

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

---

Paper 9239/11  
Written Exam 11

## Key messages

It is important that candidates read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, to answer all the questions set. This applies in all questions, for example in **Question 1(a)**: 'identify', 'the planet's most serious environmental challenges', 'as given by the author', **Question 1(b)**: 'identify', 'examples of environments that are not suitable for growing vegetables' 'as given by the author', **Question 2**: 'evidence' and 'impact', **Question 3**: 'perspectives', 'judgement' and 'stronger'.

Candidates did not focus too much of their time on **Question 1** and so left themselves more time for **Questions 2** and **3** which had much higher total marks. **Question 1** only requires short answers or bullet points, and most candidates answered in this way. However, candidates should be aware that the 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 gain higher marks in **Questions 2** and **3** there should be clear development of the points made. For example, making a point, illustrating using information or appropriate quotes from the text and explaining it in the context of the document. Instead of just stating **what** a strength or weakness may be, the candidates should also explain **how** or **why** it is a strength or weakness. There should also be explicit reference to perspectives in **Question 3** and reflection on the impact of the evidence in **Question 2**. In both documents, judgements are required.

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

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

Candidates could improve in the following Assessment Objectives: **AO1b** (Explanation) in **Question 2** and **AO1b** (Perspectives) and **AO1c** (Evaluation of key components) in **Question 3**.

## General comments

Many candidates showed an understanding of the requirements of the questions and adapted to the direction given. Several candidates recognised the need to explain the impact of the evidence on the author's argument in **Question 2**, with many coming to a reasoned judgement at the end. Candidates were often able to give limited reasons as to why a piece of evidence was strong or weak but were unable to fully develop this into a clear explanation. It is important that candidates read and understand the **whole** of the question before answering. Although some candidates did not address the authors' perspectives in **Question 3** as required by the question, many candidates made a clear effort to identify and describe them as an introduction to their answer. Some gave only evaluations of the key components that might have applied to any document.

Many candidates organised their time well, in particular candidates who were brief and focused in their answers to **Question 1** and confined their answers to assessing evidence in **Question 2**, leaving more time for **Question 3** which was worth over half of available marks. It is important that candidates recognise the value of each question and respond with a suitable length. Candidates should remember that the authors perspective is only creditworthy in **Question 3** and so reference to it as an introduction to **Question 2** gains no credit.

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

The rubric of the paper requires candidates to write in continuous prose. While concise answers in **Question 1** are acceptable and encouraged, in **Questions 2** and **3** full paragraphing in an essay format, rather than bullet points, should be used. Some candidates used paragraphs and made one point within each of them. This helped candidates to track the separate points they were making, develop them and conclude the impact or strength. It also avoided repetition of points, such as several instances of cited sources. As the specific points were readily visible at the beginning of each paragraph, it also aided the flow of the candidates' argument.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Question 1**

**Question 1** encourages candidates to fully read and understand the detail of both documents before starting their response to the questions. The question paper indicates that approximately 15 minutes should be used for examining the documents. It is included within the time set for the exam. Answers only need to be brief and can be in bullet points and copied directly from the text. A few candidates chose to leave **Question 1** until after they had answered the other two questions. The answers to **Question 1(a)** and **1(b)** are found as part of the reading and understanding of the documents. These answers are relatively straightforward to extract and record and so answering the questions in order is a recommended approach.

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

Both parts of the question are looking for candidates to **identify** points mentioned by the Author. There is no requirement or expectation that explanation is included. Copying appropriately from the document is acceptable.

**Question 1(a)** was looking for candidates to **Identify** three of the planet's most serious environmental challenges, as given by the author of **Document A**.

Careful reading of **Document A** shows that the author provided a limited number of challenges, but listed reasons ('drivers') that caused those challenges. Many candidates provided the reasons, rather than the challenges, that the author considered serious.

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

- *Using almost all of earth's resources, deforestation and the rising temperatures.* The first part is a cause of the problems, not an environmental challenge.

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

- *Livestock farming and industrialised agriculture, rising temperatures and global meat consumption.* The first and last reasons given are causes of the problem.

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

- *A meat heavy diet, livestock farming and record concentrations of greenhouse gas.* All these answers are causes of the environmental challenges as identified by the author.

**Question 1(b)** was looking for candidates to **Identify** two examples of environments that are not suitable for growing vegetables, as given by the author of **Document B**.

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

- *Dry rocky ranches and monocultures.*

An example of an approach to **Question 1(b)** giving 0 out of 2 marks was:

- *A landscape where cattle were raised first and Mexico.*

## Question 2

This question produced many strong answers. Most candidates correctly assessed to some extent the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence used by the author to support their argument. Some candidates opened with an introduction about the perspective of **Document A** which is not required and so cannot be credited. Some candidates assessed the key components of the argument rather than evidence provided by the author, and this is not creditworthy in **Question 2**. Explanations for why a piece of evidence was strong or weak were often limited to 'more trustworthy', 'expert' or 'can't be fact checked'; more development is required for an explanation to be credited under **AO1b**. There was a specific requirement in the question to explain the impact of the evidence on the author's argument or claim. The candidates were clearly well-prepared for this part of the question and demonstrated skill in this assessment area. In addition, many candidates attempted a reasoned summary judgement. Most candidates attempted some impact and were able to develop this sufficiently to achieve the highest marks. The question was looking for analysis of 'evidence' and so answers that related to language, counterargument or structure were not credited in this question.

Most common discussion points were around the provenance of the author, the statistics and sources used, the unsourced data, and the provenance of Alejandra Borunda. Candidates were better able to address strengths accurately, and so some answers were unbalanced. In many cases, evidence later in the answer had less discussion.

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

A clearly structured approach for some was to:

- 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 **why** it is a strength or weakness (**AO1b**);
- evaluate the impact of the evidence on the argument or authors claim or on the reader (**AO1c**).

The strongest answers used paragraph format to explain in turn each strength/weakness including the impact. They gave judgements at the end of strengths and of weaknesses, followed by an overall judgement 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 could not gain more than half marks.

For example, an answer: '*...this is a great strength as it is backed up by sources.*' identifies the use of numbers as evidence but does not offer any examples of the sources from the document. Use of this approach throughout could only be awarded less than half marks.

Higher scoring responses for this aspect would give several types of evidence with examples, such as: '*it has relevant quantitative data, with statistics such as '71% of all the earths ice free land is used for agriculture grazing and forestry'*'. This candidate made a point about statistics and gave an example.

For **AO1b** – Analysing the strengths and weaknesses of evidence - the strongest responses analysed a range of evidence and looked for a balance between strengths and weaknesses. They also gave clear explanations as to **why** they were considered to be strengths or weaknesses rather than just stating a point.

Strong answers used a 3-pronged approach to fully demonstrate the skill of explanation of why evidence was

strong or weak. For example: *'the author holds a high level of education as he is a professor who researches environmental issues who not only has a high amount of knowledge, but it is relevant to this subject leading to an expert view throughout the article.'*

The following example shows that the candidate identified a weakness, quoted it and explained why it was a weakness: *'the first paragraph is the author's daughters own opinion as to environmental issues. This is a weakness in supporting their argument as it isn't factual, and she is not an expert and only covers what one individual has said. This isn't seen as credible information because everyone has their own opinion and so it may not be accurate about the environmental issues being faced.'*

Lower scoring responses concentrated on strengths rather than weaknesses and only stated them with limited explanation. For example: *'A strength is referencing the IPCC referring to the fact that 71% of the earth's ice-free land cover is currently used for agriculture grazing forestry the IPCC is a reliable and trusted source'*. There is a clear strength recognised with an example, but only limited explanation. To improve, the candidate would need to explain why a credible and trusted source is important when considering the value of the statistic.

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

Lower scoring responses used simple assertion without explaining why or how there is an impact on the argument, for example: *'This evidence creates a strong and backed up argument'*.

The most common answers for **AO1c** identified an impact with a simple evaluation, such as *'the National Geographic article is from 2019 and so this source is not outdated. This strengthens the argument as the information is still valid.'*

A more developed evaluation of impacts could be for example *'despite the fact that it is convenient to the authors argument the impact of the unsourced statistics could result in a decrease in reliability of the claim which makes it weaker and so less persuasive to the reader.'*

Higher scoring responses evaluated the impact of the individual pieces of evidence on the argument and then included an overall judgement of the effectiveness of all the evidence at the end. For example, *'In conclusion I believe this is a strong article as the many strengths such as the author and the global facts outweigh the few weaknesses. I believe that the amount of good sources stated and expert comment override some of the negative aspects. However, we cannot ignore the fact some evidence is five years out of date, but the authors expert opinion means that he has a high enough level of education to include future impacts therefore this is a strong article.'*

The evaluation is well explained and there is an emphasis on the impact throughout this section. There is a judgement at the beginning which is then explained while weighing up the value of the various pieces of evidence discussed earlier in the answer.

### Question 3

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

The most common approach was to initially attempt to identify and describe the perspectives of each document and then directly compare the key components of the argument of the two documents throughout the answer. The higher scoring responses achieved this well with analysis and clear evaluation of the relative strengths of each document and were able to make a judgement as to which was more convincing. There was no correct answer, and candidates were free to argue for their preferred judgement. It was equally possible to evaluate the arguments of both documents separately and then have a concluding judgement. However, this can lead to fewer points being made and repetition in the conclusion. This approach can also encourage candidates to consider different key components from each document and so there is no direct comparison between the two, which limits access to higher marks even though many key components are identified.

Many candidates were able to pick out the aspects that reflect a strong argument, for example, the credibility of the authors, level of potential bias and the amount of supporting evidence provided. Responses achieving the highest marks gave clear examples from the documents and then 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 using a list of 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**), Provide a judgement about argument and perspective (**AO1d**), and **AO3** – communication.

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

- identifying, describing and explaining the perspectives of the authors of both documents (**AO1b**), and then:
- identifying and comparing key components of the argument (**AO1a**);
- evaluating the relative strengths of the key components of argument using appropriate examples and analysis of impact (**AO1c**);
- giving an intermediate judgement (**AO1d**);
- coming to a reasoned judgment as to which argument, if either, is stronger in a final conclusion (**AO1d**).

For (**AO1a**) – Identify and compare key components of arguments – many candidates gained high marks as they were able to compare a range of key components of arguments from both documents. Some lacked comparison in their answer and were unable to achieve more than half marks. The strongest responses provided a small number of good comparisons and limited themselves to 3 or 4 key components, allowing more time to demonstrate other skills.

For example, higher scoring responses provided a range of compared key components. This is an example of one component, the use of statistics: *'document A includes quantitative data e.g., statistics such as 71% of ice-free land ... and 23% of greenhouse gases... the use of statistics strengthens the argument as it seems more well researched than document B where the author has used no statistics at all.'*

For **AO1b** – Analyse and compare perspectives – marks for this assessment objective were varied as some candidates did not provide any analysis of perspectives. Lower scoring responses simply identified perspectives, often from just one document. However, higher scoring responses compared, described and explained the significance of the perspectives in both documents. Candidates were well-prepared for this part of the question, with more candidates clearly identifying the author's opinion and main claim and describing how they built their case.

The following is an example of a high scoring response: *'in document A the author discusses the impact of meat consumption by providing three arguments on the climate change. He comments on the planet's capacity, our long-term survival and the deforestation and melting ice. He suggests that major damage can be prevented by increasing veganism and hence lowering the amount of meat in our diets. Document B considers that veganism isn't the main solution of climate change. The author discusses methane emissions, monoculture farming and culture limitations of veganism suggesting that it is not right to suggest that veganism is the only thing you can do for the environment and that other solutions should be considered as well.'*

Lower scoring responses only stated what the document was about, what the theme of the documents was from the stem of the question, or what the title of the article was without any analysis, rather than identifying the author's opinion. For example: *'Both documents look at how veganism can solve the climate crisis', 'Document B's argument says that you can be a vegan if you want to', 'Document A claims that being vegan is good for the climate.'* There is no identification or description of the authors claim, or any comparison or explanation.

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

The following is an example of a higher scoring response providing evaluation and illustration. This is one part of several evaluations that were balanced across both documents. *'Document B utilises no specific statistics which are sourced. All statistics referred to are nonspecific like 'significant amounts' and 'in many cases' and these facts are not backed up. When sources and no exact numbers given the reader has nothing to rely on. As they cannot judge the quality of the evidence or fact check the information this means that the credibility of the claim is questionable and so less persuasive.'*

Here is an example of a lower scoring response: *'Both authors have a reputation to uphold but the author of Document A would have more expertise in the field as he has done research.'* There is some basic evaluation but no clear illustration nor reasoning as to the impact of this point on the argument. For example, why does having done research make him more expert or his argument more reliable?

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

The strongest responses concluded with comments which summarised the intermediate conclusions throughout the answer, for example: *'I believe that both documents in a way have an understanding about the issues and challenges brought up but are lacking different elements. Document A lacks an organised feel and enough evidence to back up their points and opinions whilst document B lacks statistical proof of their points and clear evidence of the justification behind their thinking. Therefore, document A is the strongest document for me because of the relationship to personal experience of their daughter being vegan, some justification for their reasons and the well picked sources such as reports from the IPCC and a writer from National Geographic. It is also very likely that the author possesses sufficient knowledge in human nature and the environment to understand the exact challenges involved.'*

A lower scoring response simply stated an unsupported judgement without comparison, for example: *'Document A is stronger because of the authors job and the sources they use.'*

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

Overall, higher scoring responses linked aspects to examples in the text and with explanation of why this supported the argument. Middle scoring responses made a point and illustrated it from the document but did not explain why this was more convincing. A small number made assumptions based on preconceived ideas about what makes a good argument, rather than reading and evaluating the documents clearly. Candidates are required to engage critically with the documents. Generalised comments that could apply to any document are not creditworthy.

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

Paper 9239/12  
Written Exam 12

## Key messages

It is important that candidates 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 1a**: 'identify', 'three things the government must do', 'as given by the author'; in **Question 1b**: 'identify', 'two different regulations', 'as given by the author'; in **Question 2**: 'evidence' and 'impact'; and in **Question 3**: 'perspectives', 'judgement' and 'stronger'.

Candidates managed their time well and 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 1a** might be found anywhere in Document A, and responses to **Question 1b** 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. Instead of just stating what a strength or weakness may be, the candidates should also explain how or why it is a strength or weakness. There should also be explicit reference to perspectives in **Question 3** and reflection on the impact of the evidence in **Question 2**. Judgements are required in both questions.

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

Candidates could improve in the following Assessment Objectives: **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, adapting well to the given directions. Several candidates recognised the need to explain the impact of the evidence on the author's argument in **Question 2**, with many reaching a reasoned judgement by the end. While candidates often provided reasons for why a piece of evidence was strong or weak, they did not always manage 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 a concerted effort to identify and describe them as an introduction to their answers. Some candidates only evaluated key components that could have applied to any document.

Many candidates managed their time effectively. Candidates who were brief and focused in answering **Question 1** 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 writing 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.

Some responses to **Question 3** were not fully developed or supported by precise references to the documents. Stronger responses selected relevant and appropriate points from the documents and evaluated

their significance within the argument. 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 within an essay format, 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.

### 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 1a** and **1b** are found as part of the reading and understanding of the documents. These answers are straightforward, so answering the questions in order is recommended.

There are two parts to **Question 1**. **1a** refers to Document A and **1b** 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.

**Question 1a** asked candidates to identify three things the government must do to reopen the country to tourism, as given by the author of Document A. The expected answers were:

- Encourage people back to work in tourism.
- Support the development of skills needed for tourism.
- Provide economic support (for local businesses).
- Launch tourism initiatives/rebrand tourism.

There were four possible answers, and candidates could score full marks by identifying any three of them.

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

- *Government must rebrand tourism by increasing sustainable, environmentally low-impact activities.*
- *Increase ecotourism and adventure holidays, like hiking or mountain biking.*
- *Encourage domestic tourists to spend money in Cambodia rather than Thailand or Vietnam.*

The first two responses are correct. The third response is about domestic tourists, and therefore not about *reopening* the country.

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

- *The government must support the development of skills needed for tourism, such as commercial cooking and catering and foreign language teaching.*

The points about commercial cooking and catering and foreign language teaching are examples of the skills development needed, which therefore only cover one of the bullet points above.

**Question 1b** asked candidates to identify two different regulations that might help Venice solve its tourism problems, as given by the author of Document B. There were only two acceptable answers:

- *Implement a tourist tax.*
- *Limit tourist numbers (to about half the current level).*

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



- *Set up a tourist tax.*
- *Reduce the usage of motorboats and encourage walking.*

Only the first of these is a regulation which, according to the text, might be introduced.

An example of an approach to **Question 1b** giving 0 out of 2 marks was:

- *Hotels will have to find other uses and property owners will have to take residential instead of inflated tourist rents.*
- *Souvenir shops and restaurants and new jobs will be needed.*

These are examples of actions which need to be taken, but they are not regulations set by the government.

## 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. Some candidates began with an introduction about the perspective of Document A, which is not required and is not credited. Others assessed key components of the argument rather than the evidence provided by the author. Neither of these skills were rewardable in **Question 2**. Explanations for why a piece of evidence was strong or weak were often limited to terms such as 'more trustworthy,' 'expert,' or 'can not 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, many candidates attempted a reasoned summary judgement. Most candidates attempted some impact analysis, and more were able to develop this sufficiently to achieve the highest marks. The question focused on the analysis of 'evidence,' so answers that related to language or structure were not credited. Common discussion points included the background of the author, the statistics, and the sources used.

Candidates were assessed on **Assessment Objective 1 (AO1 – research, analysis, and evaluation)**. The three aspects were: Identifying evidence (**AO1a**), Analysing the strengths and weaknesses of evidence (**AO1b**), and Evaluating evidence (**AO1c**). Many candidates gained high marks for **AO1a**. Marks for **AO1c** showed the greatest range, 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. They provided judgements at the end of strengths and weaknesses, followed by an overall judgement 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 could not gain more than half marks, for example, '...this is a great strength as it is backed up by sources.'. This identifies the use of sources as evidence but does not offer any examples of the sources from the document. Using this approach throughout would gain less than half marks.

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

- *The document contains a lot of statistics. For example, visitor numbers fell by 80 per cent in 2020. In 2019, tourist revenue accounted for 150.5 billion USD with 6.6 million tourists. Domestic tourist numbers fell by 36 per cent, each spending USD 800.*

The candidate made a point about statistics and gave a number of examples. A high scoring response would identify a number of different types of evidence, giving at least one example for each.

For **AO1b – Analysing the strengths and weaknesses of evidence**, higher-scoring responses analysed a range of evidence and looked for a balance between strengths and weaknesses. They also gave clear explanations as to why they were considered 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:

- *Moreover, Document A uses evidence from credible sources, such as the United Nations World Tourism Organisation. This is a credible source; therefore, it is trustworthy because the information is checked for accuracy and bias. It provides reliable information because high standards of information are maintained, making the information well-researched.*

Lower-scoring responses only stated strengths or weaknesses with limited explanation, for example:

- *In paragraph 3, the author states that the tourism sector of Cambodia 'grown from 2.1 per cent' to 19 per cent of the country's economy. This is not supported by any source nor evidence.*

There is a clear weakness identified with an example, but only limited explanation. To improve, the candidate would need to explain why this is a weakness, and why a credible and trusted source is important when considering the value of the statistic.

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 judgement.

Lower-scoring responses used simple assertions without explaining why or how there is an impact on the argument, for example, 'this evidence creates a strong and backed-up argument'.

The most common kind of answers for **AO1c** identified an impact with an evaluation, such as

- *Document A uses statistics as evidence in supporting the arguments. As it mentions, 'Cambodia's tourism sector had grown from 2.1 per cent of the country's economy to around 19 per cent.' Statistics can give credibility to the arguments because they use data. Readers might fully trust the arguments based on data rather than those that lack solid data to support.*

Higher-scoring responses evaluated the impact of the individual pieces of evidence on the argument and then included an overall judgement at the end of the effectiveness of all the evidence, for example:

- *The evidence provided by the author of Document A has strengths and weaknesses. Even though some evidence is not cited properly, and fewer global perspectives have been included, the author has included evidence from relevant sources with authority. The use of a range of statistical data from different authoritative sources makes it more believable for the readers. He shows how significant the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic is on tourism in Cambodia. Overall, the strengths of the evidence provided by the author outweigh its weaknesses. This limits the chance of counterarguments towards the author's argument, especially given the provenance and evidence of the author.*

The evaluation is well explained, and there is an emphasis on the impact throughout this section. There is a judgement which is explained while weighing up the value of the various pieces of evidence discussed earlier in the answer.

### 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 responses 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. The strongest responses 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.

Higher-scoring responses 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 author of Document A, Markus Bell, is a research fellow at La Trobe University. On the other hand, Neal E. Robbins, the author of Document B, is a former professor of journalism and a foreign correspondent for international news agencies. As a researcher, this allows the author of Document A to have broader knowledge and information to back up his research. Whereas, with a background as a former professor of journalism, the author of Document B's writing tends to be more subjective. Given that the author also has a background as a foreign correspondent, this influences his perspective. For international news agencies and as the author of several books, Neal E. Robbins (Document B) may be better known to the public. As a result, the author of Document B can provide a more influential impact on the readers as he is already known by the public. This makes Document B's argument stronger than Document A.*

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 response is:

- *The perspective of Document A is that Cambodia needs to encourage people to re-enter the tourism business to attract foreigners to visit Cambodia. This is explained by highlighting the reliance on tourism for the Cambodian economy and how, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, tourism dropped significantly, causing many Cambodians who benefit from tourism to suffer. On the other hand, Document B believes that tourism is worsening in Venice and that regulations should be placed to manage the number of tourists. This is done by comparing the vast millions of tourists entering Venice every year with the thousands of Venetians moving away from Venice over the decades and how the tourists disturb the*

*locals' daily lives. However, they also discuss the impact of this solution on the economy, which heavily relies on tourism. These two perspectives are contrasting: Document A advocates for increasing tourism, while Document B strongly argues against it, considering the drawbacks.*

Lower-scoring responses 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. For example:

- *Both documents A and B discuss issues relating to tourism. Document A addresses the economic problems Cambodia has faced due to a lack of tourism, while Document B discusses the problems Venice has encountered due to mass tourism.*

There is no identification or description of the authors' claims, or any comparison or explanation.

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

An example of a higher-scoring candidate providing evaluation and illustration is given here. This is one part of several evaluations that were balanced across both documents.

- *The documents differ in terms of global scop. Document B includes other countries in the author's claims, such as Amsterdam, Barcelona, New Orleans, and Dubrovnik. This allows the research to be more global. The author finds that Amsterdam and Barcelona have already begun to solve their problems with tourism, while Venice is behind. This puts the research in a more global perspective and does not limit it only to Venice. Readers are then convinced of the claims as the work is applicable worldwide. This is unlike Document A, where only a national scale is set for Cambodia. The only data used is from Cambodia. The research could have included other countries to show that the situation is happening elsewhere, making the paper more applicable. This makes Document B stronger than Document A in terms of scope.*

Below is an example of a lower-scoring response:

- *Document A is written by Markus Bell, and Document B is written by Neal E. Robbins. Neal E. Robbins, a former professor of journalism and foreign correspondent, is an Italian-speaking professional journalist and the author of many books, including 'Venice' and 'Odyssey.' He is much closer to the problem than Markus Bell, who is a researcher at La Trobe University.*

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 a book make the author more expert or the argument more reliable?

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

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

- *In conclusion, both documents have many strengths and weaknesses. However, I maintain that Document B is stronger. Although its evidence is uncited and it is more difficult to read, the author is certified in journalism and knowledgeable in Venetian culture, which compensates for this. Concerns over reliability due to the lack of referencing are rebutted by the author's need to uphold a reputation and thus publish only credible information. Document B, unlike Document A, acknowledges and rebuts counterarguments nicely, while Document A may be considered more neutral. However, the purpose of both documents is to convince people that changes to tourism are necessary, whether that be reform or reduction. Therefore, neutrality is not a big concern. Document B's variety of evidence and emotional style appeal to the reader, achieving its goal of convincing tourists to consider reducing travel due to the ethical, environmental, and social detriment Venice has endured. Thus, Document B is stronger than Document A as it is convincing, reliable, and appeals to the audience, which Document A does not.*

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

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

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

Paper 9239/13  
Written Exam 13

## Key messages

It is important that candidates 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 1a**: 'identify', 'three things the government must do', 'as given by the author'; in **Question 1b**: 'identify', 'two different regulations', 'as given by the author'; in **Question 2**: 'evidence' and 'impact'; and in **Question 3**: 'perspectives', 'judgement' and 'stronger'.

Candidates managed their time well and 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 1a** might be found anywhere in Document A, and responses to **Question 1b** 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. Instead of just stating what a strength or weakness may be, the candidates should also explain how or why it is a strength or weakness. There should also be explicit reference to perspectives in **Question 3** and reflection on the impact of the evidence in **Question 2**. Judgements are required in both questions.

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

Candidates could improve in the following Assessment Objectives: **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, adapting well to the given directions. Several candidates recognised the need to explain the impact of the evidence on the author's argument in **Question 2**, with many reaching a reasoned judgement by the end. While candidates often provided reasons for why a piece of evidence was strong or weak, they did not always manage 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 a concerted effort to identify and describe them as an introduction to their answers. Some candidates only evaluated key components that could have applied to any document.

Many candidates managed their time effectively. Candidates who were brief and focused in answering **Question 1** 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 writing 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.

Some responses to **Question 3** were not fully developed or supported by precise references to the documents. Stronger responses selected relevant and appropriate points from the documents and evaluated

their significance within the argument. 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 within an essay format, 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.

### 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 1a** and **1b** are found as part of the reading and understanding of the documents. These answers are straightforward, so answering the questions in order is recommended.

There are two parts to **Question 1**. **1a** refers to Document A and **1b** 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.

**Question 1a** asked candidates to identify three things the government must do to reopen the country to tourism, as given by the author of Document A. The expected answers were:

- Encourage people back to work in tourism.
- Support the development of skills needed for tourism.
- Provide economic support (for local businesses).
- Launch tourism initiatives/rebrand tourism.

There were four possible answers, and candidates could score full marks by identifying any three of them.

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

- *Government must rebrand tourism by increasing sustainable, environmentally low-impact activities.*
- *Increase ecotourism and adventure holidays, like hiking or mountain biking.*
- *Encourage domestic tourists to spend money in Cambodia rather than Thailand or Vietnam.*

The first two responses are correct. The third response is about domestic tourists, and therefore not about *reopening* the country.

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

- *The government must support the development of skills needed for tourism, such as commercial cooking and catering and foreign language teaching.*

The points about commercial cooking and catering and foreign language teaching are examples of the skills development needed, which therefore only cover one of the bullet points above.

**Question 1b** asked candidates to identify two different regulations that might help Venice solve its tourism problems, as given by the author of Document B. There were only two acceptable answers:

- *Implement a tourist tax.*
- *Limit tourist numbers (to about half the current level).*

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

- *Set up a tourist tax.*
- *Reduce the usage of motorboats and encourage walking.*

Only the first of these is a regulation which, according to the text, might be introduced.

An example of an approach to **Question 1b** giving 0 out of 2 marks was:

- *Hotels will have to find other uses and property owners will have to take residential instead of inflated tourist rents.*
- *Souvenir shops and restaurants and new jobs will be needed.*

These are examples of actions which need to be taken, but they are not regulations set by the government.

## 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. Some candidates began with an introduction about the perspective of Document A, which is not required and is not credited. Others assessed key components of the argument rather than the evidence provided by the author. Neither of these skills were rewardable in **Question 2**. Explanations for why a piece of evidence was strong or weak were often limited to terms such as 'more trustworthy,' 'expert,' or 'can not 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, many candidates attempted a reasoned summary judgement. Most candidates attempted some impact analysis, and more were able to develop this sufficiently to achieve the highest marks. The question focused on the analysis of 'evidence,' so answers that related to language or structure were not credited. Common discussion points included the background of the author, the statistics, and the sources used.

Candidates were assessed on **Assessment Objective 1 (AO1 – research, analysis, and evaluation)**. The three aspects were: Identifying evidence (**AO1a**), Analysing the strengths and weaknesses of evidence (**AO1b**), and Evaluating evidence (**AO1c**). Many candidates gained high marks for **AO1a**. Marks for **AO1c** showed the greatest range, 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. They provided judgements at the end of strengths and weaknesses, followed by an overall judgement 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 could not gain more than half marks, for example, '...this is a great strength as it is backed up by sources.'. This identifies the use of sources as evidence but does not offer any examples of the sources from the document. Using this approach throughout would gain less than half marks.

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

- *The document contains a lot of statistics. For example, visitor numbers fell by 80 per cent in 2020. In 2019, tourist revenue accounted for 150.5 billion USD with 6.6 million tourists. Domestic tourist numbers fell by 36 per cent, each spending USD 800.*

The candidate made a point about statistics and gave a number of examples. A high scoring response would identify a number of different types of evidence, giving at least one example for each.



For **AO1b – Analysing the strengths and weaknesses of evidence**, higher-scoring responses analysed a range of evidence and looked for a balance between strengths and weaknesses. They also gave clear explanations as to why they were considered 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:

- *Moreover, Document A uses evidence from credible sources, such as the United Nations World Tourism Organisation. This is a credible source; therefore, it is trustworthy because the information is checked for accuracy and bias. It provides reliable information because high standards of information are maintained, making the information well-researched.*

Lower-scoring responses only stated strengths or weaknesses with limited explanation, for example:

- *In paragraph 3, the author states that the tourism sector of Cambodia 'grown from 2.1 per cent' to 19 per cent of the country's economy. This is not supported by any source nor evidence.*

There is a clear weakness identified with an example, but only limited explanation. To improve, the candidate would need to explain why this is a weakness, and why a credible and trusted source is important when considering the value of the statistic.

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 judgement.

Lower-scoring responses used simple assertions without explaining why or how there is an impact on the argument, for example, 'this evidence creates a strong and backed-up argument'.

The most common kind of answers for **AO1c** identified an impact with an evaluation, such as

- *Document A uses statistics as evidence in supporting the arguments. As it mentions, 'Cambodia's tourism sector had grown from 2.1 per cent of the country's economy to around 19 per cent.' Statistics can give credibility to the arguments because they use data. Readers might fully trust the arguments based on data rather than those that lack solid data to support.*

Higher-scoring responses evaluated the impact of the individual pieces of evidence on the argument and then included an overall judgement at the end of the effectiveness of all the evidence, for example:

- *The evidence provided by the author of Document A has strengths and weaknesses. Even though some evidence is not cited properly, and fewer global perspectives have been included, the author has included evidence from relevant sources with authority. The use of a range of statistical data from different authoritative sources makes it more believable for the readers. He shows how significant the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic is on tourism in Cambodia. Overall, the strengths of the evidence provided by the author outweigh its weaknesses. This limits the chance of counterarguments towards the author's argument, especially given the provenance and evidence of the author.*

The evaluation is well explained, and there is an emphasis on the impact throughout this section. There is a judgement which is explained while weighing up the value of the various pieces of evidence discussed earlier in the answer.

### 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 responses 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. The strongest responses 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.

Higher-scoring responses 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 author of Document A, Markus Bell, is a research fellow at La Trobe University. On the other hand, Neal E. Robbins, the author of Document B, is a former professor of journalism and a foreign correspondent for international news agencies. As a researcher, this allows the author of Document A to have broader knowledge and information to back up his research. Whereas, with a background as a former professor of journalism, the author of Document B's writing tends to be more subjective. Given that the author also has a background as a foreign correspondent, this influences his perspective. For international news agencies and as the author of several books, Neal E. Robbins (Document B) may be better known to the public. As a result, the author of Document B can provide a more influential impact on the readers as he is already known by the public. This makes Document B's argument stronger than Document A.*

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 response is:

- *The perspective of Document A is that Cambodia needs to encourage people to re-enter the tourism business to attract foreigners to visit Cambodia. This is explained by highlighting the reliance on tourism for the Cambodian economy and how, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, tourism dropped significantly, causing many Cambodians who benefit from tourism to suffer. On the other hand, Document B believes that tourism is worsening in Venice and that regulations should be placed to manage the number of tourists. This is done by comparing the vast millions of tourists entering Venice every year with the thousands of Venetians moving away from Venice over the decades and how the tourists disturb the*

*locals' daily lives. However, they also discuss the impact of this solution on the economy, which heavily relies on tourism. These two perspectives are contrasting: Document A advocates for increasing tourism, while Document B strongly argues against it, considering the drawbacks.*

Lower-scoring responses 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. For example:

- *Both documents A and B discuss issues relating to tourism. Document A addresses the economic problems Cambodia has faced due to a lack of tourism, while Document B discusses the problems Venice has encountered due to mass tourism.*

There is no identification or description of the authors' claims, or any comparison or explanation.

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

An example of a higher-scoring candidate providing evaluation and illustration is given here. This is one part of several evaluations that were balanced across both documents.

- *The documents differ in terms of global scop. Document B includes other countries in the author's claims, such as Amsterdam, Barcelona, New Orleans, and Dubrovnik. This allows the research to be more global. The author finds that Amsterdam and Barcelona have already begun to solve their problems with tourism, while Venice is behind. This puts the research in a more global perspective and does not limit it only to Venice. Readers are then convinced of the claims as the work is applicable worldwide. This is unlike Document A, where only a national scale is set for Cambodia. The only data used is from Cambodia. The research could have included other countries to show that the situation is happening elsewhere, making the paper more applicable. This makes Document B stronger than Document A in terms of scope.*

Below is an example of a lower-scoring response:

- *Document A is written by Markus Bell, and Document B is written by Neal E. Robbins. Neal E. Robbins, a former professor of journalism and foreign correspondent, is an Italian-speaking professional journalist and the author of many books, including 'Venice' and 'Odyssey.' He is much closer to the problem than Markus Bell, who is a researcher at La Trobe University.*

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 a book make the author more expert or the argument more reliable?

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

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

- *In conclusion, both documents have many strengths and weaknesses. However, I maintain that Document B is stronger. Although its evidence is uncited and it is more difficult to read, the author is certified in journalism and knowledgeable in Venetian culture, which compensates for this. Concerns over reliability due to the lack of referencing are rebutted by the author's need to uphold a reputation and thus publish only credible information. Document B, unlike Document A, acknowledges and rebuts counterarguments nicely, while Document A may be considered more neutral. However, the purpose of both documents is to convince people that changes to tourism are necessary, whether that be reform or reduction. Therefore, neutrality is not a big concern. Document B's variety of evidence and emotional style appeal to the reader, achieving its goal of convincing tourists to consider reducing travel due to the ethical, environmental, and social detriment Venice has endured. Thus, Document B is stronger than Document A as it is convincing, reliable, and appeals to the audience, which Document A does not.*

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

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

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

---

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

## **Key messages**

A successful essay requires a clear and concise title question that sets up a debate between contrasting perspectives.

Successful essays include developed critical evaluation of four key sources. Candidates should use one or two evaluation criteria for each source.

Referencing needs to be presented using a logical and effective system. Citations should be clear in the essay and readily found in the bibliography or footnote.

## **General comments**

In order to demonstrate all of the skills assessed in this component, candidates need to plan carefully. There were many candidates not addressing all of the ten different assessment aspects in their essays. The assessment aspects are split across three assessment objectives; the first five relate to research, analysis and evaluation, the next three relate to reflection and the final two relate to communication. Each aspect is given its own heading in this report.

The vast majority of candidates were able to focus on issues with global significance that derived from the topics listed in the syllabus. Popular issues addressed this series were the impact of Artificial Intelligence, Social Media, Energy Security and Climate Change. Overall, essays demonstrated varied research and addressed pertinent issues.

## **Comments on specific aspects**

### **Analysis of Question**

An effective title question is the foundation of a good essay. A concise title question that sets up a debate between contrasting perspectives will give the candidate every opportunity to achieve against all assessment areas.

The title question should raise an issue of global significance, for example, '*Should countries develop nuclear energy?*'. This question clearly sets up a debate between two contrasting perspectives, those in favour of nuclear energy and those against. This particular question from the recent series is very broad and enabled the candidate to consider several different implications. The essay in question considered several implications by analysing the question through the lenses of different themes. In this case the environmental, economic and political themes were used. The candidate introduced each section of the essay by clearly identifying each theme or implication of the title question, '*The second theme we need to consider is the environment.*'. Assessors are looking for a clear identification of a theme which will then be used to analyse the implications of the question via the use of source material (see Range of Sources below). The highest achieving candidates will use themes that can support both of the contrasting perspectives, so in the case referred to, the candidate was able to compare the environmental benefits with the environmental costs of developing nuclear energy. (This will be further developed later, see Comparison of Perspectives below).

The following examples are of title questions that either did not set up a debate or were too convoluted to enable the candidate to remain focused. Title '*What should governments do to improve quality of life for their citizens?*' has no debate. Titles such as '*Should we limit smart internet devices for the privacy threats they propose to protect individual rights?*' or '*Has the ignorance of governments contributed to the lack of online*

*safety for today's youth?* will not enable the candidate to remain focused on the question which is an important part of the AO3 assessment (see Communication below).

## Building Perspectives

Centres are encouraged to remember that if the candidate's title has not set up a debate and the response is descriptive or one-sided, the candidate will not be able to meet the assessment criteria for this aspect.

Synthesis is a key skill that is assessed across the Global Perspectives and Research syllabus. To achieve high marks candidates are required to make connections between their source materials by synthesising arguments and evidence together as they build coherent perspectives. To reach the highest achievement levels candidates need to make explicit links between two sources, both of which directly respond to the title question. Simply juxtaposing sources together or linking them with a discourse marker, such as 'similarly', is not sufficient. The two sources need to work together to develop a perspective that is responding to the title question.

The following adapted extract comes from an essay with the title '*Will Artificial Intelligence replace human roles in the future?*'. The candidate identifies an implication of the question (creative industries) and then explicitly links the two sources to build the perspective that yes, in creative industries humans will be replaced.

*'The creative industries are an area of focus that requires consideration. AI's expansion into creative industries can support the argument that it will replace human roles. Lutkevich (2024) illustrates how ChatGPT and other similar AI tools can now be used for creative works such as writing and graphic design. An example is a tech startup that used AI to replace a human writer with the aim of cutting costs on the production of content. This supports the argument by showing the possibility of replacing human labour in creative industries, which were considered to be non-automatable before AI appeared on the market. The real-life case of AI substituting a human writer proves that creative occupations are in danger at the hands of artificial intelligence. Urwin (2024) also has some validation for this point, as he points out that AI is entering creative industries, strengthening the argument that even creative professions are not safe. Since AI is coded to do creative work, it means that in the near future, it will replace workers in domains that have previously been considered immune from the effects of automation. Like Lutkevich, Urwin argues that essentially no industry is safe. If creative writers can be replaced then what human skills can not?'*

## Range of Sources

The range of sources used this series was very broad. Relevant and credible source materials emanating from Africa, North and South America as well as Europe and Asia were widely used by candidates. Candidates are encouraged to use sources that emanate from different global contexts or present arguments and evidence relating to different global contexts. The highest achieving candidates will be able to demonstrate the use of sources from four or more different global contexts. Candidates should clearly identify the global context of their material. This can be done either by reference to the author or publication ('according to *The Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction* . . .') or by clearly stating to which global context the argument or evidence pertains (*in South Africa cottonseed costs are increasing dramatically, farmers in Montagu reported* . . .').

The range of source material selected should be used to support perspectives and analyse the implications of the question. This requires engaging with the source in a way that uses evidence from the source and explains how the source supports the perspective. This requires more than a brief reference to the source. Some candidates used too many sources and this allowed them to demonstrate range but not engagement. Candidates are not required to use more than eight relevant sources with global range to reach the highest attainment levels. The most successful candidates used about four sources to support each perspective.

## Appropriateness of Sources

Critical evaluation of source material is a skill that is assessed in all components of the syllabus. Nearly forty percent of candidates did not address this aspect of assessment.

It is not necessary for candidates to critically evaluate all of the sources used and the most successful candidates evaluated four or five of their key sources. Candidates should consider both strengths and weaknesses of their source material. Criteria for evaluation could include for example quality of evidence, logic of argument, credibility of author or issues of bias and vested interest. This is not an exhaustive list. It is

better for candidates to develop a single criterion of evaluation rather than offer a less developed range of different criteria. Here is an example of some developed critical evaluation from the current series.

*'We know that this source is reliable because the author of it Krystyna Swiderska leads the International Institute for Environment and Development's work on traditional knowledge and biocultural heritage. Holding such a position enhances the author's credibility and enables the reader to have faith in her evidence and because her work focuses on protecting the biodiversity and cultural heritage and the related rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities her specialised expertise links directly to the topics that have been covered in this essay. Clearly this is a trustworthy source.'*

### **Comparison of perspectives**

Similarly to Building Perspectives (see above), if the candidate does not set up a debate between contrasting perspectives they will not be able to achieve in this area of assessment. Rather than just presenting contrasting perspectives, the candidates need to actively compare them. A well-structured essay will offer several opportunities for the candidate to offer some comparison of perspectives. When setting up their debate in the essay's introduction, many candidates were able to offer a brief and descriptive comparison of perspectives. This is likely to be brief but if done well, it is creditworthy. If the candidate identifies a theme that can support both of the contrasting perspectives, there is the opportunity to compare two different views. Expanding on the example above, (see Analysis of Question) in the essay the candidate explored the economic implications of their title question ('Should countries develop nuclear energy?'). The set up costs of nuclear energy were used to support the 'no' perspective and the consistency of energy supply was used to support the 'yes' perspective. The candidate was able to actively compare perspectives from within a theme.

It is expected that candidates will compare their perspectives holistically before arriving at their final conclusion. It is important that candidates move beyond simply juxtaposing summaries of both perspectives. To reach the higher levels candidates should consider strengths and weaknesses of each perspective as they develop their evaluative comparison.

### **Consideration of Contrasting Perspectives**

This is the first of the three Reflection assessment criteria. To achieve well in this assessment area, there should be a balanced approach as candidates consider their contrasting perspectives. Very few candidates demonstrated strong bias towards a particular perspective and for the most part they presented both perspectives with thoughtful objectivity. Assessors consider balance in two ways, firstly in terms of equal space and research given to each perspective and secondly that each perspective is treated fairly and considered on its merits rather than being influenced by preconceived ideas.

The previous area of assessment discussed (Comparison of perspectives) also provides candidates with an opportunity to demonstrate they have given due consideration to both perspectives.

### **Reflection and Impact on Personal Viewpoint**

Reflection is a skill that is assessed in three of the Global Perspectives and Research components. The vast majority of candidates addressed this area of assessment, however approximately fourteen percent of candidates did not offer any reflection on this assessment area or the next (Further Research) in their essays.

This particular aspect of reflection assesses candidate's ability to express how engaging with the contrasting perspectives has changed or consolidated their personal viewpoint. In the highest attainment levels candidates will make specific reference to perspectives, detailing how engaging with research material has impacted their personal viewpoint. The following is a strong example from the current series, it comes from an essay with the title 'Does divorce contribute to juvenile delinquency?'.  
*'Throughout the course of this essay, I have gained valuable insights into the complex relationship between divorce and juvenile delinquency, and my perspectives have evolved. My initial viewpoint assumed that divorce was a straightforward cause of juvenile delinquency. However, through research, it has become clear that divorce is only one factor among many. What I found particularly enlightening was the realization that children's resilience to divorce is heavily influenced by the support they receive and the societal structures they live in. This deeper understanding has led me to recognize the importance of a more holistic approach, considering not only the psychological effects of divorce but also the social and economic context in which a child grows up. My research has highlighted that the relationship between divorce and juvenile delinquency*

*is not a one size fits all. Children won't be affected by it equally, and there are different factors, such as academics, parental involvement, and culture, that will influence juvenile delinquency.'*

### Further Research

Many candidates simply assert that more research should be done, however this is not creditworthy. Assessors are looking for a new area for further research to be identified and then developed with reasons as to why this would be important and also how such research might be undertaken. The following example offers a new area for further research and reasons as to why that would be useful. However, the explanation is a little generic and to reach the higher levels the candidate needed to develop either how the research would be undertaken or be more specific in terms of what insights would be gleaned by such research. The example comes from an essay with the title *'Should we have stricter laws to make facilities more inclusive for disabled people?'*.

*'If there is further research, I would include more insights from people with disabilities. Right now, my essay mostly relies on experts' views. I want to make sure this essay stays fair and unbiased by not favouring any group. By hearing directly from those affected and incorporating perspectives from different countries, I hope to better understand the challenges faced worldwide. This way, I can offer a more complete picture of disability issues and participate to a more understanding conversation about inclusion.'*

### Structure

The vast majority of candidates were able to present essays with a logical structure. These essays had a clear introduction followed by the main body of the essay and culminated in a supported conclusion. The effective use of discourse markers is required for candidates to reach higher attainment levels. Phrases like 'On the other hand' were successfully used by candidates to signpost a shift in perspectives. Synthesis may be signposted in many different ways, a good example from this series was *'This concern is further underscored by data from the National Centre for Education Statistics which shows a steady rise in . . .'*.

To further underline the importance of an effective title question (see Analysis of Question), candidates need to remain focused on their title question to achieve the highest attainment levels. Essays should meet the word count requirements of being between 1750–2000 words, written in continuous prose and not relying upon graphs, charts or images.

### Referencing

Any system of referencing is acceptable for candidates to use. The candidates that used Harvard style systems tended to be the most effective. The citations used in the Building Perspectives extract (see above) were an example of this type of system. The two citations appeared in an alphabetical bibliography and the references can be seen here.

Lutkevich 2024, 'Will AI replace jobs? 17 job types that might be affected', Last Edited: 28 August 2024, Date of viewing: 17 July 2024, Informative Webpage. <https://www.techtarget.com/whatis/feature/Will-AI-replace-jobs-9-job-types-that-might-be-affected>.

Urwin 2024 'AI Taking Over Jobs: What to Know About the Future of Jobs' Last Edited: 19 July 2024, Date of viewing: 15 July 2024, Informative Webpage 2. <https://hbr.org/2023/08/ai-wont-replace-humans-but-humans-with-ai-will-replace-humans-without-ai>

Footnote systems are acceptable, 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 are easily found and carry the appropriate details. There are still many candidates offering URLs and nothing more. This is not considered to be effective referencing.



# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

---

<p><b>Paper 9239/03</b> <b>Team Project</b></p>
---

## **Key messages**

Candidates produced presentations on a wide range of topics this series. There were presentations on deforestation, the depletion of fossil fuels, rising rates of obesity and issues surrounding healthcare. Some common themes included tourism, health, the environment, crime, and the pressures facing urban areas due to population growth. This series has some of the strongest presentations the Principal Examiner has seen since the change in syllabus – it was wonderful to see candidates achieving top marks across several assessment objectives.

Many presentations were clear and focused, which showed that the presenters have the confidence to use technology as well as the ability to make valid and relevant choices in the selection of their source materials. Successful, high performing candidates made detailed references to visual aids to help back up their arguments. For example, they used images and graphs throughout the presentation to develop an already well-explained issue. There was also much more use of language to engage the audience than has been seen in previous series.

## **General comments**

Teachers should note that there is no need for them to speak at the start to introduce the candidate, it has led to presentations running over ten minutes which could impact the candidate's marks. There is also no longer a requirement for there to be an audience, so using presentation time to prove that there is one isn't necessary. One centre spent time at the start of each presentation setting up the camera – this should be cut out before submitting the presentation.

A small number of centres presented a joint team presentation. This is not permitted for this component and led to candidates' marks being limited and only the work of each specific candidate being credited, rather than the presentation as a whole. Joint team presentations should be avoided as it leads to candidates achieving very low marks.

Several candidates this series still proceeded to list their team members' perspectives during their presentation. This was a requirement of the old syllabus and is no longer necessary - it wastes valuable presentation time and should be avoided.

Some candidates from the same group were starting their presentation in the same way as each other; their presentations only differed when it came to the solution. Candidates should make sure that the entirety of their presentation is different to that of their team members.

There has been some obvious use of AI to complete this component, mainly in the reflective paper. Centres need to take care to check candidates work for this before submitting it.

Another quite common approach this series was for candidates to speed up their recordings so that they were able to fit a longer presentation into the 10-minute time limit. This proved detrimental to marks awarded in some cases as it had a negative impact on the effectiveness of their presentations. It was often difficult to absorb what was being said. Candidates should avoid speeding up the recording of their presentations and instead focus on delivering their presentation within the ten-minute time limit.

One other issue was that 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 acceptable, but it needs to be submitted together as one video file.

## **Presentation**

### **Individual analysis of the problem**

As always, the choice of issue is often crucial to the overall success of the presentation. Generally speaking, the more locally or personally relevant the issue is, the greater the involvement of the candidates in analysing, researching and finding solutions to it, and the higher the overall standard of the presentation.

Examples of presentations that were firmly rooted in local issues, but where the candidate was also able to provide a global context include racial discrimination in New Zealand, doctor shortages in Portugal, and floods in Argentina. Candidates who scored top marks often mentioned the causes but focused more on the impact of their team's problem. Most candidates incorporated statistical data at local and global levels. For example, a candidate presenting on care for the elderly considered the local impacts in New Zealand and more globally in Nepal.

### **Range of research undertaken**

Some of the best presentations came from candidates who had refined their research and focused precisely on the information they needed with no digression. On the other hand, some presentations seemed swamped with research, which left little room for personal viewpoint and evaluation. The most effective presentations included a number of sources that were carefully evaluated and assimilated into the body of the presentation with data, charts and quotes being used judiciously to support the presentation.

The most successful candidates found research from a wide variety of sources – self-conducted surveys, case studies, official reports, newspaper articles, historical data, and economic comparisons, examples from other countries. The range of research was not as evident as it was in the summer series so fewer candidates scored top marks.

An example of a candidate scoring top marks presented on endangered animals and supported their focus with information from several sources. These included newspapers; reports, government websites, journals, and researchers. This fulfilled the requirement for the broad range of sources. The candidate also used data from New Zealand, Africa and Asia to illustrate the points made, giving depth to the global perspective.

### **Evaluation of sources to support the research**

This is almost certainly the criterion which candidates had the most difficulty in achieving higher marks. The vast majority did little more than identify sources. To achieve marks for AO1c, candidates need to evaluate sources by showing how valid they are. An example of this may be that they talk about the age of the source and whether it is still relevant, or how reputable the author is. The candidate needs to go further than just saying where the source is from – they need to explain why this makes it a reliable source. Candidates then need to synthesise their sources to allow them access to higher marks for AO1c. What an examiner would be looking for here is the candidate comparing what two different sources say about the same point or idea – either showing how they back each other up, or by going into detail about how they contradict each other. This was only seen a small number of times this series.

It is apparent that some candidates are looking for ways to do more than simply identify or evaluate sources, and to achieve some sort of synthesis. One fairly common strategy is to offer a 'round up' of sources that have been used, often at the end of a presentation. A candidate might evaluate the sources used and describe some of their common characteristics. One problem with this approach is that it does not lend itself to the type of synthesis that is being looked for, as the sources are then dealt with in isolation, detached from the points or arguments where they might have supported or contradicted one another at particular junctures during the course of the presentation.

There have also been presentations where the transcript includes academic-style citations of sources and their authors (inserted where relevant throughout the transcript) that are not explicitly referred to in the presentation itself. In some cases, this approach of including details of sources in the transcript was apparent, but no explicit reference was made to the sources during the presentation itself, thereby running the risk of getting no marks for this criterion.

### **Justification for the individual solution which is proposed**

A considerable number of candidates, even those who had shown good analysis of their issue supported by detailed research, then went on to introduce solutions which were unsupported by evidence of any sort, and sometimes appeared to be the product of nothing more than wishful thinking. A strategy used by some candidates was to introduce their solution at a relatively early point in their presentations. This may enable them to provide plenty of detailed evidence in support of their solution, but it also may result in insufficient analysis of their issue in terms of its impact. One presentation seen on drip irrigation gave a very detailed and sustained argument in favour of its solution and managed to avoid this problem by introducing case studies that enabled them to continue analysing why drip irrigation schemes had been needed in different contexts, as well as then detailing the results of their implementation. On the other hand, a candidate presenting on contour farming had a good balance of analysis and solution, but in this case, although the solution was argued for persuasively, it was not supported with enough detailed evidence to achieve the top mark for this criterion. To achieve well for this criterion, the solution must be supported with evidence.

There was tendency amongst some candidates to offer a lot of different solutions to the issue but introducing these on a superficial level. This approach usually created a list but little else. The best answers focused on one key solution and spent time explaining it and giving examples of where it had been tried or what evidence might support it.

### **Production of an organised argument**

Most candidates managed to structure their presentation to some extent, and to develop an argument. How well the argument is structured is often quite closely linked to the candidate's ability to analyse their issue and develop a solution, but language choices can also play a role, especially when it comes to signposting the direction an argument is taking. One example of a well-structured, well-argued presentation was on the topic of immigration. The presentation made good use of discourse markers to make the argument easier for the audience to follow. Another candidate presenting on Hawaiian culture made less obvious use of discourse markers but had a well-constructed argument which achieved coherence through a wide variety of rhetorical devices. Careful use of research also enabled candidates to achieve well for this criterion as it allowed them to develop their argument.

### **Presentation of visual information to support an argument**

Successful presentations were mostly produced by candidates that were well-informed, enthusiastic and who used the visual aids as a support and enhancement of the material, rather than the main focus. The best presentations showed interaction with visual aids such as graphs and data, for example, showing change or impact after solutions had been applied.

Many candidates interacted more effectively with their presentations than in previous series. There was a notable increase in the number of candidates choosing to submit voiceovers rather than in-person presentations, but candidates still interacted with data, charts, maps etc., using highlighter, pointers or description to involve the listener.

### **Use of language to address an audience**

It is apparent that some candidates are responding well to this criterion, having understood the need to vary their use of language to engage the audience. However, a high proportion of candidates are still not doing enough in this respect, perhaps feeling that the academic nature of their presentation demands a more impersonal tone. One candidate presenting on microplastics demonstrated that a well-researched and rigorous analysis of an issue and its solution can achieve an academic tone while still managing to engage the audience. Another candidate presenting on menstruation provided an excellent example of maintaining a tone of engagement with the audience throughout the presentation, while at the same time delivering a successful analysis of their chosen issue.

Some candidates scored 2 marks for including the audience with language such as 'you' or 'we', but to achieve higher marks they need to go further than this and engage their audience with a mixture of sentence structures; including statements, commands and rhetorical questions.

It appears that 'voice-over' presentations are increasingly popular, perhaps because candidates feel that this gives them greater editorial control over their presentations, and this in turn may give them more confidence when presenting. However, live presentations can be just as successful, with many candidates choosing this

option benefiting from the additional energy and impact that can be communicated through body language, particularly when the candidate is speaking in front of an audience of peers.

### ***Reflective paper***

There were some good examples of reflective papers this series. Many candidates now achieve a good balance in their Reflective Paper between AO2a and AO2b, although there are some exceptions which suggest that more teacher guidance is needed on what this paper should include.

Several candidates used their reflective paper to evaluate their sources. This needs to happen in the presentation, as candidates do not gain credit for it in the reflective paper and it wastes valuable space that could be used evaluating their teamwork or their learning. Another thing candidates do not need to do in the reflective paper is write about their group solution, unless they are specifically doing it to show how much they have learned. Often, it takes up a large proportion of the paper and does not gain any credit at all.

### **Reflection on the effectiveness of collaboration**

When discussing collaboration, many candidates are still prone to presenting a narrative description of what their team did, rather than any evaluation of its impact. Collaboration was most often seen at the research stage of the project where groups had shared sources or compared solutions or supported each other in organising their final presentations. Some candidates were able to evaluate how the team's handling of certain situations impacted the outcome of their presentation, enabling them to achieve higher marks for this criterion.

A trend this series seems to be towards candidates working more in teams of two rather than larger groups. It is not always clear that this is an advantage when it comes to writing the reflective paper: on the one hand, candidates working with only one other team member may avoid getting bogged down in the minutiae of team dynamics; on the other, depending on the pairing, collaboration may become an almost insignificant part of their experience of working on their presentation.

### **Reflection on learning**

Candidates often focused more on the learning which happened as a result of working with others (for example, new research or presentation skills that they acquired), rather than on how their thoughts related to their chosen issue had changed or developed.

Some candidates did overtly explore their changed attitudes, their weaknesses, and how their whole approach to research had changed, for better or worse. Reflection on learning was most clear when candidates went beyond describing what new information they had learnt and considered the impact of the project on their thinking or attitudes, or how their skills and life experience had improved.

# GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

---

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

## **Key messages**

The Cambridge Research Report is the A Level component of the skills-based Global Perspectives and Research qualification. The Cambridge Research Report is assessed against 15 criteria, and 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 AO2 Reflection aspects and a methodology section that some candidates did not include.

Teachers and candidates should use the Research Proposal Form as a framework for dialogue to ensure that their research question is appropriate. A well-crafted title question is the foundation for a successful research report.

In their introductions candidates must set out which themes they are using to analyse the implications of their title question. At the same time, they should outline why these themes are important and how they relate to the contrasting perspectives.

## **General comments**

Candidates produced some really detailed, well-structured and well-researched reports that covered a range of topics and issues. Candidates are encouraged to choose a topic area that is of significant interest to them. The topic area and issues addressed in the report need to be contentious in as much as they allow for contrasting perspectives and arguments. The Cambridge Research Report should be presented as a debate and not an informative report. Popular areas of focus this series were International Aid, Renewable Energy, Vaccinations and Artificial Intelligence. Topic areas such as these provided candidates with a broad range of research opportunities. Candidates need to engage in preliminary topic area research to understand the key issues arising from the topic as well as the contrasting perspectives that respond to those issues. 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***

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

For assessment objective AO1, assessors are looking for planning and the recording of pertinent information. In AO1 candidates should be looking forward and setting out objectives and milestones giving a clear indication of planning. They should also record key information. For AO2 candidates need to demonstrate the skill of stepping back to reflect upon the decisions made and research undertaken. Many candidates presented their Research Log in a diary form and therefore it was always looking backwards. The Research Log should be a live working document that demonstrates forward thinking and planning as well as reflection.

## ***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 three 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 did well in this area, however for example title *'How do different types of music influence the emotional state of mind?'* has no inherent debate and a report responding to such a question will 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 does tourism have an effect on habitat loss and endangered species?'*. Is the debate here between no impact and much impact, or between positive impact and negative impact? Another tendency with 'To What Extent' questions is to offer tangential perspectives. The candidate that offered title question *'To What Extent does technology positively impact modern education?'* dedicated half of the report to exploring the positive impact technology has on modern education and the other half of the report to discussing other factors that have a positive impact on modern education, such as formative assessment. These are not contrasting perspectives. The two example title questions could have been improved by rephrasing them as *'Does tourism have a negative impact on the local environment?'* and *'Is technology in schools beneficial for student learning?'*, respectively.

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, *'To what extent is biofabrication a useful and prominent tool in addressing present and future health problems within the medical and nutritional sector?'*. It is important that candidates remain focused on their title question throughout the report and therefore such a title question might be problematic for the candidate and impact the assessment levels they achieve.

Thirdly, the candidates must be able to find sources that support the contrasting perspectives raised by the title question. This is why it is so important to do preliminary research before finalising the title question. Some candidates put forward title questions with the prefix 'Are we doing enough', for example *'Are we doing enough to deal with global gender equality?'* or *'Are we doing enough to deal with child poverty?'*. In both of these examples there will be enough research to support the no perspective but, taking the second example, it is unlikely that candidates are going to find sources that will argue that yes, we are doing enough to end child poverty.

Synthesising research material to build coherent perspectives is a key assessment aspect of the Cambridge Research Report. Candidates should make explicit links between their research materials as they develop arguments and perspectives for and against the title question. 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 treat each source in isolation as this denies the possibility of making links between materials.

The adapted example below shows explicit synthesis as the candidate develops a perspective in response to the question *'Should animal testing be banned?'* when considering the ethical implications of the question.

*'The philosopher and a specialist in biomedical ethics, Carl Cohen (1986) presents an argument in his widely referenced work The Case for the Use of Animals in Biomedical Research, one of the clearest defences of animal testing from a rights-based perspective that animals lack moral rights due to their inability to make moral judgments—a capacity he considers essential for possessing rights. Cohen argues that, while animals deserve moral consideration, they do not hold rights in the same way humans do. Thus, he asserts, using animals in research is morally acceptable if it leads to significant human benefits. This view is rooted in the moral distinction between species, suggesting that human welfare should take precedence when it conflicts with animal interests. Cohen's pragmatic approach, which prioritizes human needs, has appeal in biomedical ethics, where research often aims to alleviate human suffering.'*

*'Cohen's framework (1986), known as Bateson's Cube aligns with Singer's (2022) position which uses three criteria- suffering, research quality, and benefit likelihood—to assess the justification for animal testing. Research that is high-quality, beneficial, and minimizes suffering is considered ethically acceptable, while painful, low-quality studies with low success potential are not. Singer's utilitarian view, advocating a balanced ethical assessment rather than an outright ban supports the argument put forward by Cohen, however there is an issue with both Singer and Cohen's argument in that there is no standardised criteria to define what*

*counts as substantial, human benefit. This therefore could create ambiguity and subjectivity, leading to varied interpretations.'*

It is clear that the candidate is not treating source materials in isolation, and they are demonstrating the skill of synthesis as they build perspectives in response to the title question.

The comparison of perspectives is a skill that should be demonstrated throughout the report. Candidates whose titles do not set up debates will not be able to achieve in this aspect of assessment. It is recommended that candidates compare perspectives as a way of supporting intermediary and final judgements. Evaluative comparisons that compared the various strengths and weaknesses of the perspectives achieved the highest attainment levels. Many candidates offered more descriptive comparisons which were essentially summaries of the two perspectives that were then juxtaposed before reaching a final or intermediary conclusion. This is creditworthy but not at the higher attainment levels where evaluation and active comparison is required.

### **Sources**

Candidates are advised to use sources that offer strong lines of argument rather than informative sources which are sometimes used descriptively. In the example used above (see Questions and Perspectives) the sources Singer and Cohen both have clear lines of argument that directly address the title question, thereby demonstrating relevance. Given that the Cohen source has been widely referenced, it can be readily accepted that this is a credible source as well. 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. Some candidates use too many sources to try and build points - two or three well-chosen sources to support a perspective within each theme used to analyse the implications of the question is sufficient. Referring to the example above, the candidate used two sources when considering the pro animal testing perspective via the ethical lens. Candidates should try not to use more than six sources when considering each thematic implication of their title question.

The skill of critical evaluation is assessed right across the Global Perspectives and Research syllabus and the vast majority of candidates are now addressing this assessment aspect in their research reports. Many candidates 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 'Animal Testing' report previously referred to.

*'Franzen's methodology, which involved structured surveys of 15 experts in pharmaceutical and biotech industries, academia, and organ-on-a-chip development, lends credibility to these projections. By gathering insights from industry professionals with firsthand experience in R&D, the study balances qualitative data with quantitative cost estimates, offering a robust view of potential savings. However, while the findings are promising, they remain largely predictive rather than grounded in longitudinal, real-world data. The lack of extensive empirical data limits the certainty of these projections, and it remains uncertain whether organ-on-a-chip systems can meet regulatory standards for drug safety and efficacy. If additional testing is required to validate the results obtained through these methods, some of the projected cost savings may diminish, affecting the practical and economic feasibility of a complete transition away from animal models.'*

The example shows an insightful and developed evaluation of the data used to support Franzen's argument.

### **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 these concepts, complex ideas and subject specific terminology as they develop their contrasting perspectives and consider the implications of the title question. By engaging with relevant concepts candidates are demonstrating academic engagement and rigour.

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 'Animal Testing' report again offers some good examples to elucidate this aspect of assessment. 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 and use concepts and complex ideas. This can be seen in the following adapted example.

*'Adding further evidence to Akhtar's claims, Chengyu Hu and colleagues from Southeast University of China, in their article Organoids and Organoids-on-a-Chip as New Testing Strategies for Environmental Toxicology (2024), argue that organoids and organoids-on-a-chip can better mimic human responses than animal models. Organoids are tiny, self-organized three-dimensional tissue cultures that are derived from stem cells. Such cultures can be crafted to replicate much of the complexity of an organ (Harvard Stem Cell Institute). Through a literature review, Hu et al. demonstrate the functionality of these human-derived models outperform animal models in various toxicology applications, including those involving the liver, lungs, and kidneys, by eliminating species-related discrepancies. Hu and colleagues assert that organoids provide a more controlled, reproducible, and accurate testing environment than animal models, reinforcing Akhtar's view on the limitations of animal testing.'*

These are complex ideas related to scientific concepts of structure and function and it is clear the candidate has a sound grasp of their material while at the same time making the ideas accessible to the lay person.

Methodology sections are required, and this series fewer candidates omitted this aspect of assessment. However, some candidates were very generic in their methodology sections, as can be seen from the example below:

*'I have conducted a wide range of research for this essay and ensured I have included both primary and secondary research. My original thought was to carry out a questionnaire or survey within my school to research current asthma rates, however with more thought this wouldn't have been accurate or allow me to compare the results to the rate 10 years ago, as I don't have access to that information. This changed my primary research to an interview, and I interviewed . . . from the . . . Campus. She is an expert as she's a qualified chemist, and this knowledge from her will help back up the arguments within my essay and it gives me strong evidence to strengthen my perspective.*

*The bulk of my research however is secondary, as I had access to massive amounts of statistics and quantitative data on air pollution, which I used to back up statements and perspectives too. This research led to a lot of cross-referencing within my essay, and I ensured to consider the date, author, range of quantitative data, evidence and sources that make this type of research trustworthy. Also, I've included a range of viewpoints and source types, and I ensured that I didn't include any bias knowledge. Using this research, which helped as I was easily able to cover both sides of the argument on air pollution.'*

Although this is creditworthy, until the very last sentence the methodology does not link to the topic area. In essence this section could apply to almost any research report. Candidates demonstrate understanding of their methodology when they are able to explain why the methods they have chosen are the most appropriate ones for their report. Page 27 of the syllabus provides some helpful information about research methods and methodology.

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 'Animal Testing' report set out three themes with which to analyse the implications of the title question; scientific, ethical and economic. At the end of each thematic discussion the candidate offered an intermediary judgement. 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. Some candidates arrive at intermediary judgements that have drifted from their title question, and such judgements are not deemed creditworthy. Focus on the title question throughout is important.

## Reflection



It is important that candidates identify their chosen themes in the introduction and/or methodology. This can be done in a very succinct way. The 'Animal Testing' report stated in the opening paragraph that '*This report will explore whether a complete ban on animal testing is justified by examining scientific, ethical and economic themes.*'. Another example reads '*Based on my preliminary research, I have chosen to focus on the ethical, legal and medical dimensions of surrogacy, as these are most pertinent to the debate.*'. The latter example shows that the candidate is just moving toward discussing why they have chosen these specific themes. This is one aspect of reflection that assessors are looking for. Candidates should reflect on how the interplay between themes and perspectives will shape the report. Candidates should focus on why particular themes have been selected and how they relate to the contrasting perspectives. There are some helpful diagrams on page 15 and 16 of the syllabus that visualise the interplay of topics, themes, issues and perspectives.

Many candidates 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 engaged with consolidated or changed the candidate's original point of view. 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. To reach the higher attainment levels candidates must reflect on why particular themes have been selected and how they interact with the perspectives presented in the report. To reiterate, it is anticipated that this will occur within the report's introduction and/or methodology.

The second area of reflection for assessment is the candidate's ability to reflect upon the strengths and limitations of their conclusion. Many candidates considered strengths or weaknesses of the process behind producing the report without actually focusing on the conclusion. 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 these ideas about further research did not link to improving the report's conclusions. When reflecting upon the report's conclusions, candidates need to consider both the strengths and limitations of the conclusions reached in the report.

It should be noted that candidates are not required to offer solutions to any of the issues raised nor is further research a requirement.

### **Communication**

Focus on the title question is key to a successful report, and the assessment of AO3 Communication is no exception. Content pages and headings are not mandatory but they provide a useful framework. If they are logical and adhered to then they will help structure the report. Many candidates utilised one or both of these strategies.

Candidates also need to construct their introductions carefully. The terms and scope of the report set out in the introduction need to be adhered too. For example, there were cases where candidates introduced key concepts that would underpin the report and then never referred to them again and this is not effective structure.

Candidates should use discourse markers to effectively guide the reader through the report. An effectively structured report will contain both final and intermediary conclusions. The report must be written in continuous prose and must not exceed 5000 words, so any charts and images should be added to the appendix and not in the main body of the report. Candidates must not rely on charts and images to convey meaning. The best approach is to avoid including them altogether.

Another skill being assessed is the candidates' ability to engage with subject specific terminology in way that makes this accessible to the lay reader. Some candidates chose to list dictionary definitions of key terms however, this not an effective way to demonstrate the use of appropriate terminology. When candidates engage with concepts and subject specific terminology, they should make them understandable to the reader through their explanations and arguments; this demonstrates the skill of communication.

Although different subject areas use different referencing systems and candidates are free to use any appropriate system, the Harvard referencing system is recommended as it makes it clear to assessors where and how sources are being used to support perspectives.

Most candidates were able to present effective referencing systems regardless of which referencing system they chose to use. Assessors, when reading the report, will check citations against the bibliography so it is important that 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.