

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

Paper 9239/11
Paper 11

Key messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, to answer the questions set. This applied in all questions, for example in **Question 2** where there were 3 key words: convincing, view and sad. Several candidates simply evaluated the argument put forward by the author without addressing the subtleties of the question. Some did not respond to the idea of how much the arguments in one document were stronger than the other in **Question 3** so scored lower for judgement.

There was good balance between the time taken on each of the questions, so reflecting the number of marks available. There was little 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 evidence and 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 author's view 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 stronger 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** 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: 'convincing', 'view' and 'sad' in **Question 2** and 'stronger' in **Question 3**.

It was encouraging to see some candidates applying a higher-level skill by comparing the arguments put forward in the documents in **Question 3**, but some only gave a general judgement.

The length of answers was appropriate for the number of marks available and no candidate ran out of time. The most effective approach to **Question 1** (worth 6 marks) was to provide 3 separate paragraphs as this gave good structure. There was limited evidence of planning for the longer questions. If it had been included, the key words may have been addressed more fully and better structure of assessment and judgement would have been achieved.

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. In **Questions 2 and 3** full paragraphing in an essay format, rather than bullet points, should be used. In **Question 1** as the question required 'identify and explain', short paragraphs were best for each of the 3 approaches.

Most 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

As an 'Identify and Explain three approaches...' question, **Question 1** required candidates to create their own structure for their answer. This was best done by creating a separate paragraph (including both identification and explanation) for each approach. **Question 1** provides encouragement to candidates to fully read and digest the detail of **Document 1**. The key words in the question refer to the disappearance of traditional Yoruba architecture.

The question required candidates to identify and explain three **reasons for** the disappearance of traditional Yoruba architecture as mentioned by the author of Document 1. Emphasis is on the disappearance not on the reasons it developed in the first place.

Candidates scored one mark for a basic, correct identification that could be quoted from the text, for example, 'ex-slaves returned from Brazil' or 'Portland cement became popular' for each of three approaches. For the explanation mark there was a need to reflect the author's thoughts and meaning without introducing the candidate's only knowledge. It is also expected that the answer should be in the candidate's own words or a paraphrase of those of the author – not directly copied from the document. Correct synthesis of the author's words from different parts of the document are also creditworthy.

This example shows information taken from the document and then interpreted and rephrased by the candidate.

'...when European missionaries arrived (I) this aided the disappearance of the architecture as before, the construction of houses was 'not done professionally', so the arrival of the missionaries caused this part of Yoruba architecture to disappear through standardising (E) them.'

'...multi-storey homes became more popular as they symbolised wealth (I) meaning that Yoruba architecture began to disappear as people preferred multi-story houses to display wealth...traditional single-storey houses were marked out to gain more storeys reducing the number of traditional Yoruba homes.' (E)

Another example of a two-mark answer is:

'With the world being a global village (I) culture is not influencing Nigerian architecture as palaces are replaced by ultra-modern government houses and the rich want Caribbean-style mansions. This is because ancient courtyard buildings that (once) spoke of family wealth now indicate poverty as they are no longer in demand (E).'

Question 2

This question received a range of answers. Many did not consider the subtlety of the question, instead using a more formulaic approach to an 'argument' question. The question required an assessment of strengths and weaknesses of the author's view. While credibility of the author, use of evidence and style of writing (in a convincing manner) were all important, there should have been less emphasis on the structure (of the argument) as this did not fit the question, making it different to **Question 3**.

The highest achieving candidates recognised that the author could be considered to have credibility being a student of architecture and Nigerian, giving personal experience. Many candidates saw this as a strength, while others argued that it was a weakness owing to his lack of experience and possible local bias. There was limited reference to evidence that the author provided as the qualitative nature of it was less well recognised than had it been quantitative. Higher scoring candidates recognised evidence or provenance,

named appropriate examples, and explained why these showed strength. This three-stage approach tends to lead to higher marks.

For weaknesses, higher scoring candidates saw that there were some unsupported details especially in the conclusion, and that there was a one-sided view regarding the author's admiration for the traditional architecture, rather than considering the alternative view of modernisation.

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

As the question was, 'how convincing...', candidates need to give a judgement in order to obtain higher marks. Many only gave a limited judgement – a few gave no judgement at all.

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

'The article was written by Adams Adeosun, a Nigerian writer and a student in architecture. This gives him a huge advantage as he has extensive knowledge in the field of architecture and, also knows a lot about his Nigerian history. This increased the credibility of the article, making it very convincing as it is obvious that he is educated on the matter.'

The following example indicates how the candidate used evidence from the author to show the convincing nature of his view:

'He brings in valid and notable reasons behind the change, stating that foreigners with new ideas are the cause of the move away from traditional architecture. Valid evidence is given to persuade readers such as the 1842 incident when Reverend Townsend laid the foundation for the White House in Badagry. Laying out the exact instance of the switch to modernisation strengthens his point as it shows how traditional architecture began to disappear rather quickly...supports this by giving the example of Egun House in 1914.'

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

'One way in which the author's view that Yoruba architecture is disappearing is sad and not convincing is that there is a distinct lack of sources throughout the text. There is a lot of evidence used throughout but as there are no sources it can be assumed that the information stems only from the author's personal knowledge. This leads to a single perspective which shows bias.'

'Adeosun only gives arguments favouring the idea that architecture/culture is the number one priority. He makes it quite clear that he is against modernisation because, 'it crumbles the history' and mentions his priority for architecture many times. He even ends by saying that he is sad it is disappearing. He rarely makes a point on why it is good that people modernise. Therefore, the (lack of) balance could be considered a weakness.'

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 stronger than Document 1 or the opposite. It was possible to argue that neither was stronger or weaker than the other. In all cases justification for the final judgement was required.

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:

Provenance:

'The argument in Document 2 is stronger than the argument in Document 1 as the author, Kamara, can be considered an expert in the architectural front as she founded and is Principal of Atelier Masomi, an architectural practice. She also founded 'a global collective of architects' While the evidence is not sourced it is more likely to be factual as it comes from a credible source who could have a vested interest to state the truth or lose her credibility. Document 1's evidence is also not sourced but, as Aleosun is a writer and candidate of architecture, the information is less credible, making the argument in Document 2 stronger.'

An alternative perspective is:

'Kamara also puts forward a more balanced argument as she acknowledges that African architecture can both be traditional, as she explains in the third paragraph, 'a second approach... and modern. In paragraph 6 she explains, 'some architects believe the way forward for African architecture is through a unique modern identity' and positively describes this as 'very exciting'. Document 1 on the other hand is strongly against the modernisation of architecture and places this modernisation in a more negative light with words such as '...our history is crumbling...' and '...sad'. Its author only looks at the positive sides of Yoruba architecture.'

Judgement – this example concludes that Document 2 is stronger than Document 1. This is a summary of intermediate judgements that had been made throughout the answer.

'In my judgement, the argument in Document 2 is stronger than the argument in Document 1 as it focuses more on specific examples to exemplify points rather than generalising which occurs in Document 1. Also, the author of Document 2 is more credible as she is an expert in the subject, therefore making it stronger than document 1 overall.'

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 & RESEARCH

Paper 9239/12
Paper 12

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(a)**: 'positive consequences', **Question 1(b)**: 'barriers', **Question 2**: 'evidence' and **Question 3**: 'stronger'.

There was a good balance between the time taken on each of the questions, so reflecting the number of marks available. There was no 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 stronger 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)** 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**.

The length of answers was generally appropriate for the number of marks available and no candidate appeared to run out of time. 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 digest the detail of Document 1. The key words in the question refer to positive consequences of low birth rate in South Korea.

Many candidates scored full marks and indeed, sometimes included more than two measures.

For example, listing:

1. 'An economic Blessing'
2. 'Households saved more'
3. 'Households invested in children's development'

Reference to negative consequences, like less tax paid, and Government policies for increasing birth rate were not relevant to the question.

- (b) The question required candidates to identify and explain two barriers to increased birth-rate,

Candidates scored one mark for an identification 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. 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.

The following examples show information taken from paragraphs 4 and 5 and then interpreted and rephrased by the candidate.

'(Cost of Education) ...parents need to pay a high amount of money of the children's education (such as teacher, college fee) in order to educate their children well. It leads to reduced birth-rate, because most of the parents give birth when they can afford to pay the costs and raise their children.'

'(Decreasing numbers of marriages) ...most of the children are born to married couples but the number of marriages is decreasing...due to economic reasons. Marriage requires employment and high amounts of money to pay costs of housing which is very hard and economically impossible for unmarried young couples leading to reduced number of marriages.'

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

'The first barrier identified by the author is the cost of education (I) as South Korean parents spend 7 per cent of their disposable income on private teachers and pay absurdly high process for children's college education. This limits the number of children parents can afford to raise.'

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. In an 'evidence' question the provenance of the document and the credibility of the author is only 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. 'absurdly high price') 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, not just identifying them, or not referencing the document. Several candidates made basic statements without explaining or developing them.

An example of an answer that recognises the author's credibility to select appropriate evidence is:

'The author is an expert in the field of economics as he was Chief Economist of the Asian Development Bank and an advisor to former South Korean President... This means that he likely has access to a wide array of data and expertise to use evidence that accurately and honestly portrays the situations mentioned in the document and thus support his arguments. This is a strength of his evidence.'

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

'The author uses a wide range of both recent and historical. He provides much statistical and empirical data, such as quoting the fertility rates and college enrolments for women in 1980 and 2015 which makes the argument seem more concrete....'

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

'...the problem here is that the author compares the cost of South Korea to other OECD countries. The author lacks evidence that is sourced to offer a comparison of costs of education. With no sourced evidence it is difficult to believe in the accuracy of the evidence. It further weakens the evidence as the author might have picked evidence from a source with biased intentions.'

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 stronger than Document 1 or the opposite. It was possible to argue that one was neither more nor less strong. 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.

‘Both arguments talk about birth-rate related issues. Document 2 takes a more global perspective and makes a better structured argument. Document 1 on the other hand is written by someone with greater expertise, is more detailed and the argument is more decisive. Both arguments also show some strengths as in their use of a wide array of evidence and many weaknesses such as the lack of named sources and lack of first-hand perspectives. Both also have differences due to their different geographical perspectives and non-conflicting conclusions. As a result of all of this, I cannot conclude that one document is stronger than the other, thus, the argument in Document 2 is not much stronger, if at all, than the arguments presented in Document 1 on the issues of birth-rate.’

Scope – A global view

‘Document 1 mainly focuses on history whilst Document 2 focuses on the present, ‘technology plays a greater role in the birth rate each year’. Also, the author in document 2 uses more globally relevant evidence to support his argument, ‘women who continue education, as in Japan, have fewer babies. In Eritrea, where education is lacking the birth-rate is 4.6. Using global evidence affects the strength of the argument as it shows the impact of low and high education levels more clearly and effectively.’

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 & RESEARCH

Paper 9239/13
Paper 13

Key messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, to answer the questions set. This applied in all questions, for example in **Question 1** where some candidates evaluated the Kenyan approach to poaching rather than just the Lewa conservation area, as required in the question. Some did not respond to the idea of how convincing the arguments were in **Question 3** so scored lower for judgement.

There was good balance between the time taken on each of the questions, so reflecting the number of marks available. There was no 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 evidence and 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** 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, 'Lewa' in **Question 1**, 'evidence' in **Question 2** and 'convincing' in **Question 3**.

It was encouraging to see some candidates applying a higher-level skill by comparing the arguments put forward in the documents in **Question 3**, but some only gave a general judgement.

The length of answers was appropriate for the number of marks available and no candidate ran out of time. This was an improvement on last year. The most effective approach to **Question 1** (worth 6 marks) was to provide 3 separate paragraphs as this gave good structure. There was limited evidence of planning for the longer questions. If it had been included, the key words may have been addressed more fully and better structure of assessment and judgement would have been achieved.

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. In **Questions 2 and 3** full paragraphing in an essay format, rather than bullet points, should be used. In **Question 1** as the question required 'identify and explain', short paragraphs were best for each of the 3 approaches.

Most 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

As an 'Identify and Explain three approaches...' question, **Question 1** required candidates to create their own structure for their answer. This was best done by creating a separate paragraph (including both identification and explanation) for each approach. **Question 1** provides encouragement to candidates to fully read and digest the detail of **Document 1**. The key words in the question refer to the approached impacting the Lewa Conservation Area (so, not the impact on Kenya as a whole).

The question required candidates to identify and explain three approaches that have helped the Lewa conservation area combat poaching.

Candidates scored one mark for a basic, correct identification that could be quoted from the text, for example, 'reform poachers' or 'investigation of corruption' for each of three approaches. For the explanation mark there was a need to reflect the author's thoughts and meaning without introducing the candidate's only knowledge. It is also expected that the answer should be in the candidate's own words or a paraphrase of those of the author – not directly copied from the document. Correct synthesis of the author's words from different parts of the document are also creditworthy.

This example shows information taken from paragraph 6 and 4 and then interpreted and rephrased by the candidate.

'...the surrounding communities are a great line of defence (I). If neighbouring communities to Lewa also are against poaching, it makes it harder for people to infiltrate or escape if they are trying to poach in these areas (E).'

Another example of a two-mark answer is:

'...head of Lewa, Ekiru, hired poachers to work on the conservation land (I). This also removed them from the poaching community so there less people harming rhinos and elephants (E).'

It was not appropriate to refer to details such as: *'There is a new maximum penalty of life imprisonment for poachers...'* as this refers to the whole of Kenya rather than just Lewa Conservation Area.

Question 2

This question was generally well answered with 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.

The highest achieving candidates recognised that the author used a range of supporting evidence including first-hand (primary) evidence through interviews with local people. They also recognised the appropriate use of statistics, for example, the amount of ivory burnt in one month. Higher scoring candidates recognised evidence, named appropriate examples, and explained why they showed evidence as a strength. This three stage approach tends to lead to higher marks.

For weaknesses, higher scoring candidates saw that there were some unsupported details, for example what role the Kenyan Wildlife Service (KWS) has as there is no supporting detail or source in the document. Also, the statistics related to the burning of 100 tonnes of ivory was unsourced. Higher scoring candidates explained how both 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, not just identifying them, or not referencing the document. Several candidates made basic statements without explaining or developing them.

In an 'evidence' question the provenance of the document and the credibility of the author is only relevant when it shows the author's ability to research and select appropriate evidence.

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

'Document 1 (Adam Vaughan) uses an abundance of strong evidence to emphasize the dangers of poaching on Kenya. Vaughan uses a variety of perspectives such as the of former poachers (Ali and Lofak), conservationists (Dr Leakey) and the leader of a conservation area (Eriku). The large range of perspectives strengthens the credibility of the evidence as the reader is able to see the true extent of the problem of poaching from those trying to stop poaching and those who once took part in poaching.'

This example shows how the candidate has addressed the sources of evidence, explained the significance of the sources and given examples from the document.

'Vaughan also used the first-hand experiences of Abdi Ali and Lochuch Lofak, former full-time poachers. The personal testimonies of the poaches gave an insight to the illegal trade thus helping the readers gauge the extent of poaching in Kenya, thus strengthening Doc 1's evidence.'

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

'One weakness was a lack of sourced data. Although there were statistics, many such as USD 40000 – USD 60000 on the black market, did not have a stated source. This weakened the evidence and its credibility as readers would not know whether they could trust the data.'

'One weakness is that some of the claims mentioned are not backed up by any sources. For example, the opening sentence: 'Kenya is losing more elephants and rhino than ever before' cannot be validated as there is no source to back it up. The claim is also vague as it does not specify how many more elephants and rhino are being lost as well as any comparison timeframe. Also not backed up: 'More ivory is shipped from Mombasa than anywhere else in Africa.'

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 neither was more convincing. In all cases justification for the final judgement was required.

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:

Provenance:

This is an example of an approach reflecting possible bias

'Document 2 is not stronger than Document 1 because the context of the authors in Document 2 may be biased. Although they are in a much higher position to make authoritative claims, their vested interest to promote their organisation can lead to selectivity. (The first world wildlife crime report was published by

UNODC) This means they are more selective as by using examples and evidence from their own organisation can limit the accuracy of the argument. In Document 1 the author does not have any gains from reporting on poaching in Kenya hence the evidence may be less subjective. ...Document 2 focuses on promoting the event that UNODC and CITES co-hosted...'

An alternative perspective is:

'A reason Document 2 is stronger than Document 1 is that both the authors of Document 2 are able to peer-review their article. This means that information can be assessed and reviewed by both authors before going to publication...'

Judgement – although not entirely accurate this gives a good final judgement relating to the equally convincing nature of Documents 1 and 2.

'In conclusion, both documents had various strengths and weaknesses – Document 1 had a wider range of perspectives but less expertise – while Document 2 was more global yet potentially unbalanced and biased. I believe that they were both equally strong as both sources had similarities in reliability and reliable sources and originating from a reputable publication...'

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 & RESEARCH

Paper 9239/02
Paper 2

Key messages

- Developing coherent perspectives requires candidates to make links between their research materials. Evidence and arguments from different authors should be synthesised to form coherent perspectives.
- Conclusions should be reflective and demonstrate how the candidate's thinking has changed throughout the process of researching and writing the essay. Conclusions also need to consider relevant areas for further research.
- Source material used to should be critically evaluated. Candidates must consider what makes the selected source appropriate and relevant, candidates must also recognise any weaknesses of the source material.

General comments

Much of the work seen by Examiners was of good quality and demonstrated engagement with a range of global topics. Popular topics that enabled candidates to develop contrasting perspectives included Artificial Intelligence, Sustainable Futures, Tourism and Alternatives to Oil, amongst others. There is a list of topics published in the syllabus.

Global Perspectives and Research is a skills-based syllabus and in completing the Essay component candidates are assessed against seven different criteria. All the criteria have equal weighting. As ever the candidate needs to balance their response in order to demonstrate all of the skills being assessed. It remains the case that some essays omitted to address all the criteria. Two key omissions were critical evaluation of source material and the development of globally contrasting perspectives.

This Principle Examiner's 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 will address the interplay between them and should enable teachers to see some of the areas where improvements would be welcome as well as examples of successful practice from this series.

Perspectives

The syllabus defines perspectives as a coherent world view which is a response to an issue. The most important aspect for candidates to recognise is the need to identify two contrasting perspectives, i.e. perspectives that respond to an issue in a contrasting way. The November series saw much improvement here with the vast majority of candidates successfully setting up a debate between two contrasting perspectives.

Choice of title is key to success here. 'Should we ban single use plastic?' is an effective title that offers the opportunity for debate between two distinct points of view. 'To what extent should governments limit freedom of speech?' This example is equally effective though does not set up a yes/no debate but rather a more nuanced examination of the pros and cons of freedom of speech.

A title such as 'How do we stop hate crimes?' is unlikely to offer the basis of a successful essay. There is no explicit contrast within the question. Title questions beginning with the word 'How' are less likely to set up a clear debate.

Once candidates have established a contrast between two perspectives, they need to treat each perspective fairly. This syllabus aims to get candidates to engage with a range of views on global issues. The most

successful candidates will be those who are able to give a fair hearing to perspectives that they may not necessarily agree with.

The skill of giving contrasting perspectives an equal hearing is assessed through the level of empathy and balance the candidate affords each perspective. Empathy will come through in the manner a candidate engages with perspectives. Candidates do need to evaluate each perspective but in a measured and considered way. Ideally it will not be obvious which perspective the candidate has sided with until they make their final evaluative judgement in the conclusion.

Balance will be demonstrated in two ways. Firstly, each perspective should be given equal space in the essay and secondly each perspective should be supported by arguments and evidence derived from a balanced range of source materials. A perspective that is supported by academic source material from prestigious universities contrasted with a perspective supported by sources lacking in credibility would not be deemed balanced.

Candidates should be made aware of the importance of synthesis when developing their contrasting perspectives. The definition of perspectives outlined above made mention of 'a coherent world view'. Candidates need to make links between source materials; making it clear how one source supports or corroborates another source.

This can be seen in the following example:

'let us consider the perspective 'technology is not effective in creating social justice'. A source that associates with this perspective is a document by O' Donoghue, a research manager . . . An article by Milano 'The digital skills gap is widening fast' also supports this perspective . . . another article by Naude and Nagler 'Is technological innovation making society more unequal?', further emphasises the perspective.'

This candidate clearly demonstrates the synthesis of evidence and argument into a unified and coherent perspective.

Having discussed the need to have balanced and contrasting perspectives that are built through the synthesis of argument and evidence there is one more element that candidates need to consider. The perspectives need to have a global contrast. Unfortunately, this remains an area that many candidates do not adequately consider.

The essay mentioned above 'Should we ban single use plastic?' was one that successfully developed globally contrasting perspectives. The candidate focused on the consequences of dumping of plastic at sea in the Philippines and how Bangladesh was the first country to ban plastic bags. From the other perspective the candidate focused on a Danish report that argued cotton reusable bags have detrimental environmental impacts and the importance of single use plastic in US hospitals. By using evidence and arguments relating to diverse parts of the world the candidate successfully develops globally contrasting perspectives.

Source Material

Research is a core skill for this syllabus and a successful essay needs to be informed by varied research. Candidates must support their perspectives with evidence and arguments emanating from reliable and relevant sources. To reach higher attainment levels candidates should gather their source material from publications with a range of global provenance. This could be comprised of an academic article from the National University of Singapore and an article from The New Yorker magazine, used to support one perspective and the contrasting perspective being supported by articles from The South China Morning Post and Al Jazeera. A candidate using sources such as these would demonstrate the necessary skill of research and source selection required for a top-level response. Many candidates demonstrated excellent research skills this series and the range of source material used was often globally diverse.

Having selected their source materials, the next requirement for candidates is to demonstrate their understanding of the selected material. To do this the candidate must first read and analyse the source material, which should have an appropriate level of complexity, and then be able to present the source's arguments in a coherent manner. The candidate needs to be able to express the arguments emanating from the source in a controlled manner and in so doing demonstrate a strong understanding. Many candidates were able to engage with complex source material and offer thoughtful explanations that outlined the central arguments.

This short extract from a Level 5 essay demonstrates strong understanding of source material, succinctly putting forward the author's argument supported by effective use of quotations. The candidate is able to synthesise arguments which further demonstrates control and understanding of their source material.

'An article by Jonathon Ford (2019), after sourcing data from the US National Renewable Energy Laboratory, concluded that a hypothetical renewable offshore-wind scheme would cost 'about £722/kW', whereas a nuclear plant of the same energy output would be '£6400/kW', plus a further £300 – £4000 for financing costs. While nuclear energy comes out as more in total, Ford adds that the nuclear plant would 'last at least twice as long as offshore renewables', so perhaps cost no longer has to be a barrier for nuclear plants. To further support this argument, Echavarri (2016) points out that 'renewable energies are much more expensive since their operating hours of 2000 – 2500 per year on average are far fewer than the 7500 – 8000 per year nuclear reactors achieve.'

The final skill the candidates are required to demonstrate is the critical evaluation of the source materials. In essence the candidate should demonstrate why the source is worthy of being used but also acknowledge any weaknesses it may contain. This is an area of the essay that candidates still find difficult to get right. Too much emphasis on critical evaluation will not give the opportunity for candidates to demonstrate understanding whereas limited or no critical evaluation – still far too common – will prevent candidates from reaching higher levels. Candidates should evaluate at least two sources, one from each side of the debate. They should try and use a range of criteria when doing so. This could be the use of evidence, vested interest, author credibility, logic of argument, balance or provenance amongst many other possible areas for critical evaluation.

Many candidates are too assertive in their responses.

'(The author) Arwa Mahdawi is a Guardian columnist and a brand strategist based in New York. Since Mahdawi is a brand strategist her article could be biased.'

This example references the professional credentials of the author and then asserts that her article could be biased. The candidate is leaving too much unsaid; why is being a brand strategist likely to make one biased?

Another example will demonstrate a more evaluate tone and insightful critique of source material.

'The use of evidence from a credible government organisation strengthens the argument as it was most likely researched for scientific purposes and would be relatively unbiased. The Ford (2019) article's context strengthens it further as the publisher, The Financial Times, is considered to (sic) highly reliable for fact checking.'

Conclusions

Candidate conclusions should be supported and reflective. Conclusions should also outline possibilities of further research that could be considered in the light of the candidate's judgement.

A supported conclusion should link explicitly back to the question posed in the title and should follow on logically from the debate that has been presented. The candidates should have presented a balanced debate between two contrasting perspectives and the conclusion is their opportunity to evaluate the merits of the debate and offer a final judgement.

This series saw many candidates base their conclusion on the relative strength of the source material supporting each perspective. This is not an effective approach as the conclusion is determined by the quality of the supporting sources rather than the pros and cons of each coherent perspective.

'To conclude . . . looking at the reliability of the four articles, most of them are strong . . . As the first two articles have more and better evidence than the last two that are against the statement, yes, vegetarianism should be mandatory worldwide.'

The example above has not considered the merits of the perspectives in reaching a conclusion but simply arrived at a judgement based on their evaluation of source material. Candidates who took this approach did not reach higher levels for their conclusions.

'from one side of the argument it is recognised that shark finning is an important part of Chinese culture . . . the other perspective demonstrates that sharks are important for the ecosystem as they are apex predators and their survival is essential for the entire ocean ecosystem. The global ecosystem carries more importance

than national culture so I conclude that arguments for banning shark finning outweigh the arguments against it.'

In this example the candidate has weighed up the merits of each perspective and arrived at a final conclusion, which is supported.

Reflection was far more prevalent in conclusions this series for which candidates were rewarded. When reflecting candidates should consider what they thought when formulating the title of their essay and then consider how research and engagement with different perspectives has shaped their thinking. This can be done quite succinctly as can be seen by the example below.

'Before I began my research, I was in support of nuclear energy, despite living in a staunchly nuclear free country. However, this research has made me realise that it is not simply about which source generates the most electricity. It has made me more open-minded to the disadvantages of nuclear energy and I acknowledge that we cannot rely on one source of energy alone.'

The final thing to consider in the conclusion is a suggestion for further research. Too many candidates omitted this aspect of the essay. The candidates should consider how their essay could be improved by suggesting areas of further research that could take the debate forward. Once again this can be done quite succinctly as can be seen by the very successful example below.

'I could have improved my research by finding a larger variety of views on this issue, however, with the decreasing frequency of research on this topic, it was very difficult. To fill this gap, we must examine the effects of cultural imperialism, especially concerning urbanisation and globalisation. We also must examine glocalisation, which combines elements from both global and local cultures to create cultural products, and determine how it aids local cultures as well as how it acts as an agent for cultural imperialism.'

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. The use of discursive makers to guide the reader through the essay is a good way to do this. Many candidates successfully employed discursive markers such as: firstly, secondly or finally to show the order of ideas. Intermediate conclusions can be signalled by markers such as: consequently or therefore. Many candidates were able to signal a shift in perspectives using markers such as: however, alternatively or on the other hand.

Finally, candidates must offer full referencing of their source material via citations and a bibliography. To reach the higher levels, as many candidates did, the referencing needs to be effective. To be considered effective, referencing should be consistent and functional i.e. the relationship between citation and the bibliography is readily discernible.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

Paper 9239/03
Team Project

Key messages

Issues were successfully defined when placed within a larger context, and supported by research which was woven through the presentation as a whole.

Presentations were effectively structured when they defined issues and built solutions progressively throughout what was said.

Enough time needed to be left within the presentation to include a detailed solution.

Successful candidates engaged with their slides as part of their argument.

Reflective papers worked well where they evaluated the candidate's own performance within the context of the team and the material within which they had been engaging.

General comments

Team projects selected a wide range of engaging issues and there were many good examples of candidates working together as well as individually to present their research and argue for solutions, as well as reflecting on their experiences. This report explores these using the criteria for assessment as a structure.

Definition of issue and range of research

The majority of candidates successfully defined or clearly defined their issue by stating it clearly and maintaining that definition with some development of detail. Relatively few moved to precise definition however. This was because candidates did not tend to make the link between their particular area of focus with the over-arching group issue and having embarked on their own area of focus and their elaboration of it, they did not place it in the context of that larger issue. The minority of candidates who did not reach Level 3 on this criterion were at that level mainly because there was a lack of focus on the main issue and they tried to cover an inconsistent mixture of different areas. The most successful use of research wove it through presentations to support both information and argument. For example, a presentation on educational reform and employment which reports that the unemployment rate in India is 6.1 per cent but sets alongside this the 165 million who are underemployed in addition to the 188 million unemployed, thus using this evidence to argue that underemployment is the real problem. Where research was at Level 2, this was generally because it was apparent that very little had been done and little or no data was provided other than the candidate's own assertions, or some of the research was only tangentially relevant to the issue and/or argument.

Differentiation of perspective

Most candidates succeeded in identifying their own perspective and those of their teammates. Presentations scored higher on this criterion when groupmates' perspectives were elaborated to an extent their and the differences between them explained. At Level 2, most of the candidates either mentioned what perspective they had adopted, or, in some cases, did not explicitly identify it although made it clear over the course of the presentation what that perspective was.

Structure of argument and support

Some candidates took the approach of presenting an argument in one paragraph and then went on to refute the argument in the next with no conclusion drawn and this led to a segmented approach which made it harder for them to build a sustained argument about a problem and solutions. Other candidates presented

'piece by piece' arguments culminating in 'mini solutions' which were never brought together, even at the end of the presentation. More successful candidates used signposting words as discursive indicators at a paragraph level (e.g. 'first', 'next', 'finally') to indicate its relationship to what came before and what is to follow. Support for arguments varied considerably. Sometimes candidates simply gave examples or provided some elaboration to illustrate the points they were making. Candidates who achieved Level 4 or above usually developed examples with specific, sourced quantitative or qualitative data to support their argument.

Conclusion and Solution

The strongest work identified the focus of the presentation at the outset and then summed up all the key arguments before presenting the solution. There were some candidates whose solutions were built up throughout the response and this did provide solid focus. However, it was sometimes the case with this approach that there was no obvious conclusion which made the structure less clear. Occasionally, candidates who built up too much information in the time they had available without coming to a conclusion or identifying a solution ran out of time and their conclusion, when it came, fell outside the eight minute running time and could not be marked. Those candidates who had built up their solutions throughout the presentation were successful because the solution was there already before they reached the end.

Presentational methods

Centres utilised a number of methods this session in order to conduct socially distanced presentations. Within these, individual candidates demonstrated a range of presentational achievement. Some candidates projected a single slide behind them listing all of the perspectives within their team. However, where they then did not refer to this at all during their presentation this did not add anything and could not be credited. In addition, a single slide is not an effective approach for a presentation in showing the development of an argument, especially where it did not separately identify the issue and its solutions. Some centres used 'Zoom' or 'Teams' with a picture of the presenter in one corner. This worked well as long as the presenter engaged with the slides, rather than only reading a memorised script. Slides were less successful when used as an additional transcript, but more successful when they were explicitly referenced to elaborate on a particularly important point. Candidates then referred to them explicitly in explaining their importance. Slides worked best when they were an integral part of the argument made in the presentation, and candidates made concerted efforts to explicitly engage with them.

Reflective Paper: evaluation of collaboration

Some reflective papers only described what the team did, rather than analysing how they did it and what impact this had on the group and their work. The strongest work showed candidates engaging with not only the strengths and weaknesses of the group's work as a team but also the part their personal strengths and weaknesses in enhancing or detracting from the team effort and the impact of this. Some candidates spoke of their own reticence in working as part of a group, or their tendency to dominate and this provided good opportunities for evaluation.

Reflective Paper: reflection on learning

Most candidates were able to identify some concrete things they had learned about the issue itself – either from their own research or that of their teammates. General statements such as 'I learned a lot about this issue' without specifying what had been learnt did not add to the usefulness of reflective papers. In the best work, candidates explained clearly any specific new learning about the issue both from their own research and what their teammates researched or presented and they often touched on the impact this had had on them at a personal level.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

Paper 9239/04
Paper 4

Key messages

- A report should use, evaluate and synthesise evidence.
- Reflection is an integral part of the process of critical research.
- Logs should drive the research process not merely describe findings.

General comments

There was variation in topics and approach to the research process and the use of evidence. Strongest reports maintained a focus on the issue rather than offering information about the general topic. It was helpful when markers' annotations showed a distinction between simple description and factual material taken from evidence and supported evaluation and judgement which used evidence. In some cases, what was being presented was more like a general project than an investigation into an issue which made conscious use of the critical skills developed in the earlier Global Perspective papers. At the higher end of the mark range, there was a clear analysis of different perspectives about the issue in the question. Evidence was brought to bear which both supported and challenged different overall viewpoints. The evidence was treated critically using a range of critical thinking criteria. There were clear interim judgements to help the reader engage with the follow of the argument and these judgements were consistent with the final conclusions which followed logically from the critical analysis offered.

The entire report was firmly evidence based with sound referencing and a realistic bibliography. The best work did show that the report showed an understanding of the critical process with reputable, if competing, evidence treated critically and here was evidence of synthesis of evidence and also an ability to reconcile competing viewpoints in what were often nuanced and balanced conclusions. Lower scoring reports made very little reference to evidence in the body of the report, despite the inclusion of a bibliography, or used a narrow range of evidence, some of it inappropriate to an advanced level study. The impression given was of an essay, rather than a report on evidence. Luckily, this was not common, but there was work which seemed to be more like a literature review than a final developed report. Thus, a survey of evidence was undertaken, involving a general description of what the sources contained, not always focused on the topic, with some consideration of the author's qualifications and the origin of the evidence. A series of sources supporting a view was considered in this way, largely discretely and this was followed by a series of sources which challenged the view. The sources were not considered in relation to each other and there was little attempt to synthesise the supporting evidence. By working through the evidence collected in this way, the overall argument and evaluation of the perspective as a whole was often lost and the result was not so much an integrated analysis but a series of descriptions and comments on evidence.

Some candidates organised their reports using subheadings based on different aspects of the topic. In some cases, these seemed to be formulaic rather than arising naturally from the nature of the debate. So regardless of the topic, predetermined aspects such as 'political', 'social', 'economic' were considered. Within these subsections, sources were described with various degrees of focus on the actual topic. There was sometimes a reference to 'perspectives' but what was being considered were not always different arguments and views behind an overall viewpoint, but rather different elements or aspects. It is really the overall perspective that should be analysed and judged and starting simply with a review of separate pieces of evidence or different aspects of the topic was not always helpful in reaching a balanced conclusion, consistent with a through critical analysis.

Evaluation should not rely on simply looking at the author's credentials. It has become very apparent in the pandemic that experts with very similar credentials and working in a well-established medical or academic establishments writing in similarly respected publications have come to very different conclusions as to what should be done as a result of their studies. This is an object lesson in the limitations of relying on these

relatively simple means of assessing evidence without looking at assumptions, the basis of evidence, the consequences of adopting actions based on the views and corroboration. Even the way evidence is presented may be significant. It may seem comforting for example if a vaccine has proved 70 per cent effective but if the findings were recording as nearly a third of those taking it were not likely to be safe, then it might be more worrying. However, if one knew that flu vaccines were considered to work well if they achieved 70 per cent effectiveness then this might be more reassuring, but if the sample of vaccine tests were known – did hundreds trial it? Did thousands? Then a fuller judgement might be established. If knowledge about storage, temperature control and distribution problems were gathered from other sources and brought to bear, then a fuller picture still of the implications of the research might emerge. Simply looking at the academic credentials of vaccine teams is quite limited, though obviously not irrelevant.

To develop this point, the logs should do more than simply record the process of research as a sort of diary, e.g.

Today I met my teacher and we discussed the topic. Then I went to the Library, but it was shut, so I worked on my computer and found some sources on my topic) or simply outline findings. (I read a website giving me an insight into my topic. This was from the World Wildlife Association. It showed me that endangered species.....)

The log should give an insight into the process of research, how evidence was reflected on and how further issues arising was researched and evaluated. This means the log is not just a diary but a working document. Logs did vary from little more than bibliographies to substantial documents running to more words than the actual report. There is a sensible midway point, and it was the intention that logs help learners to develop their ideas and research, rather than becoming a very onerous and time-consuming activity. The quality rather than the quantity of the log should be taken into account, when assessing AO1. If no log is offered, then the mark for AO1 Research cannot go beyond Level 1.

Reflection is a key element and not merely a small adjunct to the report. It is strongly recommended that it is written under a separate heading. Reflection should step back from the report by reviewing how research had modified initial ideas, by considering the scope of the research and the methodology and by stating how far these enabled a sound judgement to be made. Reflecting on decisions is an important life skill and vital when decisions have to be made about competing viewpoints, so is well worth developing. There is a distinction between simple musings on the process and using developed critical skills to consider methodology, evidence which led to a personal judgement and implications arising from the judgement. The marks given should take into account the depth of self-analysis offered.

The opportunities offered to candidates to undertake this sort of critical research are increasingly valuable as more and more information and opinions are accessible. More detailed information does not always mean wiser judgement and so encouraging learners to engage with competing views and evidence is of huge value. Teachers who have facilitated this by support of this qualification are to be warmly thanked and encouraged, especially in demanding and difficult times. The above comments are intended to support valuable work, not as a criticism and thanks are extended to all who have worked so hard on this qualification.