

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/11
Written Examination 11

Key messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, to answer all the questions set. This applied in all questions, for example in **Question 1**: 'identify', 'as given by the author', **Question 1b**: 'negative', **Question 2**: 'evidence' and 'impact', **Question 3**: 'perspectives', 'judgement' and 'stronger'.

Many candidates spent too long on **Question 1** and so left themselves short of time for **Question 2 and Question 3** which had much higher total marks. **Question 1** only required short answers or bullet points.

To gain higher marks in **Questions 2 and 3** there should be clear development of the points made. For example, making a point, illustrating using information or appropriate quotes from the text and explaining it in the context of the document. Instead of just stating **what** a strength or weakness may be, the candidates should also explain **how** or **why** it is a strength or weakness. There should also be explicit reference to perspectives in **Question 3** and reflection on the impact of the evidence in **Question 2**. In both documents, judgements are required.

Candidates will not gain credit for using material from their own knowledge that is not contained within the documents. Copying from the document is acceptable in the identification questions in **Question 1** but not for analysis and evaluation in **Question 2 and Question 3**.

The marking approach is closely linked to the Assessment Objectives (AOs) given in the syllabus. These AOs are split into distinct aspects so candidates should be aware of what they are assessing and develop their answers accordingly.

AOs requiring specific improvement are: AO1c (Evaluation) in **Question 2** and AO1b (Perspectives) in **Question 3**.

General comments

There was little evidence of candidates misunderstanding the documents and many showed an understanding of the requirements of the questions and adapted to the direction given. However, several candidates did not respond effectively to the need to explain the impact of the evidence on the author's argument in **Question 2**. This was specifically mentioned in the second part of the question emphasising the need to read and understand the whole of the question before answering. Equally some responses did not address the authors' perspectives in **Question 3** as mentioned in the question. Some also gave only cursory intermediate judgements or a final judgement that could have applied to any set of documents.

Many candidates organised their time well. However, a significant number spent too long on **Question 1 and Question 2** leaving less time for **Question 3** which was worth over half the number of available marks. It is important to recognise the value of each question and to write an appropriate amount.

Some answers to **Question 3** were not fully developed or supported by precise references to the documents. Stronger responses selected relevant and appropriate points from the documents and evaluated their significance as part of the argument. Stronger answers also considered the authors' perspectives and compared them in both documents.

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

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Question 1 encourages candidates to fully read and understand the detail of both documents before starting the questions. The question paper indicates that approximately 15 minutes should be used for this. It is included within the time set for the exam. Answers only need to be brief and can be in bullet points. A significant number of candidates wrote long answers which inevitably restricted the time available for the much higher number of available marks in **Question 2** and **Question 3**.

There are two parts to **Question 1**. **1(a)** refers to **Document A** and **1(b)** refers to **Document B**. Candidates are encouraged to answer both questions before proceeding to **Question 2**.

Both parts of the question are looking for candidates to **identify** points mentioned by the Author. There is no requirement nor expectation that explanation is included. Copying appropriately from the document is acceptable.

Question 1(a) was looking for candidates to **identify** different ways the juvenile system is better for young offenders according to the author of **Document A**.

Many gained the full three marks by mentioning, for example, more rehabilitation, lower re-arrest rates and more protection (by having their records hidden from public view). Some mentioned only rehabilitation, education and community service as their three ways. However, these were parts of the same way that the juvenile system is better for young offenders, so only counted as one of the three different ways required by the question.

An example of a 3-mark answer was:

- *'The Juvenile Justice System has more rehabilitation.'*
- *'Juveniles who go through the youth justice system have lower re-arrest rates.'*
- *'The juvenile system offers more protection.'*

A 1-mark answer was:

- *Engaged them in education (Correct)*
- *Community Service (Repetition so no further mark)*
- *Work with people their own age (Repetition so no further mark).*

Question 1(b) was looking for candidates to **identify** two different negative effects of prison on prisoners as given by the author of **Document B**. Many candidates gained two marks by recognising that mixing of violent and non-violent prisoners led to influencing or recruiting of non-violent offenders and that prisoners were subjected to stigmatization when they left prison.

An example of an approach to **Question 1(b)** giving 1 out of 2 marks was:

- People believe that when they are imprisoned, they automatically lose their right to basic humanity (Incorrect – it is our belief not an effect of prison).
- When prisoners are released many of them are uneducated and poor (Incorrect as not linked directly to the effect of prison) which makes it very difficult for them to reintegrate into society (Correct).

Question 2

This question was generally well answered with most candidates correctly assessing to some extent the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author to support their argument. Some candidates concentrated more on the assessment of the argument which was not expected in this question. There was a specific requirement in the question to explain the impact of the evidence on the author's argument. Most candidates attempted some explanation, but few were able to develop this sufficiently to achieve higher

marks. The question was looking for analysis of 'evidence' and so answers that related to language or structure were not credited in this question.

Most common discussion points were around the provenance of the author, the statistics and sources used, the limited focus and limited global view. Candidates seemed better able to address strengths accurately and so answers might have been unbalanced. In many cases evidence later in the answer had less discussion.

Candidates were assessed on Assessment Objective 1 (AO1 – research, analysis, and evaluation). The three aspects were Identifying evidence (AO1a), Analysing the strengths and weaknesses of evidence (AO1b), and evaluating evidence (AO1c). Many candidates gained high marks for AO1a. Marks for AO1b showed the greatest range. Many candidates scored lower marks for AO1c.

A clearly structured approach for some was to:

- Identify a type of evidence (AO1a)
- give an example from the document (AO1a)
- assess whether it is a strength or weakness (AO1b)
- explain why it is a strength or weakness (AO1b)
- evaluate the impact of the evidence on the argument (AO1c).

For AO1a – Identify evidence – candidates were expected to give examples from the document to illustrate the types of evidence rather than providing a general answer that could apply to any document. Without examples candidates could not gain more than half marks.

For example, *'...this is a great strength as it is backed up by numbers.'*

This identifies the use of numbers as evidence but does not offer any examples of numerical data from the document. Use of this approach throughout would gain less than half marks.

A higher scoring candidate for this aspect would give several types of evidence with examples, such as: *'In Document A, the author used statistics as it was stated that 'last year in California, there were nearly as many arrests for 18 and 19-year-olds (14,1400) as for all youth aged 10 through 17 (17,200).'*' The candidate made a point about statistics and gave an example.

For AO1b – Analysing the strengths and weaknesses of evidence.

Higher scoring responses analysed a range of evidence and looked for a balance between strengths and weaknesses. They also gave clear explanations as to why they were considered to be strengths or weaknesses rather than just stating a point.

For example: *'One weakness is that the text does not always clearly cite where the information is from, instead just stating, 'research shows.' This undermines the argument the author makes since the reader is unable to easily check the claim that is made. The reader may conclude that the author has made it up.'* The candidate identified a weakness, quoted it and explained why it was a weakness.

Lower scoring responses concentrated on strengths rather than weaknesses (or the opposite) and only stated them with limited explanation.

For example: *'A strength is the use of third-party research such as stating: 'Research from the centre for Disease Control' found that juveniles in the youth justice system have 'lower re-arrest rates.'"* There is a clear strength recognised with an example, but the explanation is limited. To improve, the candidate would need to explain why this source is seen to be strong and how it impacts on the credibility of the argument (Link to AO1c).

For AO1c) – evaluating evidence – candidates were expected to evaluate the impact of the evidence on the argument. This ranged from making a simple assertion, through some evaluation of the impact, to evaluation that included a judgement.

For example, lower scoring responses used simple assertion without explaining why or how there is an impact on the argument. *'This evidence is strong because it supports the author's claim and provides an example...'*

For example, higher scoring responses evaluated the impact of the evidence on the argument and included a judgement of its effectiveness. *'When comparing these strengths and weaknesses it is reasonable to conclude that the evidence used in Document A consists of more strengths than weaknesses and this is more positive for the argument. The author's claim and reasoning are obvious, using a range of examples coming from reputable sources and statistical evidence. This clearly demonstrates why youth justice systems should include young adults. This positive approach limits the impact of a counterargument.'*

The evaluation is well explained and there is an emphasis on the impact throughout this section. There is a judgement at the beginning which is explained below.

Question 3

The question asked candidates to evaluate the arguments of both authors and consider their perspectives. Candidates were also required to provide a judgement as to whether Document A was stronger than Document B, Document B was stronger than Document A, or they were both equally strong.

The most frequent approach was to directly compare the key components of the arguments of the two documents throughout the answer. The higher scoring responses 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 for their preferred judgement. It was equally possible to evaluate the arguments of both documents separately and then have a concluding judgement. This tends to lead to fewer points being made and repetition in the conclusion.

Many candidates were able to pick out the aspects that reflect a strong argument, for example, the credibility of the authors and the amount of supporting evidence provided. Candidates achieving the highest marks gave clear examples from the documents and then explained the impact on the overall argument culminating in an intermediate judgement.

There were two assessment objectives used. First of them was AO1 (Research, analysis, and evaluation) which was separated into four aspects: Identify and compare key components of arguments (AO1a), Analyse and compare perspectives (AO1b), Evaluate arguments (AO1c), Provide a judgement about argument and perspective (AO1d). The second assessment objective was AO3 – communication.

The highest scoring responses adopted a structured response to answering the question by methodically:

- Describing and explaining the perspectives of the authors of both documents (AO1b),

and then:

- Identifying and comparing key components of the argument (AO1a);
- Evaluating the relative strengths of the key components of argument using appropriate examples and analysis of impact (AO1c);
- Giving an intermediate judgement (AO1d);
- Coming to a reasoned judgement as to which argument, if either, is stronger in a final conclusion. (AO1d).

For AO1a) – Identify and compare key components of arguments – many candidates gained high marks as they were able to compare a range of key components of arguments from both documents. Some lacked comparison in their answer so were unable to achieve more than half marks.

For example, higher scoring responses provided a range of compared key components. This is an example for one component – provenance: *'The author of Document A was a former commissioner of the New York City Department of Probation which brought knowledge and credibility. Document B was written by a journalist living in Guyana. As a freelance journalist she may have vested interest in promoting her own work.'*

For AO1b) – Analyse and compare perspectives – there was a range of marks as some candidates did not provide any analysis of perspectives, while lower scoring candidates simply identified perspectives, often from just one document. However, higher scoring candidates compared, described, and explained the significance of the perspectives in both documents.

This is an example of a high scoring response: *'The author of Document A is of the perspective that 'young people whether they are 18 or 20, do not belong in adult courts or prisons.' This author is of the sentiment that adulthood does not necessarily occur at 18 which is well supported with numerous laws and social practices. Document B on the other hand is of the perspective that rehabilitation is more effective than prison for prisoners. Both authors are of quite different perspectives.'*

Lower scoring responses only stated the perspective without any analysis, for example: *'Document A's author is arguing that the age limit for the youth justice system should be raised.'* There is no description, comparison, or explanation.

For AO1c) – Evaluate Arguments – Higher scoring responses evaluated the key components of arguments that had been identified with clear illustration from and balanced reference to both documents. Lower scoring responses simply made unsupported points about the argument and may only have referred to one document.

An example of a higher scoring response providing evaluation and illustration is given here. This is one part of several evaluations that were balanced across both documents. *'Unlike Document A, Document B does not use reliable sources. For example, the author claims 'Decades of research has proven...' This weakens the articles because it is not provided with a credible source. It is not known from where the research the author uses comes, making the author's claim less credible.'*

Lower scoring responses gave answers like: *'This evidence weakens the author's text as it is unsourced and unknown if it is reliable data.'*

There is some basic evaluation but no clear illustration nor reasoning as to the impact of this point on the argument. For example, why does having unsourced data make the argument less credible.

For AO1d) – Provide a judgement about argument and perspective – Higher scoring responses compared key components of the argument throughout their answer. This allowed intermediate judgements to be made when both documents had been evaluated and compared. The candidates then provided a conclusion summarising the intermediate judgements they had made in order to come to an overall conclusion. Lower scoring responses simply made partially reasoned but unsupported judgements.

High scoring responses completed their answer with comments like this which summarised the intermediate conclusions throughout the answer: *'In conclusion, I believe that Document A is the stronger argument as its evidence and authorship make it a reliable source and argument regarding youth offenders and the adult justice system. Although Document B has many positive aspects to it and is strong in terms of its emotive and persuasive language, it is weakened considerably by its lack of authorship credentials and evidence which is key to both a strong argument and to being a reliable source.'*

A lower scoring response might simply state an unsupported judgement, for example: *'In Documents A and B arguments are expressed regarding the justice system. While both documents offer a good argument, Document B's is stronger and more balanced than Document A's.'*

For AO3 – Communication – higher scoring responses produced a clearly written, well-structured and logical argument focused throughout on the question. Lower scoring responses produced arguments that lacked clarity, had an uneven structure, or did not always link to the question.

Overall, higher scoring responses linked aspects to examples in the text and with explanation of why this supported the argument. Middle scoring candidates made a point and illustrated it from the document but did not explain why this was more convincing. 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 9239/12
Written Examination 12

Key messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, to answer all the questions set. This applied in all questions, for example in **Question 1**: 'identify', 'as given by the authors', **Question 1a**: 'those who did not have COVID-19...', **Question 1b**: 'financial impacts', **Question 2**: 'evidence' and 'impact', **Question 3**: 'perspectives', 'judgement' and 'stronger'.

Many candidates spent too long on **Question 1** and so left themselves short of time for **Question 2** and **Question 3** which had much higher total marks. **Question 1** only required short answers or bullet points.

To gain higher marks in **Questions 2 and 3** there should be clear development of the points made. For example, making a point, illustrating using information or appropriate quotes from the text and explaining it in the context of the document. Instead of just stating **what** a strength or weakness may be, candidates should also explain **how** or **why** it is a strength or weakness. There should also be explicit reference to perspectives in **Question 3** and reflection on the impact of the evidence in **Question 2**. In both documents, judgements are required.

Candidates will not gain credit for using material from their own knowledge that is not contained within the documents. Copying from the document is acceptable in the identification questions in **Question 1** but not for analysis and evaluation in **Question 2** and **Question 3**.

The marking approach is closely linked to the Assessment Objectives (AOs) given in the syllabus. These AOs are split into distinct aspects so candidates should be aware of what they are assessing and develop their answers accordingly.

AOs requiring specific improvement are: AO1c (Evaluation) in **Question 2** and AO1b (Perspectives) in **Question 3**.

General comments

There was little evidence of candidates misunderstanding the documents and many showed an understanding of the requirements of the questions and adapted to the direction given. However, several candidates did not respond effectively to the need to explain the impact of the evidence on the authors' argument in **Question 2**. This was specifically mentioned in the second part of the question emphasising the need to read and understand the whole of the question before answering. Equally some did not address the authors' perspectives in **Question 3** as mentioned in the question. Some also gave only cursory intermediate judgements or a final judgement that could have applied to any set of documents.

Most candidates organised their time well. However, some spent too long on **Question 1** and **Question 2** leaving less time for **Question 3** which was worth over half the number of available marks. It is important to recognise the value of each question and to write an appropriate amount.

Some answers to **Question 3** were not fully developed or supported by precise references to the documents. Stronger responses selected relevant and appropriate points from the documents and evaluated their significance as part of the argument. Stronger answers also considered the authors' perspectives and compared them in both documents.

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

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Question 1 encourages candidates to fully read and understand the detail of both documents before starting the questions. The question paper indicates that approximately 15 minutes should be used for this. It is included within the time set for the exam. Answers only need to be brief and can be in bullet points. Some candidates wrote long answers which inevitably restricted the time available for the much higher number of available marks in **Question 2** and **Question 3**.

There are two parts to **Question 1**. **1(a)** refers to **Document A** and **1(b)** refers to **Document B**. Candidates are encouraged to answer both questions before proceeding to **Question 2**.

Both parts of the question are looking for candidates to **identify** points mentioned by the Author. There is no requirement nor expectation that explanation is included. Copying appropriately from the document is acceptable.

Question 1(a) was looking for candidates to **identify** different ways that Rwanda ensured that those who did not have COVID-19 felt safe according to the author of **Document A**.

Many gained the full three marks by mentioning, for example, use of a toll-free phone number, specialised treatment centres for those with COVID-19 and use of specific ambulances to transport infected people.

An example of a 3-mark answer was:

Rwanda assigned specific ambulances (correct) and personnel to bring people thought to have an infection to a facility. It set up specialized pandemic treatment centres (correct) to help the people and the Ministry of Health asked people to call a toll-free phone number (correct) if they suspected they had an infection. People also feel safe to pursue healthcare since it is decentralised and community health workers are common and highly trusted. (Unnecessary as maximum mark already achieved – it would also apply to all Rwandans just those who did not have COVID-19 so would not be correct.)

An example of a 1-mark answer was:

- *Rwanda made sure that the public felt safe during the pandemic by educating the citizens on measures to fight coronavirus. (Incorrect as this would apply to all Rwandans not just those not affected by COVID-19).*
- *They designated ambulances to safely transport infected people (correct).*
- *The Government set up free testing, isolation and quarantine. (Incorrect as this would apply to all Rwandans not just those not affected by COVID-19).*

Question 1(b) was looking for candidates to **identify** two financial impacts of introducing universal healthcare as given by the author of **Document B**. Many candidates gained two marks by mentioning the pay cut for doctors and that it would deter potential medical candidates would be unable to pay off high debts.

An example of an approach to **Question 1(b)** giving 1 out of 2 marks was:

'Introducing universal healthcare has an impact of a large pay cut on the physicians (correct), and there will be doctor shortages.'

This is a short answer and only addresses one point. It does not, for example, identify that deterring potential medical candidates as they would not be able to afford to pay-off their debts is the financial impact. (Leading to possible doctor shortages.)

Question 2

This question was generally well answered with most candidates correctly assessing to some extent the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author to support their argument. Some candidates concentrated more on the assessment of the argument which was not expected in this question. There was a specific requirement in the question to explain the impact of the evidence on the author's argument. Most candidates attempted some explanation, but only some were able to develop this sufficiently to achieve higher marks. The question was looking for analysis of evidence and so answers that related to language or structure were not credited in this question.

Most common discussion points were around the provenance of the authors, the limited global view, the statistics and the sources the author used. Candidates seemed better able to address strengths accurately and so answers could be unbalanced. In many cases evidence later in the answer had less discussion and was often simply quoted.

Candidates were assessed on Assessment Objective 1 (AO1 – research, analysis, and evaluation). The three aspects were: Identifying evidence (AO1a), Analysing the strengths and weaknesses of evidence (AO1b), and evaluating evidence (AO1c). Many candidates gained high marks for AO1a. Marks for AO1b showed the greatest range. Many candidates scored lower marks for AO1c.

A clearly structured approach for some was to:

- Identify a type of evidence (AO1a)
- give an example from the document (AO1a)
- assess whether it is a strength or weakness (AO1b)
- explain why it is a strength or weakness (AO1b)
- evaluate the impact of the evidence on the argument (AO1c).

For AO1a – Identify evidence – candidates were expected to give examples from the document to illustrate the types of evidence rather than providing a general answer that could apply to any document. Without examples candidates could not gain more than half marks.

For example, '*...the authors provided statistical evidence such as the number of COVID-19 cases.*'

This identifies the use of numbers as evidence but does not offer any examples of numerical data from the document. Use of this approach throughout would gain less than half marks.

A higher scoring response for this aspect would give several types of evidence with examples, such as: '*Document A had given many statistics and evidence such as the 5100 cases of COVID-19 in Rwanda and 204,000 in USA but without a proper source.*' The candidate made a point about statistics and gave an example and linked it to another point about the lack of sources. So, it has both strengths and weaknesses in this short section.

For AO1b – Analysing the strengths and weaknesses of evidence.

Higher scoring responses analysed a range of evidence and looked for a balance between strengths and weaknesses. They also gave clear explanations as to why they were considered to be strengths or weaknesses rather than just stating a point.

For example: '*Document A had given many statistics and evidence such as the 5100 cases of COVID-19 in Rwanda and 204,000 in USA but without a proper source. This makes the evidence significantly weaker as the reader is only left with an option to trust the authors, or the reader may conclude that the author has made it up.*' The candidate identified a weakness, quoted it and explained why it was a weakness.

Lower scoring responses concentrated on strengths rather than weaknesses (or the opposite) and only stated them with limited explanation.

For example: '*The authors of Document A work in healthcare as Vice Chancellor and research associate with first-hand experience of the topic.*'. There is a clear strength recognised with an example, but the explanation is limited. To improve, the candidate would need to explain why having first-hand experience is seen to be strong and how it impacts on the credibility of the argument (Link to AO1c).

For AO1c) – evaluating evidence – candidates were expected to evaluate the impact of the evidence on the argument. This ranged from making a simple assertion, through some evaluation of the impact, to evaluation that included a judgement.

For example, lower scoring responses used simple assertion without explaining why or how there is an impact on the argument. *‘...this increases the credibility of the document and helps to trust the article more.’*

For example, higher scoring responses evaluated the impact of the evidence on the argument and included a judgement of its effectiveness. *‘Overall, the lack of sources, sense of biasedness and promotive tone of the local region weakens the document as a whole. The last sentence, ‘It is only when we achieve THC that we can ensure safety for all,’ is a very fixed and closed conclusion lacking data and statistics. However, the strength and high-level expertise of the authors outweigh the absence of credible statistics. Both have an impact on the overall argument. But the strengths are greater.’*

The evaluation is well explained and there is an emphasis on the impact throughout this section. There is a judgement at the end.

Question 3

The question asked candidates to evaluate the arguments of both authors and consider their perspectives. Candidates were also required to provide a judgement as to whether Document A was stronger than Document B, Document B was stronger than Document A, or they were both equally strong.

The most frequent approach was to directly compare the key components of the arguments of the two documents throughout the answer. The higher scoring 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 for their preferred judgement. It was equally possible to evaluate the arguments of both documents separately and then have a concluding judgement. This tended to lead to fewer points being made and repetition in the conclusion.

Many candidates were able to pick out the aspects that reflect a strong argument, for example, the credibility of the authors and the amount of supporting evidence provided. Candidates achieving the highest marks gave clear examples from the documents and then explained the impact on the overall argument culminating in an intermediate judgement.

There were two assessment objectives used. First one was AO1 (Research, analysis, and evaluation) which was separated into four aspects: Identify and compare key components of arguments (AO1a), Analyse and compare perspectives (AO1b), Evaluate arguments (AO1c), Provide a judgement about argument and perspective (AO1d). The second assessment objective was AO3 – communication.

The highest scoring responses adopted a structured response to answering the question by methodically:

- describing and explaining the perspectives of the authors of both documents (AO1b),

and then:

- identifying and comparing key components of the argument (AO1a);
- evaluating the relative strengths of the key components of argument using appropriate examples and analysis of impact (AO1c);
- giving an intermediate judgement (AO1d);
- coming to a reasoned judgement as to which argument, if either, is stronger in a final conclusion (AO1d).

For AO1a) – Identify and compare key components of arguments – many candidates gained high marks as they were able to compare a range of key components of arguments from both documents. Some lacked comparison in their answer so were unable to achieve more than half marks.

For example, higher scoring responses provided a range of compared key components. This is an example for one component – provenance: *‘One major difference is in the authors and their achievements for both articles. Document A has highly esteemed authors with distinguished qualifications such as degrees and jobs of high status. Document B is written by Helen McNulty who is only a candidate, undermining her credibility in comparison.’*

For AO1b) – Analyse and compare perspectives – there was a range of marks as some candidates did not provide any analysis of perspectives, while lower scoring responses simply identified perspectives, often from just one document. However, higher scoring responses compared, described, and explained the significance of the perspectives in both documents.

An example of a high scoring response is: *‘The author of Document B argues that universal healthcare is not the way forward to empower healthcare in the US, especially given its drawbacks for doctors. Document A directly juxtaposes this claim by asserting that universal healthcare is the key to pandemic management.’*

Lower scoring responses only stated the perspective without any analysis, for example: *‘Documents A and B argue different perspectives about universal health care. Document A’ states that it is essential for the management of COVID-19.’* There is no description, comparison, or explanation.

For AO1c) – Evaluate Arguments – higher scoring responses evaluated the key components of arguments that had been identified with clear illustration from and balanced reference to both documents. Lower scoring responses simply made unsupported points about the argument and may only have referred to one document.

An example of a higher scoring response providing evaluation and illustration is given here. This is one part of several evaluations that were balanced across both documents. *‘Document A is written by Agnes Binagwaho who has had many administrative positions, including executive health secretary and minister of health. Her research assistant has a Batchelors in Global Health. This shows that these two individuals are very adept at policy making and public health analysis, Agnes Binagwaho in particular has likely witnessed the effects of policies implemented in Rwanda and seen the ones proven to be most effective, confirming her credibility.’*

Lower scoring responses were such as: *‘In terms of author provenance Document A is stronger since the authors are more experienced in the healthcare sector.’*

There is some basic evaluation but no clear illustration nor reasoning as to the impact of this point on the argument. For example, in which ways does the experience make the argument more credible?

For AO1d) – Provide a judgement about argument and perspective – higher scoring responses compared key components of the argument throughout their answer. This allowed intermediate judgements to be made when both documents had been evaluated and compared. The candidates then provided a conclusion summarising the intermediate judgements they had made in order to come to an overall conclusion. Lower scoring responses simply made partially reasoned but unsupported judgements.

High scoring responses completed their answer with comments like this which summarised the intermediate conclusions throughout the answer: *‘Overall it can be asserted that Document B is far less convincing than Document A. Although Document B appears to offer a more holistic perspective of the issue by targeting the USA and healthcare in general, it presents only one aspect of a very intricate topic. Document A describes the situation in Rwanda accurately, provides substantiated claims and an effective conclusion. This coupled with the credibility of A’s authors who are both experts, as compared to a (potential) medical candidate, makes Document A, clearly and evidently more convincing.’*

A lower scoring response might simply state an unsupported judgement, for example: *‘Overall I would say Document A is stronger as it analyses the argument in further detail making a more compelling case. Document B is strong, however, it fails to provide strong evidence to back its claims.’*

For AO3 – Communication – higher scoring responses produced a clearly written, well-structured and logical argument focused throughout on the question. Lower scoring responses produced arguments that lacked clarity, had an uneven structure, or did not always link to the question.

Overall, higher scoring responses linked aspects to examples in the text and with explanation of why this supported the argument. Middle scoring responses made a point and illustrated it from the document but did not explain why this was more convincing. 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 13

Key messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, to answer all the questions set. This applied in all questions, for example in **Question 1**: 'identify', 'as given by the author', 'costs', **Question 1b**: 'positive impacts', **Question 2**: 'evidence' and 'impact', **Question 3**: 'perspectives', 'judgement' and 'stronger'.

Many candidates spent too long on **Question 1** and so left themselves short of time for **Question 2 and Question 3** which had much higher total marks. **Question 1** only required short answers or bullet points. A significant number only produced very short answers to **Questions 2 and 3**.

To gain higher marks in **Questions 2 and 3** there should be clear development of the points made. For example, making a point, illustrating using information or appropriate quotes from the text and explaining it in the context of the document. Instead of just stating **what** a strength or weakness may be, the candidates should also explain **how** or **why** it is a strength or weakness. There should also be explicit reference to perspectives in **Question 3** and reflection on the impact of the evidence in **Question 2**. In both documents, judgements are required.

Candidates will not gain credit for using material from their own knowledge that is not contained within the documents. Copying from the document is acceptable in the identification questions in **Question 1** but not for analysis and evaluation in **Question 2** and **Question 3**.

The marking approach is closely linked to the Assessment Objectives (AOs) given in the syllabus. These AOs are split into distinct aspects so candidates should be aware of what they are assessing and develop their answers accordingly.

AOs requiring specific improvement are AO1c (Evaluation) in **Question 2** and AO1b (Perspectives) in **Question 3**. The main point for many, though, is to allow enough time to appropriately answer all questions to reflect the number of marks available.

General comments

There was little evidence of candidates finding the documents difficult to access but many appeared unsure of the requirements of the questions in analysing evidence in **Question 2** and identifying and evaluating perspectives and argument in **Question 3**. Several candidates did not respond effectively to the need to explain the impact of the evidence on the author's argument in **Question 2**. This was specifically mentioned in the second part of the question emphasising the need to read and understand the **whole** of the question before answering. Equally some did not address the authors' perspectives in **Question 3** as mentioned in the question. Some also gave only cursory intermediate judgements or a final judgement that could have applied to any set of documents. Many candidates' answers lacked depth and breadth so were reflected by lower and middle range marks.

Some candidates organised their time well. However, a significant number spent too long on **Question 1** (worth 5 marks) leaving less time for **Question 2** (15 marks) and **Question 3** (25 marks, over half the number of available marks). It is important to recognise the value of each question and to write an appropriate amount when answering.

Some answers to **Question 3** were not fully developed or supported by precise references to the documents. Stronger responses selected relevant and appropriate points from the documents and evaluated their significance as part of the argument. Stronger answers also considered the authors' perspectives and compared them in both documents.

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

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Question 1 encourages candidates to fully read and understand the detail of both documents before starting the questions. The question paper indicates that approximately 15 minutes should be used for this. It is included within the time set for the exam. Answers only need to be brief and can be in bullet points. Several candidates wrote longer answers which may have restricted the time available for the much higher number of available marks in **Question 2** and **Question 3**.

There are two parts to **Question 1**. **1(a)** refers to **Document A** and **1(b)** refers to **Document B**. Candidates are encouraged to answer both questions before proceeding to **Question 2** in order to get an overview of the documents.

Both parts of the question are looking for candidates to identify points mentioned by the author. There is no requirement nor expectation that explanation is included. Copying appropriately from the document is acceptable.

Question 1(a) was looking for candidates to identify two costs to Greece of the financial rescue, given by the author of **Document A**.

Many gained both marks by mentioning, that the finance minister lost his job, the Prime Minister had to resign, or that Greece had to follow EU economic requirements. Some mentioned the value of the bailouts, but this was not a cost according to the author.

An example of a 1-mark answer was:

- *Finance Minister Yanis Varoufakis lost his job (Correct).*
- *Greece needed to pay 150 m USD (Incorrect as this applies to Zimbabwe not Greece).*

Question 1(b) was looking for candidates to identify three positive impacts of flipping accountability to the community as a new approach to managing aid projects as given by the author of **Document B**. Many candidates gained three marks by recognising that 'communities topped up grants through voluntary work,' 'women improved their bargaining power' and 'community members could negotiate lower prices'.

An example of an approach to **Question 1(b)** giving 2 out of 3 marks was:

- Women have improved their bargaining power (correct).
- Communities are more motivated (Incorrect – needs link to topping up grants by voluntary work...).
- Community members are able to negotiate with the private sector and secure lower prices (Correct).

Some answered the question as if it were about Zimbabwe perhaps expecting the whole of **Question 1** to be just taken from Document A. Encouragement to read the questions carefully would hopefully resolve this issue.

Question 2

Most candidates were able to assess to some extent the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author to support their argument. Some candidates concentrated more on the assessment of the argument which was not expected in this question. There was a specific requirement in the question to explain the impact of the evidence on the author's argument. Some candidates attempted explanation, but it was frequently just assertion with few candidates developing this sufficiently to achieve higher marks. The

question was looking for analysis of 'evidence' and so answers that related to language or structure were not credited in this question.

Most common discussion points were around the provenance of the author, the statistics and sources used. Candidates seemed better able to address strengths accurately and so answers might have been unbalanced. In several cases candidates simply described points made by the author without identifying the type of evidence and not attempting any analysis.

Candidates were assessed on Assessment Objective 1 (AO1 – research, analysis, and evaluation). The three aspects were: Identifying evidence (AO1a), Analysing the strengths and weaknesses of evidence (AO1b), and evaluating evidence (AO1c). Many candidates gained high marks for AO1a. Marks for AO1b showed the greatest range. Most candidates scored lower marks for AO1c.

A clearly structured approach for some was to:

- Identify a type of evidence (AO1a)
- give an example from the document (AO1a)
- assess whether it is a strength or weakness (AO1b)
- explain why it is a strength or weakness (AO1b)
- evaluate the impact of the evidence on the argument (AO1c).

For AO1a – Identify evidence – candidates were expected to give examples from the document to illustrate the types of evidence rather than providing a general answer that could apply to any document. Without examples candidates could not gain more than half marks.

For example, '*...there are some statistics shown but they are not specific enough.*'.

This identifies the use of statistics as evidence but does not offer any examples of numerical data from the document. Use of this approach throughout would gain less than half marks.

A higher scoring response for this aspect would give several types of evidence with examples, such as: '*The use of statistics in the document lends specificity to the argument which is a strength. For example, the premise that a 150 million USD downpayment certainly does not look like much when compared to the 326 billion Euro that Greece received over the five years it requested financial aid.*'. The candidate made a point about statistics and gave an example.

For AO1b – Analysing the strengths and weaknesses of evidence.

Higher scoring responses analysed a range of evidence and looked for a balance between strengths and weaknesses. They also gave clear explanations as to why they were considered to be strengths or weaknesses rather than just stating a point.

For example: '*A strength of the evidence is the broad sources used. The author uses international organisations (like the IMF), sources from Zimbabwe (the President) as well as mentioning reactions from around the world (London, New York...) Instead of just focusing on information sourced from Zimbabwe the range of evidence allows the author to appear unbiased.*'. The candidate identified a strength, gave named sources from the document and explained why this evidence could be considered a strength.

Lower scoring responses concentrated on strengths rather than weaknesses (or the opposite) and only stated them with limited explanation.

For example: '*Document A makes use of credible sources such as the International Monetary Fund which insists that Zimbabwe must pay off its debts before receiving more money.*'. There is a clear strength recognised with an example, but the explanation is limited. To improve, the candidate would need to explain why this source (the IMF) is seen to be credible.

For AO1c) – evaluating evidence – candidates were expected to evaluate the impact of the evidence on the argument. This ranged from making a simple assertion, through some evaluation of the impact, to evaluation that included a judgement.

For example, lower scoring responses used simple assertion without explaining why or how there is an impact on the argument. *'All the evidence is centred around the author's argument so helps make it stronger.'*

For example, higher scoring responses evaluated the impact of the evidence on the argument and included a judgement of its effectiveness. *'I believe the weaknesses outweigh the strengths. While the author did include a credible first-hand account – being the Zimbabwe President, I believe the lack of sources for the given data to be detrimental to not only the evidence but the argument as a whole. The readers cannot simply trust anything an author provides. Credible sources let the readers know that the information had been gathered by a reliable and vetted expert and has most likely been peer reviewed. In failing to provide this the author has garnered a more distrusting audience that may be sceptical towards the data and in turn become suspicious of the overall argument.'*

The evaluation is well explained and there is an emphasis on the impact throughout this section. There is a judgement at the beginning which is explained below.

Question 3

The question asked candidates to evaluate the arguments of both authors and consider their perspectives. Candidates were also required to provide a judgement as to whether Document A was stronger than Document B, Document B was stronger than Document A, or they were both equally strong.

The most frequent approach was to directly compare the key components of the argument of the two documents throughout the answer. The higher scoring responses 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 for their preferred judgement. It was equally possible to evaluate the arguments of both documents separately and then have a concluding judgement. This tended to lead to fewer points being made and repetition in the conclusion.

Many candidates were able to pick out the aspects that reflect a strong argument, for example, the credibility of the authors and the amount of supporting evidence provided. Candidates achieving the highest marks gave clear examples from the documents and then explained the impact on the overall argument culminating in an intermediate judgement.

There were two assessment objectives used. First one was AO1 (Research, analysis, and evaluation) which was separated into four aspects: Identify and compare key components of arguments (AO1a), Analyse and compare perspectives (AO1b), Evaluate arguments (AO1c), Provide a judgement about argument and perspective (AO1d). The second assessment objective was AO3 – communication.

The highest scoring responses adopted a structured response to answering the question by methodically:

- describing and explaining the perspectives of the authors of both documents (AO1b),

and then:

- identifying and comparing key components of the argument (AO1a);
- evaluating the relative strengths of the key components of argument using appropriate examples and analysis of impact (AO1c);
- giving an intermediate judgement (AO1d);
- coming to a reasoned judgement as to which argument, if either, is stronger in a final conclusion (AO1d).

For AO1a) – Identify and compare key components of arguments – some candidates gained high marks as they were able to compare a range of key components of arguments from both documents. Many lacked comparisons in their answer so were unable to achieve more than half marks.

For example, higher scoring candidates provided a range of compared key components. This is an example for one component – provenance: *'The reputation of the authors themselves greatly impacts their arguments' strength. Document A is written by an investigative journalist, a person who likely had experience with writing professionally. Document B is written by the Women's Development Program Director for YMCA East Jerusalem, while she does have a large role and experience with empowering youth, she does not seem to have experience writing articles or research, which weakens her argument.'*

For AO1b) – Analyse and compare perspectives – there was a range of marks as some candidates did not provide any analysis of perspectives, while lower scoring responses simply identified perspectives, often from just one document. However, higher scoring responses compared, described, and explained the significance of the perspectives in both documents.

Here is an example of a high scoring response: *‘Both Document A and Document B make arguments about international aid and more specifically how financial accountability should be controlled and handled. Document A argues that countries/communities in need of aid should follow the conditions of the donors who used financial accountability. Document B argues that accountability should be given to the community because donors ignore the needs and strengths of the community and ‘promote a dependency culture.’*

Lower scoring responses only stated the perspective without any analysis, for example: *‘The argument in Document B is that letting community members lead a ‘project cycle’ is effective.’* There is no description, comparison, or explanation.

For AO1c) – Evaluate Arguments – higher scoring responses evaluated the key components of arguments that had been identified with clear illustration from and balanced reference to both documents. Lower scoring candidates simply made unsupported points about the argument and may only have referred to one document.

An example of a higher scoring response providing evaluation and illustration is given here. This is one part of several evaluations that were balanced across both documents. *‘The author of Document A is also the director of the Women’s Development program for YMCS East Jerusalem. This gives the author credibility because she is able to witness first-hand how programs such as flipping financial accountability can impact youth and communities. This may also cause the author to be biased as she will be inclined to only say positive things about programs like the one, she is implementing.’*

Lower scoring responses were such as: *‘The author of Document B is the Director of the YMCA Easy Jerusalem which gives her the authority to talk on the subject and be trusted.’*

There is some basic evaluation but no clear illustration nor reasoning as to the impact of this point on the argument. For example, how does this give her the authority and why is she trusted?

For AO1d) – Provide a judgement about argument and perspective – higher scoring responses compared key components of the argument throughout their answer. This allowed intermediate judgements to be made when both documents had been evaluated and compared. The candidates then provided a conclusion summarising the intermediate judgements they had made in order to come to an overall conclusion. Lower scoring responses simply made partially reasoned but unsupported judgements.

High scoring responses completed their answer with comments like this which summarised the intermediate conclusions throughout the answer: *‘Both the arguments from Document A and Document B are strong in their own right. Document A for bring insightful with its monetary facts and worldwide reach and Document B for being direct and having personal perspectives on what had happened. Overall, I consider the argument from Document B to be the stronger argument because information is coming directly from the source and has an emotional approach, describing what it overcame and still neds to go through.’*

A lower scoring response might simply state an unsupported judgement, for example: *‘Although the authors do present different arguments on international aid, I felt more that Document B had a stronger approach.’*

For AO3 – Communication – higher scoring responses produced a clearly written, well-structured and logical argument focused throughout on the question. Lower scoring responses produced arguments that lacked clarity, had an uneven structure, or did not always link to the question.

Overall, higher scoring responses linked aspects to examples in the text and with explanation of why this supported the argument. Middle scoring responses made a point and illustrated it from the document but did not explain why this was more convincing. 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 9239/02
Essay 02

Key messages

Title questions should be concise and set up a clear debate between contrasting perspectives. The title should be broad enough to enable the candidate to consider several implications of the question.

Having presented contrasting perspectives candidates need to actively compare their strengths and weaknesses before arriving at a final judgement.

Candidates should make clear which country their research comes from or to which country it refers to.

General comments

Most candidates were able to choose issues with global significance that derived from the topics listed in the syllabus. Popular topics for focus were Media and Communication, Social Inequality, Climate Change, Animal Rights and AI Technologies. The essays were for the most part well researched and made for interesting reading.

There are ten aspects used for assessment and candidates need to plan carefully to ensure they demonstrate all of the skills assessed in this component. The aspects are split across three assessment objectives; the first five relate to research, analysis and evaluation, the next three relate to reflection and the final two relate to communication.

Comments on specific aspects

Analysis of Question

Devising a title question that sets up a debate between contrasting perspectives in response to an issue of global significance is the foundation of a successful essay. The most successful title questions are brief and clear. It is recommended that questions begin with 'Should' or 'Are' or 'Is'.

Candidates are required to consider the implications of the question. To do this, candidates should try and view their question through the lens of a range of themes, for example, Ethics, Culture or Economics. A list of possible themes is outlined in the syllabus, though this list is not comprehensive and candidates may consider other themes by which to examine the implications of their question. It is therefore important for candidates to devise title questions that are broad in scope. Here is an example of a title question from this series: *'Does globalisation benefit developing countries economically?'*. This question has global significance and sets up a debate between contrasting perspectives, however by placing the word 'economically' in the title, the focus of the question is narrowed considerably. The candidate in this example was still able to consider three implications of the question. These were trade, capital flows and migration. However, had the candidate's title question been *'Does globalisation benefit developing countries?'* the broader themes of culture, economics or the environment, for example, could have easily been used to consider the implications of the question. Candidates should be encouraged to state clearly the themes through which they are considering the implications of the question.

The candidates must remain focused on their question throughout the essay. There were several cases this series where candidates lost focus and consequently they moved away from considering the implications of their question and were not able to reach the higher assessment levels.

Building Perspectives

If the title has not signalled a debate and the response is descriptive or one-sided, candidates will not be able to meet the assessment criteria for this aspect.

Synthesis is a skill that underpins Global Perspectives and Research and one that is assessed in this component. Candidates are required to make links between their source materials by synthesising arguments and evidence together to form coherent perspectives. Here is a clear example of synthesis found in an essay titled *'Do the benefits of Cryptocurrency outweigh the costs?'*

'He argues that susceptibility to cyberattacks is reduced as a result of the complex security cryptography provides (Dumitrescu, 2017). Dumitrescu's argument about the security benefits of cryptocurrencies can be corroborated by Chao Yu and his team's article in which they discuss the encryption performed by the SHA256 algorithm to explain the security it offers on blockchain networks. They go on to state that attacking the encryption requires the attacker to go for a brute force attack which means trial and error with about 2256 guesses (Yu, 2022). This information supports Dumitrescu's argument about the security benefits offered as it shows how infeasible it is to attack a blockchain network's encryption.'

The link between the two sources is made explicitly clear and the candidate uses one source to support another as they build the perspective that argues for the benefits of cryptocurrency using the theme of security. The most successful candidates will be able to demonstrate synthesis on both sides of the debate. More and more candidates are demonstrating this skill in a sustained manner.

Range of Sources

Research is at the heart of this course and the candidates are assessed both against their ability to research a range of source material as well as their ability to engage with the arguments put forward by their selected source material.

In terms of range, assessors are looking for sources that emanate from different global contexts or present arguments and evidence pertaining to different global contexts. Ideally sources will relate to or come from four different contexts. It is recommended that candidates state clearly the global context of their material. They can do this either by stating the provenance of the source, for example *'the article was published in The Times newspaper, based in London UK'* or by stating which global context the source pertains to, for example *'Muhammed Sacirbey investigates the success and downfalls of the NATO-led operation in Bosnia arguing that the intervention saved lives . . .'* Many candidates were able to demonstrate global range in their chosen source material and fewer candidates omitted the global dimension from their essays.

As stated above, the other element being assessed here is engagement with the arguments put forward by the source material. Candidates who tried to use too many sources were able to demonstrate range but not engagement. Candidates should be encouraged to be more selective in their research and use six to eight relevant sources with global range to support their essays. The most successful candidate used about four sources to support each perspective.

Appropriateness of Sources

This aspect assesses the candidates' ability to critically evaluate their source material using a range of criteria. Candidates may evaluate the evidence provided by the source, the reasoning and argument put forward by the source or the credibility of the author, amongst many other potential criteria for assessment. This is a skill that is assessed right across the Global Perspectives and Research syllabus. However, many candidates are not offering any justification for the sources they select. The most successful responses critically evaluated four sources, two key sources on each side of the debate.

As this is a skills-based syllabus, candidates will achieve more if they use one criterion for critical evaluation per source and fully develop that specific line of interrogation rather than offering several different lines of evaluation without development. The two approaches are illustrated below. The first example offers a series of assertive statements whereas the second achieves more for a single point of evaluation that is well-developed.

'Overall this argument has many strengths from having a credible author, many forms of model representation to the exquisite use of language giving the sources more of a sense of influence. But it also

has some weaknesses such as the second piece of evidence was chosen from a magazine article and that one of the authors was a candidate at the time that the article was written.'

'Most of the points made are only based on the American education system and culture where the typical curriculum of the primary and secondary schools is represented by English subjects. This means the argument is limited only to American education and may be weaker when considering other countries school education curriculum since they may consist of different subjects and approaches, therefore the argument cannot be generalised.'

Comparative Evaluation

Ideally candidates will answer the question they pose having researched and presented contrasting perspectives that respond to the issue raised by the question. In order to make that informed judgement the candidates need to offer a comparison of the contrasting perspectives. Some candidates simply presented both perspectives and then offered a judgement without weighing up the strengths and weaknesses of each perspective.

There were some good examples of perspective comparison. Generally, the comparison of perspectives will come toward the end of the essay before the final judgement is made. This is a strong example from this series.

'The argument that military intervention protects human rights is forwarded by the points that it protects civilians and rehabilitates fragile state institutions. The latter point, however, is only applicable to peace-building operations by IGOS and hence cannot be generalized to all kinds of intervention. The protection of civilians from severe war crimes and genocide is perhaps the strongest in terms of logical reasoning. The argument that intervention violates human rights is advanced by the points that it intensifies state repression and undermines long-term stability. The former point is compromised by the assumption that the intervening state or IGO is the sole actor in the region since non-state actors (e.g. terrorist groups) also partake in degrading democratic governance. The latter point takes into account both the major and underlying impacts of an intervention, thus making it holistic. This argument takes into account not only the complex nature of such operations but also the long-term effects which the preceding argument fails to consider. Prior to this research, I held the viewpoint that military intervention is essential to resolving human rights issues in fragile states. As I looked into its role in saving civilians from extreme war crimes, I became convinced of its merit. However, research into the destruction of state institutions owing to the use of air strikes shifted my perspective and compelled me to consider how such operations beget unseen violations.'

The candidate is balanced in their comparison and demonstrates some critical insight *'the former point is compromised'* as they weigh up the contrasting perspectives. Some candidates offer a comparison of perspectives in their introductions as they outline the debate. This is not likely to produce anything as evidence based as the example above, but such approaches can still be creditworthy.

Consideration of Contrasting Perspectives

It is important that candidates devise a question that they are able to approach objectively and fairly. If a candidate is highly engaged in the issue raised by the question and possesses a strong viewpoint at the outset it can be difficult to give due consideration to both perspectives. This tendency was seen in some essays that engaged with highly emotive issues such as animal testing. In the main candidates demonstrated a maturity and were able to apply the same levels of research, critical evaluation and word-count to both perspectives. The previous aspect (Comparative Evaluation), if done well, provides candidates with a good opportunity to demonstrate they have given due consideration to both perspectives.

Reflection and Impact on Personal Viewpoint

Many more candidates are now demonstrating this skill and there were many examples of thoughtful reflection. It is likely that a candidate's point of view will have been changed or consolidated when researching and writing the essay. Assessors are looking for candidates to be able to express this with explicit reference to the perspectives presented. This is a strong example from the current series.

'Prior to this research, I held the viewpoint that military intervention is essential to resolving human rights issues in fragile states. As I looked into its role in saving civilians from extreme war crimes, I became convinced of its merit. However, research into the destruction of state institutions owing to the use of air strikes shifted my perspective and compelled me to consider how such operations beget unseen violations. Understanding the distinction between the different generations of human rights and the impact of military

intervention on each of these enabled me to determine its effectiveness in a logical manner. Although both arguments offer logical explanations with compelling evidence, my final viewpoint stands that intervention is ultimately harmful to the long-term protection of human rights, especially in conflict zones.'

Further Research

Although this aspect of the essay is often omitted by candidates, more and more candidates are now giving consideration to potential further research. Candidates tend to present their ideas for further research as the culmination of the essay. This is fine, however, planning is crucial so candidates have a portion of their word count left after presenting a final judgement and reflecting on their personal viewpoint. The 2000-word count remains a strict limit. Approximately 100 words for further research is recommended.

The strongest responses identify a specific area for research and then develop some details about the potential research. To reach the higher attainment levels, candidates should offer some reasoning as to why this research should be undertaken, for example, addressing gaps in their initial research. Here is a strong example from this series.

'It is vital that additional research is done to challenge and support the beliefs that I have in regard to remote work and its prioritization. Much of the research done focuses on western countries such as the UK, Canada, and the United States, as these locations are laden with office workers, and much of the research found on this subject has the propensity to take place in primarily English-speaking countries. Future research should focus on countries outside of these and how they are impacted by remote work, either negatively or positively. This additional research would allow more insight into how different cultures feel about remote work and the potential unseen benefits and downsides that these cultures glean from remote work.'

Structure

Most candidates were able to present essays with an organised structure. These essays had a clear introduction followed by the main body of the essay and culminating in a supported conclusion. To reach higher attainment levels candidates should use discourse markers effectively to guide the reader through the essay rendering transition from section to section clear and obvious.

Referencing

Candidates need to cite all sources used and make sure the associated references are easily found and carry the appropriate details. Footnote systems are fine though footnotes should only be used for reference details and not extra information or critical evaluation. Most candidates were able to present citations and references but the relationship between the two was not always clear. For the component two essay, the Harvard referencing system is recommended. This system is exemplified in the Building Perspectives section.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/03
Team Project

Key messages

Many candidates have fully embraced the requirements of the new syllabus and took advantage of having 10 minutes in which to present, though some still went over this time. A significant number, though, did not use the time effectively and rushed at the end which harmed the quality of their presentation.

The majority of candidates were naming and analysing their team members' solutions, which isn't required by the new syllabus.

Many candidates focused on familiar topics which have been explored frequently in the past, for example invasive species; gender inequality; tackling obesity or drug addiction; homelessness etc. There were also some refreshingly new topic choices such as: Lithium mining; the extraction of precious resources in space; AI; ineffective urban development and penal reform etc. Understandably, a large number of teams chose to explore the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. In such submissions, while there was often evidence of a good deal of information and detail, there was also a lack of argument and presentations tended to be narrative in nature rather than argumentation. For instance, an overarching topic question such as 'What was the impact of Covid-19?' is inevitably likely to lead to a presentation that is largely descriptive in nature. On the other hand, a question such as 'Why was the impact of Covid-19 so devastating to some countries and less so to others and how could the impact have been mitigated?' would allow for a great deal of scope for research on a local and global level and a variety of possible solutions to be explored.

General comments

Presentation

AO1 – Research, analysis and evaluation

A – Individual analysis of the problem

This criterion was generally handled well, though some candidates limit themselves by just giving dictionary definitions of terms rather than identifying what the problem is. Equally, some candidates focused far more on solutions than on the problem itself so that it was not always clear why the problem was a problem. The best presentations sought to ensure that analysis was sustained by asking questions such as 'so, why is this a problem?' and 'why should we care?' Clear and precise answers to such questions gave firmer foundations to the research and to the solution.

Successful presentations took a systematic approach to defining, breaking down and exemplifying the problem; an example of this was a script on endangered cultures. The candidate explored the problem and looked in depth at its impact both locally and globally. Though there were some excellent presentations which scored highly for this criterion, few were sustained enough in carrying their analysis throughout the presentation to merit four marks. Less successful presentations defined the problem and perhaps provided some statistical evidence or examples but did not discuss the effect the problem had on people, animals, the environment, or the economy, for example. Alternatively, the definition of the problem was broad or vague. Some candidates hit AO1a skills within the first minute or two of the presentation, but then tended to move on to describing research for most of the remaining time, forgetting to consider it analytically in relation to the problem.

B – Range of research undertaken

For this criterion, considerable volumes of research were evident, often very detailed but relying heavily on secondary sources such as articles and papers from the internet. A small number conducted primary research, such as carrying out interviews or questionnaires within college or further afield. In one particularly high scoring presentation, the candidate questioned relatives in Jamaica about the practice of water harvesting.

Those candidates who scored in the lower bands of the mark scheme for this criterion tended to be those who had carried out minimal research, made very brief reference to research, lacked links between the research and the focus of the presentation, or those who had relied solely upon research relating to their home state, or country. For 4 marks for this criterion requires candidates to demonstrate specifically the skill of using research from a variety of contexts; for example, websites as well as journals and news articles, or looking at research from a variety of different countries. Another way of achieving a variety of research would be for the candidate to conduct both primary and secondary research.

There were numerous examples of candidates focusing only upon their chosen issue within just the local area or their own state or who widened their scope of research to other parts of their country but not further afield, not giving consideration to the issue within other countries or contexts. There were of course, some examples of candidates who managed this successfully. A candidate who did this well used sustained research, considering the impact of internet usage amongst teens, citing various countries around the world. Some candidates had taken the time to speak with experts and university professors within the field of their chosen issue, speaking about email exchanges and interviews they had carried out, helping them to better understand the research they were citing. The highest marks for this criterion were awarded to candidates who had clearly gained a fully rounded understanding of their issue and were able to cite examples and solutions seen in various countries/contexts around the world.

C – Evaluation of sources to support the research

This criterion is new for the new syllabus and was often missed or not done well. Most candidates scored one mark by referencing their sources, but very few evaluated their sources to score more highly than that. What we are looking for here is candidates telling us how and why the sources they have chosen are valid.

A few candidates did synthesise (i.e., compare/contrast/integrate information drawn from different sources) but because they had not also included any source evaluation, they could not then gain access to the higher marks. A few candidates did successfully evaluate and synthesise source material. One notable example of this was where the candidate successfully managed to draw comparisons between sources, as well as evaluate the validity and scope of the research. Another candidate who demonstrated skill in this area did so by considering opposing views within various research, as well as considering the validity and credibility of the source materials.

Some candidates discussed the credibility of their sources within the reflective paper instead of within the presentation itself and therefore could not be credited for it.

D – Justification for the individual solution which is proposed

Most candidates proposed a solution and stated why it would work, however for most this was not based on any evidence, rather their own opinion. Some candidates performed well, supporting their solution with some evidence – such as how their solution worked in other countries.

There were some candidates who scored zero because their presentation exceeded the time limit and their solution was outside of the time limit and so could not be credited.

There were some new trends that emerged this session. One in particular involved candidates inventing a new product or similar to address their chosen problem. For example one candidate who presented a product to improve biodegradation, or one with a product to stop children getting addicted to vapes. At the other end of the scale, there were candidates who merely described solutions which were already in place, for example, spear fishing to eradicate invasive species.

For candidates to score well they need to use different sources to show how their solution would work – they do not need to prove that it is innovative, but they need to show that it would be effective by using research. One example of this could be to show that the solution was already working in other countries and what impact this solution had in those places.

A good example of a candidate achieving 4 marks for this criterion was a candidate who explained in good detail how her solution will be implemented to overcome water contamination, how it has been used in different countries at different stages and the benefits of her solution in detail. A similar approach was taken by a candidate who discussed a number of effective solutions to overcome the problem of drug addiction. She explains how these have been implemented in a variety of different countries. A specific focus had been given to how her solutions are effective in different parts of the world.

AO3 – Communication

A – Production of an organised argument

There were varying approaches to the structure of argument. Many candidates presented an argument with some structure and made some well-argued points within that structure. There was a flow to such presentations, they were fairly easy to follow and had a degree of natural progression and order. Some candidates used signposting effectively to produce a well-structured argument. Such candidates often structured their argument very methodically, relying upon key slides and headers, beginning with a clear definition of the issue, moving into research perspectives, and then reaching a solution and explaining the justification for, and effectiveness of, their chosen solution. Alternatively, some candidates chose to outline their solution very early on in their presentation and then move into their arguments and justifications.

The strongest examples stood out because of their use of cohesive devices. Those candidates who had prepared and planned their work thoughtfully produced well-structured presentations, with signposts used between sections or slides and a smooth, ordered delivery of information.

B – Presentation of visual information to support an argument

The vast majority of candidates chose to use PowerPoint as a means to present information to the audience. The success of utilising PowerPoint varied significantly. The least effective use of this method was when candidates used the slides merely as a background image. Many candidates used photographs relating to their issue, with little text or little in the way of statistics/graphs etc. and often made no reference to the images at all. Most candidates did talk through their slides, but a large number had pictures rather than data slides which offered no support to the argument. Others had at most one or two data slides which they talked through which applied relevant methods of visual representation which achieved a middle mark for this criterion.

If a candidate had several slides which supported the argument and they talked through them consistently throughout the presentation they accessed the higher marks. There were a number of candidates who put almost their entire script onto the slides so that the slides themselves become little more than an exercise in reading and this showed a lack of understanding of the term ‘presentation’.

Few candidates truly engage with their visuals in order to support their argument. To score highly in this criterion, it is important for candidates to engage with their visuals by describing and analysing what graphic representations of data, such as graphs, tables or charts, are actually saying about their problem and to talk about the relevance of the images they display to the problem they are describing.

Stronger candidates are inventive in the ways they use their visuals to develop their argument and enhance the impact of what they are saying. They select visuals that are directly relevant to the content they are presenting and identify features of images or graphic representations of data that support their argument. The best examples included moments where the candidate spoke (often without a script or prompts) about the figures seen within a graph, elaborating upon what these meant, and then drawing contrasts/comparisons between other research and statistics. Some candidates considered changing numbers of data over time, or within different contexts, encouraging the audience to engage with, and understand the research.

C – Use of language to address an audience

Some candidates did not demonstrate an awareness of audience; this limited them to lower marks for this criterion. Most candidates greeted the audience but went no further to include them in the presentation. As with presentations in the former syllabus a lot of candidates use an essay style format to deliver the ideas, rather than engaging in a first-person communication that connects with the audience. To score more than one mark for this criterion, the candidate needs to use language to draw the audience in.

Candidates who scored well here made effective use of language to consistently address their audience. When interacting with the data on visual aids, or discussing specific information on graphs, tables, photographs etc. to support an argument, they would say, 'let us look at', 'as you can see here' and engaged the audience with their research and findings.

One excellent example of AO3c being demonstrated effectively was where the candidate addresses the audience throughout by using phrases such as 'you might', 'why must we' etc. and a variety of sentence forms were also used. The audience is clearly at the forefront of the candidate's mind, with commands such as 'take a look' and a clear sense of the issue affecting society as a whole, rather than just the speaker delivering information without relating it to us as a collective.

Reflective paper

The majority of candidates made good use of their 800 words to reflect on collaboration and learning but a significant number did not, some writing as few as 200 words. Reflections were often descriptive rather than evaluative, but some candidates clearly articulated what had been learned, how their own perspective(s) had changed and how this project would impact future action, whether that be in teamwork or in how they were going to contribute to making the problem less of a problem.

AO2 – Reflection

A – Reflection on the effectiveness of collaboration

The most successful reflective papers were those which detailed the processes undertaken by the group. Some candidates spoke about the influence other group members' findings had upon their own opinions/learning within the topic. Some spoke about how their groups overcame difficulties, such as tracking down research, understanding data, conflicting views about solutions etc. A common theme was communication – both good and bad, with many candidates detailing how the group had overcome poor communication or misunderstandings within their groups by setting up working documents, WhatsApp groups, Teams meetings etc. Strong candidates considered how effective their collaboration was; the impact of their collaboration upon them and their team and made sustained evaluative comments throughout.

Less successful reflective papers were those which tended to provide a running commentary and were descriptive, often with little consideration of collaboration or learning. Some students used the reflective paper as a format to voice irritations or describe at length points of conflict with their group members, using it as an opportunity to name the least helpful members of their team.

B – Reflection on learning

Better candidates provided detailed and wide-ranging evaluation of what they knew about the issue at the outset of the project and what they knew at its completion after all the research that had been carried out. One strong candidate provided some solid evaluation of learning and considered how the research undertaken had changed his thinking and considered how that learning influenced the collaborative activities of the group. Candidates are now able to use this criterion to evaluate their learning from teamwork too, and several candidates did this successfully and were able to score highly because of this.

Some candidates made limited evaluative comments on their learning and gave little detail. One common mistake that candidates made was to use the reflective paper to talk about the project in detail and not about the team's collaboration or their own learning.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/04
Cambridge Research Report 04

Key messages

There are 15 aspects assessed in this component and although they do not have equal weighting it is important that candidates address all of them. Notable omissions from this series were methods and methodology, critical evaluation and reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of the report's conclusions.

Candidates should set out which themes will be used to consider the implications of the question in the introduction. The report should follow the framework set out in the introduction.

Candidates need to embark upon research before devising their title questions. Title questions should be developed over time and through dialogue with the teacher. Title questions must set up a debate between contrasting perspectives.

General comments

Candidates were able to produce some well-organised and well-researched reports that covered a wide range of topics and issues. Some candidates chose to have very specialised and narrowly focused title questions whereas others chose very broad questions. Both approaches can be successful if the title question is carefully considered and there are a variety of themes that can be used to explore the implications of the question.

Research Log

There is no set format for the Research Log, although exemplars are available in the syllabus and from other training materials. There was a wide variety of formats adopted by candidates, but the most successful formats were grid based with headings and dated entries. A weekly or fortnightly reflective entry that evaluates planning, decisions and research is recommended.

Many Research Logs were presented as diaries detailing what the candidate did and when. Although this is creditworthy, it is too descriptive an approach to reach the higher assessment levels. For AO1 assessors are looking for planning and the recording of pertinent information. For AO2 assessors are looking for reflection on the decisions that have been made. Candidates need to be aware of the distinction between the skill of recording information about their research and the actions they are planning, and the skill of stepping back to reflect upon the decisions made and research undertaken.

Questions and Perspectives

The process of formulating a research question needs to be given more consideration. Having selected a topic area or issue for focus, the candidates should first embark on some initial research and in that way, they will become familiar with the key academic debates in their chosen area. Through this initial analysis they will be able to formulate a title question knowing that there will be research to support both sides of the debate. It is also important at this stage that candidates consider the different themes that are underpinning and shaping the debate. It is important that candidates are able to consider the implications of their question through the lens of different themes, for example, Political, Economic or Environmental. A list of possible themes is outlined in the syllabus, though this list is not comprehensive and candidates may consider other themes by which to examine the implications of their question. Candidates should set out which themes will be used to consider the implications of their title question in the report's introduction.

The title question must set up a debate between contrasting perspectives, although there does not need to be a global dimension to this debate. Many candidates use the 'To what extent' prefix to their questions but care needs to be taken to ensure that there is a debate inherent in the question. For example, *'To what extent has the COVID-19 pandemic reduced global tourism?'* is a question that lacked a real debate. A successful title question format that was adopted by many candidates can be exemplified here *'Do the advantages of Universal Basic Income outweigh the disadvantages?'*. Title questions beginning with 'Is' or 'Should' are also successful in setting up clear debates, for example, *'Is globalization leading to a homogenized world?'*.

Synthesising arguments and evidence to formulate coherent perspectives is a skill central to Global Perspectives and Research. In the Cambridge Research Report candidates are required to make explicit links between their research materials, showing clearly how different sources can be woven together to build perspectives.

There were some candidates that treated each source in isolation and therefore denied themselves the possibility of making links between materials. Other candidates juxtaposed sources together without drawing out the links between arguments and evidence.

The example below from a report titled *'Are educational facilities being designed in ways that are beneficial for candidates?'* is developing an argument through the lens of an economic theme. The candidate is demonstrating awareness of the links between the sources without actually making the links explicit.

'They often reason that "schools in the future will cost more than current prices because the designs will be more complex and built for varied functions using more sophisticated components and materials." (Fred C.L.). Another example of this claim is this article by Gary T. et. al. They identified in 1994 that, "There is a crisis in education in the United States and in many other industrialized nations and in the infrastructure of school buildings".'

This is creditworthy but to reach higher levels the synthesis needs to be purposefully used to build the perspective. More explicit and developed synthesis can be seen in the following abridged example discussing the links between the economy and religion.

'... individuals who worked full-time, "the Catholic religion may enhance productivity by teaching discipline or by fostering other characteristics that are rewarded in the labor market; (in addition,) firms may recognise that Catholics have certain desirable traits that are generally unobservable, such as drive, motivation, honesty, trustworthiness, or strong work ethic, which may indicate a lower likelihood of shirking" (Ewing 2000). Thus, this signals that this is an aspect of being raised in the Catholic faith... At the beginning of the 20th Century, Max Weber explored the same concept but in regards to Protestantism. Weber argued that protestants were more motivated to apply themselves because they valued their worldly success with salvation (Bailey 2013).'

It is important that candidates offer comparisons of perspectives that help inform judgements. Candidates should offer comparisons throughout the report as they come to the end of a particular theme. In the *'educational facilities'* example used above, the candidate is exploring the implications of the question through the lens of the economic theme. In the report the candidate compared the economic benefits and costs before arriving at an intermediary conclusion (see Concepts, Research Methods and Judgements below). Taking such an approach enables the candidate several opportunities to offer perspective comparison.

It is anticipated that candidates will offer a more holistic comparison of perspectives before the final judgement is made. There are many candidates who present contrasting perspectives and then offer a final judgement without comparing the strengths and weaknesses of the contrasting perspectives.

Sources

The range of research demonstrated both in the reports and the research logs was very impressive. There was a tendency to try and weave too many sources into the report and candidates should be more selective in their use of sources. Locating source materials with clear perspectives and strong lines of argument will prove more beneficial than research material that is informative and descriptive. It is recommended that candidates select approximately six key sources with strong arguments to support each perspective. The key sources may then be supported with more informative and descriptive sources if required. It is also important that candidates are able to not only use sources to support perspectives but also that they use sources to actively challenge perspectives.

The example below shows a candidate referencing five different sources in a less than 150 words.

'Čekerevac et al. (2022), Oscar et al. (2011), Sioshansi and Denholm (2009), and van Vliet et al. (2011) suggest that while not all countries have the suitable infrastructure to provide energy for electric vehicles from renewable sources, those that do have the necessary infrastructure can help reduce GHG emissions from the energy production for electric vehicles . . . Holmberg and Erdemir (2019) have also found that the use of renewable energy to power electric vehicles is more efficient and contributes to even lower GHG emissions due to the ability of renewable sources of energy to reduce energy loss caused by friction by 60 per cent (Holmberg and Erdemir, 2019). Additionally, Schmidt et al. (2011) and Sobol and Dyjakon (2020) have stated that bioenergy can also be used as a renewable alternative to fossil fuel energy production for electric vehicles.'

This approach was not uncommon. It allows the candidate to identify supporting sources but they are not really using the source effectively to support the perspective. Some candidates having done their research find it's necessary to include every source they have researched, but this is not the most successful approach.

Candidates should critically evaluate their key sources using a range of evaluative criteria. This is a skill that is assessed right across the Global Perspectives and Research syllabus, yet many candidates are not offering any critical evaluation of the sources they select.

Some candidates do not move beyond consideration of the author's credibility or the source provenance. Though these approaches to evaluating source material are creditworthy, to reach the higher levels candidates should be using criteria that are more explicitly related to the perspectives or evidence used. Here is an example of some strong critical evaluation from the June series.

'This study is a notable example of how the legalisation of prostitution would lead to economic mobility on a national level and creates a direct link to the debate. The authors have conducted a detailed quantitative analysis taking into account multiple variables, making the data more accurate and reliable as the analysis of numbers in quantitative data provides meaningful findings which can be applied for practical use. However, it is to be noted that this study is based solely on assumptions and is a theoretical model. The results may or may not reflect the actual outcome. Additionally, the study only considers quantitative data and does not consider the qualitative aspects, such as community reactions, and the behaviour and decisions of sex workers and clients.'

It is not necessary to critically evaluate every source and it is recommended that candidates evaluate two or three key sources on each side of the debate.

Concepts, Research Methods and Judgements

In the context of the Cambridge Research Report, concepts are defined as terms or ideas which are relevant to the subject area of the chosen topic. These usually have specialised meanings which are specific to that subject. By engaging with relevant concepts candidates are demonstrating academic engagement and rigour. It is important that candidates are able to employ concepts in a manner that is accessible to the lay reader (see Communication section below).

In the report referenced above (*'Is globalization leading to a homogenized world?'*), the candidate was able to engage with several relevant concepts, for example, assimilation, cultural imperialism and hybrid cultures.

Some candidates decided to undertake primary research. It should be noted that this is **not** a requirement. It should also be noted that candidates should not be engaging with primary research that may break ethical guidelines or compromise their safety. Teachers should give due consideration to any proposed primary research before giving their approval in the research proposal form.

Methods and methodology is an area that many candidates overlooked. Candidates should set out their methodology in or just after their introduction. Many candidates offered a separate methodology section with a heading, this is a recommended approach. Candidates should also return to their methodology when reflecting on the strengths and limitations of the conclusions reached (see Reflection section below).

Candidates should understand methodology to refer to the set of methods which are most suitable for use within a particular subject area. Candidates demonstrate understanding of their methodology when they are able to explain why the methods they have chosen are the most appropriate ones for their report.

As referenced above, when candidates offer perspective comparison having looked at the implications of the question with regard to a specific theme or context, they will offer a supported intermediary judgment. Ideally a candidate will make two or three intermediary judgements before their final judgement. Many candidates were able to do this, though sometimes the judgements were assertive rather than based on the evidence presented.

Reflection

Many candidates offered reflection on how the perspectives engaged with had consolidated or changed their original point of view. Candidates generally offered this approach to reflection on perspectives at the end of the report. This is creditworthy, but to reach the higher assessment levels candidates should reflect upon how the perspectives presented have influenced the report. The best way to do this is in the report's introduction. Below is an abridged example that was found in the introduction of a report.

My initial theory is 'foreign aid has been greatly effective in improving developing countries overall'. It was clear from initial research that the most dominant themes used to explore perspectives were economic, political, and social lenses. I chose these themes because they comprehensively cover the effects of foreign aid and are popular in academic literature surrounding aid. In terms of the efficacy of foreign aid these themes were prevalent in both perspectives and so were useful in developing a balanced report . . . Not only that, these themes are interlinked and the connections between them shaped both perspectives. I chose not to include the ethical theme as much of the research available here was one-sided and used to support the perspective against foreign aid and as I wanted a balanced report it was felt best to exclude this theme so the against perspective was not dominant.

The second aspect for assessment is the candidate's ability to reflect upon the strengths and limitations of their conclusion. There were too many examples of reports that omitted this skill. Many candidates offered thoughts for further research which are creditworthy, but to reach the higher levels candidates should consider further research explicitly in the light of the conclusions reached in the report, for example, by asking how would further research consolidate the report's conclusions.

Candidates may consider other areas of the report in terms of the strengths and limitations of the conclusions reached. For example, the range of research, the selection of themes or the methodology employed are just some areas that could be used to reflect upon the conclusions reached.

Communication

For the most part, candidates were able to present well-structured essays. Candidates need to offer a clear introduction that sets out the report's perspectives, themes, and methodology. The report should follow the structure set out in the introduction. There were cases where candidates set out which themes would be used to consider the implications of the question but these were then not addressed in the report. This is not effective structure. Candidates should use headings and discourse markers to effectively guide the reader through the report. The report should be focused on the title question throughout. An effectively structured report will contain both final and intermediary conclusions. The report must be written in continuous prose and must not exceed 5000 words, so any tables or charts should be added to the appendix and not appear in the main body of the report.

When discussing concepts, it is important that candidates engage with subject specific terminology but at the same time they need to make this accessible to the lay reader. Offering long lists of dictionary definitions is not an effective way to do this. Many candidates defined key terms in the introduction and this is fine, but this approach should not be exhaustive. When candidates engage with concepts and subject specific terminology they should make them understandable to the reader through their explanations and arguments. This is the skill of communication assessors want to see.

The final aspect of communication assessed is the candidate's ability to use an appropriate referencing system that is consistently applied across the research report. Each citation should have a full reference and this should be easily found. All reports should have a separate bibliography. When candidates use their sources to support and build perspectives, assessors need to be able to see clearly which source has been used and where. The examples reproduced above (see Questions and Perspectives and Sources) clearly cite the sources using the Harvard referencing system. Although different subject areas use different referencing systems and candidates are free to use any appropriate system, the Harvard referencing system is recommended as this makes it clear to assessors where and how sources are being used to support perspectives.