

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/11 Written Exam

Key messages

The key messages from this examination series are that candidates were able to:

- identify information and data from source material relevant to a global issue
- describe the perspective of a group towards a global issue
- analyse sources

Candidates would benefit from further guidance in:

- explaining the strengths and weaknesses of research into a global issue
- justifying a course of action using carefully explained reasons

General comments

The Written Exam consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In November 2025, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Health and Well-being. Access to healthcare and education was the main issue explored.

In November 2025 the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good.

Many candidates are developing an excellent understanding of the causes and consequences of global issues. They can describe and explain different perspectives on global issues. It is pleasing to see candidates assessing the potential impact and effectiveness of different actions in response to global issues, as well as being aware of the ethical and moral dimension to many global concerns.

Candidates understood the source material in the Insert Booklet very well. They were able to identify the main types of evidence, reasoning and language within sources, describing them clearly and accurately. Similarly, candidates were able to analyse a source to identify and describe the main elements of the perspective of a group towards a global issue.

The evaluation of research into a global issue to identify and explain the strengths and weaknesses of the research is a skill that candidates need to develop further. Candidates were usually able to identify and briefly describe several strengths and weaknesses of research. However, many candidates did not explain the significance of the identified strength or weakness for the research or quality of the evidence gathered.

Candidates generally recognised that their answers should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of their opinion is generally not sufficient in response to most questions. Whilst many candidates are using material from the sources to support their arguments, for example through summary or quotation, some would benefit from guidance on how to plan and organise an argument to support a claim or opinion. Scaffolding of lines of argument and essay structure would help in this process. Evidence and reasons should be clearly and explicitly used to justify the argument. Longer responses should be carefully planned and organised.

Some candidates are using their own experience and ideas encountered in their courses to supplement material drawn from the sources. It is valuable and encouraged but not essential as the examination primarily tests the ability to apply critical thinking and research skills to the analysis and evaluation of sources and perspectives. It is not necessary to have prior knowledge of the specific topic or issue in the Written Exam.

Most candidates showed interest in the topic and discussed the issues about healthcare with enthusiasm. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to a government to improve community health. However, candidates should assess and explain the potential impact and consequences of the proposals in detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgement within the conclusion.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- explain the strengths and weaknesses of research into a global issue
- justify and fully explain an action in response to global issue

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) From Source 1, nearly all candidates correctly identified the percentage of the global population that cannot access healthcare services as 30 per cent. Candidates demonstrated an excellent ability to identify information from the source.
- (b)(i) From Source 2, nearly all candidates correctly identified an example of a prediction. A prediction is a statement about what might happen in the future.
- (ii) Candidates were expected to explain why the example identified in **Question 1(b)(i)** from Source 2 is a prediction. Most candidates understood the nature of a prediction; however, some candidates did not explicitly relate their response to the identified example of a prediction.
- (c) Most candidates successfully analysed the source and were able to describe three or four aspects of the teacher's perspective on health education. Candidates reaching the higher levels of response often used examples from the source to support their analysis.

Some candidates outlined their own views on the issue or attempted to evaluate the source. This is not necessary as candidates are only asked to describe the perspective.

- (d) Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying and justifying from Sources 1 and 2 which benefit of a healthy lifestyle was the most significant, in their opinion.

The most common reasons given by candidates related to issues of impact, including:

- the number of people affected
- the amount of impact on health now and in the future
- how long the benefit might affect individuals, the community, country and world
- the impact on quality of life for different groups
- the effects on economic development
- issues of human rights and social justice
- ethically and morally most important
- the creation of multiple positive consequences
- the costs involved

The strongest responses explained three or four reasons. Some candidates compared the relative significance of different benefits, but this was not necessary to gain full marks and often led to answers which lost focus. Weaker responses simply stated the issue and asserted several reasons without explanation.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the research in Source 3 and identify several strengths and weaknesses of the methods and evidence.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- a clear purpose that guides the research and keeps it on track

- use of a structured interview that is relevant to the research question and will gather appropriate evidence
- the data gathered is measurable and can be analysed to answer the question factually/statistically in a systematic way
- a clear outcome that makes the answer to the research question clear
- recording of interviews ensures information is accurate and not lost

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- a small sample of families may make data less accurate and biased
- this may be an unrepresentative sample as just one type of family in one location may make the data unreliable
- the presence of the researcher may influence the responses and cause bias
- lack of privacy due to the presence of family members may make responses selective, for example due to embarrassment
- the noise of children may cause inaccuracy or loss of data

The strongest responses clearly explained several credible strengths and weaknesses of the research. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted strengths or weaknesses rather than explaining the strengths and weaknesses systematically. Some weaker responses simply described aspects of the research within the source but did not explain why the identified feature of the research was a strength or weakness.

Candidates should be encouraged to explain the identified strengths and weaknesses of the research by referring to the impact on the quality of the evidence and data gathered and the potential of the research to answer the research question in the source.

Candidates should be advised that the question requires candidates to evaluate the *research* described in the source. Evaluation of the source, perspective and language is not necessary or credited for this question.

- (b) For this question, when designing a research strategy to test a claim, candidates should explain their choice of research methods and evidence. Simply listing a range of methods and sources of evidence is not sufficient to reach the higher levels of response.

Candidates that performed well in this question described in detail several methods and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, '*Many families want the government to help pay for healthcare*'. The methods of testing the claim suggested were clearly explained and carefully related to this claim. Weaker responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence and did not make any link to the purpose of the research i.e. the claim being tested.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, observation, surveys, and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example with families, economists, doctors and hospital authorities.

Other methods included consultation with experts, local government, and action groups or charities who are likely to have relevant information and the ability to know. Interviews with people who have direct experience of the issue and can provide personal testimony and first-hand data were also suggested.

Nearly all candidates proposed secondary research using sources from the internet. Many described the types of source that were likely to be reliable and free from bias or vested interest, for example from governments, NGOs, and United Nations organisations. Universities, experienced reporters, news broadcasters and other media experts were often mentioned.

A few candidates responded to the question by describing their opinion about paying for healthcare rather than describing how it could be researched. These responses gained very few, if any, marks.

Candidates should be given regular opportunity to design research strategies to test claims or answer research questions as a regular part of their courses.

Question 3

Most candidates carefully compared both Amari's and Nasha's statements in a structured way. They discussed issues relating to reasoning, evidence and use of language.

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the quality or value of each statement; this included structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a discussion of several aspects of the reasons and/or evidence and/or language. Use of language was often discussed in relation to the clarity of argument, the logic of the argument, and the tone. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion about which person offered the more convincing argument.

Candidates are expected to cite material from the source to support their view of which argument is more convincing. Higher levels of response quoted the arguments explicitly and used material from the statements directly as evidence to support the candidate's view of which person had the most convincing argument. Responses that explained in detail just three or four strengths and/or weaknesses of each person in the source, explaining carefully how they affected credibility and how convincing their argument was, reached higher levels of response.

At the lower levels of response, the discussion was unlikely to be supported by material from the source and their opinions about each statement tended to be mainly asserted, sometimes with little clarity. These answers tended to focus on healthcare issues in general rather than the reasons, evidence, or language in the statements. At the lower levels of response, candidates often limited their evaluative comment to one of the statements or failed to reach a clear conclusion about which argument was most convincing.

An example of a weaker or asserted evaluative point is:

'Nasha's argument is supported by lots of examples which is a strength, for example, 'With greater well-being and mindfulness, people will be more productive at work and enjoy better relationships with friends and family.'

Whilst the evaluative point is appropriate and is supported by material quoted from the source, it is not explained or related to the question about which argument in the source is the most convincing. This response does not explain why examples are a strength and make the argument more convincing.

An example of a strong, explained evaluative point is:

Amari's argument is supported by lots of examples which is a strength, for instance 'We need more hospitals, nurses and doctors to reduce waiting lists for operations and relieve suffering quickly' This is a strength because examples help the reader to understand the argument and make it clearer. The example is also evidence that supports the reason being given by Amari that the government should spend more money on healthcare. Therefore, the use of examples in his argument makes it more convincing than Nasha's argument.'

This evaluative point is developed, explains its strength, and why it increases confidence in the argument.

Some candidates found this question quite challenging. To prepare candidates, candidates should be given frequent opportunities to compare and evaluate sources on global issues from a variety of different perspectives. Candidates should be encouraged to assess the impact of strengths and weaknesses on the quality of the argument using critical thinking and research concepts like reliability, validity, accuracy, representativeness, generalisation, bias, vested interest, expertise and ability to know.

Question 4

This question required candidates to recommend an action to a government to improve health in the community. Candidates were expected to justify their recommendation using reasons and material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and ideas.

There were many thoughtful discussions of the proposed actions. Some candidates chose to compare all actions, some to justify just one of the actions. Both approaches to answering the question were effective ways to structure the argument in the candidate's response.

Most candidates recommended either providing more health education lessons in schools or employing more doctors and nurses. Few candidates recommended rewarding people for adopting a healthy lifestyle

Candidates tended to discuss the following factors or reasons in making a recommendation:

- the scale of impact on community health
- different outcomes or consequences of the action for different groups, for example differences between young people and the elderly in the need for and access to healthcare
- cost and resources needed to implement the action
- the length of time needed to make a difference
- economic and political considerations
- conflicts of interest and power
- planning and coordination difficulties
- barriers to change, for example the attitudes of governments and politicians towards increased expenditure and taxation
- opportunity costs

Responses at the highest level of response tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the actions, providing a balanced assessment of the impact of the action on healthcare. These responses explicitly used material drawn from the sources in the insert, often supported by examples and material drawn from their own experience and learning. A clear, balanced conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the purpose of the actions, and simply described their own opinion. These responses tended to be unsupported and asserted. Some responses simply listed the benefits of healthcare rather than explaining why one action was likely to be more effective. Also, some candidates tended to describe how the actions could be implemented rather than explain why one of the actions was most likely to be successful. Candidates should be encouraged to plan their responses carefully and focus upon the impact of the recommended action.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/12 Written Exam

Key messages

The key messages from this examination series are that candidates were able to:

- identify information and data from source material relevant to a global issue
- describe the perspective of a group towards a global issue
- analyse sources

Candidates would benefit from further guidance in:

- explaining the strengths and weaknesses of research into a global issue
- justifying a course of action using carefully explained reasons

General comments

The Written Exam consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In November 2025, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Digital World. Online shopping was the main issue explored.

In November 2025 the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good.

Many candidates are developing an excellent understanding of the causes and consequences of global issues. They can describe and explain different perspectives on global issues. It is pleasing to see candidates assessing the potential impact and effectiveness of different actions in response to global issues, as well as being aware of the ethical and moral dimension to many global concerns.

Candidates understood the source material in the Insert Booklet very well. They were able to identify the main types of evidence, reasoning and language within sources, describing them clearly and accurately. Similarly, candidates were able to analyse a source to identify and describe the main elements of the perspective of a group towards a global issue.

The evaluation of research into a global issue to identify and explain the strengths and weaknesses of the research is a skill that candidates need to develop further. Candidates were usually able to identify and briefly describe several strengths and weaknesses of research. However, many candidates did not explain the significance of the identified strength or weakness for the research or quality of the evidence gathered.

Candidates generally recognised that their answers should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of their opinion is generally not sufficient in response to most questions. Whilst many candidates are using material from the sources to support their arguments, for example through summary or quotation, some would benefit from guidance on how to plan and organise an argument to support a claim or opinion. Scaffolding of lines of argument and essay structure would help in this process. Evidence and reasons should be clearly and explicitly used to justify the argument. Longer responses should be carefully planned and organised.

Some candidates are using their own experience and ideas encountered in their courses to supplement material drawn from the sources. It is valuable and encouraged but not essential as the examination primarily tests the ability to apply critical thinking and research skills to the analysis and evaluation of sources and perspectives. It is not necessary to have prior knowledge of the specific topic or issue in the Written Exam.

Most candidates showed interest in the topic and discussed the issues about online shopping with enthusiasm. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in exploring the benefits and problems associated with online shopping. However, candidates should assess and explain their opinions in detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgements within the conclusion.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- explain the strengths and weaknesses of research into a global issue
- justify and fully explain an action in response to global issue

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) From Source 1, nearly all candidates correctly identified the predicted percentage increase of online sales between 2021 and 2026 as 56 per cent. Candidates demonstrated an excellent ability to identify information from the source.
- (b)(ii) From Source 2, nearly all candidates correctly identified an example of an opinion. An opinion is an individual's point of view or belief which is not necessarily shared by others and/or supported by evidence.
- (ii) Candidates were expected to explain why the example identified in **Question 1(b)(i)** from Source 2 is an opinion. Most candidates understood the nature of an opinion; however, some candidates did not explicitly relate their response to the identified example of an opinion.
- (c) Most candidates successfully analysed the source and were able to describe three or four aspects of the author's perspective about online shopping. Candidates reaching the higher levels of response often used examples from the source to support their analysis.

Some candidates outlined their own views on the issue or attempted to evaluate the source. This is not necessary as candidates are only asked to describe the perspective.

- (d) Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying and justifying from Sources 1 and 2 which advantage of online shopping was the most significant, in their opinion.

The most common reasons given by candidates related to issues of impact, including:

- the number of people involved in online shopping
- the impact on product availability for different groups of people
- the range of products – type and quality
- convenience of being able to shop remotely and from home
- the effects on economic development
- benefits to retailers
- lower prices from competition
- reduction of costs and environmental impact of transport
- globalisation of shopping
- the costs involved

The strongest responses explained three or four reasons. Some candidates compared the relative significance of different advantages, but this was not necessary to gain full marks and often led to answers which lost focus. Weaker responses simply stated the issue and asserted several reasons without explanation.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the research in Source 3 and identify several strengths and weaknesses of the methods and evidence.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- a large sample of employees may make data more accurate and not biased
- use of a questionnaire that is relevant to the research question and will gather appropriate evidence
- the use of several methods provides more information and allows checking and verification
- the data gathered is measurable and can be analysed to answer the question factually/statistically in a systematic way
- a clear outcome that makes the results credible
- recording of interviews ensures information is accurate and not lost

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- a lack of clear purpose and a research question that guides the research and keeps it on track
- this may be an unrepresentative sample as just one factory in one location may make the data unreliable
- the presence of the researcher in the factory may influence the responses and cause bias
- the noise of the factory may cause inaccuracy or loss of data
- the use of a break time for the research may cause the employees to rush the responses to save their time and therefore the data might be inaccurate

The strongest responses clearly explained several credible strengths and weaknesses of the research. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted strengths or weaknesses rather than explaining the strengths and weaknesses systematically. Some weaker responses simply described aspects of the research within the source but did not explain why the identified feature of the research was a strength or weakness.

Candidates should be encouraged to explain the identified strengths and weaknesses of the research by referring to the impact on the quality of the evidence and data gathered and the potential of the research to answer the research question in the source.

Candidates should be advised that the question requires candidates to evaluate the *research* described in the source. Evaluation of the source, perspective and language is not necessary or credited for this question.

- (b) For this question, when designing a research strategy to test a claim, candidates should explain their choice of research methods and evidence. Simply listing a range of methods and sources of evidence is not sufficient to reach the higher levels of response.

Candidates that performed well in this question described in detail several methods and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, '*Some people still enjoy going to local shops*'. The methods of testing the claim suggested were clearly explained and carefully related to this claim. Weaker responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence and did not make any link to the purpose of the research i.e. the claim being tested.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, observation, surveys, and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example with shoppers, members of the public, shopkeepers, and business owners.

Other methods included consultation with experts, economists, local government, and action groups or charities who are likely to have relevant information and the ability to know. Interviews with people who have direct experience of the issue and can provide personal testimony and first-hand data were also suggested.

Nearly all candidates proposed secondary research using sources from the internet. Many described the types of source that were likely to be reliable and free from bias or vested interest, for example from governments, NGOs, and economic organisations. Universities, experienced reporters, news broadcasters and other media experts were often mentioned.

A few candidates responded to the question by describing their opinion about online shopping rather than describing how it could be researched. These responses gained very few, if any, marks.

Candidates should be given regular opportunity to design research strategies to test claims or answer research questions as a regular part of their courses.

Question 3

Most candidates carefully compared both Viran's and Anesha's statements in a structured way. They discussed issues relating to reasoning, evidence and use of language.

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the quality or value of each statement; this included structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a discussion of several aspects of the reasons and/or evidence and/or language. Use of language was often discussed in relation to the clarity of argument, the logic of the argument, and the tone. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion about which person offered the more convincing argument.

Candidates are expected to cite material from the source to support their view of which argument is more convincing. Higher levels of response quoted the arguments explicitly and used material from the statements directly as evidence to support the candidate's view of which person had the most convincing argument. Responses that explained in detail just three or four strengths and/or weaknesses of each person in the source, explaining carefully how they affected credibility and how convincing their argument was, reached higher levels of response.

At the lower levels of response, the discussion was unlikely to be supported by material from the source and their opinions about each statement tended to be mainly asserted, sometimes with little clarity. These answers tended to focus on the issues associated with online shopping in general rather than the reasons, evidence, or language in the statements. At the lower levels of response, candidates often limited their evaluative comment to one of the statements or failed to reach a clear conclusion about which argument was most convincing.

An example of a weaker or asserted evaluative point is:

'Viran's argument is supported by lots of examples which is a strength, for example, 'I have seen new digital technology every day, for example, artificial intelligence, automation, robotics and drones used for delivery.'

Whilst the evaluative point is appropriate and is supported by material quoted from the source, it is not explained or related to the question about which argument in the source is the most convincing. This response does not explain why examples are a strength and make the argument more convincing.

An example of a strong, explained evaluative point is:

Viran's argument is supported by many examples, for instance 'I have seen new digital technology every day, for example, artificial intelligence, automation, robotics and drones used for delivery.' This is a strength because examples help the reader to understand the argument and make it clearer. The example is also evidence that supports the reason being given by Viran that we should be concerned about the future of small, local shops that are threatened by online shopping. Therefore, the use of examples in his argument makes it more convincing than Anesha's argument.'

This evaluative point is developed, explains its strength, and why it increases confidence in the argument.

Some candidates found this question quite challenging. To prepare candidates, candidates should be given frequent opportunities to compare and evaluate sources on global issues from a variety of different perspectives. Candidates should be encouraged to assess the impact of strengths and weaknesses on the quality of the argument using critical thinking and research concepts like reliability, validity, accuracy, representativeness, generalisation, bias, vested interest, expertise and ability to know.

Question 4

This question required candidates to discuss a statement about online shopping. Candidates were expected to justify their opinion using reasons and material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and ideas.

There were many thoughtful discussions on the issue. Most candidates recommended that online shopping should be encouraged. Most candidates appropriately discussed arguments for and against the statement showing an appreciation of different perspectives and a balanced approach.

Candidates tended to discuss the following factors or reasons in making a recommendation:

- the scale of impact on local communities and businesses
- different outcomes or consequences of online shopping for different groups, for example differences between young people and the elderly in the need for and access to products
- environmental costs of online and traditional shopping locally
- the length of time needed to get a product
- economic and political considerations
- conflicts of interest and power

Responses at the highest level of response tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the actions, providing a balanced assessment of online shopping. These responses explicitly used material drawn from the sources in the insert, often supported by examples and material drawn from their own experience and learning. A clear, balanced conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the purpose of the action, and simply described their own opinion. These responses tended to be unsupported and asserted. Some responses simply listed the benefits of online or local shopping rather than addressing the question directly about 'encouraging online shopping'. Candidates should be advised to plan their responses carefully and focus upon the aim of the action being discussed.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/13 Written Exam

Key messages

The key messages from this examination series are that candidates were able to:

- identify information and data from source material relevant to a global issue
- describe the perspective of a group towards a global issue
- analyse sources

Candidates would benefit from further guidance in:

- explaining the strengths and weaknesses of research into a global issue
- justifying a course of action using carefully explained reasons

General comments

The Written Exam consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In November 2025, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Water, Food and Agriculture. Food waste was the main issue explored.

In November 2025 the quality of work and levels of achievement were very good.

Many candidates are developing an excellent understanding of the causes and consequences of global issues. They can describe and explain different perspectives on global issues. It is pleasing to see candidates assessing the potential impact and effectiveness of different actions in response to global issues, as well as being aware of the ethical and moral dimension to many global concerns.

Candidates understood the source material in the Insert Booklet very well. They were able to identify the main types of evidence, reasoning and language within sources, describing them clearly and accurately. Similarly, candidates were able to analyse a source to identify and describe the main elements of the perspective of a group towards a global issue.

The evaluation of research into a global issue to identify and explain the strengths and weaknesses of the research is a skill that candidates need to develop further. Candidates were usually able to identify and briefly describe several strengths and weaknesses of research. However, many candidates did not explain the significance of the identified strength or weakness for the research or quality of the evidence gathered.

Candidates generally recognised that their answers should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of their opinion is generally not sufficient in response to most questions. Whilst many candidates are using material from the sources to support their arguments, for example through summary or quotation, some would benefit from guidance on how to plan and organise an argument to support a claim or opinion. Scaffolding of lines of argument and essay structure would help in this process. Evidence and reasons should be clearly and explicitly used to justify the argument. Longer responses should be carefully planned and organised.

Some candidates are using their own experience and ideas encountered in their courses to supplement material drawn from the sources. It is valuable and encouraged but not essential as the examination primarily tests the ability to apply critical thinking and research skills to the analysis and evaluation of sources and perspectives. It is not necessary to have prior knowledge of the specific topic or issue in the Written Exam.

Most candidates showed interest in the topic and discussed the issues about food waste with enthusiasm. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in exploring the problems associated with food waste. However, candidates should describe and explain their opinions in detail, before reaching a balanced and supported judgements within the conclusion.

To improve performance further, candidates should be encouraged to:

- explain the strengths and weaknesses of research into a global issue
- justify and fully explain an action in response to a global issue

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) From Source 1, nearly all candidates correctly identified fruits and vegetables as the food type which has the highest percentage of waste. Candidates demonstrated an excellent ability to identify information from the source.
- (b)(i) From Source 2, nearly all candidates correctly identified an example of a generalisation. A generalisation is a broad statement about an issue or problem based on a small number of specific cases. It may not be true for all cases.
- (ii) Candidates were expected to explain why the example identified in **Question 1(b)(i)** from Source 2 is a generalisation. Most candidates understood the nature of a generalisation; however, some candidates did not explicitly relate their response to the identified example of a generalisation.
- (c) Most candidates successfully analysed the source and were able to describe three or four aspects of the environmental group's perspective on food waste. Candidates reaching the higher levels of response often used examples from the source to support their analysis.

Some candidates outlined their own views on the issue or attempted to evaluate the source. This is not necessary as candidates are only asked to describe the perspective.

- (d) Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying and justifying from Sources 1 and 2 which consequence of food waste was the most significant, in their opinion.

The most common reasons given by candidates related to the impact of food waste, including:

- the number of people affected by food waste
- the impact on food availability for different groups of people
- the range of foods – type and quality
- impact on the environment and global warming, for example of fertilisers and pollution
- impact on water as a resource
- the effects on economic development
- transportation issues related to food and waste
- the costs involved

The strongest responses explained three or four reasons. Some candidates compared the relative significance of different consequences, but this was not necessary to gain full marks and often led to answers which lost focus. Weaker responses simply described the issue or asserted several reasons without explanation.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to evaluate the research in Source 3 and identify several strengths and weaknesses of the methods and evidence.

The strengths of the argument most often identified were:

- a large sample of students may make the data more accurate and not biased

- use of a questionnaire and survey that are relevant to the research and will gather appropriate evidence
- the use of several methods provides more information and allows checking and verification
- the data gathered is measurable and can be analysed to answer the question factually/statistically in a systematic way
- a clear outcome that makes the results credible
- recording of food waste volumes by weight ensures information is accurate and not lost

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- the number of students that did not respond may make the data inaccurate
- a lack of clear purpose and a research question that guides the research and keeps it on track
- this may be an unrepresentative sample as just one school in one location may make the data unreliable and unrepresentative
- the presence of the researchers in the school, and as students, may influence the responses and cause bias due to vested interest
- the presence of non-food waste in bins may cause inaccuracy or loss of data
- the chef and school leadership may have a vested interest in the issue and bias responses

The strongest responses clearly explained several credible strengths and weaknesses of the research. Weaker responses often simply stated or asserted strengths or weaknesses rather than explaining the strengths and weaknesses systematically. Some weaker responses simply described aspects of the research within the source but did not explain why the identified feature of the research was a strength or weakness.

Candidates should be encouraged to explain the identified strengths and weaknesses of the research by referring to the impact on the quality of the evidence and data gathered and the potential of the research to answer the research question in the source.

Candidates should be advised that the question requires candidates to evaluate the *research* described in the source. Evaluation of the source, perspective and language is not necessary or credited for this question.

- (b) For this question, when designing a research strategy to test a claim, candidates should explain their choice of research methods and evidence. Simply listing a range of methods and sources of evidence is not sufficient to reach the higher levels of response.

Candidates that performed well in this question described in detail several methods and types of evidence that could be used to test the claim that, '*Many schools recycle food waste*'. The methods of testing the claim suggested were clearly explained and carefully related to this claim. Weaker responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence and did not make any link to the purpose of the research i.e. the claim being tested.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, observation, surveys, and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example with students, school management, and a range of different schools.

Other methods included consultation with experts, education authorities, local government, and action groups or charities who are likely to have relevant information and the ability to know. Interviews with people who have direct experience of the issue and can provide personal testimony and first-hand data were also suggested.

Nearly all candidates proposed secondary research using sources from the internet. Many described the types of source that were likely to be reliable and free from bias or vested interest, for example from governments, NGOs, and food organisations.

A few candidates responded to the question by describing their opinion about food waste rather than describing how schools and food waste could be researched. These responses gained very few, if any, marks.

Candidates should be given regular opportunity to design research strategies to test claims or answer research questions as a regular part of their courses.

Question 3

Most candidates carefully compared both Dara's and Mirna's statements in a structured way. They discussed issues relating to reasoning, evidence and use of language.

Responses at the highest levels contained well supported judgements about the arguments with a clear assessment of the quality or value of each statement; this included structured evaluation of how well the argument worked with a discussion of several aspects of the reasons and/or evidence and/or language. Use of language was often discussed in relation to the clarity of argument, the logic of the argument, and the tone. These responses were usually balanced with a clear conclusion about which person offered the more convincing argument.

Candidates are expected to cite material from the source to support their view of which argument is more convincing. Higher levels of response quoted the arguments explicitly and used material from the statements directly as evidence to support the candidate's view of which person had the most convincing argument. Responses that explained in detail just three or four strengths and/or weaknesses of each person in the source, explaining carefully how they affected credibility and how convincing their argument was, reached higher levels of response.

At the lower levels of response, the discussion was unlikely to be supported by material from the source and their opinions about each statement tended to be mainly asserted, sometimes with little clarity. These answers tended to focus on the issues associated with food waste in general rather than the reasons, evidence, or language in the statements. At the lower levels of response, candidates often limited their evaluative comment to one of the statements or failed to reach a clear conclusion about which argument was most convincing.

An example of a weaker or asserted evaluative point is:

'Dara's argument is supported by an example which is a strength, for example, 'In my opinion, governments need to raise public awareness. Restaurants and supermarkets should be accountable ...'

Whilst the evaluative point is appropriate and is supported by material quoted from the source, it is not explained or related to the question about which argument in the source is the most convincing. This response does not explain why examples are a strength and make the argument more convincing.

An example of a strong, explained evaluative point is:

Mirna's argument is supported by examples, for instance 'I think that many restaurants and supermarkets are donating food near their sell by dates to charities to reduce food waste and help people in need. More like this should be done to reduce food waste.' This is a strength because examples help the reader to understand the argument and make it clearer. The example is also evidence that supports the reason being given by Mirna that we should be concerned about food waste. Therefore, the use of examples in her argument makes it more convincing than Dara's argument.'

This evaluative point is developed, explains its strength, and why it increases confidence in the argument.

Some candidates found this question quite challenging. To prepare candidates, candidates should be given frequent opportunities to compare and evaluate sources on global issues from a variety of different perspectives. Candidates should be encouraged to assess the impact of strengths and weaknesses on the quality of the argument using critical thinking and research concepts like reliability, validity, accuracy, representativeness, generalisation, bias, vested interest, expertise and ability to know.

Question 4

This question required candidates to recommend an action to a government to reduce food waste in their country. Candidates were expected to justify their recommendation using reasons and material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and ideas.

There were many thoughtful discussions of the proposed actions. Some candidates chose to compare all actions, some to justify just one of the actions. Both approaches to answering the question were effective ways to structure the argument in the candidate's response.

Most candidates recommended either providing education on how to reduce and reuse leftovers, or taxing restaurants and supermarkets for wasting food.

Candidates tended to discuss the following factors or reasons in making a recommendation:

- the scale of impact on food waste
- different outcomes or consequences of the action for different groups, for example differences between rich and poor people
- cost and resources needed to implement the action
- the length of time needed to make a difference
- economic and political considerations
- conflicts of interest and power
- planning and coordination difficulties
- barriers to change, for example the attitudes of businesses with vested interests in food
- opportunity costs

Responses at the highest level of response tended to have well supported, logical reasoning and make clear judgements about the actions, providing a reasoned assessment of the proposed actions. These responses explicitly used material drawn from the sources in the insert, often supported by examples and material drawn from their own experience and learning. A clear, balanced conclusion was also reached.

Responses at the lower level tended to be generalised, lack relevance to the purpose of the actions, and simply described their own opinion about food waste generally. These responses tended to be unsupported and asserted. Some responses simply listed the benefits of reducing food waste rather than explaining why one action was likely to be more effective. Also, some candidates tended to describe how the actions could be implemented rather than explain why one of the actions was most likely to be successful. Candidates should be encouraged to plan their responses carefully and focus upon the impact of the recommended action.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/02 Individual Report
--

Key messages

- Candidates should formulate a question that focusses on **one single global issue**.
- The candidate's response must present **different perspectives** on their chosen issue.
- Candidates should analyse the **causes and consequences** of their chosen issue.
- Candidates should present **two courses of action** and **select one**.
- Candidates should **evaluate evidence** and individual **sources** they use.
- Candidates should clearly **cite** all their sources.
- Candidates should **answer** their research question.

General guidance

Successful work for this component is well-structured and logical. It provides a clear introduction to the chosen global issue. The introduction explains why it is an issue and provides evidence that it is a global issue. Successful candidates explicitly present several different well-supported perspectives, including **at least one global and one national perspective** on the issue identified in their question. They show clear evidence of research, with accurate citation of all sources used.

The strongest candidates analyse and explain the causes and consequences of the issue identified in their question. Successful candidates provide full details of two courses of action, including details of how the course of action would be implemented and evaluating the practicality and the possible impact on the issue. They select one preferred course of action and explain their choice.

Strong candidates remain focused throughout on the central issue. They clearly and explicitly conclude by answering their question. They reflect on their own perspective and how this has been impacted by their findings, their learning and by others' perspectives.

Comments on specific assessment criteria

Assessment Objective 1: Research, Analysis and Evaluation

The strongest work responds to a **clear question** about a **single global issue**. This enables candidates to present clear global perspectives, national perspectives, and their own perspective on this issue. Simple, direct, issue-based questions allow candidates to be clear about their topic and issue, to focus on that throughout and to identify different views.

Successful questions this session included:

- Should products made with child labour be banned from being sold?
- Can governments effectively reduce gender inequality in education for young women in developing countries?
- Should genetically modified organisms (GOMs) be abolished in agriculture?
- Are electric vehicles more environmentally friendly than combustion vehicles?
- Should governments be responsible for mitigating climate change?
- Should pharmaceutical companies be required to reduce prices for life-saving medicines?
- Should juvenile offenders be tried as adults?

Some candidates wrote extremely long complicated questions and were unable to control the argument or answer their question clearly and succinctly. Many candidates did not identify an issue in their question or explain an issue in their introduction. They asked general topic questions and then wrote informative essays on that subject, rather than a Global Perspectives Individual Report. Some appeared to be descriptive essays for a different subject.

Some candidates presented a research question related to a single country and, as a result, did not provide a global issue at any point during their essay. This meant that their achievement was limited across several criteria as the component is designed for consideration of a global issue.

There were several reports without any research question and some with no title or topic. This has a clear impact on their success, as the mark scheme is based on the premise that the candidate has researched an issue and is answering a research question by exploring different perspectives and coming up with their own response as a result of all the research done.

Analysis of a global issue:

The strongest work analyses a global issue, establishing the global nature of the issue and presenting relevant supporting information and explanation.

Successful candidates introduce their report by identifying the issue under consideration, explaining how or why it is an issue and providing evidence that it is indeed a global issue. This provides them with a clear introduction to their report and sets the stage for the rest of their essay. For the purposes of this component, an issue can be anything that causes a problem, disagreement, an ethical dilemma, conflict, damage or suffering.

An example of a simple but effective introduction which outlines the issue and provides evidence that it is global:

Around the world there is a lot of discussion about juvenile delinquency. A WHO report states that 193,000 homicides among people aged 15 and older take place each year, making up 40 per cent of all homicides worldwide. (World Health Organisation, 2024). As a result, addressing juvenile crime under the age of 18 has become a global concern. In practically every nation, juvenile delinquency is an issue. A person's life may be impacted by the serious physical and psychological effects of juvenile delinquency. Thus, I would like to know if juvenile offenders should face adult trials. Due to the age, some juvenile offenders receive a light punishment while others are housed in adult prisons, which can negatively affect their physical and mental health.

Analysis of causes and consequences:

Most candidates explained the consequences of their chosen issue.

Where candidates had not identified a global issue, or where they wrote descriptive essays, they found it difficult to identify or explain any causes or consequences. Weaker work showed a lack of research into the causes or reasons for their issue. This work tended to start with the issue and only consider its impacts or consequences. In some cases these were separately sub-headed as causes and consequences, but both sections presented only consequences.

Analysis of different perspectives:

The strongest work shows a clear understanding of perspectives.

A perspective is a view, opinion, or attitude: it is based on what people think or feel about the issue. It is not enough to present general information, facts and figures on a topic from different parts of the world.

A global perspective is a supported view about a global issue raised in the question. It should be clear whose perspective this is – a quote from the relevant person or organisation should be attributed to them, or the candidate should draw together supporting information and attitudes to tell us explicitly who, or which group of people has this perspective. In all cases, information should be presented to explain the perspective and support it.

Successful work included paraphrased and/or direct quotes showing a clear global perspective. **A global perspective** should be clearly identified as such and include an opinion or attitude:

The UN acknowledges gender inequality in education as a global issue and addresses it through their Sustainable Development Goal for which aims to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education.¹⁸ Their targets for 2030 focus on worldwide access to quality education, removing gender disparities and expanding access to education for girls in low income countries.¹⁹ Furthermore, through the coordination of IIEP-UNESCO and UNGEI, The Gender at the centre initiative operates globally in 11 developing countries, working to incorporate gender equality into education policies and practises in these countries²⁰ it challenges existing gender norms and helps to foster equal opportunities for young women, reflecting global efforts to reduce gender inequality in education.²¹ Finally, the Malala Fund, a global NGO, makes investments in advocates and activists for education who oppose the policies and customs which prevent young women from attending school in their communities²². These efforts emphasise the global dedication to eliminating gender disparities in education for women and the changing beliefs around girls' education.

Similarly, a **national perspective** is a national viewpoint on the issue presented, or an opinion/feeling about/attitude to the national situation. Again, it should be clear whose perspective is being presented, either by paraphrasing or quoting the person/s or organisation/s with clear attribution. There should be evidence of the perspective and supporting information to explain it:

In New Zealand, the government's position on the issue at hand is currently supporting pro-choice views. Laws in New Zealand view abortion to be a health issue. One regulated by the Contraception, Sterilisation and Abortion Act 1977 as a health service.³ However, there are minor organisations that go against such views in NZ, one such being Voice for Life, NZ's oldest and largest pro-life organisation with their 'Unborn Remembrance Day' and 'National March for Life'. Annual campaigns, youth camps and various voluntary service opportunities, (e.g. events coordinator, youth worker and blog writer.) Voice for Life peacefully advocates for the banning of abortion in New Zealand. This organisation works towards this course for various reasons which ultimately fall under the idea that abortion is not a healthcare service. Abortion is an intentional, intentional act of killing another human being. They believe that there are many loopholes in the current abortion laws. It offers no protection against discriminatory abortions, (gender, disability, etc.). And coercion abortions. Nor does it offer any protection to medical practitioners if they were to consciously object an abortion. In addition, a compelling argument Voice for Life has made is that it's been scientifically proven that babies after 20 weeks gestation can feel pain, yet an abortion deemed clinically appropriate is still legalised for a baby passed this.⁵ They advocate for a baby. Right to life and how abortion is just ending a life that is just beginning⁴.

Some work included a section labelled Global perspective in which views from different countries were presented. However, no global view was presented, and the different national views were not drawn together to form a global view. This work can only be credited as National perspectives.

Some **weaker work did not present different perspectives** on the issue but instead presented information about different places. This was sometimes labelled as Global or National Perspective though there were no perspectives presented. In these cases, candidates provided relevant information or statistics without telling us what anyone thought or felt about the issue.

Analysis and evaluation of Courses of Action:

Candidates must research and provide full details of two courses of action, including details of how the course of action would be implemented and **evaluating** the practicality and the possible impact on the issue.

Note: candidates are required to select a preferred option from the two courses of action they have presented and justify their choice.

The strongest work presented two developed and focused courses of action. The candidate explained each course of action: its implementation (e.g. who would do it, details of how it would be done) and gave a clear explanation of the likely impact of the two courses of action, evaluating both their practicality and their impact. The candidate then selected one of the two courses of action and justified their choice:

I believe the most effective solution for climate change is switching to renewable energy sources. This will have the most direct impact on emissions due to how prevalent the power sector is for emissions. This has been seen to work already in smaller countries and larger countries,¹⁷ Importantly, this is also at a national level, not an individual level.¹⁹ This makes it significantly easier to enforce in some larger countries. For example one in seven US adults do not think that global warming is real¹⁸ and therefore would not care about avoiding it in everyday life. This makes switching to renewable energy a very practical and effective solution to climate change.

Weaker work described solutions but did not select one and explain why that was most effective or most appropriate. Some candidates either explained how a course of action might be implemented **or** what its impact might be – but not both.

Evaluation of sources and evidence:

Note: candidates are required to evaluate their sources and evidence used.

The **strongest work** showed clear evaluation of sources **and** evidence used. Candidates evaluated the sources using different criteria and with an explanation of the impact of the quality of sources on the candidate's thinking, or work.

One of the key sources that I used in my research was the International Commission Against the Death Penalty, (ICDP). This is a credible organisation that consists of experts in human rights law and international politics, such as former judges and political leaders. I used their article 'The Death Penalty, a Violation of Human Rights', which argues the risks and injustices that capital punishment causes. However, I DP has a clear stance against the death penalty, which affects the balance of perspectives in their articles. Their sources are reputable, but sometimes they lack the direct citation of statistics. One of their papers stated that reportedly more than 1500 people were hanged between 1820 and 1900, which can affect the credibility.

Another source I used was the National Association of Criminal Defence Lawyers. Since they work directly with the justice system, their information seems more accurate due to real life experiences. One example they provided was the case of Curtis Adams, who spent 15 years on death row in Louisiana before being exonerated, which I used to show how innocent people are at risk of execution. They focus a lot on how the death penalty affects African Americans unfairly and how some people on death row might actually be innocent. I found this helpful when explaining how the justice system can be biased. Like ICDP though, they are clearly against the death penalty, so they focused more on its problems than its possible benefits, causing an imbalance in perspectives.

Finally, I used the Death Penalty Information centre DPIC. This source was one of the most balanced, giving both data and case studies from the US and international perspectives. I used their 2023 study on racial disparities in death penalty sentencing in the United States to show how race and geography influence who gets sentenced to death. While DPIC advocates for abolition, their information is based on extensive research and case studies, making them a credible and reliable source since they provided multiple perspectives, including statistical data on who is executed and why. It allowed me to write a more in depth and layered analysis of the issue.

The evaluations made should be explained. Candidates should consider why their evaluation is relevant and explain how they came to their assessment of their source and what the impact is on the evidence, perspective or the candidate's view.

Some candidates provide a generalised evaluation of their research, without any evaluation of individual sources. There is no credit for this. In these cases candidates' comments are sometimes relevant but they are descriptive rather than evaluative; general and unexplained; and not specific to one source. It is not clear, for example, which sources were biased and which unbiased, how the candidate knows this and why it might matter.

Assessment Objective 2: Reflection:

Note: candidates are required to answer their own question explicitly.

The strongest work included a clear conclusion giving an explicit answer to their question based on research findings and other perspective. It included reflection on the candidate's own perspective, on their research findings and on the perspectives they had explored. The candidate clearly explained how their own perspective had developed, been changed, or impacted by others' perspectives and by the information they had gained about the issue. Some strong candidates reflected throughout and then drew their reflections together at the end coming to a logical and supported conclusion, giving a well-supported answer to their question.

Research Question: Should governments be responsible for mitigating climate change?

Conclusion. *I believe governments should be responsible for mitigating climate change. Governments are the only entities that can utilise the solution of switching to alternative energy sources, an effective solution to global warming. The government is the only body that can take the blame for and handle the consequences of global warming. Finally, two of the key causes of global warming are the lack of action from governments and the rising population, both of which are managed by government bodies. Therefore, if the world wants to mitigate global warming, the government is the only body which can achieve this goal.*

Personal reflection. *Prior to my research, I believed that businesses should be responsible for mitigating climate change and not governments. Researching this issue has provided me new insight into this dilemma. I now understand that although businesses, primarily those that are prevalent in the power industry⁷ or those who have delayed attempts to reduce climate change emissions due to decision making², are responsible for some emissions. Government should be held responsible as they are the only body that can effectively regulate this, as usually a country's government is the largest single body and can therefore be held liable for any damages that may occur³. In the future, I will now be able to more effectively judge changes to government policy, especially if it relates to emissions. Such as problems with New Zealand's policy being ineffective⁴.*

Weaker work simply provided a general conclusion, with no personal reflection on findings, perspectives, or the issue.

Assessment Objective 3: Communication

Structure and Clarity:

Candidates are required to write their report in essay form. Their argument should be planned and logical and follow a clear structure to answer their question. They should include all required criteria. They can write between 1500 and 2000 words, and they are advised to use the full word count.

Candidates should be aware of all the required criteria and the weight of marks carried by each skill. Where a skill carries 10 marks, for example, they should expect to write much more than for a skill carrying only 5 marks.

The strongest work was easy to follow and provided a clear structured argument with an introduction establishing the global issue, addressing all the required criteria and ending with a reflective conclusion answering the question. It used the full available word count. This work started with different perspectives on the issue and kept focus throughout. The candidate kept control of their argument and did not lose contact with their question, the central issue, or their research findings.

Weaker work lacked focus. It sometimes included information that was not relevant to the question. The weakest work appeared to have copied and pasted sections from different sources, with no apparent connection between the different paragraphs or with the question or issue.

Citation and referencing:

All candidates should understand the need for **complete in-text attribution**. They should be aware that if they present material as their own when they have found it in other sources, this is plagiarism. Where they quote directly from sources, this should be in the form of short quotes, clearly attributed, and most of the material in their work should be their own. There is no one fixed method of citation or referencing for this component. **Any clear and consistent method is acceptable.**

In-text citation: Candidates may use bracketed citations, numbering, or in-text referencing, to indicate where they have used sources. They must include complete references in their work, either footnotes, endnotes, or in-text references.

References: References for books or journals should include author, date, and title of publication. References for online materials should include **at least** the full URL (leading to the document, not just to a website) and **date of access (retrieval date)**.

The full reference list/footnotes/endnotes should be clearly linked to the in-text attribution. Candidates should use one clear, consistent, and logical method (one set of numbers, or alphabetical order). References should be clearly organised and easy to find.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/03 Team Project

Key messages

- A Team must submit **ONE** Explanation of Research and Planning, and **ONE** Evidence of Action that shows that the Action took place. A team should carry out **ONE** Action.
- Each team member must **individually** produce a Reflective Paper.
- The Explanation of Research and Planning should be a planning document showing details of the preparation and planning of the project, as well as changes that had to be made to Team Project.
- The issue being researched will be identified in the Explanation of Research and Planning.
- Individual Research findings must be reported in the Reflective Paper.
- Reflections on learning from Team members are not the same as reports of own research findings.
- All members of a team must be awarded the same mark for the team collaboration, but the mark for how that candidate worked in the team can be different for each team member.
- Many candidates benefit from being offered a template with heading or questions on to guide their report.

General comments

Explanations of Research and Planning:

The most successful Explanations of Research and Planning were in table form.

Evidence of Action:

One piece of evidence that the Action took place is all that is needed– e.g. a leaflet, poster, presentation, photograph of the action taking place.

Reflective Papers:

The most successful Reflective Papers were well organised according to the criteria found in the mark scheme. The most successful evaluations consistently used evidence/examples from the team project to explain their reflections and evaluations of the different criteria.

Candidates should keep an ongoing log of their independent working and their work as a part of the team. They will need these details to evidence their evaluations and reflections. Candidates should note both what was a strength/benefit and what was a challenge/weakness, what each team member did/said to make things work well or to make difficulties, and what impact this had on the project.

Comments on specific elements

The examples below illustrate what effective planning

Team Element:

AO1 Explanation of Research and Planning and The Action

A Team Project's Explanation of Research and Planning. This is worth 10 marks:

Explanation of Research and Planning: Food waste

Our team chose the topic Water, Food, and Agriculture, focusing specifically on the local issue of food waste in our school cafeteria. We identified that large amounts of edible food were being discarded daily, which contributes to environmental harm, economic losses, and reflects a lack of awareness among candidates.

Each team member contributed through focused research:

- *B explored the environmental impact of food waste, highlighting the greenhouse gases and wasted resources linked to discarded meals.*
- *R analysed the economic consequences, showing how uneaten food costs both our school and the global economy.*
- *I researched social attitudes and candidate behaviour, identifying the reasons behind waste, such as portion sizes and lack of appreciation for food.*
- *V examined awareness strategies and created a poster to highlight the issue.*

Together, these different perspectives informed the design of our campaign by ensuring we addressed environmental, economic, and social dimensions of the problem.

Our action is a campaign titled 'Think Before You Toss', aimed at raising awareness and reducing waste. This includes posters with facts and tips, short presentations in assemblies, daily audits of food waste (measuring and photographing it), and a suggestion box to collect feedback about meals.

Each member had a clear role: B designed a survey and measured whether candidates felt more aware after the campaign. V produced posters, slides, and coordinated with school staff. R interviewed candidates. I also worked on posters, slides, and communication with staff.

Evidence of the project will include photos of food waste before and after the campaign, copies of posters and presentations. Effectiveness will be measured by comparing food waste weights.

Note: They stated a topic they want to focus on, and the local issue they wish to improve.

What aspect of the issue each member will research: perspectives on it– ideas that can help them organise their project. The Explanation of Research and Planning should say something they have found from research that explains the value of their Action. Here we see that the team identified their Actions because of the perspectives they researched.

After discussing research findings, the team makes a decision about Actions that can help with the local issue. The Team should have selected just one Action.

Too many Actions are identified for the Explanation to have detailed planning of an Action. It does include individual roles and responsibilities.

How they plan to gather evidence about how successful they have been.

AO3 Collaboration

Table C: Teachers must award a mark for how well the team have worked together to complete the project. All members of the team must be given the same mark and teachers should consider how well team members have worked together over the course of the project, including how well they have communicated with each other, solved problems, resolved conflict and divided work fairly between the team. This mark should be informed by teacher observation of teamwork and questioning of team members individually and collectively.

Table D: Teachers must award a mark for how well the individual worked in the team to complete the project. The same method and criteria should be applied.

Personal Element:

Table E1: AO1 Evaluating the Action:

Example, giving two developed points: Evaluation of Project Outcome in Achieving Project Aim

We were successful in achieving our aim. Our initial surveys showed 71.74 per cent cared little about homelessness, after our presentation results decreased to 60 per cent.

Another success was finding perspectives— we were told it provided evidence. Thames Reach, a London charity that supports people struggling with homelessness, provide services for individuals to find stable housing and support. Showing the work of this charity helped because it strengthened our argument to address the issue and brought the issue to life.

Our outcome was successful because we presented, we used images to grab the audience's attention, making it memorable and effective and facts. We shared this presentation with a range of people with our first survey sent to multiple people, we feedback and opinions which improved our presentation.

Our outcome had limitations. We failed to make a video because of the lack of planning/communication, this could've raised more awareness. Due to lack of planning, we failed to start this video.

Note: In this example we see two developed points about how far the Action helped the Team to achieve its aim, each earning 4 marks.

The evidence that they have can be from a variety of sources. Here it is about feedback from an audience, or what was observed through surveys.

If the team is raising awareness about an issue candidates can have a set of questions to ask their audience before the action and the same set asked after the action. These can then be compared to show which parts of their aim had been met and which had not. Candidates can then ask how their Action could be improved to minimise these weaknesses. Candidates can ask verbal questions to their audience about what has been learned about the issue, and what could have been improved. They can compile the team's findings and show which parts of their Action were successful in meeting their aim, and/or where it had missed its mark.

There must be a clear link between the Evaluation of the Action and the topic/the Action.

Table E3: AO1 Evaluating own performance:

Example, giving two developed points, earning a maximum 4 marks:

My research was good; I managed to gather data and statistics about the environmental impact of food waste from several places, and these were used in our presentation. However, I took too long to write the Google Forms and send them, which had a very adverse effect on the project, and the action was delayed.

AO2 Reflection

Table G1: Reflecting on Teamwork:

The question candidates must ask is: How effectively did our team work to produce our Action or meet our aim? They must then use evidence to explain both the benefits and challenges of teamwork (more than one of each), reflecting on the impact of the benefits and challenges of teamwork on the Action. Evidence could come from the log they have kept on what went well and what proved to be a challenge, or it could come from team discussions, reflecting on how decisions were made, how much in line with each other they were, how effectively they planned. In the latter case, their interpretation and writing must be their own, as this is an individual piece of work.

Only work in the Reflective Paper can earn individual marks.

Example, reflection on teamwork (G1) and Reflection on Improvements to Teamwork (G2)

Working on this project brought many benefits and challenges. Dividing responsibilities allowed us to focus on our strengths, helping us work more efficiently and produce a detailed website. We had a team member who has done this before. When some workload was delayed by one member, others stepped in to help. However, this uneven workload caused stress, as some members had to take on extra tasks. Miscommunication, like unclear research summaries, also made integration difficult, slowing down the process of combining everyone's work and taking extra time to understand content and decide where to place it in our website.

To improve future teamwork, I would make clearer internal deadlines and schedule regular check-ins to ensure we all understood each other's information. One suggestion is making a shared Google Sheet, where we could all edit and track our progress, quickly seeing what has or not been completed. Another is interacting more frequently with teammates about individual work, so we could offer support and make our action even more impactful.

Note: The details in the section on challenges of teamwork are quite explicit, but only one of each is detailed. This is just about enough to earn 4 marks (out of 5).

AO2 Reflection on Learning

Table F1: Learning from research

For Example:

Through my own research and my team's work, I gained a deeper understanding of the barriers disadvantaged youth face in accessing sports. Initially, I thought the main issues were lack of facilities and funding. However, interviews and different perspectives revealed the problem is more complex, involving cultural attitudes and psychological barriers. This project also broadened my idea of 'social inclusion', showing that sports can also act as a deterrent to crime and provide mental health support. For example, reading about Luta Pela Paz (EMpower, n.d.) highlighted how sports strengthen community identity and offer essential support beyond physical benefits. Additionally, an interview with NGO representatives showed that their coaching goes just beyond sports. Fabiano de Paula explained that participants often receive scholarships, opening doors to college and employment. Many of his candidates are the first in their families to attend university, which I found especially moving.

Note: The Reflection on Learning in this instance is from learning throughout the project. Reflection on Learning could also be reporting what other team members have found from their research, especially when they are planning Actions, or it could be Reflections on how my research has impacted me personally. Any are acceptable, if they meet the criteria.

AO3 Communication

Table H1: Clarity of communication

This assessment objective requires reflective reports to flow meaningfully with signposting and linking to make clear the aspects of the criteria being evaluated or reflected upon, their benefits/strengths and challenges/weaknesses/limitations. For instance, it should not be difficult to follow which paragraphs are evaluating the Action and which are reflecting on the candidate's role in the project. It is important that own research findings are clearly separate from learning about the issue/perspectives on it from the research of others. All criteria must be addressed for 5 marks to be considered.

Table H2: Research findings

It is expected that each member of the team will have been involved in some personal research towards to the work overall. These personal research findings need to be clearly summarised in the Reflective Paper.

Note: Teams must consist of **two to five** members. Where there is only one learner studying Global Perspectives, centres should form a team by including learners from other classes or year groups **within the centre**.