IQM3006 A3 Teacher reference commentary

Law and International Relations · Component 3 Reflective Learning Log · Assessment window: Sample assessment

Selected synthetic examples for teacher standardisation. Review before distribution.

Use the approved question paper and marking guidance alongside these extracts. Consult this proposed commentary after independent marking. Partial excerpts cannot establish a whole-script or whole-portfolio mark.

Selected task LIR RLL 06

Testing Reading R1 against independent evidence. Example Z is an exact extract from the complete log. Examples X and Y are separately authored short contrasts for this prompt; they are not full 300–500 word entries. Discuss evidence under the holistic rubric without assigning a whole-log mark from an excerpt.

Example X

R1 suggests that international connections can widen cultural opportunities but leave control with a few distributors. UNESCO's 2022 report discusses digital distribution and unequal access. This seems relevant because a television producer could reach viewers abroad through a streaming service. The producer might also depend on the service's rules. I therefore agree with R1 that there are advantages and disadvantages. Before reading, I thought globalisation meant people everywhere watching the same programmes. Now I think local programmes can circulate internationally too. However, I have not identified a specific finding from the report about who receives payment, and I cannot say how much the producer's bargaining position changes. The example helps explain the argument, but my conclusion remains broad.

Reference commentary: The mixed extract identifies the opportunity/control tension and reflects on a changed assumption. It names relevant independent evidence, but does not test the claim with a specific finding; agreement is broader than the evidence shown.

Example Y

R1 is right because everyone uses streaming now. UNESCO discusses culture and the internet, so it proves that globalism is good for all artists. If a programme is online, everybody can see it and the creator will earn more. National culture will eventually disappear because people will prefer the same international programmes. I used to think globalism was bad, but the report changed my mind completely. I do not think there are any important disadvantages once people have an internet connection.

Reference commentary: The weaker extract names a source but invents universal conclusions about access, income and cultural disappearance. It does not test R1 or evaluate a finding. Changing an opinion is not itself evidence of critical reflection.

Example Z

Reading R1 argues that cross-border connection can widen opportunities while concentrating distribution power. I tested that claim against UNESCO's Re|Shaping Policies for Creativity report, which discusses digital cultural markets and unequal access. Streaming lets a local production reach international viewers, yet a small number of platforms can control discovery and remuneration. The evidence supports R1's mechanism without proving that national culture disappears. My initial reaction was too binary. Culture can be adapted locally while the commercial route to an audience becomes more dependent on foreign firms. Testing a source changed my view more than repeating R1's wording would have done. I tested R1 with UNESCO's 2022 Re|Shaping Policies for Creativity report, which records both growth in digital cultural distribution and unequal access to markets. The report supports R1's mechanism: a platform can widen audience access while concentrating bargaining power in a small number of distributors.

Reference commentary: The extract connects a relevant concept to its context, states a changed understanding and qualifies the conclusion. Identify which supporting source details are visible and which require the full entry. This partial evidence cannot establish a whole-log mark.

Selected task LIR RLL 11

Post-war development of human-rights protection and application of the HRA to a fictional council refusal based solely on criticism. Example Z is an exact extract from the complete log. Examples X and Y are separately authored short contrasts for this prompt; they are not full 300–500 word entries. Discuss evidence under the holistic rubric without assigning a whole-log mark from an excerpt.

Example X

After 1945, the UDHR (1948) set a universal standard and the ECHR (opened 1950; in force 1953) created regional treaty obligations and a court process. Natural-rights theory explains why rights are linked to human dignity; legal positivism helps explain how rules and institutions make claims enforceable. A council is a public authority under the HRA. Refusing a hall because speakers criticise the council engages expression and peaceful assembly. However, I would need the council policy and evidence about risk before deciding whether a restriction was lawful and proportionate. The example shows why a right on paper does not settle how it is applied.

Reference commentary: The mixed extract identifies the historical sequence and a theory, then recognises the need for source and policy detail before deciding proportionality. It applies the HRA to the council but leaves the evidential assessment conditional.

Example Y

The UDHR is a UK statute that started in 1950, and the ECHR began in 1948. The Human Rights Act lets councils cancel any meeting that criticises them. Freedom of expression and assembly are absolute, so a council can never set conditions for a hall. Because the council made the decision, it must be lawful. The dates and documents are all the same kind of law, and once they exist everyone receives equal protection automatically.

Reference commentary: The weaker extract gives incorrect dates, treats rights as absolute, confuses an international declaration with domestic law, and assumes that a council decision is lawful merely because it was made by a public body. It does not assess a listed aim or proportionality.

Example Z

After the Second World War, human-rights protection developed from a universal statement of principle toward more specific legal and institutional mechanisms. The UN General Assembly adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) on 10 December 1948. It is a declaration rather than a treaty, but it set a common standard by describing rights belonging to all people. The European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) was opened for signature in 1950 and entered into force in 1953. It created regional treaty obligations and a system in which alleged violations can be considered by the European Court of Human Rights. These steps strengthened protection, although implementation still depends on institutions and state compliance. I distinguish a right from a liberty, while recognising that the boundary is not absolute. A right such as access to education may require public action and resources. A liberty such as expression protects a sphere from unjustified interference, although restrictions can be justified under defined conditions. Natural-rights theory helps explain why the UDHR presents rights as grounded in human dignity rather than granted at a government's discretion. Legal positivism adds that enforceability depends on recognised rules, institutions and remedies. The post-war sequence therefore combines a moral standard with more determinate legal procedures. The fictional council example makes the domestic duty concrete. A local council exercising public functions is a public authority for the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA); section 6 makes it unlawful for a public authority to act incompatibly with a Convention right. Refusing a community hall to a group solely because its peaceful discussion criticises the council engages freedom of expression under Article 10 and peaceful assembly under Article 11 of the ECHR. The rights overlap but are not identical: expression protects the discussion's content, while assembly protects the peaceful gathering.

Reference commentary: The stronger extract gives the required dates and institutions, explains two theories and the rights/liberties distinction, and applies section 6 and Articles 10/11 to the facts. The excerpt ends before the restriction analysis; consult the complete entry for the proposed conclusion. It supports criterion discussion but cannot establish a whole-log mark.

Selected task LIR RLL 14

Conditional forecasting about international power. Example Z is an exact extract from the complete log. Examples X and Y are separately authored short contrasts for this prompt; they are not full 300–500 word entries. Discuss evidence under the holistic rubric without assigning a whole-log mark from an excerpt.

Example X

Hegemony means a state has much more influence than others, while multipolarity involves several important centres of power. IMF quotas show that formal influence in an institution is not divided equally. They do not by themselves show who is strongest militarily or culturally. I expect power to become more widely contested because different states can bargain in different policy areas. However, I have not compared a series of figures over time, so I cannot show the speed of change. My forecast could be wrong if an economy weakened or an alliance changed. I previously treated power as one ranking, but I now think an institutional vote and the ability to influence a security decision should be examined separately.

Reference commentary: The mixed extract distinguishes concepts and keeps the forecast conditional. It correctly limits what quotas can establish, but lacks comparative evidence over time to support the predicted direction or pace.

Example Y

Multipolarity means all countries have equal power. Since more countries attend international meetings, the United States no longer has any influence. The IMF has many members, which proves every member has the same voting power. I predict that no country will be able to lead in future because globalism will make everyone equal. I do not need to compare military or economic evidence because the number of countries at a meeting already shows the result.

Reference commentary: The weaker extract confuses multiple centres of influence with equality and membership with voting power. The categorical forecast is unsupported. Credit the attempt to address the future, but not the false evidential inference.

Example Z

Hegemony describes disproportionate agenda-setting capacity; multipolarity describes several significant centres of influence. US military and institutional reach remains substantial, while China, India and the EU shape trade, technology and diplomacy. IMF quota arrangements and BRICS expansion show both the inherited order and attempts to contest it. I forecast a more competitive distribution of power, conditional on economic growth, alliances and domestic stability. Saying that US hegemony has ended would be too certain. The evidence supports movement toward multipolar bargaining, not equal power among all states. A forecast must identify the conditions that could make it wrong. The United States remains a hegemonic power in military reach and institutional influence, while China, India and the European Union shape trade, technology and diplomatic bargaining. The IMF's quota system and the expansion of BRICS illustrate different aspects of the existing order and its contestation.

Reference commentary: The extract connects a relevant concept to its context, states a changed understanding and qualifies the conclusion. Identify which supporting source details are visible and which require the full entry. This partial evidence cannot establish a whole-log mark.