

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/02
Essay

Key messages

- It is essential that both teachers and candidates are familiar with and fully understand the assessment criteria and syllabus aims.
- The choice of essay question must provide the candidate with opportunities to develop globally contrasting perspectives.
- Sources selected should offer firmly supported judgements or conclusions based on some combination of evidence, reason, argument, experience, authority and opinion.

General comments

The majority of work seen by Examiners was of good quality. Nevertheless, there are indications that some Centres have not fully embraced a skills-based approach, as specialist subject knowledge is elevated at the expense of the deconstruction and reconstruction process. This is particularly evident when the essays submitted by candidates appear to have been written for an alternative syllabus on a distinct subject rather than investigating a global topic from a range of interdisciplinary perspectives as this syllabus requires. Support and training materials are available to assist with the development of this critical path approach which, to some, may be quite new.

As with any academic essay, planning is key to success and only a minority of submissions displayed significant deficiencies in this respect. Nearly all candidates utilised the permissible word length well with only a few essays over-length, or conversely, substantially brief essays submitted. Essays were generally well structured and followed standard conventions making them easy to read and follow. Highly successful candidates displayed a particularly good level of planning when striking the necessary balance between the presentation of evidence, analysis, synthesis and evaluation in order to address all assessment criteria.

The demands of the assessment criteria, with seven in total and each carrying equal weight, are rigorous and it was thought that many candidates do not fully appreciate the requirement to address all criteria. On the whole, illuminating introductions were followed by the presentation of evidence and arguments from multiple sources. These were generally understood to a good degree as demonstrated by analysis and evaluated with very mixed results. Whilst much of this work was strong, all too often little room was left for synthesis into coherent arguments constituting perspectives which should then have been subjected to analysis and evaluation. Many essays concluded with substantial and appropriate discussions but, equally, many others failed to do justice to the arguments presented and concluded with a brief paragraph which often resulted from reaching the permitted word length. Again, the importance of a high level of planning cannot be over-emphasised.

The strongest essays proceeded from a well-considered introduction and clearly many candidates comprehended the importance of engaging the reader from the outset. Preliminary discussion regularly, and correctly, led to the emergence of globally contrasting perspectives although these were not always clearly delineated. A rather small number of candidates also offered their personal standpoint, with reasoning, which can be used to good effect when reflecting in the conclusion as there is a clear starting point for reference.

Essay titles in the form of a question were wide-ranging and generally offered the opportunity for globally contrasting perspectives, for example: "Does globalisation alleviate poverty?". Alternatively, the question: "To what extent does technological advancement create unemployment?" tended to lead to a descriptive essay

with a single perspective. Candidates must consider the availability of evidence from contrasting global perspectives which may be difficult in relation to topic areas embracing high-tech developments including the digital arena, genetic modification and artificial intelligence where sources and perspectives researched tended to be western-orientated. Some candidates also engaged in descriptive histories of developments which there is little room for in the research report, and adds little to the emerging debate. The choice of title is a critical issue for the candidate and a vital area for support and guidance from teachers.

Plagiarism is a growing problem with increasing reliance on internet-based research and copying and pasting from websites without any use of citation. The use of 'spinner' software, designed to confuse plagiarism search tools, has also been noted by Cambridge. It is essential that candidates are conversant with how to uphold academic integrity in their work, using citations and referencing conventions appropriately.

Comments on the assessment criteria

The first criterion focuses on communication skills. Most candidates displayed an appreciation of coherent essay structure, utilising appropriate and clear language. Stronger essays displayed a wide range of vocabulary, the utilisation of linking devices aiding fluency and few errors resulting from careful proof-reading. Additionally, key terms pertaining to the global topic being researched were defined and concepts simplified for the reader. Bibliographies were accurate and citations showed an improvement. Several Centres encouraged their candidates to use footnotes which were very effective. However, there were discrepancies between the citations used in the body of the report and the bibliographies provided at the end which were noted, reducing effectiveness. The syllabus document clearly provides examples of referencing systems that may be used by candidates, but stresses that what is most important is the consistency with which the referencing system is followed, therefore this is an area for future improvement.

The next two criteria consider the sources used. Criterion 2 examines the quality of source selection. A significant minority of essays were reliant on fact-based sources, devoid of argument, and were descriptive. Some very strong essays including, for example, those arguing for and against Standardised Assessment Tests were entirely focused on the US education system and, although contrasting, did not allow for the development of a global dimension. Western sources arguing the advantages and disadvantages of overseas development aid supplemented by the arguments of a Kenyan commentator for example would immediately elevate an essay to Level 4 or 5. Achieving these levels is indicative of higher level research skills.

Criterion 3 concerns the treatment of sources both in terms of analysis and evaluation and, as such, should be considered as containing two distinct elements both of which require fulfilment for high achievement. A key issue here, and linking to the previous criterion, is one of quantity versus quality. In order to achieve well for criterion 2, sources should be detailed or full and detailed. In order to achieve well for criterion 3, analysis should show a very good or full understanding and critical evaluation should be undertaken across a range of criteria. It is difficult to see how all of the above can be achieved when candidates are dealing with a large number of sources. The most successful essays tend to be limited to a small number of quality sources and often as few as four. Successful candidates utilised relatively brief quotations from sources followed by critical analysis and few candidates achieved less than Level 3.

The outcomes for evaluation were very mixed with outcomes clearly guided, or not, by Centres. A majority of candidates failed to undertake any meaningful evaluation and, at best, merely commented on the author's credentials without considering the actual content of the source. Occasionally candidates pursued a critical engagement as in this example researching into literary censorship:

"In order to strengthen his analysis, Fareed Zakaria should also have taken into account the percentage of votes that Donald Trump received from the blue-collar, and from the wealthier class, which benefits from phenomena such as immigration. Also, while the article's title is 'Populism on the March,' indicating that it would explore reasons for populism globally, it focuses primarily on America. While political trends in the West are common, there is a distinct difference between the dynamics of Brexit, Trump and Le Pen, which he does not explore".

The next three criteria assess two or more globally contrasting perspectives. Criterion 4 examines the candidate's capacity to present perspectives in a balanced way as well as accept or understand an opposing view, particularly one with which they do not agree. This does not necessarily need to be overtly stated; the essay simply needs to demonstrate that equal consideration and treatment is given to contrasting perspectives, which is indicative of a measure of empathy. However, this balance coupled with a clear

appreciation of opposing views will raise the level of achievement. For example, one candidate researching into literary censorship wrote:

“While it is not difficult to empathise with the idea that certain themes can offend the audience, that parental concerns about the education their child receives are valid and that the steps they may take to control any exposure they deem harmful for their child are justifiable, it may well be unacceptable, both ethically and legally, to take measures which will restrict others from receiving the exposure someone personally considers harmful”.

Criterion 5 is a straightforward assessment of the quality of the perspectives developed and is largely determined by the arguments derived from the source materials. The majority of candidates had little difficulty in achieving Level 3 for this criterion by presenting globally contrasting perspectives although a minority failed to achieve a global dimension whilst a smaller number struggled to achieve any contrast as a consequence of generating one single or vague perspective. Candidates too frequently confused contrasting sources to equate to contrasting perspectives, and the candidates achieving the highest marks were able to present the sources and then develop the contrasting global perspectives that the sources form. Candidates should ensure that sources provide a range of contrasting, clearly defined arguments rather than sources which simply reinforce a similar argument. The choice of sources is therefore crucial to candidates' ability to develop the global perspectives and perform highly on this criterion.

Criterion 6 concerns the treatment of perspectives both in terms of analysis and evaluation. This is a key area for development across the vast majority of Centres as candidates rarely synthesise the arguments derived from sources into clearly delineated, coherent perspectives which are then open to both analysis and evaluation. A small minority of candidates did achieve this to a high standard. Other candidates did bring arguments together and offered a brief analysis or comparative evaluation or both. Given that a key aim of the syllabus is to provide opportunities for the exercise of these higher-order thinking skills of synthesis, analysis and evaluation, the quality of candidates' skills in these areas suggests a lack of understanding of what is required.

Criterion 7 assesses the quality of the conclusion. Whilst a supported and balanced conclusion is required, candidates are also assessed on their capacity for reflection which underlines the importance of stating the personal standpoint as a reference point. Strong answers gave substantial or insightful reflection involving a degree of critical and creative thinking.

The final element requiring candidates to make suggestions for further research was commonly overlooked altogether, reducing candidates' marks. Successful candidates acknowledged the limitations of their own research or understood the ways in which their research was incomplete, considering how they may further their own understanding and indicate what research would develop this understanding. The following is a good example of reflective thinking:

“While I have always advocated for implementing meaningful steps towards combating rising carbon emissions and climate change, before I began my research for this article I was against carbon taxes, because I held the common view that they targeted low income groups and were ineffective in actually causing a substantial decrease in emissions. However my research for this article has drastically changed that view due to the reasons I have listed above. That being said, however, carbon taxes are still to a large extent a grey area in our mission of ending climate change. Empirical research on the impacts of carbon taxes in developing countries is both rare and sorely needed, especially considering the rapid growth of their emission rates”.

However, it should be noted that the research suggested in this example tends to be abstract rather than at a personal level which is not uncommon when this element of the criterion is considered. Focusing on the latter, for example, considering how their personal research could be developed, would have further improved this response.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/03
Team Project

Key messages

- Candidates were most successful when they fully defined and developed issues
- Successful presentations gained marks by clearly identifying their own perspective and explaining how it differed from those of others
- Some thought is required in planning and making clear the structure of the presentation
- The strongest conclusions to presentations were linked to the evidence developed in the explanation of the issue and showed why they were effective or innovative
- Reflective Papers should evaluate strengths and weaknesses of the team's collaboration and explain what the candidate has learnt from doing the project

General comments

A large range of interesting work was again produced by candidates working in teams before individually presenting and reflecting. As in previous sessions, the comments in this report are organised by the areas assessed in the presentation, as well as the reflective paper.

Definition of the issue

It was very pleasing to see a wide range of topics selected by teams of candidates, many of them reflecting very distinctive local problems with a global resonance. Whether solving issues of poverty to pollution, honour killing to human trafficking, reducing crime or alleviating hunger candidates were often clearly engaged in their topic and some had carried out an impressive quantity of research. Issues did need to be closely enough defined to allow them to be researched by the team within the time available and to produce an eight minute presentation. Topics which were too broad or vague did not allow for this. Defining the issue by taking a word and defining it using the dictionary also tended not to allow for a genuinely clear explanation of what the issue actually was. One successful candidate started with a definition of their issue, but then clearly outlined it in more detail, and continued to develop this throughout the presentation:

What is sexual harassment? In simple terms, it is defined as unwelcome verbal and physical advances of a sexual nature. However, it is so much more than that... I am going to be talking about Sexual Harassment. I will analyse the topic of harassment from a local and global point of view, explore its cultural relevance and attempt to develop a possible solution.

Issues were also best defined as statements rather than questions (interrogatives). Presentations for this component need to define an issue then argue for a solution, rather than debate the answer to a question, and statements of the issue provide the best opportunity to do this. For example, titles such as 'do violent video games lead to violent crimes?' and 'do the Olympic games still serve their purpose?' do not point to obvious solutions or definitions of an issue with local examples.

Differentiation of perspectives

This is an aspect which continues to improve significantly. Candidates can achieve high levels on this criterion simply by showing that they are aware of their own perspective on the issue and how this differs from those taken by others. If presentations do not mention other team members then this is difficult to achieve. An increasing number of presentations took time to explain their own perspective in relation to the approach taken by other team members, and these usually produced Level 5 work. In one of the most

successful examples of this, the candidate, having identified light pollution in their city as the problem, identified the respective strengths of solutions based on planning and light sensor technology taken by other members of the team before explaining the benefits of their own approach, centred on an analysis of human physiology and circadian rhythms.

Some candidates are still not clear on what is meant by 'perspective' or how to differentiate from alternative perspectives. In one case, the team picked crime as an issue. Rather than focusing on one aspect of crime and looking at it from different perspectives, each individual picked an area of personal interest to themselves so that there was no need for interaction with any other members of the group. The Syllabus states that 'a perspective is a viewpoint or standpoint, sometimes embedded in or strongly informed by a world view. Perspectives tend to be coloured by the circumstances in which people live, the language they use and the ideas that surround them. Different perspectives should be genuinely contrasting (i.e. they should come from a different world view rather than represent subtly different takes on an issue).' Although there is no absolute requirement that alternative perspectives be rooted in different geographical areas, genuinely different global perspectives are likely to be informed by different cultural, geographical or political environments. Candidates who did this were also helped to make their research 'varied' as well as 'detailed', a Level 5 criterion. It was evident from some candidates' reflective papers that they were anxious to avoid basing their presentation on any material that was 'biased'. In doing so they may have rejected much material that was firmly rooted in a particular perspective that would have helped them to clearly differentiate their presentation.

Structure of argument

The maximum length for a presentation is 8 minutes. On the one hand, examiners do not assess beyond this so it should not be exceeded. On the other hand, the length is there to allow for developed arguments, with issues being explored in detail and solutions explained and justified. If a presentation lasts significantly less than this (some were only 3–4 minutes long) then candidates will find it harder to achieve these outcomes. When preparing scripts, candidates should allow for 150 to 200 words per minute of spoken delivery, meaning that the transcript resulting from an 8 minute presentation will be between 1200 and 1600 words. Preparation and rehearsal remain key to successful delivery.

The most successful candidates recognised that oral delivery requires a specific approach to planning and handling the structure of the presentation. Presentations that worked effectively clearly divided their presentation into sections (such as an introduction to the issue, differentiation of perspectives, development of evidence, and so on) and very clearly signposted these for their audience, at the beginning, the end and key points of transition. Discourse markers such as 'firstly', 'finally', 'next' or 'now' were used to achieve this. Candidates who took these principles and used them to develop a structure which suited the needs of their argument were most successful, rather than ignoring structure on the one hand, or using a common template on the other.

Conclusion

It is useful to note that candidates are assessed on the degree of support they give to their conclusion as well as the effectiveness of their solution. This means that the most effective presentations maintain a good balance between the development of the issue and the explanation of the solution so that the former informs the latter. Solutions should be distinctive to the candidate's own perspective as well as being supported by specific evidence and reasoning to justify its effectiveness or innovation in order to score in higher levels. One presentation, for example, which took education as an approach to help the conservation of endangered species, gave examples of educational campaigns which have been successfully used to stabilise the numbers of specific animals, but then proposed their own educational solution as one which innovatively focused on encouraging changes in the behaviour of individuals.

Presentational skills

The Syllabus requires presentations to be live, not edited in advance. The vast majority of candidates did this and presented individually to an audience with their visual aids. Formal lecterns were used by many Centres for candidates to present from, but these are not necessary and in some cases can inhibit audience engagement and the full range of presentational skills. More successful candidates either memorised presentations or used cue cards as prompts which meant they were able to engage more directly with their audience and were not reliant on reading from a script.

Likewise, PowerPoint slides enhanced presentations where candidates were aware of the principles of effective slide design, and organised material in a visually effective way. This often meant using bold or

prominent images and organising information diagrammatically, then speaking to this in their presentations. Slides used as scripts, with candidates reading from them, did not produce effective presentations.

Candidates also introduced creativity into their presentational methods in a variety of different ways. These ranged from precisely synchronised slide images or diagrams which told their own visual narrative to invitations for audience participation or even short film clips made by the candidate which linked into specific moments of their presentation. It should be said, however, that showing YouTube videos produced by others lasting several minutes do not add creativity and only reduce the time available for the candidate to gain marks from their own work.

Presentations were generally also more effective where candidates had a quiet environment in the room without distractions or extraneous noise, and candidates who were well lit were able to show how their body language enhanced the effectiveness of their presentation.

Reflective Paper

It is important to note that reflective papers can only score Level 3 or higher when they evaluate the process of collaboration. This means identifying strengths and weaknesses, then reaching a judgement. Reflective papers which simply provide a narrative of what the team did, however fluently this is expressed, will not be able to do this. This conclusion to a candidate's evaluation of their team's collaboration is a good example of how this can be done in a straightforward but effective way:

Thus, our strengths were we made use of our time when needed, and creative thinking played a good part and our weaknesses were the inability to exchange ideas efficiently and lack of motivation during some periods of the completion of the project; these factors altered the rate at which things were completed. As a result, I think the next time, as a group, we should hold more after school and weekend meetings to completely discuss the ins and outs of the problem along with each solution.

The very best reflective papers saw candidates considering their work and the interaction between the team in a frank and honest way. This went beyond simply saying what everyone's role was to thinking more closely about how individuals exploited their strengths, added breadth and depth to the arguments, and considered others' views before coming to a group solution.

In the same way, for the second criterion of the reflective paper, it is important for candidates to specifically identify and assess the impact of other perspectives on their own learning and views. These perspectives may come from research they have done or from the findings of other team members, as in this extract from a reflective paper related to a team project on the Internet:

My individual standpoint about the effects of the internet has been affected by both my own and my teammates' perspectives. I knew the internet had several negative effects before I started researching the topic. However I did not know the details about the many negative effects on our social lives and the many negative effects of the internet on both our mental and physical health. Therefore, my own findings for the social perspective affected my view on the topic. I was definitely astonished by the findings of my teammate who covered the medical perspective. I did not know much about the medical problems the internet can cause, and felt that it was very interesting and important to know, as it affects a lot of people almost every day.

The candidate here identifies what they knew or thought before, the new information they have acquired, and how their views have changed.

A few candidates did not write about either the process of collaboration or what they had learnt from the project, so were unable to gain any credit from the Reflective Paper, but the majority clearly engaged with this opportunity to think about what they had done and how their skills and knowledge had developed as a result.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/04
Cambridge Research Report

Key messages

- Be aware of the importance of establishing arguments and evidence in the outline proposal forms
- Be aware of the distinction between explanation and evaluation
- Make sure that judgements are developed enough for them to be explained and defended in the oral interview

General comments

Candidates are clearly aware of the requirements of the Research Report and centres have applied the mark scheme appropriately. Candidates need to be aware that the report should incorporate and develop the skills learnt in the AS Global perspectives papers, particularly the evaluation of evidence in Paper 1 and the selection and assessment of evidence in Paper 2. The range of evidenced in this report is much wider and the scale of research greater, but the principles of judgement based on the critical evaluation of evidence are the same. Many candidates were aware of this and did not just produce essays referenced by some evidence. Marking by centres showed an awareness of the need to identify key elements of evaluation of individual evidence and also broad perspectives and there was much helpful evaluation. There was a general awareness, too, of the difference between work which was firmly evidence-based and showed a critical approach and work which was more descriptive.

The range of questions was wide. It must be stressed that questions should be approved via the outline proposal form and that the approval form should be included with the work submitted. It should be noted that ethical issues must be considered and that questions must be appropriate for research and differing perspectives to be discussed.

Choice of questions

Approval for questions should be obtained from Cambridge by submitting an outline proposal form. Approval is based on the following criteria:

- Are there opportunities for different perspectives to be established and evaluated?
- Does the proposal indicate that the candidate has researched the topic enough to know that there is a possible discussion and has made relevant points about different views?
- Is there a list of sources? This is a source based topic and unless the candidate has established that there are appropriate and accessible sources, then it is not possible for them to know whether the question will lead to a sustained assessment of differing evidence to reach a conclusion.

Often proposals are not more than initial ideas, which might or might not work depending on what evidence is found. Some questions lead to more description and explanation than to judgement, or have an unclear focus that will make the research difficult. Obscure and convoluted titles make it hard for candidates to establish clear perspectives as it is not clear what the title really involves. It is strongly recommended that OPFs are submitted for all candidates and that any advice given by Cambridge is adhered to.

All questions for this research report should give rise to discussion and should not rely on factual knowledge. Candidates often attempt to assess how far measures have been effective. However, this is reliant on factual information and it is often very difficult to assess this information as it relies on the availability of very detailed studies. Assessment of arguments and ideas offers generally far better opportunities to evaluate. Then factual material can be used to assess proposals and plans but also a range of different factors can be taken

into consideration. Thus while a question such as 'How effective have measures been to contain terrorism in the USA' can be discussed and there could be conflicting statistics, it may be quite difficult to assess that information. However 'Should Americans be prepared to sacrifice more of their freedom to protect themselves against terrorism' is a wider question which involves a range of arguments, including how effective measures have been.

In general more successful reports have the possibility of different perspectives being discussed. Often detailed scientific studies do have methodological issues behind different arguments, such as how that knowledge has been obtained and are not merely dependent on factual knowledge. Questions which open up broader discussions are more likely to demonstrate evaluative skills than questions which are too narrow or depend too much on explanation.

The proposal forms should show clearly what possibilities there are for discussion and evaluation. This helps the future research; it helps both teachers and candidates to know that it is a suitable topic.

AO1 Research

The better candidate logs were working documents that demonstrated that the report was the candidate's own work and that the critical thinking required had been developed. The logs should be maintained throughout the research period and should reflect the development of the candidate's research and thoughts about the issues in the question. Candidate logs did not always justify the comments awarded by the centre or the overall mark given.

AO1 analysis

Many Centres refer to the analysis of evidence and arguments in marginal comments and this is useful. Marginal comments should make it clear what skills are being shown in relation to analysis throughout, and also comment on the judgements, both interim and final.

There were some very well supported answers which used a range of evidence and analysed it very effectively in terms of different perspectives. Many candidates' arguments were firmly based on the evidence reviewed and their conclusions were compelling. Other answers offered more limited analysis but were still evidence based. Weaker answers offered their own views illustrated by evidence or argued just one point, with little consideration of different perspectives. The very weakest answers offered description of aspects of their chosen topic, sometimes only including a survey of the background. Marginal annotations showing these different approaches were often very helpful in understanding the overall mark.

AO1 evaluation

Evaluation requires making a critical judgement that has to be supported. This does not necessarily mean by factual content. The whole way that conclusions are reached by sources can be assessed by considering assumptions and methodology. The choice of topic should allow for this. Sometimes Centres rewarded explanation of evidence and views as evaluation, as shown by marginal comments. Evaluation means giving value to evidence or argument – how valid is it? How reliable is it? How useful is it? Does it link with other evidence? Evaluation is crucial to the essence of Global Perspectives. Simple comments about the authors of sources do not make for effective evaluation. However eminent a professor or an expert is, his or her arguments do need to be examined critically. Medieval experts who were highly regarded by their contemporaries thought that disease could be countered by bloodletting and many medical experts thought that smoking was rather good for the nerves in the early twentieth century. Many scientific theories widely accepted have been proved to be based on no real evidence and historical views once seen as obvious have been shown to be baseless.

AO3 Communication

Generally reports were well written and candidates were able to get their meaning across. A significant part of assessment of communication is based on the oral interview and the evidence for whether a candidate has been able to show an understanding of the work done and been able to justify and defend his or her conclusions should be given on the appropriate form for oral communication. It is important that the form does not simply offer a general comment on the work or the demeanour of the candidate but refers to key requirements set out in the assessment criteria. Sometimes the degree of challenge offered by the interview has not been made clear. It is not a general conversation, but should be focused on probing the candidate's findings and how robustly they are defended and should offer opportunities for candidates to talk about the

judgements reached. Where judgements were clear and explicit and the information provided by Centres was precise and linked to the interview, then the marks awarded could be justified and accepted.

AO2 Reflection

A separate section headed 'Reflection' would be useful to separate reflection from the actual conclusions. The better sections on reflection considered if there had been sufficient evidence for their view, what the implications are, what else the report could have considered and if the evidence changed the candidate's perspective. Reflecting on decisions is vital and looking back on research is crucial in further academic study. Reflection which is mundane, over personal or too general (not linked to the specific conclusions reached) should not be over rewarded.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/11
Written Examination

Key messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, in order to answer the questions set. This was particularly relevant in **Question 2** where many candidates evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of the argument rather than the evidence as required in the question.

The length of each answer should reflect the number of marks available. Many candidates spent too long on **Question 1** and **2** leaving insufficient time for the demands of **Question 3** which was worth almost half of the total available marks for this paper.

The key skill, particularly in **Question 3**, which candidates needed to demonstrate to achieve high marks was that of comparative evaluation, supported by precise references to the documents and in relation to the question set.

Question 3 required candidates to consider both documents and go beyond a simple comparison and description of the content in order to evaluate the source, perspectives and argument to reach an overall judgment regarding which, if any, is more convincing.

Candidates should provide brief and relevant references to the documents to support their evaluation of evidence and argument otherwise the answer is generalised containing only assertions or claims. Providing relevant references to the documents is crucial in **Questions 2** and **3** in order to attain higher marks.

Candidates will not gain credit for using material from their own knowledge that is not mentioned in the documents. Equally, copying sections from the documents, without any relevant supporting comment, except in **Question 1(a)** and part of **1(b)** will not gain credit.

In **Question 3** the strongest responses reached a supported judgment about the convincing nature of both the two arguments.

General comments

The overall standard of the responses was encouraging with candidates seemingly better prepared than in previous series. There was little evidence of candidates misunderstanding the passages and most showed a good understanding of the demands of the questions. Many candidates did not pay careful enough attention to the command words in the questions and this limited the level they achieved particularly in **Question 2**.

It was encouraging to see some candidates applying a higher-level skill by comparing the arguments put forward in the documents in **Question 3** and coming to a judgement. However, many candidates simply compared content or repeated, without evaluation, the arguments of the authors. Stronger answers often showed evidence of clear planning for the higher mark questions and this certainly helped candidates structure their answers in a coherent and logical manner.

In **Question 2** many candidates assessed the strengths and weaknesses of the author's argument rather than the evidence used. It is important for candidates to carefully read and understand what the question requires.

There were few candidates who ran out of time. However, the allocation of time relative to the number of marks available is an important issue. Many candidates wrote extensively on **Question 1(a)** and **1(b)**

whereas a few lines would have been sufficient and this had a detrimental impact on the amount of time that is necessary to gain higher marks on **Question 3**.

As a result, some answers to **Question 3** were not fully developed or supported by precise references to the documents. Stronger responses selected relevant and appropriate quotes from the documents demonstrating that they had a secure grasp of the arguments being presented and reached a supported judgment concerning the convincing nature of both of the documents.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Only **brief** statements were required. For such ‘identify’ questions, information could be copied directly from the text. The key words in the question were ‘driverless cars’. Candidates should be encouraged to carefully read the documents and questions to be able to identify the correct information. Many candidates referenced light rail systems or shuttle buses, which did not answer the question as they do not demonstrate that driverless cars were already a reality.

Typically, candidates could achieve the two available marks by quoting: ‘Driverless cars have driven from Italy to China’ and ‘The Google Self-Driving Car Project has now completed over 700 000 test kilometres.’ There were also other possible answers to choose from and candidates did not need to write extensively.

- (b) The question required the candidates to identify and explain two benefits of driverless cars. Candidates gaining full marks achieved this by combining the identification and explanation of each reason into one or two sentences forming a concise paragraph. While identification requires candidates to copy the author’s words from the text, the explanation requires the use of their own words or relevant paraphrasing of those of the author.

Many candidates simply copied out the implied reasoning that the author had used but this did not explain the benefits claimed by the author.

Some examples of identifying a benefit and providing an explanation are:

“A benefit of driverless cars is that they will remove the need for driving restrictions related to age and ability (identify) because skill and ability to drive is not necessary as the cars drive themselves’ (explanation).”

“Technology and Telecommunication sectors will see the greatest financial benefits (identify) because these sectors are needed to develop the software for the more advanced features of driverless cars (explanation).”

“Fully automated vehicles will increase road safety (identify) because most traffic accidents are caused by human error. Taking humans out of the decision-making process and replacing them with computerised surveillance systems would reduce the errors made (explanation).”

Question 2

It was important in **Question 2** to read the requirements of the question carefully. The candidates achieving the highest marks addressed strengths and weaknesses of the evidence and related this to the overall conclusion that driverless cars are already a reality. However, many candidates did not recognise the need to address the evidence used and instead evaluated the strength and weakness of the argument presented. Although these candidates used some evidence in their answer, frequently the emphasis of the answer was on the argument and consequently higher level marks were not able to be achieved. This has been identified in reports for previous series and remains an area for improvement..

For strengths of the evidence the highest achieving candidates used examples such as: ‘*The US Department of Transportation, a government agency, provides a definition of driverless cars and where they are used. This is a very credible source that shows the existence of driverless cars as stated in the conclusion.*’ This clearly and concisely reviewed the evidence used and related it directly to the question posed.

For weaknesses of the evidence the highest achieving candidates used examples such as: *'Pieces of evidence including the 22% population statistic and 90% of accidents statistic have no cited sources and appear to be self-stated by the author, weakening their credibility.'* This demonstrated a good understanding of the limitations of the sources of the evidence and the consequent lack of reliability.

For some candidates there appeared to be an expectation that the question would ask for the strengths and weaknesses of the argument rather than the evidence, and responses consequently adopted a formulaic approach assessing the argument rather than engaging with the question. These responses provided explanations such as: the credibility of the author, the range of arguments and the use of language, which were erroneously used in this context. Many candidates were able to identify that much of the evidence was not clearly cited, even when evaluating the argument rather than the evidence.

Question 3

The standard of responses to this question overall showed an improvement on previous series as the approach now seems to be more familiar to candidates. There were two main approaches used to answer this question. The first was to discuss the argument of the author of Document 1 separately from that of Document 2 and then attempt to synthesise the arguments to come to an overall judgment as to which was the most convincing. This approach was only partially successful for many candidates as the more sophisticated evaluation came at the end of the answer and was often limited in its scope. This approach also featured much narrative description, in particular extensive quotation from what the authors stated rather than undertaking evaluation of the convincing nature of the argument. This limited the marks that could be credited.

An example of stating information and simply comparing information from the document without development is:

"The author in document 2 states that driverless cars will probably not function in society just yet, while the author of document 1 claims that driverless cars are possible now."

This does not show clear evaluation of the arguments but rather, merely states the differences between the two. To gain higher marks it would be necessary to use evidence from the documents to evaluate how the authors have arrived at these statements.

The second, and most frequent approach, was to directly compare the two documents throughout the answer. The strongest candidates achieved this well with analysis and clear evaluation of the relative strengths of each document. There was no correct answer and candidates were free to argue that Document 1 or Document 2 was more convincing or that both were equally convincing. Weaker answers tended to directly compare the content of the documents without evaluating their relative strengths. 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 while weaker answers simply relied on a formulaic approach of what should constitute a strong argument without using supporting examples. Such answers were consequently superficial and relied on undeveloped quotes from the text.

Some candidates evaluated the theme of the argument in terms of their own opinion of driverless cars. This is not appropriate as the question requires evaluation of the authors' arguments.

The strongest responses adopted the second approach to answering the question, methodically evaluating the relative strengths of the argument, using appropriate examples, before coming to a reasoned judgment at the end. For example:

"The author of Document 2 is the editor of Artificial Intelligence in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Review so he is more specialised and has authority in the field of technology. Working for a renowned university makes him more credible than the author of Document 1, who is a lawyer who worked as Executive Research Officer for the World Intellectual Property Organisation, as she is not actively engaged in the field of technology limiting her authority."

This gives a developed evaluation of the relative strengths of the authors and the origin of the documents.

"While Document 1 uses some reliable sources and provides numerical statistics as evidence, Document 2 is more convincing because the author cites more relevant and authoritative sources, like Ralf Hertwich at

German automotive giant Mercedes, providing direct quotes from other credible professionals and using a primary source by interviewing Professor Leonard at MIT.”

This gives a clear evaluation of the differences in the strength of the evidence used for each of the arguments in the documents.

Some candidates seemed to be looking for a formulaic approach to the question by making assumptions based on preconceived ideas about what makes a good argument, rather than reading and evaluating the documents clearly. Some candidates used critical thinking terminology in this context which if applied and explained well enhanced the evaluation. However, other candidates used critical thinking statements that were not related to the documents in this paper nor clearly explained. Candidates are required to engage critically with the documents, rather than make generalised comments that could apply to any document.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH

Paper 9239/12
Written Examination

Key messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, in order to answer the questions set. This was particularly relevant in **Question 2** where several candidates evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of the argument rather than the evidence as required in the question.

The length of each answer should reflect the number of marks available. Many candidates spent too long on **Question 1** and **2** leaving insufficient time for the demands of **Question 3** which was worth almost half of the total available marks for this paper.

The key skill, particularly in **Question 3**, which candidates needed to demonstrate to achieve high marks was that of comparative evaluation, supported by precise references to the document and in relation to the question set.

Question 3 required candidates to consider both documents and go beyond a simple comparison and description of the content. This was to evaluate the source, perspectives and argument to reach an overall judgment regarding the extent of the challenge made by the author of Document 2 relative to Document 1.

Candidates should provide brief and relevant references to the documents to support their evaluation of evidence and argument otherwise the answer is generalised containing only assertions or claims. Providing relevant references to the document is crucial in **Questions 2** and **3** in order to attain higher marks.

Candidates will not gain credit for using material from their own knowledge that is not mentioned in the documents. Equally, copying sections from the documents, without any relevant supporting comment, except in **Question 1(a)** and part of **1(b)** will not gain credit.

In **Question 3** the strongest responses reached a supported judgment about the relative success of both the challenge of the author's argument in Document 2 compared to that in Document 1.

General comments

The overall standard of the responses was encouraging with candidates seemingly better prepared than in previous series. There was little evidence of candidates misunderstanding the passages and most showed a good understanding of the demands of the questions. Many candidates did not pay careful enough attention to the command words in the questions and this limited the level they achieved particularly in **Question 2**.

It was encouraging to see some candidates applying a higher-level skill by comparing the arguments put forward in the documents in **Question 3** and coming to a judgement. However, many candidates simply compared content or repeated, without evaluation, the arguments of the authors. Stronger answers often showed evidence of clear planning for the higher mark questions and this certainly helped candidates structure their answers in a coherent and logical manner.

In **Question 2** many candidates assessed the strengths and weaknesses of the author's argument rather than the evidence used. It is important for candidates to carefully read and understand what the question requires.

There were few candidates who ran out of time. However, the allocation of time relative to the number of marks available is an important issue. Many candidates wrote extensively on **Question 1(a)** and **1(b)**

whereas a few lines would have been sufficient and this sometimes had a detrimental impact on the amount of time that is necessary to gain higher marks on **Question 3**.

As a result, some answers to **Question 3** were not fully developed or supported by precise reference to the documents. Stronger responses selected relevant and appropriate quotes from the documents demonstrating that they had a secure grasp of the arguments being presented and reached a supported judgment concerning the extent of the challenge between them.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Only **brief** statements were required. For such ‘identify’ questions, information could be copied directly from the text. The key words in the question were ‘negative effects of smoking’. Candidates should be encouraged to carefully read the documents and questions to be able to identify the correct information.

Typically, candidates could achieve the two available marks by quoting: “Smoking is the leading preventable cause of death in the world” and “It reduces the quality of life through smoking related diseases.” There were also other possible answers to choose from and candidates did not need to write extensively.

- (b) The question required the candidates to identify and explain the two different approaches to reducing smoking. Candidates gaining full marks achieved this by combining the identification and explanation of each reason into one or two sentences forming a concise paragraph. While identification requires candidates to copy the author’s words from the text, the explanation requires the use of their own words or relevant paraphrasing of those of the author.

Many candidates simply copied out the reasoning that the author had used but this did not explain the different approaches.

Examples of responses that both identified and explained the two different approaches are: “*One approach is the use of public information campaigns. (Identify). Through this, education smokers are made more aware of the dangers of smoking and are therefore more likely to make an informed choice to quit (Explanation)*”.

“*Another approach is to require cigarettes to be sold in plain packaging without logos and colours. (Identify). Plain packaging would make cigarettes less attractive to smokers and increase their thoughts of quitting (Explanation)*”.

Many candidates used both restrictions on advertising at sports events and plain packaging as different approaches, whereas these were considered to be the same approach (advertising).

Question 2

It was important in **Question 2** to read the requirements of the question carefully. The candidates achieving the highest marks addressed strengths and weaknesses of the evidence and related this to the how convincing evidence was to support the idea that plain packaging is counter-productive. However, some candidates did not recognise the need to address the evidence used and instead evaluated the strength and weakness of the argument presented. Although these candidates used some evidence in their answer, frequently the emphasis of the answer was on the argument and consequently higher level marks were not able to be achieved. This has been identified in reports for previous series and remains an area for improvement.

For strengths of the evidence the strongest responses used examples like: “*The author gave evidence that the number of illicit cigarettes had increased substantially undermining the idea that plain packaging of cigarettes is counter-productive. This came from Australia’s Custom and Border Protection Service Annual Report, which is a frequent and reliable Governmental source of information.*” This clearly reviewed the evidence used and related it directly to the question posed.

For weaknesses of the evidence the strongest responses used examples such as: “*The document has limited statistical evidence. The author says that illicit cigarettes make up about 7.5% of cigarette sales but*

this appears to be an estimate so is less reliable. The method and source of the research are not stated, making the evidence unsupported and, therefore, less convincing." This showed a good understanding of the limitations of the sources of the evidence and the consequent lack of reliability.

For some candidates there appeared to be an expectation that the question would ask for the strengths and weaknesses of the argument rather than the evidence and responses consequently adopted a formulaic approach. These responses provided explanations such as: the credibility of the author, the range of arguments and the use of language, which were erroneously used in this context. However, many candidates were able, even in the context of evaluating the arguments, to identify some strengths and weaknesses of the evidence.

Question 3

The standard of responses to this question overall showed an improvement on previous series as the approach now seems to be more familiar to candidates.

There were two main approaches used to answer this question. The first was to discuss the argument of the author of Document 1 separately from that of Document 2 and then attempt to synthesise the arguments to come to an overall judgment as to the extent of the challenge. This approach was only partially successful for many candidates as the more sophisticated evaluation came at the end of the answer and was often limited in its scope. This approach also featured much narrative description, in particular extensive quotation from what the authors stated rather than undertaking evaluation of the nature of the argument. This limited the marks that could be credited.

An example of stating information and simply comparing information from the document without development is:

"The author of Document 2 started his article by stating how the reduction of colourful packaging would have an effect on smokers. In Document 1 he begins with what smoking can lead to and did not begin to write about the topic of plain packaging until later in the article."

This does not show clear evaluation of the arguments but rather, merely states the differences between the two approaches. To gain higher marks it would be necessary to use evidence from the documents to evaluate how the authors have arrived at these statements.

The second, and most frequent approach, was to directly compare the two documents throughout the answer. The strongest candidates achieved this well with analysis and clear evaluation of the relative strengths of each document. There was no correct answer and candidates were free to argue that Document 1 or Document 2 challenged the other or that both challenged equally. Weaker answers tended to directly compare the content of the documents without evaluating their relative strengths. 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 while weaker answers simply relied on a formulaic approach of what should constitute a strong argument without using supporting examples. Such answers were consequently superficial and relied on undeveloped quotes from the text.

Some candidates evaluated the theme of the argument in terms of their own opinion of plain packaging of cigarettes. This is not appropriate as the question requires evaluation of the authors' arguments.

The strongest responses adopted the second approach to answering the question, methodically evaluating the relative strengths of the argument, using appropriate examples, before coming to a reasoned judgment at the end.

"The author of Document 2 is a health professional who is most likely to support any positive health outcomes thus reducing the potential for bias in his work. The fact he is a professor and CEO of the Cancer Institute supports this. In comparison, the author of Document 1 is the Vice-President of a libertarian think tank, the Reason Foundation, which automatically makes him partisan on this issue."

This gives a developed evaluation of the relative strengths of the authors and the origin of the documents.

"Document 1 makes a number of vague, non-specific references to "studies" indicating plain packaging's failure to change smoking habits. For example, the author of Document 1 cites "limited experimental research" supporting the policy. The author of Document 2 addresses this specifically stating the claim of

“experimental” evidence is a misnomer as a large-scale research project by the Australian Government and follow-up from Melanie Wakefield, another researcher, supported the policy.”

This gives a clear evaluation of the differences in the strength of the evidence in the documents and leads to an appropriate judgement that Document 2 challenges Document 1.

Some candidates seemed to be looking for a formulaic approach to the question by making assumptions based on preconceived ideas about what makes a good argument, rather than reading and evaluating the documents clearly. Some candidates used critical thinking terminology in this context which if applied and explained well enhanced the evaluation. However, other candidates used critical thinking statements that were not related to the documents in this paper nor clearly explained. Candidates are required to engage critically with the documents, rather than make generalised comments that could apply to any document.

Global Perspectives

Paper 9239/13

Written Paper

Key Messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, and answer the question set.

The length of the answer should reflect the number of marks available. Some candidates spent too long on the first two questions, leaving insufficient time for the demands of **Question 3** which was worth almost half of the total available marks for the paper.

The key skill, particularly in **Question 3**, which candidates needed to demonstrate to obtain higher marks, is that of comparative evaluation, supported by precise reference to the documents and in relation to the question set.

Question 3 required candidates to consider both documents and go beyond a simple comparison and description of the content in order to evaluate the origin, perspectives and argument to reach an overall judgment regarding which, if any, is more convincing.

Brief and relevant references to the documents should be used to support evaluation of evidence and argument otherwise the answer is generalised containing no more than a series of assertions or claims. This is crucial in **Questions 2** and **3**.

Candidates will not gain credit for using material from their own knowledge that is not mentioned in the documents. Equally, copying sections from the documents without any supporting comments will not gain credit, except for questions which ask candidates to identify, as in **Question 1a** and part of **1b**.

In **Question 3** the strongest responses reached a supported judgment about the convincing nature of the two arguments.

General Comments

The overall standard of the responses was encouraging with candidates seemingly better prepared than in previous series. There was little evidence of candidates misunderstanding the documents and most showed a good understanding of the demands of the questions.

It was encouraging to see several candidates applying a higher-level skill by comparing the argument put forward in the documents in **Question 3** and coming to a judgement. However, some candidates simply compared content or repeated, without evaluation, the argument of the authors. Stronger answers often showed evidence of clear planning for the higher mark questions and this certainly helped candidates structure their answers in a coherent and logical manner.

There were very few candidates who ran out of time, although the allocation of time relative to the number of marks available is an important issue. Some candidates wrote extensively on **Question 1a** and **1b** whereas a few lines would have been sufficient and this sometimes had a detrimental impact on **Question 3**.

Some answers to **Question 3** were not fully developed or supported by precise references to the documents. Stronger responses selected relevant and appropriate quotes from the documents demonstrating that they

had a secure grasp of the arguments being considered and reached a supported judgment concerning the convincing nature of the documents.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

- a) Only **brief** statements were required. For such 'identify' questions information could be copied directly from the text. The key words in the question were "different views". Candidates should be encouraged to carefully read the documents and questions to be able to identify the correct information. Some candidates incorrectly identified Brazil which only had one view.

Typically, candidates could achieve the two available marks by stating: "*People in Australia and Canada have different views about graffiti.*" There were other possible answers to choose from and no need to write extensively.

- b) This question required candidates to identify and explain two conflicting views held by two individuals. The key words were "conflicting" and "individuals". Most candidates responded well to this question, most frequently comparing the views of Elura Emerald (for) and Judge Hardy (generally against). The unnamed UK graffiti artist was only rarely referenced as an alternative to Judge Hardy. While identification allows candidates to directly reference the author's words from the text, the explanation requires use of the candidate's own words or relevant paraphrasing of those of the author.

Some candidates simply copied out the implied reasoning that the author had used but this did not explain the benefits claimed by the author.

For example: "*American artist Elura Emerald insisted that, "Artists who paint on the street are merely expressing themselves, not hurting anyone, and should not be punished but appreciated and celebrated."*

This is a straight copy from the document and would have gained only one mark for the identification of one view.

Examples of answers obtaining the full two marks are:

"Elura Emerald thinks that graffiti artists should be appreciated and accepted by the public because their actions will not hurt others or bring great damage (identify). They are just displaying their talents so they should not be punished like thieves or murderers." (explanation).

"Judge Hardy believes that graffiti is a type of vandalism and these types of artists are very selfish (identify). They are doing what they want without the owners' permission which is unjustified as it ruins the beauty of the street or society in which they live." (explanation)

Both of these conflicting statements concisely identify the two views and then explain them using their own words with some paraphrasing of the author.

Question 2

The question required an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the author's argument in Document 1. Some candidates approached this on a paragraph by paragraph basis without providing an overall conclusion. This approach did achieve the highest marks.

The strongest responses looked at different factors influencing the relative strength of the argument and collated the strengths and weaknesses together. Aspects that were considered included: the provenance of the document and the credibility of the author, the credibility of sources and the strength of evidence, the balance of different perspectives, the use of language and how this linked to the overall conclusion. Candidates achieving slightly lower marks tended to avoid reference to the conclusion of the document.

For strengths of the argument high scoring candidates used examples like: *“The author used lots of examples from around the world like: New York gallery, jailed London artists and cases in Canada and Australia. The author uses different global perspectives and views of individuals to illustrate his final conclusion that graffiti can be an art form or a crime.”* This clearly and concisely identified the use of evidence to support the argument relating it directly to the question posed.

For weaknesses of the evidence high scoring candidates used examples like: *“The examples used were mainly focussed on particular countries, especially developed ones. What about Asian and other developing countries? The limitation of the examples can be seen to provide rather one-sided support to the conclusion and dilute the reliability of the argument.”* This showed a good understanding of the limitations of the sources of the evidence and the consequent lack of reliability.

There were several very good examples that showed a clear understanding of how to evaluate an argument and how to support it using examples from the document. This was without relying excessively on references from the document itself, instead giving a personal analysis.

Question 3

The standard of responses to this question overall showed an improvement on previous series as the approach now seems to be more familiar to the candidates.

There were two main approaches used to answer this question. The first was to discuss the argument of the author of Document 1 separately from that of Document 2 and then attempt to synthesise the arguments to come to an overall judgment as to which was the most convincing. This approach was only partially successful for many candidates, as the more difficult evaluation came at the end of the answer and was often limited in its scope. This approach also featured much narrative description, in particular extensive quotation from what the authors stated rather than undertaking evaluation of the convincing nature of the argument. This limited the marks that could be credited.

An example of stating information and simply comparing information from the document without development is:

“The author’s argument in Document 2 is the essence of graffiti art in the act of resistance and defiance. It should be seen as a basic human right rather than a crime. In Document 1, the author’s argument was whether graffiti is a form of art or if it should be seen as vandalism.”

This does not show evaluation of the arguments but merely the differences between the approaches. To gain higher marks it was necessary to use evidence from the documents to evaluate why the authors have come to make those statements.

The second, and most frequent approach, was to directly compare the two documents throughout the answer. The strongest candidates achieved this well with analysis and clear evaluation of the relative strengths of each document. There was no correct answer and candidates were free to argue that Document 1 or Document 2 was more convincing or that both were equally convincing. Weaker answers tended to directly compare the content of the documents without evaluating their relative strengths. 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 while weaker answers simply relied on a formulaic approach of what should constitute a strong argument without using supporting examples. Such answers were consequently superficial and relied on undeveloped quotes from the text.

Some candidates evaluated the theme of the argument in terms of their own opinion of graffiti. This is not appropriate as the question requires evaluation of the authors' arguments.

The strongest responses adopted the second approach to answering the question, methodically evaluating the relative strengths of the argument, using appropriate examples, before coming to a reasoned judgment at the end.

"Document 2 has many defects when compared with the first document. Sibylla is a correspondent in South America and an activist in writing about Columbia's Human Rights Crises. Her background is not as credible as the author of Document 1, Paul Vallely who is a UK Professor in public ethics. She shows weaker expertise in arguing the points of ethics and the arts. Her opinions are based on Columbia so she may have a vested interest and biased viewpoints rather than focussing on the objective perspectives. In contrast, Paul the Professor, has a more comprehensive analysis using a balanced viewpoint. Overall the provenance of Document 1 is stronger making it much more convincing."

This gives a developed evaluation of the relative strengths of the authors and the origin of the documents.

"Document 2 can be quite authoritative since it quotes the Columbian Police and the Mayor of Bogotá who are very reliable and credible. Document 1 also has strong support from artist Elura Emerald and Judge Hardy. However, Document 2 is focussed on issues in Columbia and the actions taken might not be appropriate in other parts of the world. As Document 1 refers to much broader areas, like Australia, Canada, Brazil and the UK it has wider global perspectives making it more convincing."

This gives a clear evaluation of the difference in the strength of support for the arguments in the documents.

Some candidates seemed to be looking for a formulaic approach to the question by making assumptions based on preconceived ideas about what makes a good argument, rather than reading and evaluating the documents clearly. Some candidates used critical thinking terminology in this context which if applied and explained well enhanced the evaluation.