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|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Marks available** | **Marks awarded** |
| A: Focus and method | 6 | 4 |
| B: Knowledge and understanding in context | 9 | 6 |
| C: Critical thinking | 12 | 6 |
| D: Communication | 3 | 2 |
| E: Engagement and reflection | 6 | 4 |
| **Total** | **36** | **22** |

Criterion A: Focus and method

This is a vibrant essay that focuses on a genuine ethical issue related to the candidate's career-related study. However, its weakness lies in the limited range of evidence. The collection of information relies on a narrow pool of websites that may have some bias. The way the candidate explains his search (“I managed to find a website”) suggests that there is a lack or rigour in this quest for information. For example, the specific example given on page 2 certainly illustrates a shocking situation; however, the candidate centres his conclusion on this single case. In order to gain some rigour, the candidate should have done a methodical research of renowned sources such as United Nations, non-governmental organizations and governmental agencies. He would have found some objective data. Needless to say, it would have added some credibility to the analysis.

Criterion B: Knowledge and understanding in context

The dilemma is described from two clear perspectives. The candidate has a proper understanding of the topic and its impact on the community, although there is a lack of nuance in the analysis (for example, the loss of reputation of a company that moves to a Third World country). The only thing the candidate says about this topic is that it would lose all credibility and many clients. The problem is undoubtedly more complex: a huge number of companies have moved their production to Third World countries (it has even become the norm) without any negative impact on their sales. There are some relevant examples, but specific data, which would have improved the analysis, is missing.

Criterion C: Critical thinking

The argument presented is adequate; however, the analysis is somewhat superficial. The candidate doesn’t always provide relevant evidence to support the reasons why a company should move or not. For example, the sections that present the advantages and the disadvantages for companies moving to Third World countries are made of personal observations. Personal observations are adequate and relevant when they are based on facts. For this criterion, the perspective of an expert or some scholarly sources are lacking. They would have improved the argument by adding multiple perspectives. There are at least two positions regarding the research question. Some scholars think that the economy of Third World countries is improved when Western companies move their production. Others think it is unfair for workers who lose their jobs and for employees abroad who do not have the same salary and benefits. A journey into these perspectives would have greatly improved the analysis.

Criterion D: Communication

The essay is well written. However, the structure does not allow integration of the ideas. The sections are clear enough, but the transition between them is awkward.

Criterion E: Engagement and reflection

There is evidence of student reflection and the candidate shows personal engagement with the topic. However, the reflections are too brief.