GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/11
Written Examination

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: '**different benefits (of adventure tourism…)', **Question 2: '**evidence' and **Question 3: '**convincing'. Several candidates incorrectly focused on the author's argument in **Question 2** rather than the evidence.

Some candidates spent too long on **Question 1** and so left less time for **Question 2 and Question 3** which had higher total marks. Some candidates did not complete **Question 3**, probably due to a time management issue.

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

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

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

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

General comments

There was little evidence of candidates misunderstanding the documents and most showed a good understanding of the demands of the questions. However, many candidates did not pay careful attention to the key words in the questions. For example, 'evidence' in **Question 2** where several candidates focused incorrectly on the constituents of the argument.

Most candidates organised their time well. However, a sizeable minority spent too long on **Question 1** and **Questions 2** leaving insufficient time for **Question 3** which was worth nearly half the number of 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 quotes from the documents and evaluated their significance and impact on the argument. This demonstrated that they had a secure grasp of the arguments being presented.

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

Many candidates concentrated heavily on the author's argument in **Question 2** when the key word in the question was 'evidence'. Improvement has been seen in recent years, but this year was not in line with previous improvements.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Question 1 provides encouragement for the candidate to fully read and understand the detail of Document 1. The key words in the question refer to the benefits of adventure tourism on Everest. As the question required explanation of three **different** benefits, higher scoring candidates created their own structure by writing a paragraph on each one. Lower scoring candidates tended to mix ideas and frequently only provided simple explanations.

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

The following example shows where three benefits are simply explained:

'Three different benefits that are given in Document 2 are, adventure tourism is a profitable market, it is much safer than it used to be, and more people are now able to reach the top.'

Some candidates simply started with a list of benefits and then developed them further. Some only gave a list of benefits and so could only reach a maximum of half-marks on this question.

For economic benefits, an example was: *'Adventure tourism has boosted the economy for Nepal. The Kathmandu government in Nepal earns 'huge amounts of cash' from climbing permits which typically cost USD 10,000. Additionally, the guides are said to also earn a substantial income from these tourists.'*

This scored two marks, one for the idea of boosting the economy and the second for the guides receiving a substantial income from the tourists. The second is paraphrased while the middle section about climbing permits is copied from the document and would therefore not be creditworthy.

For safety, an example was: *'Adventure tourism has made climbing Everest much safer. The use of supplementary oxygen and the help of mountain guides clipping inexperienced climbers to a handrail has much reduced the numbers of deaths compared to the number of people on the mountain.'*

This scored two marks. One for the first sentence – a simple explanation. The second for the development of the reasons which are paraphrased and synthesised (taken from different parts of the document)

Question 2

This question was generally well answered with many candidates correctly assessing the evidence rather than simply the argument. However, several concentrated on the argument and were able to score some marks for their reference to evidence, but this was rarely more than half the marks.

Higher scoring candidates recognised that the author was suitably qualified to access and select appropriate information and therefore justify his evidence. This was highlighted by his first-hand experience of climbing Everest. In an 'evidence' question the provenance of the document and the credibility of the author is particularly relevant when it shows the author's ability to research and select appropriate evidence. Higher scoring candidates referred to the authoritative sources like Mark Jenkins who could give expert judgments about the situation on Everest.

For weaknesses, higher scoring candidates saw that the supporting statistics were generally vague (e.g., 'more than 500 this year') and that evidence was largely unsourced. Higher scoring candidates explained how both these limitations had a negative impact on the reliability of the evidence.

The difference between higher and moderately scoring candidates was usually defined by the appropriate explanation of the strengths and weaknesses, rather than just identifying them, or not referencing the document. Several candidates made general statements without explaining or developing them. Higher scoring candidates were able to make a point, illustrate it from the document and explain the significance of the point in the context of the argument. Middle scoring candidates made a point and either illustrated or explained, but not both. Lower scoring candidates only made an initial point without illustration or explanation.

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

'The author has expertise on the topic. This is because the text states that he was 'the first Briton to climb Everest without supplementary oxygen' which shows that he has expertise on the topic as this requires a lot of knowledge and training. This ultimately strengthens the author's evidence as it displays that is more likely to be reliable and credible because he has first- hand capability and expertise and can make a clear judgment.'

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

'(The author) fails to take into account the stance of less experienced adventure lovers as well as locals as he provides no evidence from them. His sources are Western (even when) talking about the issue in Nepal ('German-Italian climber', 'the great UK explorer', 'Mark Jenkins wrote for the National Geographic') and he is British.'

Question 3

The most frequent approach was to directly compare the relative strengths and weaknesses of the two documents throughout the answer and look at their different perspectives. The strongest 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 that Document 2 was more convincing than Document 1 or the opposite. It was also possible to argue that both were equally convincing. In all cases justification for the final judgement was required.

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

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

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

Examples of strong evaluation of the arguments are:

'By using statistics to describe the mass amounts of trash left on the mountain, Document 2 leaves the reader with a better understanding of how problematic adventure tourism is. For example, when describing the clean up attempts on Everest, the author talks about the success of bringing down 'nearly 25 tonnes of rubbish', but how this is just a 'fraction of the waste dumped each year.' This paints a picture to the reader that this waste has been a prevalent issue and needs fixing.'

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

'I believe that Document 2 is much more convincing than Document 1 due to the credibility of the writers, the much greater use of accurate statistics and reference to local sources like Pemba Dorge Sherpa who has extensive, recent climbing experience.'

Higher scoring candidates linked aspects to examples in the text, 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 of candidates made assumptions based on preconceived ideas about what makes a good argument, rather than reading and evaluating the documents clearly. It is important that the candidates 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

Key messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, in order to answer all the questions. This applies to all questions, for example in **Question 1(a):** 'have national space mining laws', **Question 1(b):** 'different interpretations', **Question 2:** 'evidence' and **Question 3:** 'stronger'.

There was mostly a good balance between the time taken on each of the questions reflecting the number of marks available. However, a significant minority seemed to spend the same time on **Question 2** and **Question 3**, despite **Question 3** being worth nearly half of the available marks. Some wrote extensively for **Question 1(b)** where concise answers are acceptable and encouraged. There was no clear evidence of candidates running out of time.

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

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

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

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

General comments

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

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

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

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

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) As an 'identify' question the best answers simply and concisely stated the words of the author without paraphrasing or expanding. **Question 1** provides an encouragement for the candidate to fully read and understand the detail of Document 1. Two countries with national space mining laws are:

   (a) USA
   (b) Luxembourg

   Many candidates scored full marks, but others chose other named countries, e.g., Brazil or Belgium which did not answer the question.

(b) This question required candidates to explain different interpretations of the Outer Space Treaty in relation to space mining.

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

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

   'Many asteroid mining supports interpret the 1967 Outer Space Treaty (OST) as being similar to the 'global commons' agreement where although nobody can claim to own the ocean, anybody can take its fish, therefore claiming that although private companies can not colonise the territory in outer space, they should still be allowed to claim its resources.'

   The following example gained 1 mark as it is copied directly from the document without the candidate using their own words, paraphrasing or synthesizing. There is a single mark for selecting a correct point from the document but there is not a second mark for developed explanation.

   'The OST ban is similar to the status of the high seas as 'global commons'. This means that no state can colonize the ocean, yet everyone can catch its fish.'

Question 2

This question was generally well answered with many candidates correctly assessing the evidence rather than simply the argument. However, several candidates concentrated on the argument and despite being able to score some marks for their reference to evidence, they rarely gained more than half the marks.

Higher scoring candidates recognised that the author was suitably qualified, as a senior academic, to access and select appropriate information and therefore justify his evidence. In an 'evidence' question, the provenance of the document and the credibility of the author is particularly relevant when it shows the author's ability to research and select appropriate evidence. Higher scoring candidates referred in detail to experts in space law, like Frans von de Dunk and Brian Israel, who could provide further evidence to support the author's argument. Others highlighted the range of different examples from countries like Belgium, Brazil and Russia.

For weaknesses, higher scoring candidates saw that there were few supporting statistics. Also, these were generally vague (e.g., *'nearly 100 have signed it'*). Another aspect recognised by higher scoring candidates was that all of the evidence used by the author came from sources within the US and so there was a limited geographical perspective of sources. Higher scoring candidates explained how both these limitations had a negative impact on the reliability of the evidence.

The difference between higher and moderately scoring candidates was usually defined by the appropriate explanation of the strengths and weaknesses, rather than just identifying them, or not referencing the document. Several candidates made basic statements without explaining or developing them. Higher scoring candidates were able to: make a point, illustrate it from the document and explain the significance of the point in the context of the argument. Middle scoring candidates made a point but either illustrated or explained, but not both. Lower scoring candidates only made an initial point without illustration or explanation.

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

'…a strength that supports the author's argument is that it is mainly sourced from strong academics and experts that hold great relevance to the topic at hand. For example, by consistently referring to 'Frans von der Dunk, a space law professor at the US University of Nebraska, Lincoln', the author is able to support his argument with the perspectives of individuals that the readers know have great knowledge of space laws and the potential for asteroid mining; hence validating the sources and substantiating the arguments presented in the document.'

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

'A weakness in this document is the lack of statistical evidence. The only use of statistical evidence is, 'The 1967 OST forbids the nearly 100 states that have signed it from colonising objects into outer space'. In this example the use of the term 'nearly' leads to the statistics (being vague) having less significance as it is an unspecified example and the exact numerical value is not given. This can make it seem exaggerated which weakens (the support) for the argument.'

Question 3

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

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

Many candidates were able to pick out the aspects that reflect a strong argument, 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 their impact on the overall assessment, while lower scoring answers simply relied on a formulaic approach of what should constitute a strong argument without using supporting examples. Such answers were consequently superficial and relied on undeveloped quotes from the text.

The strongest responses were well-structured: they methodically evaluated the relative strengths of the argument (with intermediate judgements) and used appropriate examples and analysis of impact, before coming to a reasoned judgment at the end.

Examples of strong evaluation of the arguments are:

Use of statistical evidence:

'*By having strong data and claims, the arguments created will be more trustworthy. In Document 1 there is limited numerical data; 'nearly 100 states' and 'for the late 2020s', whereas in Document 2, there is a myriad of examples; 'USD 700 quintillion', '18 nations'...The use of hard numbers improved the credibility of the arguments as they are objective and can be tested for validity. The overall effect of the quantitative data is to add more power to the statements, hence proving that the content is of higher authority.'.*

Provenance

'(The author of Document 1) … 'is a senior academic for Technology, Energy and Society at SAFE'. This means that even though he is a senior academic/professional, his field of study does not (directly) relate to

space mining and international law. This indicates that any information claimed by him without supporting evidence could be considered as a sweeping statement. For instance, 'but not major seafaring…benefits', was not supported with evidence so could misguide readers as it is not backed up.

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

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/13
Written Examination

Key messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, to answer all the questions set. This applies to all questions, for example in **Question 1: '**different ways (to improve the status of women…)', **Question 2: '**evidence' and **Question 3: '**convincing'. Several candidates incorrectly focused on the author's argument in **Question 2** rather than the evidence.

Some candidates spent too long on **Question 1** and so left less time for **Question 2 and Question 3** which had higher total marks. Some candidates did not complete **Question 3,** which supported this observation.

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 quotes from the text and explaining it in the context of the document. So, not just stating **what** a strength or weakness may be, but also **how** or **why** it is a strength or weakness. There should also be explicit reference to the documents in **Question 3** and reflection on the impact of the evidence in **Question 2**.

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

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

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

General comments

There was little evidence of candidates misunderstanding the documents and most showed a good understanding of the demands of the questions. However, several candidates did not pay careful enough attention to the key words in the questions. For example, 'evidence' in **Question 2** where some candidates focused incorrectly on the constituents of the argument.

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

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

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

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

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Question 1 provides encouragement for the candidate to fully read and understand the detail of Document 1. The key words in the question refer to improving the status of women in the Indian film industry. As the question required explanation of three **different** ways, higher scoring candidates created their own structure by writing a paragraph on each one. Lower scoring candidates tended to mix ideas and frequently only provided simple explanations.

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

The following example shows where three improvements are simply explained without any further explanation.
This example of a response could only reach a maximum of half-marks for this question.

'The Board needs to accept more female-centric films,
Having more female filmmakers
Bringing out more narratives about women.'

Some candidates simply started with a list of benefits like this but then developed them further.

For having more female filmmakers, an example was: *'One way to improve the status of women in the Indian Film Industry according to Document 1 is to include more females in the process of creating films. Increasing the amount of women making films would include more female perspectives in movies thus improving the way they are portrayed.'*

This scored two marks, one for the idea of more female filmmakers and the second for explaining how this gives a more female perspective. Both parts are paraphrased and reworded.

For narratives, an example was: *'A way to improve the status of women that Document 1 provides is to produce more movies about women and their stories. This would help create an environment that encourages people to watch films about women.'*

This scored two marks. One for the first sentence – a simple explanation. The second for the development of the reasons which are paraphrased from the document.

Question 2

This question was generally well answered with most candidates correctly assessing the evidence rather than simply the argument.

Higher scoring candidates recognised that the sources of the evidence were relevant to the film industry and had first hand-experience making them strong and reliable. Higher scoring candidates also referred to the use of a range of accurate statistics. Some referred to the 2017 study which analysed 4000 films and so had a very large sample size, improving the reliability of the data.

For weaknesses, higher scoring candidates saw that the supporting statistics were sometimes unsourced and in others there were no initial numbers so the percentages lacked significance. Again, higher scoring candidates explained how both these limitations had a negative impact on the reliability of the evidence.

The difference between higher and moderately scoring candidates was usually defined by the appropriate explanation of the strengths and weaknesses, rather than just identifying them, or not referencing the document. Several candidates made basic statements without explaining or developing them. Higher scoring candidates were able to: make a point, illustrate it from the document and explain the significance of the point in the context of the argument. Middle scoring candidates made a point and either illustrated or explained, but not both. Lower scoring candidates only made an initial point without illustration or explanation.

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

'The evidence has a strength in its objective and concrete data and percentages. For example, noting that the study 'Analysing Gender Stereotyping in Bollywood Movies', analysed 4000 movies across … the years 1970 – 2017. This creates a very strong piece of evidence because it provides all the details of the study as well as later giving the specific percentages of screentime that females get versus males. This level of specificity makes it an easier source to trust and rely on.'

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

'*Many sources in the article are not cited so it is unclear if they are trustworthy or not. Faroogui cites 'the 2007 study' but does not say where this study came from making it hard for readers to determine the reliability of the source. The author goes on to reference 'another study' and 'this 2012 study'. In both these cases readers are not told where the information comes from…The source could be from a well-known film website or a (unsupported) blog post. Without this, we cannot determine its credibility, severely weakening the strength of the statistics.'*

Question 3

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

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

Many candidates were able to pick out the aspects that reflect a strong argument, 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 their impact on the overall assessment, while lower scoring answers simply relied on a formulaic approach of what should constitute a strong argument without using supporting examples. Such answers were consequently superficial and relied on undeveloped quotes from the text.

The strongest responses were well-structured: they methodically evaluated the relative strengths of the argument (with intermediate judgements) and used appropriate examples and analysis of impact, before coming to a reasoned judgment at the end.

Examples of strong evaluation of the arguments are:

'*Document 2 showcases events across the globe, citing the US, UN, Cairo, Venice, Berlin and the Greater Middle East. This global perspective shows readers how big an issue gender inequality in film is. It allows readers to trust their argument as well because it comes from a variety of sources, cultures and backgrounds. Document 1 only focuses on India, giving it a narrow perspective (scope) which makes readers led inclined to trust the argument because it is not portrayed as a global issue.'*

'*Document 2 uses many quotes from women in the film industry, such as Shahira Zaki and Abou Seif. Women in the film industry have first-hand experience of how the industry affects them and the portrayal of women. Because of this, readers are more likely to trust them since they are speaking from true experience.'*

Judgement – this example gives a good final supported judgement relating to the relative convincing nature of the two arguments. When reading this example, it is important to recognise that this is a summary,

providing a judgement based on points raised in detail throughout the answer. There were intermediate conclusions throughout the answer of which this is a summary.

'Overall, Document 2 was more convincing than Document 1. Document 1 uses more (statistical) evidence than Document 2 but (being unsourced) could be based on bias and personal opinion. Document 2 does a much better jo of using global evidence and so is a more developed argument than Document 1 which was based in India.'

Higher scoring candidates 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 of candidates made assumptions based on preconceived ideas about what makes a good argument, rather than reading and evaluating the documents clearly. It is important that the candidates engage critically with the documents, rather than make generalised comments that could apply to any document.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

| Paper 9239/02 |
| Essay |

Key messages

- Candidates should present globally contrasting perspectives. To achieve this, candidates must inform their perspectives with argument and evidence that relates to different global contexts.
- Conclusions are required to be reflective and present relevant areas for further research.
- Candidates should be mindful that a critical evaluation of source material is an important part of the essay.

General comments

This series has seen some really engaging essays that have addressed interesting global issues. In presenting contrasting perspectives on these issues, candidates were able to demonstrate application of the skills that underpin the Global Perspectives and Research syllabus. The issues chosen by candidates should emanate from the list of topics published in the syllabus. Some of the most popular issues candidates responded to this series included the impact of social media, the role of nuclear energy, gender and equality and the impact of tourism on developing countries.

Global Perspectives and Research is a skills-based course and in completing the Essay component candidates are assessed against seven different criteria. All the criteria have equal weighting. Addressing all of the assessment criteria within the word count requires candidates to plan their essays carefully. Some essays omitted to address all the criteria. Key omissions included critical evaluation of source material, reflection, further research and the development of global perspectives.

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

Perspectives

A perspective consists of more than one argument and should be understood as a coherent world view which is a response to an issue. The candidate needs to develop two perspectives, each of which responds to the chosen issue in a contrasting manner. The vast majority of candidates successfully set up a debate between two contrasting perspectives.

Choice of title is key to success here. '*Do the benefits of nuclear energy outweigh the risks?*' is a title that enabled the candidate to develop contrasting perspectives that responded to the issue of using nuclear energy as a replacement for fossil fuel. The title sets up a clear debate. The move to nuclear energy is an issue that many countries around the world are considering and so the perspectives developed by the candidate are able to be informed by globally contextualised arguments and evidence. To achieve higher levels at criteria **Empathy for Perspectives** and **Globality of Perspectives** candidates must use source material that pertains to different geographical contexts. It remains the case that some candidates still locate their debates in a single country or do not make it clear which global context the arguments and evidence relate to.

A title such as, '*How does the internet affect the mental health of school age children*' suggests no discernible debate. Such a title is likely to lead to a descriptive essay rather than a debate between contrasting perspectives.

Global Perspectives and Research encourages candidates to engage with perspectives that may challenge their preconceived ideas. When writing their essays candidates must remain objective and give each perspective a fair hearing. They should be balanced and empathetic when presenting each perspective. Sometimes candidates can find this difficult, particularly when they choose an emotive issue such as animal testing. It is important that candidates research an issue that they can approach it with an open mind.

The definition above stated that a perspective consists of more than one argument. Candidates need to make links between source materials, making it clear how one source supports or corroborates another source. Some candidates still look at each source in isolation. In order to develop perspectives, candidates should synthesise their research material into coherent perspectives. This can be seen in the following example:

Duffy (2022) argues that the economic sacrifice put into these facilities is not sustainable in many countries, which shows how a significant amount of money is needed for this type of tourism. This highlights how difficult it is for ecotourism to be implemented in South American countries that rely on their ecosystems as a form of economic stability. The claim is further cemented by a corroborating source stating that emergency relief funds in East Africa were difficult to assess for nature-based tourism enterprises . . . (Gallagher 2020).

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

Candidates should also offer some holistic evaluation of the perspectives presented. Candidates often do this before arriving at their final conclusion. Candidates may summarise the perspectives before weighing up their qualities in terms of evidence and argument. Candidate evaluation may make reference to some of the themes that inform the perspectives such as Environment, Ethics, Economics or Culture.

Source Material

There are two different global dimensions the candidates should consider. The first one, already mentioned above, is the concept of globally contrasting perspectives. The example reproduced above showed a candidate synthesising argument and evidence pertaining to South America and East Africa. If the contrasting perspective was informed by argument and evidence regarding developing countries in Asia, then clearly the perspectives would have global contrast.

The other global dimension candidates should consider is the provenance of their source material. Global Perspectives and Research assesses the candidate's ability to research material that emanates from different parts of the world. Not only should the research material be credible and relevant, it should have diverse global provenance. A successful candidate from this series used articles from The Jordan Times, The Asian Journal of Pharmacy, The World Health Organisation and The New European. These are all credible sources with globally diverse provenance. Sometimes the referencing does not make it clear where the source/author emanates from. In such cases it would be worthwhile the candidate briefly stating the country of origin of the source/author. There are still many candidates selecting source material that emanates from their home country only.

As the candidates begin to analyse their source material, they should refine their source selection. Sometimes the candidates are trying to use too many different sources, when six to eight well-selected sources would be sufficient. Having narrowed down their research material, the candidates are then required to demonstrate understanding of their sources. Addressing criterion **Analysis of Sources** candidates must be able put forward the arguments of credible authors in a controlled manner. To achieve higher levels, the source material should be complex, and the candidate should be able to demonstrate conceptual engagement.

Another aspect of the criterion **Analysis of Sources** that the candidates need to consider is the critical evaluation of source material. In essence, the candidate should demonstrate why the source is worthy of being used but also acknowledge any weaknesses it may contain. A significant minority of candidates do not offer critical evaluation of source material and such omissions do impact the levels awarded.

Candidates should evaluate at least two sources, one from each side of the debate, and try to use different criteria when doing so. Different criteria could be the use of evidence, vested interest, author credibility, logic

of argument, balance or provenance amongst many other possible areas for critical evaluation. The candidates are advised to offer one or two developed points of critical evaluation for up to four sources, rather than a series of assertive or under-developed points of critical evaluation. The following example from this series demonstrates one clearly developed and insightful piece of critical evaluation.

Strengths are evident in Huang's article as he provides statistical information regarding 'Mental Health and Chronic Physical Health Conditions in Children and Youth' that gives an insight on the percentages of teens being affected by mental health and getting treatment. They also include tables and graphs that prove the medical behavioural health care system is centred around the youth including prevention and treatment. By including such data, it allows the author to describe the complexity of the medical health care system in a precise manner interrelating to other factors (sic).

This is enough critical evaluation of a single source. The candidate then offers further critical evaluation of other sources using different criteria; their next piece of critical evaluation examines the potential bias of an author.

Conclusions

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

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

In this example, the candidate's conclusion is thoughtful and follows on logically from the debate presented in the essay. It is clear the candidate is weighing up the perspectives, as they move toward a final conclusion.

On evaluating both arguments, the debate attesting to the suitability of nursing for males has a stronger claim, providing substantial arguments to believe that regardless of the obstacles faced by men in the world of nursing, they still have hope as the demand for male nurses increases as do the benefits . . . The alternative viewpoint finds that nursing is not a suitable option for men as men are not given equal opportunities and are barred from practicing in obstetrics and gynaecology . . . However, through thorough research, I found that men are indeed needed in the nursing industry not only to aid male patients who might feel more comfortable with male nurses during sensitive procedures but also to cultivate gender equality in the nursing profession and eradicate any biases towards the profession and men choosing nursing as a career (sic).

Candidates are required to do two other things in their conclusion: to reflect on the impact of contrasting perspectives on their personal viewpoint, and to make recommendations for further research. To reach higher levels for the criterion **Conclusion and Reflection,** these two elements must be addressed.

Reflection should be evaluative in tone and fully address how the candidate's personal opinion has changed or been consolidated by the process. Here's a strong example from this series.

Before my research, I was solely informed about the negative impacts aquaculture has had on the environment from a discussion of mangrove destruction in marine science class. However, now that I have learned more about how aquaculture provides economic and food-related stability on an international scale, I am more cognizant of how this practice is a worldwide necessity. After furthering my knowledge on the subject, I believe the benefits of aquaculture do outweigh the environmental implications (sic).

The final thing to consider in the conclusion is a suggestion for further research. Candidates should develop a specific focus for further research that emanates directly from their research experience. This does not need to be lengthy.

To better understand various perspectives, such as how the banning of child labor imposes western ideals on said places, further research of how this ban is enacted and what it results in would contribute to proving how significant child labor is in developing countries . . . An example of this would be to conduct a study around whether banning certain laboring jobs would result in an income drop for families . . . This research would prove most significant by demonstrating how child labor regulations may improve or worsen the lives of families living in developing countries (sic).

Communication

Most candidates were successful in communicating a logical and coherent debate. To reach the higher attainment levels for this criterion (**Communication Skills**), candidates need to structure their essays effectively. The use of discursive markers to guide the reader through the essay is a good way to do this. Successful candidates used discursive markers such as *firstly*, *secondly* or *finally* to show the order of ideas. Many candidates were able to indicate the start of a new perspective using discursive markers such as *however*, *alternatively* or *on the other hand*.

It is also important that candidates keep their essays focused on the question and that the title question is answered in the conclusion. With that in mind it is important that candidates do not digress from their debate by offering lengthy introductions with historical context and definitions of key terms. The essay has a 2 000-word limit in which candidates must address seven assessment criteria, so it is important not to use an excessive amount of words on discussion that is not pertinent to the debate. A brief introduction outlining why the issue is important and what the contrasting perspectives are is all that is required.

Finally, candidates must offer full referencing of their source material via citations or footnotes and a bibliography. For referencing to be consider effective it should be consistent and logical. Candidates should not bolster their bibliographies by reproducing the bibliographies presented in their source material. Only sources that the candidate has researched themselves should be referenced. There were examples from this series of bibliographies that were five pages long with nearly 30 different references. That is not plausible for a 2 000-word essay.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

<table>
<tr><td>Paper 9239/03
Team Project</td></tr>
</table>

Key messages

Successful presentations explore their issue locally and globally and link it throughout to their arguments.

The strongest candidates differentiated their perspective by exploring other perspectives and explaining why theirs is the best throughout their presentation.

Discourse markers help to strengthen the structure of arguments and enabled candidates to score highly.

Candidates scored well when they had a clear conclusion at the end of their presentation, which was based on what they had presented so far. Good candidates also explained why their solution was effective.

Successful candidates made explicit references to visual aids to help back up their argument – for example the use of graphs to support the explanation of the issue.

Reflective papers should focus on evaluation of the group work – what went well and what could they improve on – how would they learn from it and change their teamwork if they were to do another project like this? Candidates should also reflect on their own learning – explaining what they have learnt about the issue from doing this project.

General comments

Definition of issue and range of research

The best candidates presented issues that were global in nature but had a more localised focus. Some projects were too wide in scope to provide well-developed and focused conclusions and solutions. Other projects were simply a generalised study of the issue and largely focused on background information rather than identifying a clear issue that had a solution. e.g., 'To what extent can the causes of homelessness be reduced?' or, 'Are the effects of genetically modified organisms positive or negative?'. Titles such as these tend to produce lots of information which, in turn, lead to generalised conclusions with no real solutions, or solutions that do not match the issue.

A good example of a candidate clearly defining an issue could be seen in a presentation on the issue of modern-day slavery. This was defined by a quote from a UN protocol and followed by an outline of the different forms of modern-day slavery that exist, citing statistics and reasons why an individual might find themselves involved with modern day slavery. The definition was clear, succinct and demonstrated knowledge and research. This same response also demonstrated detailed research, citing statistics and information from various countries including the USA, UK and Romania.

Candidates who scored in the lower bands of the mark scheme tended to be those who had undertaken little research; made very brief reference to research or relied solely upon research relating to their home state, or country. There were many examples of candidates confining themselves to their chosen issue within their own state, or who widened the scope of their research to other parts of the USA but not further afield, thus not considering the global aspect of the issue.

Candidates must understand the importance of careful selection in terms of the issue they plan to explore and that this stage in the process should not be rushed as this is likely to result in difficulties developing the project at a later stage. Later, in their Reflective Papers, some candidates explained how the team did some

preliminary research on potential issues before selecting one to develop and that this approach had served them well because they were able to identify any issues that were not going to be suitable for development early on. Conversely, other candidates explained how their team had decided on solutions at the outset, before carrying out any research, and then tried to match their research to their pre-determined solution. Too late, they realised that such an approach imposed too many constraints on them and did not allow them to fully develop their ideas.

It is important that candidates are aware that they should be making specific reference to their research throughout the presentation as a list of 'works cited' at the end does not provide additional credit.

Differentiation of perspective

For this criterion the majority of candidates tended to state what their own perspective was and which perspectives their team members were considering. Some candidates differentiated between perspectives on the issue from the standpoint of their solutions. While these approaches did allow for some differentiation (Level 3), they did not allow candidates to reach the upper levels of the mark scheme because there was insufficient engagement with other perspectives to count as 'differentiated (L4)', or 'sharply differentiated (L5)'. This is achieved by candidates actively engaging with their team members' perspectives by comparing/contrasting them with their own perspective and/or rebutting other solutions by evaluating why their own solution would be better. There were some excellent examples of this from some candidates this year, but most candidates achieved a Level 3.

Occasionally, candidates took a very different but nevertheless perfectly valid approach to perspective differentiation, an approach which did not rely solely on stating their teammates' alternative perspectives and/or solutions. Candidates taking this approach tended to have chosen an issue with some degree of controversy attached to it with arguments to be made both for and against what was under discussion. For instance some candidates chose to explore the issue of access to abortion. In this instance, the candidate not only identified their own and their team members' perspectives, they went on to develop their own argument by drawing together the different opposing views their research had uncovered and either agreeing or disagreeing with those views and explaining why, before coming to a logical conclusion based on the evidence they had presented (L5) and proposing a solution to the problem. When this approach was done successfully, it demonstrated not only a high level of skill in terms of being able to differentiate between alternative perspectives, it also indicated an ability to synthesise information/views across different (often scholarly) research sources. If adopting this approach though, it is important that candidates ensure that the presentation flows well to avoid the structure of the presentation becoming segmented.

Structure of argument and support

The basic structure of most presentations was generally sound (L3), with the issues outlined clearly; research elaborated on; conclusions drawn and solutions offered. Weaknesses were often linked back to ill-defined topic issues or scope that was too broad to offer adequate supporting judgements. To provide solid support, candidates need to meaningfully use what they have discovered in their research to support or justify their assertions, conclusions or proposals, providing elaboration and explaining their reasoning.

Some candidates structured their argument very methodically, relying upon key slides and headers, beginning with a clear definition of the issue, moving on into research perspectives and then reaching a conclusion, proposing a solution and explaining the potential for their chosen solution. Some candidates took a different approach and chose to outline their solution very early on in the presentation and then move on to presenting their arguments and justifications for that solution. For presentations to be considered 'well-structured and argued (L4)', there should be clear signposting of the overall direction the argument is taking, with the use of general discourse markers such as 'therefore'; 'consequently'; 'similarly'; 'in contrast to', for example. The best presentations flowed well due to clear transitions and signposts. However, some candidates tended to go straight into discussing a solution, without outlining or explaining the actual issue/s they were trying to solve.

There were a substantial number of brief presentations (four minutes or less) which made identifying the structure difficult as the time was too short to establish the structure and argument. There were also candidates who did presentations which were longer than ten minutes and this impacted their ability to score highly for the structure as well as conclusion and solution.

Conclusion and Solution

While there were some well thought out conclusions, these tended to be few and far between. For the most part conclusions were either mostly or partly based on the evidence that had been presented, with less strong responses tending to finish abruptly – sometimes this was due to the time limit. Some conclusions were very brief and sometimes simply repeated the solution rather than summarising the key points of the argument in the presentation. Often, even effective solutions were not accompanied by any kind of conclusion, and the solutions were not being arrived at as a logical outcome from the research and development of the argument. In stronger responses, candidates supported why their solution would work and, in some cases, was better than their teammates'.

Weaker responses simply identified a solution and lacked any kind of elaboration. Some candidates presented as their own solutions that were already in place, without any kind of modification to fit the context of their own project. There were also a number of very idealistic solutions that were, for a wide variety of reasons, impractical.

Higher marks are not awarded for simply stating that a solution is 'effective' or 'innovative'. Candidates need to demonstrate why this is the case, for instance by evaluating the effectiveness of their own solution against other solutions and explaining why theirs is the best/strongest. Some candidates tried to do this by listing the pros and cons of their solution, which was a good place to start, but then they did not take the further, essential step, of how the cons might be addressed in order to retain their solution and/or make it effective. There were few 'innovative' solutions. Candidates should be aware that they do not need to come up with an idea that is completely unique to achieve L5 for the solution. It might be the case that what they are proposing has never been tried in their own country/state etc. but has been tried elsewhere and found to work very well. Innovation could then be shown in how the solution could be adapted to work in their own context and how it could be implemented.

Presentational methods

The best candidates engaged well and consistently with their slides, for example demonstrating a judgement by pointing to graphs, tables, photographs etc., was a commonly used and valuable technique to communicate ideas and give some interaction with their PowerPoint.

Less successful examples of presentations were those where the candidate had used slides to depict cartoon images or photos, with very little text and no verbal elaboration; or those candidates who seemed to use their PowerPoint slides merely as a background, whilst they read their presentation. Some made no, or very little reference to their slides. Neary all candidates looked to the camera, even those who relied upon reading their presentation tended to glance up now and then. Some candidates talked extremely quickly, apparently not due to nerves but to seemingly ensure their content made it under the 8-minute limit. Some candidates did not take note of the 8-minute time allowance, and therefore lost out as the conclusions and solutions occurred after the time limit and so could not be given credit.

A notable aspect seen was the number of candidates delivering their presentations remotely. This method was embraced and delivered excellently by many of the candidates.

Overall, candidates might benefit from further skills in presentation delivery. Aspects such as interacting with the Power Point, highlighting information on the slides, and elaborating upon it would benefit candidates. Some were very well-versed in these techniques and demonstrated ease and confidence in doing so. Those candidates who clearly knew their topic, knew what they wanted to say, and had seemingly put a lot of time and effort into preparation, often delivered a well-paced and projected presentation.

The effectiveness of some presentations was marred by a background of noise or music, or candidates were positioned in such a way as to obscure their presentation slides or kept them in a side-on position rather than frontal.

Reflective Paper: evaluation of collaboration

Much of the evidence presented here was a description of events and how they unfolded, which kept responses at L2. There was often little in the way of evaluation or reflection on what went well, what did not, how decisions were finally arrived at and whether those decisions were the right ones. Rarely did candidates go into depth about instances of how certain actions influenced the development of the project (either positively or negatively). There was little evidence of honest reflection and most candidates reported that their team had all worked perfectly well together. There was a lot of description of how the group organised

themselves in terms of the logistics of working as a team, almost a diary approach. The best reflection critically evaluates the candidate's strengths and weaknesses as team players.

The best candidates reflected on what went well in their groups, as well as what did not go well and could have been improved on – for example, several candidates talked about how the lack of communication within the group hindered them in various ways, and then wrote about how they could improve this if they were to do the project again.

Reflective Paper: reflection on learning

The best reflections were when candidates demonstrated the impact the project and their own and their teammates' research had had on them; how it had made them think differently or had made them consider a change in their own behaviour or attitude as a result of what they had learned. Candidates should be advised that what is required here is reflection on the issue itself and the research carried out by both themselves and their teammates, and not a reflection on what new skills they have learned, such as public speaking; effective researching, or making PowerPoint slides. Considerations for future research should arise naturally from their reflection on this research, rather than being an 'add-on'. Candidates should also be reminded that reflection on what has been learned; how their perspective has changed and future research, belongs in the Reflective Paper and not in the Presentation itself. Including these elements in the presentation takes up time reducing the time available for developing their arguments and building up to the conclusion and solution and gains no credit under the presentation assessment criteria.

There was sometimes significant imbalance in the way candidates addressed the two criteria for the Reflective Paper. Some candidates placed considerable emphasis on evaluating their collaborative experience while neglecting to reflect on their learning, and vice versa. To score highly a candidate must focus on both elements.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/04
Cambridge Research Report

Key messages

The question must allow a sustained discussion and evaluation of different perspectives.

The evidence chosen should be credible and not selected simply to criticize it.

Evaluation should be clear rather than just juxtaposition of different views.

General comments

Most reports were based on evidence and showed commitment to individual research. However, there was a gap between reports which showed a sustained critical sense and deployed the skills developed in GP, and reports that were more like projects with the emphasis on conveying information rather than demonstrating higher level thinking skills. In some cases, the choice of title was unhelpful in leading to higher-level work. There was a distinction between reports which primarily described and explained, and reports which analysed and evaluated. There was also a distinction between reports which selected a range of evidence suitable to the nature of the topic and reports which relied on superficial or unreliable evidence. In many cases the results were impressive, and the logs showed a degree of involvement and hard work from the candidates and their teachers. Where the results were more variable, the learners still benefited from the experience. Undertaking the Cambridge Report will stand candidates in good stead for the demands of higher and further education and the world of work.

Choosing a question is a vital first step and the logs often revealed how seriously this was taken by the candidates and their teachers. Where the questions led naturally to an extended analysis of different credible perspectives, this was time well spent. However, where questions led more naturally to an explanation of a series of factors or explanations rather than to supported judgement, some reports were less successful. Candidates should avoid asking 'Why...? or 'How...?' or using titles which are not in the form of a question at all. In some cases the wording was so complex and obscure that it was impossible to see what issue was to be discussed. Candidates are encouraged to ask clear questions which invite a discussion. Reports should not have to spend a long time explaining what the question involves but should be able to get quickly to an outline of the possible debate. It sometimes requires moderators to look at the first sections of a report to see what the candidate has identified as the key issue. For example, if the topic is simply 'Nuclear power', it is difficult to see where the report is going, especially if it takes two pages of background description before the thrust of the debate is established – that is, in this example, how far countries should meet energy needs by nuclear power. 'Nuclear Power' could be the title of a project, but this report needs a specific question which leads to different perspectives.

The evaluation of a range of evidence for different perspectives is crucial to forming a decision. If the evidence for one perspective is more convincing and substantial, the report will be more of a demonstration of a viewpoint than an evaluation of different views. The choice of topic can be crucial and it should allow for a critical consideration of different credible views. While there may well be different views on 'Should women have equal pay?', if the counter argument is simply based on prejudiced and tendentious websites or blogs which can be 'evaluated' by analysing bias, irrationality and lack of substantiation, then the whole point of the discussion seems to be lost. It would be the equivalent of asking someone with no mathematical knowledge about Fermat's Theorem and then saying that they were a useless source of knowledge. In some cases a survey of classmates or other students seemed to fall into that category. If the investigation was about the attitudes or the experience of young people, then this sort of survey could be relevant. If it is about a complex issue of which the respondents had no particular expertise, then it seems pointless to ask them simply to say

that the survey was unreliable. There was some over reliance on simple or uniformed evidence that happened to be accessible via the internet. Greater discrimination in the choice of evidence would have led to better-informed reports and the chance to engage with and assess studies which were not self-evidently weak or unreliable.

Evaluation and judgement are vital to the reports. Many candidates offered little more than the juxtaposition of different explained views. The greater use of interim judgements and more specific evaluative terms would have helped many candidates to form more judgements. Simply explaining who the authors of conflicting studies were often did little to evaluate the arguments and evidence. Some reports were more like literature reviews in which sources supporting and opposing a viewpoint were described sequentially and their authors identified. To take an example, a source from an organisation funded by energy companies make an argument against a windfall tax on profits. Certainly, knowing the origin of the source might lead to the need to look carefully at the arguments, but it would not necessarily make them invalid. If a key argument was that companies needed money to invest, then this would need to be investigated by finding out how much they had actually invested. An instant judgement based on the origin of evidence is often formulaic and unconvincing. In an academic debate it is likely that protagonists will be equally well qualified 'experts' so judgment depends on the arguments they offer, the strength of evidence, the degree of corroboration from other evidence and any underlying assumptions that may affect their thinking. Without this type of analysis, 'evaluation' may be as superficial and misleading as simply accepting opinion at face value.

In terms of marking, most centres ensured that the levels given for the key elements in AO1 Analysis corresponded to the final mark, though some logs which were simply records of sources read seemed to be over credited. Sometimes the logs suggested a more evaluative approach than was adopted in the actual report. The most accurate assessment was for AO1 Analysis and marks often reflected the relevance of the research done, though it would have helped some markers to indicate where there was excessive description or where the report had lost sight of the question and was relying on the conveying of information. The biggest difference between centre marking and moderator marking continued to be in AO3 Evaluation. Evaluation means making a judgement and supporting that judgement on evidence and following from that on the whole perspective by thinking critically.

Sometimes centre annotation suggested that explanation of evidence was seen as evaluation and sometimes marks for evaluation were given when no marginal annotation had identified any critical assessment. There is guidance available about this crucial aspect and if moderation feedback suggested there was a problem, centres are strongly advised to seek advice before next year when these reports will be externally marked. The marking of communication was generally realistic but the prevailing trend in assessing Reflection was to be over generous to comments which explained personal experience rather than reflecting on methodology and adequacy of evidence.

The Cambridge Research Report remains a highly valuable undertaking in terms of educational and personal development. As dilemmas and issues in the world become more complex, the massive increase in information has not led to consensus about solutions but has often added to the problems. To be able to look at different viewpoints and information critically and have to the tools to manage this flow of information is increasingly vital for all citizens.