

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/12
Written Exam

Key messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, paying close attention to the key words, to answer all the questions set. This applies to all questions. For example, in **Question 1(a)**: ‘identify’, ‘two surveys used to measure public opinion’, ‘as given by the author’; in **Question 1(b)**: ‘identify’, ‘three organisations’, ‘as given by the author’; in **Question 2**: ‘evidence’ and ‘impact’; and in **Question 3**: ‘perspectives’, ‘judgement’ and ‘stronger’.

It was encouraging to see that very few candidates spent too long on **Question 1**, allowing more time for **Question 2** and **Question 3**, which carry much higher total marks. **Question 1** only requires short answers or bullet points, and most candidates responded accordingly. However, candidates should be aware that responses to **Question 1(a)** might be found anywhere in Document A, and responses to **Question 1(b)** might be found anywhere in Document B.

To achieve higher marks in **Questions 2 and 3**, candidates should develop their points clearly. This involves making a point, illustrating it with information or appropriate quotes from the text, and explaining it in the context of the document. This means not just stating what a strength or weakness may be but also explaining how or why it is a strength or weakness. There should also be reflection on the impact of the evidence in **Question 2** and explicit reference to perspectives in **Question 3**.

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 is not appropriate for perspectives, analysis, and evaluation in **Questions 2 and 3**.

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

AOs requiring general improvement are: **AO1b (Explanation)** in **Question 2**, and **AO1b (Perspectives)** and **AO1c (Evaluation of key components)** in **Question 3**.

There was little evidence of candidates misunderstanding the documents, and many demonstrated a clear grasp of the question requirements. It was encouraging to see that many candidates recognised the need to explain the impact of the evidence on the author’s argument in **Question 2**, with many reaching a reasoned judgment by the end. However, while candidates often provided reasons for why a piece of evidence was strong or weak, they struggled to fully develop these into clear explanations. It is crucial for candidates to read and understand the entire question before answering. Although some did not address perspectives in **Question 3** as required, many more made an effort to identify and describe them as an introduction to their answers. Some, however, only evaluated key components that could have applied to any document. Candidates who were brief and focused in answering **Question 1(a) and 1(b)** and confined their responses to assessing evidence in **Question 2** had more time for **Question 3**, which accounted for over half the available marks. It is important for candidates to recognise the value of each question and allocate their time accordingly. Candidates should remember that the author’s perspective is only relevant in **Question 3**, so referencing it in **Question 2** does not earn credit and is not a good use of time. **Question 2** is focussed solely on the evidence in the first document, and candidates should concentrate on this aspect only. In **Question 3**, stronger responses selected relevant and appropriate points from the documents and evaluated their significance. These stronger answers also considered the authors’ perspectives and compared them across both documents.

The rubric of the paper requires candidates to write in continuous prose. While concise answers in **Question 1** are acceptable and encouraged, **Questions 2 and 3** should be answered in full paragraphs, rather than using bullet points. Using paragraphs to make each point helps candidates track their separate points, develop them, and conclude with their impact or strength. This approach also helps avoid repetition, such as citing the same sources multiple times, and aids the flow of the argument by making specific points readily visible at the beginning of each paragraph. Some candidates wrote well-structured responses for **Questions 2 and 3**, while others wrote in a less well-organised way.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Question 1 encourages candidates to fully read and understand the details of both documents before starting the questions. The question paper indicates that approximately 15 minutes should be used for this, which is included within the exam time. Answers only need to be brief and can be in bullet points, copied directly from the text. The answers to **Question 1(a)** and **1(b)** are found as part of the reading and understanding of the documents. These answers are designed to be straightforward, so answering the questions in order is recommended.

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

Both parts of the question require candidates to identify points mentioned by the authors. No credit is given for any response which is not a point identified by the authors of the documents.

Question 1(a) asked candidates to identify two surveys used to measure public opinion, as given by the author of Document A. The expected answers were:

- (Survey by) World Animal Protection/WAP
- (Survey by) Humane Society International/Africa/HSI/Africa

There were two possible answers, and candidates could score full marks by identifying both of them. Almost all candidates scored 2 marks for this question.

Question 1(b) asked candidates to identify three organisations that have considered Syed Yahya Shah's proposal (which is described in the document). There were three acceptable answers:

- International Union for Conservation of Nature
- Gilgit-Baltistan Forest and Wildlife Department
- World Wide Fund (for Nature)/WWF

A large number of candidates scored full marks here. A small number scored only 1 or 2 marks. An example of an approach to **Question 1(b)** giving 2 out of 3 marks was:

- *Gilgit-Baltistan Forest*
- *Wildlife Department*
- *World Wide Fund for Nature*

Here, the candidate appears not to have understood that Gilgit-Baltistan Forest and Wildlife Department, as mentioned in the document, is one organisation.

An example of an approach to **Question 1b** giving 0 out of 3 marks was:

Three organisations which have considered Syed Yahya Shah's proposal are Bar Valley Community, Siberian Ibex and Community Based Hunting Programme.

Here, the candidate appears to have misunderstood key elements of the document and/or the question.

Question 2

This question was well-answered, with most candidates correctly assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author to support their argument. Explanations for why a piece of evidence was strong or weak were often limited to terms like 'more trustworthy,' 'expert,' or 'can't be fact-checked.' More development is required for an explanation to be credited under **AO1b**. The question specifically required candidates to explain the impact of the evidence on the author's argument or claim. Candidates were well prepared for this part of the question and demonstrated this skill. Additionally, some candidates attempted a reasoned summary judgment. Some candidates attempted some analysis of the impact of the evidence on the argument, and some were able to develop this sufficiently to achieve higher marks. The question focused on the analysis of 'evidence,' so answers that related to language or structure were not credited. Common discussion points often included the use of the statistics and survey information in the document.

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**). A score of 5 marks for AO1a was common. Marks for **AO1c** were often the lowest, while many candidates scored mid-range marks for **AO1b**.

A clearly structured approach is:

- Identify a type of evidence (**AO1a**)
- Give an example of that type of evidence from the document (**AO1a**)
- Clearly assess whether it is a strength or weakness (**AO1b**)
- Provide a developed explanation of why it is a strength or weakness (**AO1b**)
- Evaluate the impact of the evidence on the argument, author's claim, or on the reader (**AO1c**).

Strong answers used a paragraph format to explain each strength/weakness, including the impact on the argument. They provided judgments at the end of strengths and weaknesses, followed by an overall judgment weighing up the strengths and weaknesses and the overall impact of all the evidence.

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 would not gain many marks.

A higher-scoring candidate for this aspect would give several types of evidence with examples, such as:

Document A is written by Don Pinnock, who is a writer, investigative journalist and photographer. The article includes a range of sources such as the world animal protection – WAP, Humane Society International Africa surveys, and even specialists in this field to name a few, Dr Matthew Schurch and Edith Kabesiime.

For **AO1b – Analysing the strengths and weaknesses of evidence**, higher-scoring candidates 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 strengths or weaknesses rather than just stating a point.

Strong answers used a three-pronged approach to fully demonstrate the skill of explaining why evidence was strong or weak. For example:

Document A has both strengths and weaknesses. The article is written by Don Pinnock who is a South African writer, investigative journalist and photographer, he is also a researcher in the Centre of Criminology, University of Cape Town. This means that he has the experience in the field, and this indicates that his statements are more likely to be backed by valid research.

As we can see, in this example, there is a three-pronged approach. Firstly, the candidate notes that the author has a credible background. Secondly the candidate notes that this implies he has relevant experience and finally the candidate states that this experience means the author's statements are more likely to be backed by valid research.

Many candidates focussed a great deal on the evidence provided by the survey data in the document. Some of the highest scoring candidates made a number of valid points about this information, for example:

The author supports his argument by giving authoritative evidence of a survey by world animal protection WAP of 10,900 people across the world which does include international tourists who had frequently visited

South Africa. This survey also included South African citizens. The HSI survey also found objection to trophy hunting; the most important point is that people were asked of all races and gender groups, six language groups and a range of ages and household incomes both in rural and urban areas.

This example illustrates that candidates can make a number of valid points about one particular type of evidence, and gain credit for doing so.

For **AO1c – Evaluating evidence**, candidates were expected to evaluate the impact of the evidence on the argument, on the author's claim, or on the reader. This ranged from making a simple assertion to some evaluation of the impact, to evaluation that included a judgment.

Some candidates scored marks for **AO1c** by a limited description of the impact of the evidence on the argument, as in these two examples:

The author cites the source for its evidence about trophy hunters that fly into South Africa – he cites the Professional Hunters Register which is a plausible source. Readers would therefore be convinced by the information as the source may be authentic and adds to its credibility.

The author mentions the name of the WAP wildlife campaign manager Edith Kabisiime – her comments about government listening to South African voices is highly relevant, because as due to her expertise readers would believe and be convinced about the argument being made.

In both of these examples, the candidates do mention something about the impact of the evidence on the argument, or on the reader. However, these comments are quite limited and general and do not gain the candidate a great deal of credit.

Other candidates scored higher on **AO1c** with more extended and detailed descriptions of the impact of the evidence on the argument. Again, a three-pronged approach may be helpful here, for example:

The document includes a number of both local and international sources, for example the Hunters register and the HSI Africa; this firstly negates any doubt regarding the source of statistics and this in turn makes the arguments more reliable and professional, due to the use of renowned and credible sources, improving the chance of acceptance and its impact on the readers who then have greater trust.

In this example, the candidate makes a more extended point and includes three ideas in their evaluation of the impact of the evidence on the argument – firstly, the sources are credible and varied, secondly, this makes the argument appear to be reliable as it is backed up by professionals, and finally this makes the readers trust the information more.

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 on whether Document A was stronger than Document B, Document B was stronger than Document A, or if they were both equally strong. Each of these conclusions can be equally valid.

The most common approach was to first identify and describe the perspectives of each document and then directly compare the key components of the arguments throughout the answer. Higher-scoring candidates excelled in this, providing analysis and clear evaluation of the relative strengths of each document, and making a judgement on which was more convincing. There was no correct answer, and candidates were free to argue for their preferred judgement. It was also possible to evaluate the arguments of both documents separately and then provide a concluding judgement. However, this approach often led to fewer points being made and repetition in the conclusion. It could also result in candidates considering different key components from each document, which limits direct comparison and access to higher marks, even though many key components are identified.

Many candidates successfully identified aspects that reflect a strong argument, such as the credibility of the authors, the level of potential bias, and the amount of supporting evidence provided. Candidates achieving the highest marks gave clear examples from the documents and explained the impact on the overall argument, culminating in an intermediate judgement. It is important that candidates exemplify the key components using the documents rather than merely listing pre-learned key components that might apply to any document.

There were two assessment objectives used – **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**), and provide a judgement about argument and perspective (**AO1d**). The second assessment objective was **AO3 – Communication**.

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

- Identifying, describing, and explaining the perspectives of the authors of both documents (**AO1b**)
- Identifying and comparing key components of the argument (**AO1a**)
- Evaluating the relative strengths of the key components of the 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 answers and were unable to achieve more than half marks. Very good candidates realised that a small number of well-developed comparisons can score highly and limited themselves to 3 or 4 key components, using their time more profitably to demonstrate other skills.

For example, higher-scoring candidates provided a range of compared key components. This is an example for one component – the authors' background. This candidate included this point, alongside comparisons of other key components of the documents:

The authors of Document B work at the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development. This is a global organisation which makes it a strong source of information. And as the author works there, they must have expertise. Additionally, their expertise in the mountains makes them a relevant stakeholder to write about the issue of hunting and population of animals. However the author of Document A on the other hand is an investigative journalist and photographer. He is a research fellow at the Centre for Criminology; this shows the reader that he may not have relevant information about the topic which can reduce his credibility.

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.

An example of a high-scoring candidate is:

The authors of Documents A and B present contrasting views on trophy hunting and wildlife conservation. In document A the author advocates for the banning of trophy hunting in South Africa in order to fulfil the goal of wildlife conservation in Africa while maintaining a good reputation for the African country. In contrast, the author of Document B argues that encouraging and giving control of trophy hunting to local residents of the Gilgit Baltistan area Pakistan would help conservative increase the population of ungulate wildlife such as the Siberian ibex.

Lower-scoring candidates only stated what the documents are about, or the theme of the documents from the stem of the question, or the title of the article without any analysis, rather than identifying the authors' opinions. Other candidates made only a very brief identification of the author's perspective, and again this does not score a high mark, for example:

The author of Document A argues against trophy hunting by providing his perspectives about its disadvantages and using evidence to support them. On the other hand, the authors of Document B are arguing in favour of trophy hunting.

There is only a basic identification or description of the authors' claims here.

For **AO1c – Evaluate Arguments**, higher-scoring candidates evaluated the key components of arguments 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. Here is an example of a higher-scoring candidate providing evaluation and illustration:

Document A has made use of statistical data from international organisations for example, surveys by the World Animal Protection and Humane Society International Africa. This is a strength as they can support the author's views and claims with data from internationally reliable organisations. On the other hand, Document B has also presented statistical information, but the author has not referred to the source of it, for example it is stated that the population of markhor in Gilgit Baltistan increased from 1900 in 2012 to 2800 in 2016. This is a relevant statistic which backs up the author's view, however it is a weakness as no reference is provided. This does not enable the reader to check the source and whether or not it is true. This weakens the author's argument making it unlikely to be trusted.

Lower-scoring candidates included ideas like this:

Both the documents are published in newspapers and to maintain their reputation they are unlikely to have any vested interest or prior bias in the topic.

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 writing in a newspaper prove that there is no vested interest?

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

High-scoring candidates completed their answer with comments like this, which summarised the intermediate conclusions throughout the answer:

Overall, I believe Document B is much stronger and more convincing than Document A. Document B creates a connection with the readers by stating how animals are a source of income meat and hides, which allows readers to clearly understand the value of hunting the animals and creates a connection between the reader and the topic. Furthermore, Document B is a well-structured argument, as it starts with an introduction by Shah, that moves on to the history of trophy hunting in Pakistan presenting the proposal given and also giving qualitative data about the aftermath of this proposal. Document A on the other hand lacks any counter argument and even though it has secondary evidence from surveys, it is very narrowly focused and thus creates a certain kind of bias, whereas in contrast Document B does present a counter argument and also mentions how Shah's work has been given much scrutiny. Therefore, Document B is stronger for showing a better structure a better connection with the readers and a solution for the issue.

A lower-scoring candidate might simply state an unsupported judgement, without comparison.

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

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

<p>Paper 9239/02 Essay</p>
--

Key messages

Candidates are assessed against ten different assessment criteria. Some candidates are not addressing all of these criteria. Notable omissions were critical evaluation of sources and suggestions for further research.

Building coherent perspectives through the synthesis of source material is a core part of the essay. Candidates should make links between their research materials and not treat each source in isolation.

Candidates need to give greater consideration to their titles. It is particularly important that title questions set up a debate of global significance. Candidates need to remain focused on their title question throughout the essay.

There is no requirement to offer solutions in this component of Global Perspectives and Research.

General comments

Candidates need to plan carefully to ensure they demonstrate all of the skills assessed in this component. There are still too many candidates not addressing all the assessment aspects in their essays. There are ten different aspects used for assessment that 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. Each aspect is given its own heading in this report.

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

Comments on specific aspects

Analysis of Question

An effective title question is at the foundation of a good essay. The title needs to be concise and set up a debate between contrasting perspectives. The issue raised by the question needs to be of global significance. Candidates should analyse the implications of their question by considering it through different lenses or themes. Candidates need to clearly identify these implications as can be seen in the following example from this series. It comes from an essay with the title '*Should the use of human deception in psychology be regulated?*' and the candidate writes '*The second theme looks at the debate through the scientific lens*'.

Not only is the theme clearly identified, but the question itself is also very effective. There are two clearly contrasting perspectives, 'yes' the use of deception should be regulated and 'no' the use of deception should not be regulated. Given that psychological studies take place around the world this is clearly a debate of global significance. Other effective titles from this series include the following: '*Should governments regulate social media?*', '*Should juvenile offenders be tried and treated like adults?*' and '*Has there been a positive impact of globalisation on Indigenous tribes?*'.

Candidates should try and incorporate three or four discrete themes in their essays and the thematic analysis of their title question should be supported by two or three different sources.

Building Perspectives

For candidates to achieve in this assessment criterion, their essay must have contrasting perspectives. There were very few one-sided or descriptive essays submitted for this series.

Synthesis is a skill that underpins Global Perspectives and Research. Candidates are required to make links between their source materials by synthesising arguments and evidence together to build coherent perspectives. The first example shows some partial awareness of the links between sources. Here the candidate has used the sources briefly and they are juxtaposed rather than explicitly linked. This is still creditworthy but not at the higher attainment levels. The essay is titled *'Should juvenile offenders be tried and treated like adults?'*

'From a psychological developmental perspective, research has shown that toddlers can distinguish between basic moral and socio-conventional events. By 42 months, children can also judge a moral violation as more serious and non-admissible than a socio-conventional violation. They perceive the violation of morals as wrong independently of authorities' statements and rule contingency. (Smetana and Braeges, 1990). Children are also aware of the consequences of their actions and they judge behaviors that break moral rules as wrong because intrinsically unfair (Helwig et al. 2001).'

To reach the higher attainment levels candidates need to make the links between the sources explicit and both sources need some development to fully demonstrate the skill of synthesis. The *Helwig et al* source does not have enough development for higher level synthesis.

Range of Sources

Candidates should use a wide range of relevant and credible source material. Range refers to sources that emanate from different global contexts or present arguments and evidence pertaining to different global contexts. Ideally sources will pertain to or come from four different global contexts. Candidates are advised to state clearly the global context of their material. Looking at the extract below it is clear that the *Oketch et al* source is offering evidence from Kenya and Tanzania. The essay is titled *'Has there been a positive impact of globalisation on Indigenous tribes?'*

'The Maasai Tribe from Kenya and Tanzania are a good example of how an Indigenous tribe can benefit from Exposure to new ideas, as they have now been introduced to sustainable farming, eco-tourism and clean energy through their partnership with NGOs, as well as being introduced to modern medicine and healthcare facilities, all of which have improved the quality of their lives, while still respecting the traditions of the Tribe (Oketch et al., 2024).'

Candidates are also required to use the source material to support perspectives. This requires engaging with the source in a way that uses evidence from the source and explains how the source supports the perspective. The extract above does not quite achieve this, the candidate has not quite made the link between the exposure to new ideas and globalisation as a positive force.

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.

Appropriateness of Sources

Critical evaluation of source material is assessed in all components of the syllabus and as such is a core skill. Despite this, there are far too many candidates that do not address this aspect of assessment in their essays. The most successful candidates critically evaluated four key sources. 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 and without development. Criteria for evaluation could include, quality of evidence, logic of argument, credibility of author or issues of bias and vested interest.

This is a good example of developed critical evaluation from the March series, it comes from an essay with the title *'Should juvenile offenders be tried and treated like adults?'*

'In the case of the anti- incarceration side of the debate, a prominent resource is the National Library of Medicine. This is a verified site by the United States government. This increases the provenance of the article which would help to apply the knowledge provided in legal systems, without any speculation revolving

around the vested interest of the author. The evidence provided in this article also has some historical and psychological backing which results in a more valid and reliable search.'

Comparison of perspectives

If the candidate's essay does not set up a debate between contrasting perspectives they will not be able to achieve in this assessment criterion. A well-structured essay will provide several opportunities for candidates to compare perspectives. Firstly, candidates will often set up the debate by way of an introduction and this can contain some comparison of perspectives. Comparison in the introduction is likely to be brief and descriptive but nonetheless this is creditworthy. Secondly, many of the themes used to analyse the implications of the question will be able to support both perspectives. The essay titled '*Should governments regulate social media?*' considered the political implications of the question. In so doing the candidate compared the positives of political free speech and political activism against the downside of too much regulation and censorship by authoritarian leaders. Thirdly, it is expected that candidates will compare their perspectives holistically before arriving at their final judgement.

Consideration of Contrasting Perspectives

This assessment criterion demands that candidates approach their chosen issue in a balanced and objective way. Generally candidates demonstrated a maturity and were able to apply the same levels of research, critical evaluation and word-count to both perspectives. The aspect above (**Comparison of perspectives**) also provides candidates with an opportunity to demonstrate they have given due consideration to both perspectives. 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.

Reflection and Impact on Personal Viewpoint

This assessment criterion tests the ability of candidates to reflect on how engaging with the contrasting perspectives has impacted their personal viewpoint. Candidates' opinions may have been changed or consolidated. The following example is an extract from the candidate's reflection. The essay was titled '*Does social media positively influence travel trends?*'

'Before conducting my research, I maintained a neutral perspective on social media's influence on travel trends, primarily due to a lack of awareness of its broader implications, particularly in shaping traveller decisions. However, after analysing the economic consequences of social media-driven tourism—such as over-tourism, rising travel costs, and environmental harm—I developed a more critical viewpoint on its expanding role. The increasing reliance on digital platforms for travel inspiration and planning reinforced these concerns. At the same time, exploring the positive aspects of social media deepened my understanding of its benefits, including fostering cultural exchange, enhancing global connectivity, and increasing destination visibility. I realized that tourism boards and businesses are not solely profit-driven but also use social media to encourage cross-cultural interactions and sustainable travel practices. Additionally, social media's ability to shape perceptions and enhance traveler engagement offers intangible benefits that cannot be easily quantified in economic terms.'

The candidate sets out their initial thoughts on the issue and then develops how engaging with each perspective and some specific themes has seen their personal viewpoint change.

Further Research

For success in this area of assessment, candidates should identify a specific new area for research and then develop some details about the potential research. To reach the higher attainment levels, candidates should also offer some reasoning as to why this research should be undertaken. Several candidates did not address this area of assessment in their essays.

The following example comes from an essay titled *Should the use of human deception in psychology be regulated?*

'Reflecting on the essay a few areas could be analysed more thoroughly such as the long term effect of deception on participants' mental health or exploring themes such as cultural differences of deception. This could add depth to the understanding of deception in research.'

The candidate identifies two new specific areas for further research but neither have any reasoning or explanation. Simply stating that this further research will '*add depth*' is not enough to move this beyond the lower attainment levels.

Structure

Most candidates were able to present essays with a clear introduction followed by the main body of the essay and culminating in a supported conclusion. Ideas and themes should be separated with logical paragraphing. 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. Discourse markers include terms such as 'on the other hand, furthermore, in conclusion'. To demonstrate good structure candidates also need to remain focused on their title question and ensure that their essay meets the word count requirements of being between 1750–2000 words. Candidates should not include tables, charts or diagrams in their essays.

Referencing

Candidates are free to use any system of referencing they choose but the Harvard system is recommended. All of the citations in the extracts used in this report have used a Harvard style system. This is the most effective way to make it really clear where sources are being used to support perspectives. Footnote systems are fine though footnotes should only be used for reference details and not extra information or critical evaluation. Candidates need to cite all sources used and make sure the associated references have the appropriate details and are easily found in a separate bibliography.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/03
Team Project

Key messages

Overall centres seem to be engaging with the syllabus well and there has been a clear move away from the old specification compared to previous sessions. AO1c is still an area for improvement, particularly including source synthesis when source evaluation has taken place. A strength this session seemed to be AO3c where the Principal Examiner saw lots of good practice and engagement with the audience. Most reflective papers contained some evaluation, but there is still a lot of description, which is limiting candidates' marks.

General comments

Something that several candidates do, which was a requirement of the old syllabus, is list their team members' perspectives during their presentation. There is no need to do this, and it uses valuable time within the presentation.

Some submissions did not include an actual presentation – just an audio file and an accompanying PowerPoint. The requirement of this syllabus is to submit a presentation – a voiceover on a PowerPoint is absolutely fine, but it needs to be submitted together as one video file.

Presentation

AO1 – Research, analysis and evaluation

A – Individual analysis of the problem

Most candidates have discussed the problem and explained the impact of the problem so are able to access 3 marks. Some candidates were able to offer a sustained analysis and reach 4 marks this session. However, an example of a candidate who was able to effectively do this a candidate whose presentation was on population explosion – they explained the impact in detail and backed it up with relevant figures and statistics.

B – Range of research undertaken

Many candidates were able to use detailed research in their presentations to support the issue they were discussing. Fewer candidates were able to show evidence of sustained research from a variety of sources. Candidates can achieve a variety of sources in a couple of ways – they can either use sources from multiple countries, or they can use different types of sources – books, journals, websites etc. To achieve 4 marks, the research not only has to be varied, but the use of it must be sustained throughout.

C – Evaluation of sources to support the research

This assessment objective was not done well this session. Many candidates made no attempt to evaluate or synthesise sources. Some candidates have attempted to evaluate the sources but have not explained why they are reliable/unreliable so were unable to access more than 1 mark. A few candidates did not identify sources at all in their presentations. Even when showing the bibliography at the end some candidates did not state that these were the sources they used in their answer. Therefore, they were not awarded any credit for this assessment objective.

D – Justification for the individual solution which is proposed

The vast majority of candidates identified a solution to their problem and were to provide support/evidence for their solution. Usually, this was how their solution has worked either in their country or in other countries. There were some candidates who did not have a solution to their presentation as they mainly evaluated a topic – such as the use of AI. Because they did not go into detail about there being an issue, they did not include a solution, so lost marks for this assessment objective. Candidates are encouraged to discuss an issue in their presentation and then form a solution for it.

AO3 – Communication

A – Production of an organised argument

Most candidates were able to achieve either 3 or 4 marks for this assessment objective. 4 marks was seen less frequently because often a candidate's presentation was well structured, but it was not always well argued. Using research to back up and develop points and then expanding on this will help candidates achieve marks for their presentation being well-argued.

B – Presentation of visual information to support an argument

All candidates applied relevant methods of visual representation to their presentations and therefore there were no cases where 0 or 1 marks were awarded. The common mark for this criterion was 3 or 4 marks as there was engagement with the visuals from the majority of candidates. Those achieving 4 marks engaged with their visual aids at several points throughout the presentation.

C – Use of language to address an audience

This was the assessment objective where the Principal Examiner saw the most improvement from previous sessions. Candidates did a really good job of addressing the audience, using a variety of sentence forms. Some candidates were also able to reach 4 marks where they 'effectively' engaged the audience.

Reflective paper

AO2 – Reflection

A – Reflection on the effectiveness of collaboration

Most candidates were able to evaluate some of the collaborative activities and therefore achieve at least 3 marks. There need to be several evaluative points for a candidate to achieve 4 marks, and this was less common this series.

B – Reflection on learning

Most candidates were able to reflect on their learning and it was good to see that this was discussed on two levels. Firstly, what they learnt about the issue/topic discussed in their presentations and secondly, what they learnt about working in a group.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

<p>Paper 9239/04 Research Report</p>
--

Key messages

The Cambridge Research Report is assessed against 15 skills-based criteria. In order to reach the higher attainment levels, it is important that candidates address all the areas for assessment. Candidates were largely well prepared, and the vast majority were able to meet all the assessment criteria. Assessment areas most often omitted were the methodology section and critical evaluation of sources.

In their introductions or methodology sections candidates must set out which themes they are using to analyse the implications of their title question. It is also important that candidates outline why these themes are important and how they shape the contrasting perspectives.

A well-crafted title question is the foundation for a successful research report. Teachers should use the Research Proposal Form in conjunction with the candidate to ensure that their title questions are compatible with the assessment criteria.

General comments

Candidates produced research reports that covered a wide range of topics and issues. The topic area and issues addressed in the report need to be contentious in as much as they allow for contrasting perspectives and arguments. It is also important that candidates choose a topic area that is of significant interest to them. The Cambridge Research Report should be presented as a debate and not an informative report. Popular areas of focus this series were Urbanisation, Climate Change and Migration. These topic areas provided candidates with a broad range of research opportunities. When setting out on their research journey candidates need to engage in preliminary topic area research to understand the relevant issues and perspectives. Only when the candidate has got this initial overview should they begin to construct their title question. The title of the Cambridge Research Report must be in the form of a question.

It should be noted that unlike AS Level coursework, there is no requirement for the report to have a global dimension.

Research Log

Although exemplars are available in the syllabus and from other training materials, there is no set format for the Research Log. Several different formats were used by candidates, but the most successful formats were grid based with headings and dated entries. Grids that included headings such as source notes, reflections and future plans or next steps provided effective frameworks for successful Research Logs. A weekly or fortnightly entry is recommended. Candidates should show forward thinking in terms of planning and next steps, as well as offer reflective comments on decisions and research.

Assessment Objective 1 (AO1) is focussed on the skill of planning and the recording of pertinent information. Candidates should record information in a manner that gives a clear sense of the research process. In AO1 candidates should be looking forward and setting out objectives and milestones giving a clear indication of planning. AO2 is focussed on the skill of reflection, here candidates should reflect upon the decisions made and research undertaken. In AO2 candidates should also record source notes. Many candidates presented their Research Log in a diary form and consequently they were descriptive accounts rather than being forward looking. The Research Log should be a live working document that demonstrates forward thinking and planning as well as reflection. Candidates often focused more on recording source details than they did on reflecting upon research decisions.

Questions and Perspectives

Choosing a title question is the key decision for this component. Candidates should choose their title question through dialogue with their teacher, and the Research Proposal Form should be used as a framework to support that dialogue. Many of the 15 assessment areas are impacted by the choice of question and some candidates are presenting titles that need further consideration. There are two areas in which candidates can improve in choosing their title question.

Firstly, the candidates need to offer a title question and that title question must set up a debate between contrasting perspectives. Most candidates were able to do this, however titles such as, *'What are the reasons for the worldwide rise in crime rates?'* have no obvious debate and consequently reports responding to questions like these are likely to be descriptive. A report that does not set up a debate with contrasting perspectives is not likely to meet many of the assessment criteria. It is important that the perspectives are contrasting and clearly arguing for and against the title question. With that in mind, *'To What Extent'* questions can be problematic. Sometimes the contrasting perspectives are not obvious, for example *'To what extent is climate change perceived as a significant threat and considered a priority globally?'* The debate here could be very nuanced and the contrasting perspectives may be hard to identify. The first example title question could have been improved by rephrasing it as *'Are crime levels increasing?'* The *'To What Extent'* question could have been written as *'Are governments responding effectively to the threats posed by climate change?'*

Secondly, the title question needs a clear focus and should raise an issue that can be explored through different themes, such as economic, environmental or technological, to name a few. If a title question lacks clarity and is convoluted, it will be difficult to consider implications of such a question. For example, *'Is wildlife rehabilitation truly effective and what ethical dilemmas does it present?'* Here the candidate presents two questions in one. Some candidates did offer secondary questions throughout the report and this too will prove to be problematic. It is important that candidates remain focused on their title question throughout the report.

Candidates should make explicit links between their research materials as they develop arguments and perspectives for and against the title question. This is the skill of synthesis. Synthesising research material to build coherent perspectives is a key assessment aspect of the Cambridge Research Report. At the research stage it is advised that candidates use their Research Logs to make notes of similarities and differences in sources in terms of the arguments and evidence used. Candidates should not present analysis of each source in isolation as this denies the possibility of making links between materials.

The example below shows some partial awareness of the links between sources as the candidate develops a perspective in response to the question *'Are refugees a burden to the host country?'* when considering the ethical implications of the question.

'An influx of refugees can affect a community's ability to preserve its way of life and significantly interfere with communal identity (Carens, 1992). To illustrate, Syrian refugees in Lebanon have led to strain on local resources, leading to tensions over housing, employment, and public services (Atrache, 2016). This has disturbed the cultural identity and social cohesion in Lebanon. Similarly, Rwandan refugees in Uganda and Tanzania have altered community dynamics (Atrache, 2016).'

This is creditworthy but not at the higher attainment levels because the candidate has not shown enough engagement with each source, the use of the source by Carens is particularly brief. To achieve higher attainment levels the links between source should be developed with a real sense that the candidate is developing a perspective in response to the title question. The March 2025 series did show a few good examples of this skill such as this example taken from the same report.

'In an often-cited comparative and statistical analysis, Salehyan and Gleditsch (2006) found that refugees from neighbouring countries significantly increase the chances of civil war in host states. Even though refugees themselves don't directly engage in violence, they can alter ethnic composition, aggravate economic competition, and lead to the spread of arms, militants, and ideologies fostering conflict (Salehyan and Gleditsch, 2006). Their conclusion is supported by multiple refugee-induced conflicts relevant to the 2000s, like the flight of militarised Rwandan Hutus to Zaire impaired the relationship between local Hutus and Tutsis. Moreover, their argument remains relevant even today and is often used by political leaders to refuse asylum. To illustrate, the influx of Afghan refugees in Balochistan was soon followed by an ethnic conflict (Rüegger, 2018). President Abdel Fathe el-Ssisi claimed that Egypt's refusal to accept Palestinian refugees is partly rooted in the fear of Palestinian militants entering Egyptian territory and launching resistance operations from there. This would endanger the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt, who has only

recently been able to suppress Islamist insurgents and is currently facing an economic crisis. This shows how refugees can often become a political burden by causing conflicts and instability in the host country.'

The links between *Salehyan and Gleditsch (2006)* and *Rüegger (2018)* are explicitly made and the work together to develop the perspective. It is clear that the candidate is not treating source materials in isolation, and they are demonstrating the skill of synthesis.

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 report about refugees used above, the candidate set out in the introduction that they would consider the economic, political and ethical implications of their title question. Within each theme the candidate put forward arguments for and against the issue that refugees are a burden to the host country. Toward the end of each thematic section the candidate compared the merits of the contrasting perspectives before arriving at an intermediary judgement (see Concepts, Research Methods and Judgements below).

It is anticipated that candidates will then offer a more holistic comparison of perspectives before the final judgement is made. Most candidates were able to demonstrate this, however the approach taken was often summative and resulted in a descriptive juxtaposition of perspectives rather than a comparison that evaluated the difference between perspectives.

Sources

Candidates are advised to use sources that offer strong lines of argument. Using purely informative sources often leads to descriptive reports rather than reports that develop clear arguments and perspectives in response to the title question. In the example used above (see Questions and Perspectives) the sources *Salehyan and Gleditsch (2006)* and *Rüegger (2018)* both have clear lines of argument that directly address the title question, thereby demonstrating relevance. The bibliography shows that both these sources are taken from academic journals and so can be deemed highly credible. Credible and relevant sources with a strong line of argument will enable the candidate to develop clear perspectives in response to the title question. Such sources also enable candidates to offer extended analysis of the arguments and evidence being used. Candidates should try not to use more than six sources when considering each thematic implication of their title question. Using too many sources prevents the candidate from being able to offer full analysis of each source.

The skill of critical evaluation is assessed right across the Global Perspectives and Research syllabus. That said, there are still candidates that are not addressing this area of assessment in their research reports. Those candidates that do offer critical evaluation often focus on evaluating source provenance and author credibility and while this is creditworthy, candidates doing only this will not reach the higher assessment levels. To reach the higher levels candidates need to evaluate aspects more specifically related to the arguments or evidence presented by the source, thereby making the critical evaluation explicitly relevant to the title question. The example below comes from the previously referred to report '*Are refugees a burden to the host country?*' The critical evaluation is insightful and explicitly relevant to the focus of the report.

'The study's findings may have limited generalisability due to the diverse context and varying methodologies of the reviewed studies. A limitation of the study is that one third of the results are for the Syrian crisis. Moreover, it excludes episodes of refugee crises due to environmental or other types of disasters. Despite these limitations, this is a fairly credible source, as the limitations have been clearly communicated by the author. Additionally, the report has been used in three policy sources so far. Lastly, to account for heterogeneity and endogeneity—which could possibly lead to biased results or inaccurate conclusions various analytical tools like instrumental variable (IV) and random effect models have been used. This adds to the credibility of the meta-analysis.'

Concepts, Research Methods and Judgements

Candidates will encounter relevant concepts and complex ideas through extensive research into their chosen topic area. Specific topic areas will have their own key terms. It is for the candidate to present, analyse and evaluate concepts, complex ideas and subject specific terminology throughout their report.

Teachers are not expected to be experts in the topic areas chosen by their students. The Research Proposal Form enables teachers and students to develop a dialogue and identify relevant concepts and complex ideas that will inform the research report. Candidates need to be able to employ concepts and complex ideas within their report in a manner that is accessible to a non-specialist reader. There is no disadvantage to a candidate that does not have a teacher with subject expertise. If through dialogue with the teacher a

candidate cannot explain clearly how concepts relate to their research report, they are likely to find it difficult to do that within their report.

The 'Refugee' report previously referred to offers some good examples of this particular skill. At one point the candidate writes '*Singer's utilitarian view*' which is perfectly legitimate, but this is not analysed or deconstructed at all. While the candidate is able to identify a concept, they do not move beyond that. However, at other points the candidate is clearly able to demonstrate the ability to engage with concepts and complex ideas. This can be seen in the following adapted example.

'A similar statistical analysis done by Lischer (2017) did not replicate the findings of Salehyan and Gleditsch (2006). By specifically looking at how refugees alter the ethnic structure of the host country, Lischer concluded that the distribution of power amongst different ethnicities in the host country ultimately influences the refugees impact on stability. When refugees are co- ethnics of politically marginalised groups, the chance of conflict increases. Refugees increase the political leverage of the marginalised population by increasing their numbers. These imbalances can lead to previous minorities confronting governments or the current dominant ethnic group fearing loss of power pre-emptively or reactively suppressing other ethnic groups who retaliate. This shows refugees don't cause conflict but only amplify the existing tension and marginalisation.'

As stated above the source material is highly credible and the candidate is clearly in control of academic material and complex ideas. Here the concept of political marginalisation is thoroughly explored.

Methodology sections are required and assessed. The majority of candidates did include methodology sections though some candidates omitted this aspect of assessment. To reach higher attainment levels candidates should explain why they have chosen their methods and how the underpinning methodology relates to the title question. There is a tendency for candidates to be generic in their approach. The example below comes from a report looking at climate change, but it could actually apply to any report.

'My main methodological approach is conducting desk research, and have explored articles which contain literature reviews of authors which highlight their individual expertise level and have looked at sources which are credit worthy such as of the World Economic Forum and OECD. I have also used sources which have collected information and data from countries worldwide, in addition to academic research papers. I will see whether the evidence gathered by me will be consistent and back up support for my original formulated research question.'

Primary research 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.

As mentioned above (see Questions and Perspectives) it is anticipated that final and intermediary judgements will be preceded by a comparison of perspectives that offers support for the judgement made. Candidates should offer an intermediary judgement for each of the themes used to analyse the title question's implications. For example, the 'Refugees' report set out three themes; economic, political and ethical with which to analyse the implications of their title question. The candidate offered an intermediary judgement at the end of each thematic discussion. The candidate then came to a final judgement in the report's conclusion. It is really important that all judgements respond directly to the title question. Focus on the title question throughout the report is important.

The example below comes from a report titled '*To what extent has sustainable fashion been effective in improving the fashion industry?*'. The section shown comes at the end of the political theme and although the judgement is short and somewhat equivocal, it does directly address the question.

'Overall, I believe that the impact of government policies on sustainable fashion is mixed. To a certain extent the policies and schemes made by the government have caused an impact on promoting sustainability through fashion globally. The awareness spread has led to increased recycled clothing and production growth. However, the article by Greggs also portrays a strong opposing viewpoint to this statement with a local perspective of the UK, where to date government interventions have not improved the fashion industry.'

Reflection

Candidates should identify their chosen themes in the introduction and/or methodology. This can be done in very briefly. The 'Sustainable Fashion' report referenced above states in the introduction that '*To support my thesis, this report will examine how sustainable fashion affects the fashion industry from an economic, political, social and cultural standpoint.*' Having set out the themes the report will cover candidates should

reflect upon why these particular themes have been chosen. The vast majority of candidates did not do this, rather they offered the type of reflection on perspectives seen in components two (The Essay) and three (Team Project). This type of reflection focuses on how the perspectives have consolidated or changed the candidate's original point of view and generally comes at the end of the report rather than in the introduction or methodology. In other cases, candidates offered a descriptive account of what had been learned during the process of producing the report. This is creditworthy, but only at the lower assessment levels. There are some helpful diagrams on page 15 and 16 of the syllabus that visualise the interplay of topics, themes, issues and perspectives.

The next area of reflection for assessment is the candidate's ability to reflect upon the strengths and limitations of their conclusion. Although many candidates considered strengths or weaknesses of the process behind producing the report they did not always reflect explicitly on the strengths and limitations of their conclusions. This is creditworthy but not at the higher assessment levels. Many candidates offered ideas for further research which implicitly hint at weaknesses within the report but generally suggestions for further research did not link to improving the report's conclusions. Candidates are not required to offer suggestions for further research.

Several candidates offered solutions for the issues raised in the report. It should be noted that candidates are not required to offer solutions.

Communication

The AO3 skill of communication is assessed holistically. There are several strands to this area of assessment. Candidates need to construct their introductions carefully. The terms and scope of the report set out in the introduction should be adhered to. For example, there were cases where candidates identified themes in the introduction and then never referred to them again, and this is not effective structure.

Content pages and headings are not essential, but they do provide a useful framework. Headings in particular are an effective way for the reader to navigate the report. Many candidates successfully used headings to structure their report. Candidates should also use discourse markers to effectively guide the reader through the report. An effectively structured report will contain clearly signposted final and intermediary conclusions. The report must be written in continuous prose and must not exceed 5000 words. Candidates must not rely on charts and images to convey meaning. Several candidates did not adhere to this stipulation that is clearly stated on page 24 of the Syllabus.

Another skill being assessed is the candidates' ability to engage with subject specific terminology in way that makes this accessible to the lay reader. It should be remembered that reports should be written for an audience that does not have expertise in the topic area. Making terminology understandable to the reader through explanations and arguments demonstrates the skill of communication.

The Harvard referencing system is recommended as it makes it clear to assessors where and how sources are being used to support perspectives. This system has been exemplified in the candidate extracts used in this report. It is recognised that different subject areas use different referencing systems and candidates are free to use any appropriate system. Many candidates were able to present effective referencing systems regardless of which referencing system they chose to use. An effective system is one where each citation should have a full reference that is easily located in the bibliography. A full reference means that the reader should have enough detail to enable them to find the source without relying on a hyperlink. The references should be set out systematically and logically in the bibliography.