest responses adopted a structured response to answering the question: methodically evaluating the relative strengths of the evidence (with intermediate judgements), using appropriate examples and analysis of impact, before coming to a reasoned judgment at the end.

Examples of strong evaluation of the evidence are:

'For the range of evidence Document 2 is stronger. In Document 2 the author focuses the problems in South Africa but also includes evidence from the US, UK and Japan which introduces a global view for this problem. However, the authors in Document 1 only use evidence from India which lacks transferability. The evidence is not enough to consider the problem only in India. Considering evidence in a global view would strengthen the evidence by showing the problem fully'.

'The author in Document 2 has more clear, cited and sufficient evidence than Document 1. In Document 2 the author cites words from Helen Rees and Tamara Kredo who are the experts in medical area. Citing words directly show their perspectives in a straightforward way and the high provenance of those experts would increase the credibility of evidence by their professional knowledge'.

Judgement –this gives a good final judgement relating to Document 2 being stronger than Document 1. When reading this example, it is important to recognise that this is a summary, providing a judgement based on points raised in detail throughout the answer. There were intermediate conclusions throughout the answer of which this is a summary.

'In comparison to Document 1, Document 2's evidence is stronger in range and quality (more statistics and less vagueness) and credible sources (standing in academia). Document 2's examples are more detailed with clear reference. Document 1's evidence has a greater range of perspectives. Overall, the credibility in Document 2 is stronger than Document 1.'

Generally, this was well done with higher scoring candidates linking aspects to examples in the text and with explanation of why this supported the argument. A small number made assumptions based on preconceived ideas about what makes a good argument, rather than concentrating on the evidence. Candidates are required to engage critically with the documents, rather than make generalised comments that could apply to any document.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

<div style="border:1px solid black">

Paper 9239/02
Essay

</div>

Key messages

- Reflection on learning and the consideration of the impact of contrasting perspectives on the candidate's standpoint are necessary elements of a successful conclusion.
- When selecting an issue to focus on for the research essay, candidates must ensure that the issue has relevance beyond the local or national context. It must be a global issue.
- When conducting research for the essay, candidates should select diverse source material that originates from different geographical regions.

General comments

Much of the work seen by Examiners was of good quality and demonstrated engagement with a range of global topics. Popular topics included Alternatives to oil, Impact of the internet, Urbanisation, Climate change, Industrial pollution and Gender issues, amongst others. There is a list of topics published in the syllabus. From these broad topics candidates were able to focus in on specific issues that presented globally contrasting perspectives.

When completing the Essay component candidates are assessed against seven different criteria. All the criteria have equal weighting. Addressing all of the assessment criteria within the word count requires candidates to plan their essays carefully. It remains the case that some essays omitted to address all the criteria. Some key omissions were critical evaluation of source material, the development of globally contrasting perspectives and identifying areas for further research.

This Principal Examiner Report for Teachers will consider four broad areas of assessment: Perspectives, Sources, Conclusions and Communication. Condensing the seven different assessment criteria into these broader areas of focus ill address the interplay between them. It should also enable teachers to see some of the areas where improvements would be welcome as well as examples of successful practice from this series.

Plagiarism is a growing problem with increasing reliance on internet-based research. Inaccurate citations and in-text references, verbatim copying and pasting of large sections instead of paraphrasing and synthesizing of materials as well as discrepancies between text citations and the bibliography are some of the more common issues. The use of 'spinner' software, designed to confuse plagiarism search tools, has also been noted. It is essential that candidates are conversant with citation and referencing conventions and utilise them appropriately.

Perspectives

A perspective should be understood as a coherent world view which is a response to an issue. When candidates decide which issue to focus upon, it is important that they choose a global issue. A global issue is one that extends beyond a local or national context and would be experienced by people wherever in the world they live or work. Therefore, global perspectives are likely to be informed by different cultural, geographical and political environments.

Choice of title is key to success here. '*Is nuclear energy a viable alternative to fossil fuel?*' this title enabled the candidate to develop contrasting perspectives which responded to the issue of energy security. The title also offers the opportunity to use globally diverse arguments, evidence and context to build globally contrasting perspectives.

This title, '*Is compulsory vaccination of people aged 5 to 18 in the United States justifiable?*' is very specific and likely to locate the debate in a single geographic context. Candidates that develop contrasting perspectives but without a global dimension cannot achieve higher levels at **Globality of Perspectives**.

This year many candidates offered titles that began '*To what extent'.* This was not always effective, as a debate between contrasting perspectives may not emerge. Far better is a title that begins 'Is' or 'Should' such as '*Should citizens be required to carry ID cards?*', here the debate is clear. A question such as '*To what extent are ID cards useful for national security*', does not present the same opportunities for a debate between clearly contrasting perspectives.

Candidates are required to build contrasting perspectives by synthesising research material into a coherent response to an issue of global significance. It was pleasing to see more candidates moving beyond working at a source level. Although some candidates still treat each piece of source material individually, increasingly candidates are able to synthesise arguments and evidence from a range of sources.

'The fast fashion industry provides jobs for a multitude of people. For instance, as stated by Forbes, the '*textile business is the number one industry in Bangladesh, accounting for 80 per cent of the country's exports', employing millions of workers (Suhrawardi, 2020). To further support this claim, according to The Jakarta Post which is a daily English-language newspaper in Indonesia 'Up to 4 million people are currently working in Indonesia's textile industry'' (HernitaningTyas, 2019).'*

Those candidates that do not reconstruct their research material into coherent perspectives will not able to demonstrate all the skills embedded in the Critical Path.

Source Material

There are two different global dimensions that candidates should consider. The example reproduced above showed a candidate presenting global evidence pertaining to Bangladesh reported by 'Forbes' synthesised with evidence pertaining to Indonesia reported by 'The Jakarta Post'. There are two clear global contexts informing the candidate's perspective. The candidate brought together evidence about Indonesia with evidence about Bangladesh and is beginning to develop a global perspective.

The other global dimension candidates should consider is the provenance of their source material. Referring back to the example about the fast fashion industry, it can be seen that the candidate references two sources; Forbes and The Jakarta Post. Not only is the perspective globally contextualised but the source material demonstrates global range too. Forbes is a global media company based in the US and The Jakarta Post is daily English-language newspaper based in Indonesia. The distinction between global source material and global context for perspectives is important, though there may well be overlap. The Jakarta Post is used to provide evidence about Indonesia, here the context and provenance do overlap whereas the evidence about Bangladesh emanates from the global media company, Forbes.

To reach higher attainment levels candidates should gather relevant source material from publications with a range of global provenance. A successful candidate from this series used articles from Al Jazeera (Qatar), The United Nations (Global), Le Monde (France) and The Conversation (US). These are all credible sources with globally diverse provenance. In the example above the candidate explicitly states that the Jakarta Post is Indonesian, this is a worthwhile approach, particularly, if the details in the bibliography do not make it clear where the source material emanates from.

Once candidates have decided upon their issue, they need to engage in focused research in order to select globally diverse source materials that are credible and relevant. Having read and analysed their sources, candidates are required to demonstrate their understanding of the selected material. The candidate needs to be able to present the arguments emanating from the source in a clear and logical manner.

Candidates should not be using more than six key sources to support their globally contrasting perspectives. It is very difficult, in a 2000-word essay, to demonstrate full understanding of research material if too many sources are employed. Selecting the right source material is a key research skill.

It is important to remember that Global Perspectives and Research is a skill-based course. One of the skills assessed is the critical evaluation of source material. There are still too many candidates that omit this aspect of the essay. In essence the candidate should demonstrate why the source is worthy of being used but also acknowledge any weaknesses it may contain. As this is a skills-based course, it is important that candidates interrogate their source material with reference to different evaluative criteria. Many candidates

assess the credibility of the author for each of their research materials and in so doing are essentially demonstrating the same skill repeatedly.

It is perfectly reasonable to critically evaluate four different sources using four different criteria, this would demonstrate a range of evaluation skills. For example, candidates could offer evaluation of argument which might include consideration of assumptions, rhetoric, counter-argument, bias, reasoning or conclusions. Or candidates could offer evaluation of evidence which might include consideration of primary evidence, secondary evidence, quantitative and qualitative data, facts, opinion and relevance. Lastly candidates could offer evaluation of the context of the source which might include consideration of the publisher, author, date, or location.

It is important that candidates move beyond assertive evaluation. Some candidates are still offering undeveloped and generic evaluation, for example, 'A *weakness of this article is that the evidence used in the article is not cited. This is a weakness because it makes the evidence less reliable.'* This could be said of any source and lacks specificity and exemplification. Whereas in this example the candidate's evaluation is specific and developed, '*The Durham University Pro Bono Society Blog is run by candidates at Durham University as a platform to discuss currant affairs and human rights issues. While Joanna Ivanova is associated with a reputable organisation, her position as a candidate does not give her opinion enough weightage to be considered highly credible. Despite a lack of credentials, the author's arguments are considered highly convincing as all are backed by legal documents and based around treaties formed by global organisations.'*

Four pieces of developed critical evaluation across a range of sources would demonstrate high level skills for this assessment criterion (**Analysis of Sources**). Candidates must strike a balance when critically evaluating their research material. Too much emphasis on critical evaluation will not leave space for candidates to demonstrate full understanding of their source material.

Conclusions

To reach the higher levels for this criterion (**Conclusion and Reflection**) candidates are required to present a supported and reflective conclusion. Many more candidates this series engaged with the skill of reflection; a key part of the Critical Path. The quality of reflection has improved with far fewer descriptive responses. Candidates this series were able to offer evaluative reflection that considered fully the impact of contrasting perspectives on their standpoint. Here is one of many strong examples, '*Prior to looking into antidepressants or doing any in depth research I thought that antidepressants were a universal solution to depression with some side effects. I believed that antidepressants, although they could and did have nasty side effects, were still worth taking for anybody who is having problems facing and dealing with their depression. It had seemed like those who were against antidepressants were somehow being cynical or refused to look at the science behind what made antidepressants work. But it is clear to me now after looking at the science behind what makes antidepressants work and looking at the research supporting both perspectives that the answer is not so clear cut ...'*

A supported conclusion is one that follows on logically from the debate presented by the candidate. It is highly likely that having presented two contrasting perspectives that the candidate will then evaluate each perspective before arriving at a final conclusion. Candidates move beyond source evaluation to consider the perspectives holistically with reference to strengths, weaknesses, implications and reasoning. A conclusion leading on from this process will naturally be supported.

The final aspect to consider in the conclusion is the suggestion for further research. Firstly, it is important that the further research is specified. This requires the candidate to move beyond a generic statement suggesting further research would be useful, to offering some detail about the nature of the proposed further research. Secondly, to reach higher levels the further research suggested should arise from the process of producing the research essay. For example, the candidate may have discovered a gap in the available research or found new questions emerging from analysis of the arguments and evidence used.

Communication

Most candidates were successful in communicating a logical and coherent debate. To reach the higher attainment levels for this criterion, candidates need to structure their essays effectively. Discursive markers can act as signposts guiding the reader through the essay and at the same time be useful in demonstrating a clear structure.

Successful candidates used discursive markers such as: firstly, secondly or finally to show the order of ideas. Many candidates were able to indicate the start of a new perspective using discursive markers such as; in contrast or on the other hand. Other useful discursive signposts include; in conclusion or on reflection.

Finally, candidates must offer full referencing of their source material via citations and a bibliography. Candidates should not bolster their bibliographies by reproducing the bibliographies presented in their source material. Only sources that the candidate has researched themselves should be referenced.

For referencing to be considered effective, it should be consistent and functional, this means that the relationship between citation and the bibliography is readily discernible. Candidates must not offer critical evaluation or further information in their footnotes or bibliographies. These are for references only.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

> **Paper 9239/03**
> **Team Project**

Key messages

Successful presentations contextualise their issue and develop it in detail by linking it to their arguments about their problem and solution.

Perspectives were differentiated effectively where candidates compared the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches and continued to engage with this throughout their presentation.

Arguments were strongest where they were structured through the use of discourse markers.

Conclusions and solutions were most effective when linked to evidence and very clearly placed the candidate's own chosen solution centre stage.

Candidates should make explicit reference to elements in their visual aids as part of their spoken argument.

Reflective papers should include specific strengths and weaknesses of the team's collaboration and draw a conclusion from this. They should also develop and reflect on individual details of the candidate's learning about the issue at hand.

Comments on individual presentations

Definition of issue and range of research

Most candidates managed to define an issue, although clarity of definition varied considerably. Some presentations had general titles such as 'Fossil Fuels'; 'Refugees' or 'Pandemics' and would have benefitted from a closer definition of the scope or focus of the issue. Equally titles which were phrased as questions (e.g., 'Should we as a society be cautious of the body positivity movement?') did not lend themselves to a focus on issues which linked to problems and solutions. Where presentations did identify a specific problem which required a solution, there was an opportunity to develop an argument rather than leaving the focus entirely on information content. Candidates who achieved well on this criterion kept the scope of their issue quite narrow, defined the issue clearly at the outset, explained why it was an issue and gave some background to provide context. They then returned to the overarching issue at key points in the presentation in the development of their argument. Issues related to the local experience of candidates provided more opportunities for them to do this.

The following is an example of a candidate successfully describing and developing the issue of standardised testing in education, moving from the global and local context to a specific argument about why it is a problem:

'Standardised tests originated as a solution for judging knowledge fairly and accurately, intended to place everyone on the same playing field where teachers and schools have different grading standards. Under this conception, colleges place great weight on these standardised tests for college entrance exams to determine who does or does not get in. This is demonstrated by this pie chart, which estimates that this entire orange portion here is the weight of these scores when it comes to college entrance in the United States.

'However, data shows that in trying to improve the imperfect standard using grades, standardised test were less accurate at predicting later success than average achieved grades. This is because standardised tests assess knowledge, which by itself is an inaccurate predictor of success.'

![Cambridge Assessment International Education]

The first paragraph here establishes the context and the second builds an argument from it. This is also a good example of the use of visual aids as an explicit support for the argument being made.

Candidates with clear and strongly defined issues generally provided a good deal of relevant detail and examples to support the points being made and this often resulted in conclusions and solutions that were well-linked to the issue. Some candidates undertook primary research, including interviews and surveys. Where the results of this research were used meaningfully to develop an argument towards providing a solution, it could be given credit as providing relevant variety. Lists of 'works cited' at the end of presentation transcripts or on slides did not provide additional credit in themselves: candidates need to explicitly reference these sources when they speak.

Differentiation of perspective

Most candidates were able to show to some extent what made their own perspective specific and individual. They usually stated their own perspective and those of their teammates at the outset of the presentation – for example *'I will be looking at this issue from a medical perspective, while X, Y and Z will be considering the issue from the scientific, environmental and ethical perspectives'*. Other candidates explained that their perspectives would be differentiated by the different solutions they proposed. Either of these approaches is acceptable and shows some differentiation. Some candidates' perspectives were more clearly differentiated in that they not only identified the different perspectives at the outset, they returned to them at the end of the presentation when discussing the different solutions proposed by their teammates. Such candidates often evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of the solutions proposed by the other members of their team. When candidates did this fully, they did so in light of their own solution. In other words, rather than simply saying that *'X's solution would not work very well because…'* they need to explain why their own solution might be better than X's. To achieve Level 5 for this criterion, candidates need to engage with team members' perspectives consistently throughout the presentation by interweaving them with their own perspective.

Structure of argument and support

Most presentations tended to follow a similar format in which candidates introduced themselves and the issue, identifying their own perspective and those of their team members. This was then followed by some background and the local, national and global context for the issue, building in research that had been undertaken, leading to the proposal of a solution and conclusion. In order for a presentation to be well-structured, candidates need to pay attention to the logical sequence of the presentation and use discourse markers such as 'however', 'furthermore', 'although', 'in addition' and so on so that the development is clear.

Conclusion and Solution

The strongest conclusions were those which were linked to the evidence presented over the course of the whole presentation. Less strong conclusions only drew on a part of the evidence that had been presented. If the presentation overruns and the conclusion falls outside of the time limit, then no credit can be given for it.

The most successfully convincing solutions were clearly identified by the candidate as their own, and related to their own analysis of the problem pinpointed by their team's issue. Just stating 'steps taken' or solutions that have been already attempted in their own locality or other parts of the world did not add to the presentation unless they were clearly related to the solution the candidate was proposing. For a solution to be considered effective, candidates must explain why it is effective: why it will work well, or why it is better than other possible or existing solutions. Equally, for a solution to be considered innovative, candidates must explain why their solution is new. For instance, their proposed solution might have its origins in another country but may never have been tried in their own country and this is what makes it innovative, or it may be that the solution has been used in one context but never before been adapted to work in a different context. This needs to be made explicit; simply stating that a solution is innovative does not make it so.

Presentational Methods

Candidates were successful when they used their visual aids in a purposeful way to drive the presentation and their arguments forwards. Some candidates did this well by introducing graphs and charts and actively engaging with them by pointing out particularly important aspects of the data relating to the points they were making. The strongest presentations made use of visual aids throughout, making references to specific details in the slides and linking these to points being made in the argument. This could be done equally well whether the candidate was presenting in person in a room, or if the slides were being displayed on Teams or

Zoom. Very many candidates and centres adapted impressively to online or socially distanced presentations, and these circumstances did not determine how well a candidate scored on their presentational methods. Rather, this was related to how specific and sustained the candidate was with making connections between points in their arguments and the content of their visual aids, using the latter actively to support the former.

Reflective Paper

Evaluation of collaboration

In their evaluation of the team's collaboration, candidates need to consider both the strengths and weaknesses of the team's work as a whole and what impact these strengths and weaknesses had on the process of carrying out the project. This needs to be more than stating that everyone worked well together and there were no disagreements. Describing what the team did also does not count as evaluating collaboration, however detailed or articulate this description is. Reflective papers also benefitted by devoting the overwhelming majority of the 800 words available to evaluating collaboration and reflecting on learning, rather than describing the team's problem and group solution.

Reflection on learning

Reflection on learning was successful when candidates gave specific details about what they had learned from their research, as well as what they had learned from their teammates about the topic and their different perspectives on it. The strongest responses often discussed not only what they had learned but also how this might impact on their own behaviour and attitudes in the future. Some candidates also discussed what further research on the issue might be useful and linked this clearly to gaps in their own knowledge not covered by their research. Some candidates concentrated their reflections solely on what they had learned in terms of skills: working with others, presentation skills and public speaking and researching. While these are all important aspects of learning, the focus in this criterion is on what candidates have learned about the issue identified by their team project.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/04
Cambridge Research Report

General comments

There are two major elements to this qualification, the process of choosing, developing, researching and reflecting on a topic and the finished product of the Cambridge Research Report. For both, moderation depends on clear input from teachers, but it is particularly important that evidence is provided which shows what marks were awarded for process. In many cases, this evidence was thorough and complete. The Teacher Record Form showing what levels the centre had awarded as the basis for the mark for AO1 research assessment objective were clear and helpful. The levels on the form were consistent with the overall level given and the comments on the log were consistent with the evidence of the candidate log itself. The centre comments were clearly related to the criteria in the mark scheme. The other pieces of evidence showing how the candidates discussed their research in an interview and whether they were able to sustain their conclusions, were in many cases helpful and focused, and the sheets showing the breakdown of the marks for each AO were often accompanied by clear comments.

In previous years this communication between centres and Moderators has been commented on favourably, but this year there were more problems with missing materials and inconsistencies between the levels shown on the record form and the overall mark awarded for Research. There were also cases where logs which were little more than a record of what had been read and showed little development or consideration of methodology were assessed too favourably leading to AO1 Research being over generously marked. The oral explanation form was not always used to record the interview with the learners and in some cases not filled in by the centre, but by the candidates. There were cases of relevant forms and even candidate logs not being included, leading to delays in moderation. Failure to include these materials relating to process may indicate some lack of understanding of the particular nature of this paper. Credit is not just given for a final report as in many coursework qualifications, but for candidates following the critical path and developing their questions, deciding on appropriate methodology and selection of evidence and being able to work independently and sustain the research and the critical thinking about the evidence and about their own findings. Integral to this is the reflection which should be included in the report. The log should show thinking about the progress and direction of research. However, when the report has been completed and conclusions drawn about the issue in the question, then it is vital that every candidate should step back and consider the way the research was conducted and the validity of the conclusions in the light of any limitations or problems. When no reflection is offered, then a key element of the whole research process has not been understood and it is important that it is not just the end product that is being assessed. It is the process that is the real learning experience and that must be recorded by the centre, the evidence must be sent with the report sample and seen as an integral part of this paper. Thanks are extended to centres which have shown a clear understanding of this and whose assessment of the process was so thorough and helpful.

Product

Centres are required to show why and how they have come to give marks for AO1 Analysis and AO1 Evaluation. This does require the close annotation of the reports and not just summative comments. Experience shows that without this annotation it is often difficult even for experienced Examiners to reach a judgement. Cambridge International has provided guidance on the use of annotation and when this was followed, then it was much easier to see why marks had been awarded. It is important that centres should show by this annotation when research materials are relevant to the perspective being explained and evaluated and when there is simply description of the content of a series of sources. There were strong analyses which neatly linked sources to the issue, synthesised information from different evidence and referenced the information carefully. In these analyses the key element was the perspective – that is the general overview. This is different from aspects or 'lenses' which are components of different perspectives. Sometimes the impression is given that whatever the issue in the question, candidates are seeking to find a

'social perspective' or an 'economic perspective' or a 'political perspective' instead of actually looking at the different arguments and establishing their strengths and weaknesses. This approach did lead some reports to stray quite markedly from the issue in the question and marginal annotation should show where reports drift away from the question. There were many reports which selected and explained very appropriate evidence and were able to link it to different overall perspectives and to reference it, so this is not a blanket criticism. However, even when assessing strong responses, marginal annotation is still important when marking.

As has been generally true with this qualification, the evaluation of evidence and arguments has proved more demanding than the selection and analysis of sources. Annotations are vital here to show where there has been sustained and supported judgement. In many cases there appeared to be no attempt to weigh differing perspectives or the evidence which supported them, but credit was still given by the centre markers for Evaluation. Evaluation does mean literally giving a value to something. This is a key skill which should be developed from the critical thinking demanded by the AS components. Without this, the report may well be more like a rather low- level essay which simply describes and explains different views but does not engage with the evidence supporting them to reach a decision. Marginal comments which reveal strong supported evaluation that goes beyond simply commenting on the author of the evidence and their qualifications, helps to establish when a higher level is justified. Absence of marginal comment on evaluation would indicate that the requirements for this critical judgement had not been met. It must be stressed that it is the report itself which should be marked for Analysis, Evaluation, Reflection and Communication, not the log. If the log shows evaluation and this is not reflected in the actual report, then there has been some misunderstanding of the point of keeping a log.

The requirement for Reflection has already been commented on. Some reflections were outstanding in that they looked again at the conclusions, reflected on how far research had modified initial thoughts and commented on the method and range of evidence suggesting what might have been done in a longer study or with the experience of the initial research. Less compelling reflection was simply based on the candidate's personal experience during the research period. Some reports lacked any specific reflection, and a separate section is strongly recommended.

The Communication mark should take into account the interview and how well the candidate defended their conclusions and methods as well as the level of written expression and how this led to clarity of argument. There was much fluent and effective writing and use of appropriate vocabulary. In general, there was broad agreement with centre assessment here, but it is important that the oral explanation should be completed correctly and included with the Report.

There was a wide variety of both topics and standards of critical analysis. Where candidates had a clear idea of what was required in terms of establishing perspectives by analysing and referencing a range of appropriate sources and evaluating the evidence and arguments in line with the underlying philosophy of the Critical Path, results were impressive and indeed interesting and stimulating. Where candidates focused more on describing and explaining views in a way more appropriate to a literature review, or where they seemed to be offering more of an essay than a critical report, there was obviously room for improvement. But what was clear was that the experience of independent research was of considerable personal and educational value and once again centres are thanked for allowing candidates to benefit from that and for their support of the qualification.