

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/12
Written Exam

Key Messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, to answer all the questions set. This applied in all questions, for example in **Question 1**: ‘...positive contribution as mentioned by the author.’, **Question 2**: ‘evidence’ and **Question 3**: ‘stronger’.

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

To gain higher marks in **Questions 2 and 3**, there should be clear development of the points made. For example, making a point, illustrating using information or 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**.

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

General Comments

There was little evidence of candidates misunderstanding the documents and most showed a good understanding of the demands of the questions and adapted to the direction given. However, some candidates did not respond effectively to the need to explain the impact of the evidence on the author’s argument in **Question 2**. Equally some did not address the authors’ perspectives in **Question 3**.

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

Some answers to **Question 3** were not fully developed or supported by precise references to the documents. Stronger responses selected relevant and appropriate points from the documents and evaluated their significance and impact on the argument. This demonstrated that the candidates had a secure grasp of the arguments being presented. 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, in **Questions 2 and 3** full paragraphing in an essay format, rather than bullet points, should be used.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Question 1 encourages candidates to fully read and understand the detail of both documents before starting the questions. The question paper indicates that approximately 15 minutes should be used for this. It is included within the time set for the exam.

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

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

Question 1(a) was looking for candidates to identify how migration has made a positive contribution according to the author of **Document A**.

Many gained the full two marks by mentioning, for example, supporting economic growth and boosting the workforce. Some mentioned negative impacts, for example, slowing housing construction which did not answer the question.

A 2-mark answer was:

- ‘Younger migrants help increase the available workforce as older workers retire.’
- ‘Population growth due to migration boosts economic growth by increasing government revenue.’

A 1-mark answer was:

- ‘Australia’s economic growth has been positively affected by migration for the past 30 years.’ (Correct)
- ‘Migration increases the number of schools built as well as increasing the rate of investment in infrastructure.’ (Incorrect)

Question 1(b) was looking for candidates to identify three different approaches to the issue of shrinking working-age population as given by the author. Many candidates gained three marks as they could see that the author’s structure ‘firstly, secondly, thirdly’ helped with the identification. Candidates needed to identify solutions to the issue rather than give the impacts. Most identified three points, including incentives such as free childcare to increase birth rate, use of new technologies/AI, and establishment of long-term migration links with culturally similar nations. Doing so would have gained 3 marks.

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

- Social approach – the author suggests providing free childcare to increase fertility rates. (Correct)
- Technological approach – the author brings forward the advancement of robotics and artificial intelligence. (Correct)
- Political approach – the author considers rethink global politics and suggests improving relations between countries for improved co-operation. (Incorrect – this is not linked to a solution of dealing with a shrinking population).

Question 2

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

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

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

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 sentence ‘*The author explains the reasons why the population is decreasing citing multiple sources.*’ identifies the use of sources as evidence but does not offer any names or organisations from the document. Use of this approach throughout would gain less than half marks.

A higher scoring candidate for this aspect would give several types of evidence with examples, such as: ‘*The author has provided sufficient statistical evidence such as the population of Australia was 25 649 985 at the end of March 2020.*’

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

For example: ‘*Doc A has included sufficient statistical evidence to support the argument. It helps the reader to compare between data and visualise the impact of the claims made...*’. The idea of sufficient evidence is a strength with the idea of comparing and visualising being how this is a strength.

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

For example: ‘*The author Amy Remeikis used strong and up to date statistics and data as evidence. This adds more credibility to her statements and claims.*’. There is a clear strength recognised but the explanation is limited. To improve, there needs to be explanation as to why or how this adds to the credibility.

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

For example, lower scoring candidates used simple assertion without explaining why or how there is an impact on the argument. ‘*The evidence used by the author is extensive but has a lot of weak points which makes the reader think about the accuracy of the document.*’

For example, higher scoring candidates evaluated the impact of the evidence on the argument and included a judgement of its effectiveness. ‘*A predominant piece of evidence used includes the statistics reposted by the Australian Bureau. The addition of the percentage details of the net overseas immigration clearly explains the intensity of the issue at hand. Data from Government reports increase the reliability and authority of the article. But this is restricted to Australia and has no global relevance to the rest of the world, narrowing the perspective.*’

The evaluation is well explained and there is an emphasis on the impact throughout this section. There is a counter-position at the end with a judgement as to what the impact will be – narrowing the perspective.

Question 3

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

The most frequent approach was to directly compare the key components of the argument of the two documents throughout the answer. The strongest responses achieved this well with analysis and clear evaluation of the relative strengths of each document and were able to make a judgement as to which was more convincing. There was no correct answer and candidates were free to argue for their preferred judgement. It was equally possible to evaluate the arguments of both documents separately and then have a concluding judgement. This tends to lead to fewer points being made and repetition in the conclusion.

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

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

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). The second assessment objective was AO3 – communication.

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

For example, higher scoring candidates provided a range of compared key components. This is an example for one component: *‘The argument of Document A focused nationally, just about Australia. This means that the author is not talking globally unlike Document B whether the author talks in terms of whole world and not just one country. It refers to the common issue faced globally due to loss of migration.’*

For AO1b) – Analyse and compare perspectives – there was a range of marks as lower scoring candidates simply identified perspectives, often from just one document. However, higher scoring candidates compared, described, and explained the significance of the perspectives in both documents.

An example of a high scoring candidate is: *‘Document A refers to migration and so does Document A. However, document A is written with the perspective of impact of migration on the economy in Australia, whereas Document B is written on the impact of falling migration with regards to fertility rates and the impact on the working-age population. While Document A has focused on disadvantages of low migration, Document B has proposed solutions for it. Document B also gives a wider world view compared to Document A considering only one country.’*

Lower scoring candidates only stated the perspective without any analysis, for example: *‘Document A written by Amy Remeikis discusses about the impacts on Australia from decreasing immigration rate.’* There is no description, comparison, or explanation.

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

An example of a higher scoring candidate providing evaluation and illustration is given here. This is one part of several evaluations that were balanced across both documents. *‘Document B does not provide enough evidence and data to show how big the problem is or whether it is big enough to need readers’ attention. This shows the lack of knowledge if the situation. More data would have shown that the author had done research about the subject and understood the problem. The author, though, makes up for it by providing multiple solutions and how they should be applied.’*

The following is an example of a lower scoring response: *‘The author of Document A might be good at gathering information and writing however may not be well-versed in this topic.’* There is some basic evaluation but no clear illustration nor reasoning as to the impact of this point on the argument.

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

High scoring candidates completed their answer with comments such as: *‘Document B’s claims are thoroughly supported. This is made up as a more global perspective, many solutions analysed and the clear*

conclusion that ‘a fair approach to global migration’ is necessary in this shifting era of demographics. This shadows Document A’s limited perspective, ineffective expansion and explanation of evidence, facets or incidents discussed. This provides an ultimately doubtful conclusion that migration ‘isn’t necessarily bad, but it is definitely big.’ The audience therefore intuitively prefer Document B due to its wider context and logical structure of argument, including a counterargument.’

A lower scoring candidate might simply state an unsupported judgement, for example: ‘*Lastly, I believe both the arguments are equally strong.*’ and ‘*As we trust academic expertise as readers, Document B tends to be slightly more convincing than Document A.*’

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

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



GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/02
Essay

Key messages

The importance of devising a clear, concise title question that sets up a debate between contrasting perspectives cannot be overstated.

When referring to research in the essay the candidates should explicitly state which global context the research comes from or to which global context the research refers to.

Candidates need to address all areas of assessment. Notable omissions from this series were critical evaluation of sources, reflection on learning and possibilities for further research.

General comments

The vast majority of candidates were able to choose issues with global significance that derived from the topics listed in the syllabus. Popular areas for focus were Urbanisation, Immigration, Climate Change and AI Technologies. The essays were for the most part well researched and made for interesting reading.

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

Comments on specific aspects

Analysis of Question

Having selected the area of focus it is vital that candidates devise a title in the form of a question that sets up a debate between contrasting perspectives. It is also important that the question is broad enough to allow the candidate to explore the implications of the question through a range of themes, e.g. Ethics, Culture Economics, and global contexts. The most successful title questions are succinct and clear.

The question '*How does climate change lead to the endangerment of species?*' does not signal a clear debate and will lead to a descriptive essay. Although a 'To what extent' question may well lead to a debate, the debate may not always contain clearly contrasting perspectives, for example '*To what extent is gender inequality impacting society?*'. It is recommended that questions begin with 'Should' or 'Are' or 'Is'.

The question '*Is India still a casteist country after 75 years of Independence?*' does set up a debate but one that lacks global significance.

The candidates are required to remain focused on their title question and clarity is important. A question such as '*Does a society's moral code and a criminal's state of mind influence the verdict in a trial?*' is convoluted and will be very difficult to answer. It will also be very difficult for the candidate to find relevant research. An example of a successful question from this series was '*Is social media good or bad for a person's life?*'. It sets up a clear debate, the question can be examined with reference to various global contexts and can be viewed through themes such as economics, ethics, politics to name but a few.

Building Perspectives

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

When analysing their research, candidates should be making connections between similarities in the evidence and arguments put forward by different authors. The candidates are then required to synthesise this information in order to build a broad and coherent perspective. This requires more than juxtaposing different sources together. Candidates demonstrate synthesis most effectively when they make the links between sources explicit, for example *'Anette Lia in her paper on refugees argues that poorer countries have taken the greatest responsibility for receiving refugees fleeing from their homeland and that rich countries need to take a greater share of the burden (Lia 2019) . . . Jennifer Clark who works for the UNHCR corroborates Lia's argument by providing clear data that shows low income countries currently host 70% of all refugees worldwide (Clark 2012).'* The link between the two sources is made explicitly clear and the candidate uses one source to support another as they build the perspective that argues richer nations should do more to help refugees. The most successful candidates will be able to demonstrate synthesis on both sides of the debate.

Range of Sources

There are two things to consider with this particular aspect; the range of sources used and the level of engagement with those sources. In terms of range, assessors are looking for sources that emanate from different global contexts or present arguments and evidence pertaining to different global contexts. Ideally sources will relate to or come from four different contexts. Candidates were largely successful in making reference to sources with a global range. It is advised that candidates briefly, but clearly, state where their sources come from, for example *'According to Katerine Lansom, assistant professor from the University of Maryland in the US . . .'* Alternatively, candidates should clearly state which global context the source refers to, for example *'Van Rheenen argues that hosting the Olympics is detrimental to the host nation's economy. Using the Rio Olympics in 2016 as a case study . . .'*

There was a tendency for candidates to use too many sources. Although this enabled them to demonstrate range in their source material, having too many sources meant that the engagement with sources did not move beyond a fleeting reference. Several essays cited over 20 sources in a 2000-word essay. This is too many sources; candidates should be encouraged to be more selective in their research and use six to eight credible and relevant sources to support their essays.

Appropriateness of Sources

This aspect assesses the candidates' ability to critically evaluate their source material using a range of criteria. Candidates may consider the evidence provided by the source, the reasoning and argument put forward by the source or the credibility of the author, amongst many other potential criteria for assessment.

Many candidates omitted this element of their essays and did not present any critical evaluation at all. This example critically evaluates the provenance a source: *'The journal in which the article was published, improves the reliability of the article, because of its reputation as a credible publisher, and its 36% acceptance rate, which shows the meticulousness of the requirements an article must meet in order to be published in the journal¹⁵. All articles published in JS&T have been peer-reviewed, which also makes the article more trustworthy.'* This is a strong piece of critical evaluation that identifies a strength with explicit reference to the source and a developed explanation of why the provenance of the source improves its reliability and trustworthiness. Some candidates did have the tendency to be too assertive and not develop their critical evaluation at all, for example *'This source is credible because it is from the BBC, a well known news source.'*

Ideally candidates will offer four pieces of developed critical evaluation demonstrating the appropriateness of at least four different sources.

Comparative Evaluation

This aspect assesses the candidates' ability to compare the two contrasting perspectives in a holistic manner. This moves beyond the comparison of individual sources. It is through the comparison of perspectives that candidates can reach an informed and supported judgement. To reiterate the importance of devising an appropriate title, if a candidate's title question does not set up a debate between contrasting perspectives, they will not be able to meet the assessment criteria for this aspect.

Quite often candidates arrived at a final judgement with no attempt at comparing the perspectives, this rendered the final judgment somewhat assertive and unsupported. The example that follows offers a detailed comparison of perspectives and was one of the strongest examples from the March 2023 series.

'In conclusion, the transition to democracy in decolonised countries has brought both advantages and disadvantages to the nations and their citizens. Some of those advantages on the development and progress of Africa concern the continuation and survival of African values and morals, implementation of human rights and economic growth which go hand in hand with democracy. On the other hand, the research found various disadvantages as well, which, in part, stem from the mix of democratic values with local values that were derived in different types of democracies and resulted in not implementing the classic western democracy framework, but in systems of autocracies designed as democracies, for example. In addition, democracy was showed not to benefit the economy in certain regions, impacting the growth of population and therefore limiting the state's ability to provide access to public services.'

Consideration of Contrasting Perspectives

To further reiterate the importance of devising a title that sets up a debate between contrasting perspectives, candidates will not be successful in this aspect if they present a one-sided essay. The vast majority of candidates that successfully set up a debate between contrasting perspectives were able to consider those perspectives in a fair and balanced way. Candidates should not set out to prove that one perspective carries more weight than the other, rather they should be objective and give both perspectives equal treatment.

Reflection and Impact on Personal Viewpoint

This aspect assesses the candidates' ability to look back on the essay and reflect upon how engaging with contrasting perspectives has shaped their personal viewpoint. This is an aspect that some candidates did not address at all in their essays. The following extracts from one of the strongest examples of reflection from the March series will show how the candidate's reflection develops. Firstly, the candidate succinctly sets out their early thinking about the issue: *'Initially, I believed that all emigration benefits both the host nation and the home nation.'* Secondly, the candidate reflects on the perspectives and research they have engaged with: *'during my research, I understood that emigration could bring both strength and burden on a home . . . The information I gathered assisted me in clarifying my stance on emigration.'* Lastly, the candidate culminates their reflection as they explain how they view the issue now: *'Upon further consideration, I realized that I have also been impacted by . . . I now believe that regardless of whether someone migrates within their country or abroad, there will be some level of impact on the individual, their family, culture, and their country.'*

Further research

The final aspect of reflection requires the candidate to give consideration to possible further research that emanates from their essay. Several candidates omitted to address this aspect of the essay. The strongest responses identify a specific area for research and then develop some details about the potential research. To reach the higher attainment levels, candidates should offer some reasoning as to why this research should be undertaken, for example, addressing gaps in their initial research. The following extracts from the March series will show how candidates can develop their ideas for further research. *'The relation between death penalties and the communities' reactions has not been studied in specific detail. This would take into account the psychological aspects of crime and people's reactions to it. . . The psychology behind it is rarely ever examined. This is one area that this topic that has further scope for research.'* In the following example the candidate specifies an area of research and begins to develop some details before going to reason why this would be useful: *'It would give us an insight into the upbringing and mindsets of different people. And therefore help make better laws. It could further help us confirm and maybe even form new theories of crime.'*

Structure

The vast majority of candidates were able to present soundly structured essays that had a clear introduction followed by the main body of the essay culminating in a supported conclusion. To reach higher attainment levels candidates should use discourse markers effectively to guide the reader through the essay rendering transition from section to section clear and obvious.

Referencing



Candidates need to cite all sources used and make sure the associated references are easily found and carry the appropriate details. Most candidates were able to present citations and references but the relationship between the two was not always clear. For the component two essay, the style of citation exemplified in the **Range of Sources** section above is recommended.



GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/03
Team Project, Presentation and
Reflective Paper

Key messages

This is the first time we have examined the new syllabus. It was pleasing to see several candidates embracing the criteria that was new this year – some candidates evaluated the sources that they used, for example. Many candidates made the most of the full 10-minute time limit for their presentation. It was, however, clear that many centres have still been using old guidelines. There is no longer a requirement for candidates to differentiate their perspective from that of their teammates', for instance, and many candidates have used time in their presentation to do this still. The key criteria which candidates seem to be overlooking from the new specification is synthesis of the source material. The majority of presentations seen do not demonstrate an awareness of the audience.

Most presentations were clear and focused, showing adept skills in the manipulation of technology as well as making valid and relevant choices in the selection of source material. Successful candidates made explicit references to visual aids to help back up their argument – for example the use of graphs and images throughout to support the explanation of the issue.

Reflective papers should focus on evaluation of the group work – what went well, and what could they improve on – how would they learn from it and change their teamwork if they were to do another project like this? They should also reflect on their learning – explaining what they have learnt about the issue from doing this project, and what they have learnt from working as a team. Candidates who gave specific examples of what they had learnt both from their own research, and from their teammates' perspectives had the strongest reflective papers.

General comments

Presentation

AO1– Research, analysis and evaluation

A – Individual analysis of the problem

The vast majority of candidates either discussed or analysed the team's problem. The best candidates not only gave detailed information about the issue, but they explained the impact it has on others. For example, a strong candidate explained in good detail what the issue is regarding systematic discrimination and then went on to explain the impact this problem has on different groups of people. A less strong candidate may present lots of statistical data on an issue but not really explain the impact/consequences this can have on people or the local area, which limits the marks achieved.

B – Range of research undertaken

Most candidates conducted detailed research which was related to their problem/issue. The best candidates used research from different types of sources – for example, websites as well as journals and news articles. Another way of achieving a variety of research would be for the candidate to conduct both primary and secondary research or by using research about the issue in different countries. A good example of this was a candidate who used research locally and two examples globally. They also included an overview of how all three areas have tried to solve the problem in good detail.

C – Evaluation of sources to support the research

The strongest candidates in this series began to evaluate the sources that they had used, however there was no synthesis of source material by any candidates in this series. One example of a candidate evaluating sources was when they carried out their own research via a questionnaire. The candidate presented the results of the primary research but then went on to evaluate the strengths/weaknesses of the research. The candidate did not, however, offer any synthesis of the sources so this limited the marks for this criterion. Another strong candidate talked about the validity of the secondary sources that they used – evaluating both the age of the source and how reliable the author of the source is. To take this a step further, candidates need to synthesise sources by comparing two sources on the same issue. It could be that they find two opposing views of their problem and compare them or it could be using a second source to back up their findings from the first source they have spoken about. This would give candidates access to the higher marks in this criterion.

D – Justification for the individual solution which is proposed

The vast majority of candidates gave a solution to their issue. Most candidates developed their solution, but this criterion now requires their solution to be backed up with either evidence from research or by linking it to arguments from earlier in their presentation. There were few instances of solutions which were well justified with detailed support, though a strong candidate from this series clearly explained the chosen solution, provided evidence of how it has worked elsewhere and also spent time discussing why it would be effective, so was able to achieve highly. Another candidate did well by giving two pieces of statistical evidence to show how the solution has been successful in two different countries.

AO3– Communication

A – Production of an organised argument

Most candidates formed a structure in their presentation to support some well-argued points. This is essential for a strong presentation. There was evidence of progression in most arguments with some good reference to local and global issues which were well-defined and judged. Stronger candidates made use of signposts to help their arguments flow well.

B – Presentation of visual information to support an argument

Some candidates used graphs/visual images in their presentations but did not directly engage or refer to them when delivering their presentations, this limits the candidate's marks for this criterion. It is important that the visual aid links with the argument and helps to progress it. A strong example was a candidate who directly engaged with graphs throughout the presentation in an effective way which supported and furthered their argument. The candidate themselves is not a visual aid, so a candidate reading from a script with no other visual aids wouldn't achieve any marks for this criterion.

C – Use of language to address an audience

Most candidates lacked awareness of the audience and did not score well for this criterion; they presented their ideas but did not tend to address the audience. In this criterion it is important for the candidate to engage with the audience throughout – referring to them as 'you' would be a good way to do this or saying phrases such as 'I would like to draw your attention to this graph'. Also using a variety of sentence forms is important – using questions and commands as well as just statements would enable a candidate to achieve highly for this criterion.

Reflective paper

AO2– Reflection

A – Reflection on the effectiveness of collaboration

The strongest candidates for this criterion evaluated what went well with their teamwork, as well as what they didn't do so well and what the impact of this was. Candidates who did not score as highly told a story of the teamwork without evaluating the impact on their project. The best candidates looked at several stages of the teamwork and evaluated the impact of their strengths and weaknesses on the overall project.

B – Reflection on learning



Most candidates cited instances where they had learned something vital or new that had influenced them. However, there was less evidence of giving details about the significance of this learning and evaluating the effect that this had on the candidate's view of the issue or how this had changed their viewpoint – this would enable access to the higher marks. Candidates are now also awarded marks for reflection on what they have learnt about teamwork in this criterion, but most candidates have stuck to evaluating what they have learnt from their research, which is also an effective way to score highly.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/04
Research Report

Key messages

The research logs should provide more than a record of research undertaken. Candidates' research logs need to demonstrate planning as well as reflection on the research decisions taken.

For a research report of this scope, candidates need to set out their methodology clearly. They should offer details about any specific methods used.

Candidates need to devise a title question through dialogue with their teacher and only after initial research has been undertaken. Title questions require sharp focus and must set up a debate between contrasting perspectives.

General comments

Candidates engaged well with their research reports and there was an interesting range of topics addressed. Candidates are free to choose any issue for focus, as long as there is scope for a debate. For the most part the reports were well organised. The majority of issues chosen for focus enabled candidates to engage in extensive and wide-ranging research.

Research Log

The vast majority of candidates' research logs were set out clearly and contained regular entries that recorded details of research undertaken. Research logs should also be used to demonstrate planning and research decisions. Candidates need to be aware of the distinction between the skill of recording information about their research and the actions they are planning, and the skill of stepping back to reflect upon the decisions made and research undertaken. The candidates' research log should also show reflection on how their thinking has been impacted or why researching their question may have changed as a result of feedback from the teacher. A weekly or fortnightly reflective entry that evaluates planning, decisions and research is recommended.

Questions and Perspectives

Far greater consideration needs to be given to the formulation of the research question. Many of the candidate research logs indicated that candidates had framed their question as the first step in the research process. Title questions need to be formulated following initial research and through dialogue with the teacher.

Candidates need to consider whether there is enough research on the issue to support different perspectives and whether there is a clear debate between contrasting perspectives. It is also important that the question can be viewed through the lens of different themes or can be located in different contexts so candidates can examine the implications of the question in various ways.

Titles such as '*The petroleum car ban might not be the most effective solution for climate change and why?*' are not effective. Although the candidate used a question mark, there is not really a debatable question in the title and such a title is likely to lead to a descriptive essay lacking in focus. Some candidates posed two questions, for example '*To what extent is Bollywood sexist? How does this impact the mindsets of society?*'

Candidates need a clearly defined title that sets up a debate around an issue which has plenty of research available that supports contrasting perspectives. A good example from this series would be *'Should the death penalty be abolished?'*

In the introduction, candidates should set out the perspectives that respond to the research question they have posed. They should also set out which themes and contexts they will examine and why.

Although some candidates were able to synthesise their research findings and draw clear links between different authors' evidence and arguments, some candidates treated their research material in isolation. The skill of synthesising research material into coherent perspectives is assessed via this component. The following example demonstrates a candidate synthesising explicitly two sources as they build the perspective that argues patriarchy is harmful for men. *'Furthermore, Stanaland, A., & Gaither, S, (2020) argue that when there is gender pressure, men display aggression. When males are pressured to perform challenging tasks, such as being a skilled driver or a controlling parent, it evokes aggression when these identities are not fulfilled. Bosson et al., (2009) make a similar claim by showing a direct link between "precarious manhood" and a display of physical aggression based on their three studies. The idea is that physical aggression is part of men's cultural script, not women's, for them to maintain and secure their gender status. This cultural belief makes it more difficult for men to constantly prove their manhood than for women . . .'*

Many of the reports seen this series did not move beyond very a cursory comparison of perspectives. It is important that that candidates go further than just presenting two contrasting perspectives, they need to offer a considered comparison of their perspectives. It is the comparisons of perspectives that will help inform the final judgement. Candidates should examine the question through the lens of different themes or contexts, in so doing they can usefully compare the perspectives at the end of each section. It is recommended to use three or four different themes/contexts to examine the implications of the question, thus allowing several opportunities for perspective comparison.

Sources

Candidates were generally able to select credible and relevant sources. The key skill is to be able to use the sources to support the perspectives being built. Therefore, it is important that the sources selected relate explicitly to the title question devised by the candidate. There was a tendency for candidates to bring in research to their reports that was relevant to the broad topic area but lacked clear relevance to the title question. It is really important to determine that there are adequate sources to support the research question before embarking on the report.

Candidates should use sources not only to support perspectives but challenge them too.

In the analysis and research stage when candidates are identifying links between sources, they should also identify sources that challenge one another. This will ensure a balanced report that gives due consideration to both perspectives. There were only a few examples across the series where candidates were able to demonstrate the skill of using sources to challenge rather than support arguments and perspectives.

Candidates should critically evaluate their key sources using a range of evaluative criteria. Several candidates omitted to critically evaluate their source material, while some were assertive. The most successful candidates were able to critically evaluate their source material with criteria that were explicitly relevant to the issue under debate. The following example demonstrates some thoughtful critical evaluation of a key source that is well developed and relevant. *'When evaluating Miguel Kiguel's arguments, his usage of relevant statistics such as referring to the decline of the national GDP and unemployment rate helps illustrate the severe impact the crisis had on the Argentinian economy. "Mr. Kiguel also emphasises the contagion effect of the problem on neighbouring countries and highlights the need for reforms in their governance and institutions, thus giving the reader a broader perspective of the crisis and its implications. Per contra, one limitation of the article is that it does not provide a detailed analysis of the specific policies implemented by the government in response to the crisis, nor their efficacy. It would have been suitable to have further elaboration on this aspect of the case study. Another limitation is that the article was published in 2011, and the current economic climate in Argentina and financial policies has likely changed dramatically since then. Hence, it is important to be sceptical of the validity of the case study when comparing to more recent sources of information on the matter."*

Concepts, Research Methods and Judgements

Having chosen a specific area for focus and selected relevant and credible sources it is anticipated that candidates will be able to use subject specific concepts demonstrating academic engagement with complex ideas. For example, in the research report titled '*Should businesses hire a diverse workforce?*' the candidate was able to engage with a range of relevant concepts, such as stereotypical expectations, social mirroring and employment-based marginalisation to name a few. For the candidate to achieve marks in this area it is important that they are using suitably complex source material.

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

Much of the primary research undertaken lacked explicit relevance to the title question. Quite often candidates simply canvassed opinions of fellow students in a generalised way and were then unable to use the findings to explicitly support perspectives. Candidates should consider whether the primary research they plan to undertake will actually gain data that is useful.

Candidates can usefully set out their methodology in or just after their introduction. Candidates should understand methodology to refer to the set of methods which are most suitable for use within a particular subject area. Candidates demonstrate understanding of their methodology when they are able to explain why the methods they have chosen are the most appropriate ones for their report. Candidates should also explain how they carried out the research. Too many candidates omitted to make any reference to their methodology.

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

Reflection

Candidates should reflect upon how the perspectives presented have influenced the report. Candidates can reflect on how perspectives are shaped by specific themes and contexts. This will allow the candidate to reflect upon and justify the scope of their research report. Candidates did not often move beyond considering how the perspectives engaged with had shaped their personal viewpoint, this often appeared at the end of the report. Reflection on how perspectives have influenced the report can be stated in the introduction as it is here candidates may set out the scope of their report.

Candidates are also assessed on their ability to reflect upon the strengths and limitations of their conclusion. Many candidates omitted to respond to this area of assessment. In reflecting upon the conclusion candidates may suggest areas for further research though this is not a requirement. More usefully candidates may offer evaluation of their chosen methodology and link this to the veracity of the report's conclusions.

Communication

For the most part, candidates were able to present well-structured essays. To achieve this, the candidates need to offer a clear introduction that sets out the report's perspectives, themes, contexts and methodology. The report that follows should adhere to the framework set out in the introduction. Candidates should use headings and discourse markers to effectively guide the reader through the report. The report should also maintain focus on the title question. An effectively structured report will contain both final and intermediary conclusions.

It is expected that candidates will develop a strong understanding of their chosen issue and in so doing will be able use subject specific terminology. Many candidates were able to demonstrate this in their reports. It must be remembered however, that the assessors reading the reports will not necessarily have the subject knowledge in the specific area of focus. Candidates should ensure that the terminology used is made accessible to a reader that may not have subject specific knowledge. Offering lengthy dictionary definitions of key terms is not an effective way to do this as it breaks the flow of the perspectives being presented.

The final area for consideration when assessing communication is the candidate's ability to use an appropriate referencing system that is consistently applied across the research report. To be considered consistent, each citation made should have a full reference and this should be easily found. All reports should have a separate bibliography. When candidates use their sources to support and build perspectives, assessors need to be able to see clearly which source has been used and where. The example of candidate synthesis reproduced above (see **Questions and Perspectives**) clearly cites the sources being synthesised. This was deemed to be an effective and appropriate system of referencing. Both references were easily found in a bibliography organised alphabetically by author surname, see example below.

Bosson, J. K., Vandello, J. A., Burnaford, R. M., Weaver, J. R., & Wasti, S. A. (2009). Precarious manhood and displays of physical aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(5), 623-634. Published by SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167208331161> (Accessed December 12 2022)

Stanaland, A., & Gaither, S. (2020, November 21). "Be a Man": The Role of Social Pressure in Eliciting Men's Aggressive Cognition. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 47 (11), Published by SAGE. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167220984298> (Accessed November 5 2022)