IQM3001

LEVEL 3 · CONTROLLED ASSESSMENT

INTO QUALIFICATIONS

English for Academic Purposes

Writing Assessment Paper 2

Part A pre-release source pack

Duration
60 minutes

Total marks 60

Assessment window
Sample assessment

Assessment setSet S of 2026

Audience
Candidate

Release timing
exam release

Exam date
_____

Assessment set ID
2026-A

Source handling

- This pack contains two controlled source texts.
- Candidates receive this pack one week before Part A.
- Sample source material. Use fresh unannotated copies in the assessment. Do not bring your advance copy or notes into the room.

Source text 1

Source citation and provenance

Hilton, J. (2016) Open educational resources and college textbook choices: a review of research on efficacy and perceptions. Educational Technology Research and Development, 64, pp. 573–590. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-016-9434-9 CC BY 4.0 — https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/ Condensed and rewritten in accessible language for this sample. No direct quotation; headings and explanatory transitions added.

Controlled source content

Open educational resources, usually shortened to OER, include teaching materials that can be used without purchasing a conventional textbook. Open permissions can also allow users to revise and share material. A low price, however, is not the same as educational quality. Hilton examined published research to investigate whether replacing commercial resources with OER affected students' learning and how teachers and students judged the alternatives. The review therefore considered both educational outcomes and users' perceptions.

The review included sixteen studies. To qualify, a study had to concern OER used as a main learning resource in higher education, provide evidence about outcomes or perceptions, and involve at least fifty participants. The research had to be published in English before October 2015. Hilton searched relevant literature, followed references in existing studies and contacted researchers for additional work. These procedures produced a defined evidence base rather than an unrestricted collection of positive examples.

Nine studies examined learning outcomes. Overall, students using open resources generally performed as well as students using commercial materials, while spending less on textbooks. The results did not support an assumption that paying for a conventional book necessarily produces better achievement. They also did not establish that every open resource is equally effective. The studies differed in subject, institution, resource format and teaching arrangements. Consequently, a broad pattern across the studies should not be read as a guarantee for any particular course.

Seven studies examined perceptions of open resources. Students and teachers were generally positive about their quality. This evidence matters because a resource that users find unsuitable may be difficult to introduce, even when it is inexpensive. Nevertheless, satisfaction and academic performance are different outcomes. A favourable opinion can support a judgement about usability, but cannot on its own demonstrate that students learned more. Similarly, a teacher's preference is relevant to adoption without settling every question about learning.

Several features of the research limit the conclusions that can be drawn. Many comparisons did not randomly allocate students to different resources. Groups might therefore differ in ways that affect achievement independently of the textbook. In some studies, changes in resources were accompanied by changes in teaching or course delivery. For example, comparing a blended course with a traditional classroom course does not isolate the effect of openness alone. A difference in results could reflect the wider learning arrangement.

The review presents a promising case for considering OER, particularly where textbook costs prevent students obtaining required material. Its strongest practical message combines affordability with

broadly comparable outcomes in the studies reviewed. It also calls for more rigorous research rather than treating early findings as final proof. For an institution selecting materials, the distinction is useful: evidence can justify examining an open alternative without removing the need to assess its content and suitability. Decisions should recognise what was measured, how the comparison was made and whether the circumstances resemble the intended course. The review concerns resource adoption; it does not directly test a programme that teaches students to evaluate OER independently.

Source text 2

Source citation and provenance

IQM3001 sample authoring (2026) From open access to useful learning: a fictional college discussion. Original educational commentary informed by UNESCO (2019), Recommendation on Open Educational Resources (OER). https://www.unesco.org/en/legal-affairs/recommendation-open-educational-resources-oer Original sample wording. The brief policy summary is paraphrased; the college, people and proposal are fictional. First paragraph summarises UNESCO policy. All subsequent paragraphs are a newly written hypothetical application, not UNESCO findings or recommendations about this fictional college.

Controlled source content

UNESCO's 2019 Recommendation treats open educational resources as an issue involving people, institutions and access. It encourages skills development, supportive policies, inclusive resources, sustainable provision and international cooperation. Open permissions make adaptation possible, but useful provision also depends on quality, accessibility and the ability to find and use material. The Recommendation is a policy framework, rather than an experiment demonstrating an increase in examination results. The fictional discussion below explores how a college might respond to these ideas. It is an original teaching example, not a report of UNESCO research.

At the fictional Riverside College, a department proposes replacing three purchased textbooks with open resources. The finance officer welcomes the possibility that students could obtain the materials immediately. A lecturer supports the proposal but asks who will check the content each year. A librarian points out that links sometimes lead to resources with different permissions. A page that is free to read may still prohibit adaptation. Before advertising the saving, the college needs a clear account of the resources it intends to use.

The students have different concerns. One reads most comfortably from a printed page and asks whether a low-cost printed edition will be available. Another uses a screen reader and wants headings and tables that work with it. A third often studies during a long journey with unreliable internet access. For these learners, the existence of a free online text does not settle the question of access. The same resource could remove one barrier while leaving another in place.

The department considers a short workshop on evaluating OER. Students would compare the authorship, evidence, date and purpose of two resources, then explain which is more suitable for a particular assignment. They would also practise recording the source details needed for a reference. The librarian argues that a practical comparison would be more useful than simply giving students a list of websites. The lecturer agrees, but notes that workshop time would have to come from an already crowded induction programme.

An alternative proposal is to give students only a checked collection selected by staff. This could save time and reduce confusion. However, it would offer fewer opportunities to practise judging unfamiliar material independently. The discussion therefore distinguishes two aims: providing dependable course readings and developing a skill that students can use beyond that course. The college might pursue both, but would need to decide how much responsibility students should gradually take for selection.

Before committing to a larger programme, Riverside proposes a small trial. Staff would record preparation time, ask students about practical access and assess a short resource-evaluation task. They would compare those findings with the cost of the previous arrangement. Positive feedback would be encouraging, but the department would still need evidence of what students could actually do. The fictional proposal illustrates a possible response to an open-resource policy; it does not establish that the workshop would succeed. Its value lies in making the choices visible, including the relationship between financial savings, support for learners and opportunities to develop independent judgement.

Assessment window Sample assessment	**Exam date** _____
Paper P2-A	**Assessment set** Set S of 2026 Stored ID2026-A