

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.
- Analyse a source to understand and describe the perspective of a group towards a global issue.
- Explain a judgement about a cause or consequence of a global issue.

General comments

The Written Exam consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In June 2025, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Conflict and Peace. Peaceful, non-violent protest about global concerns was the issue explored.

It is apparent that many candidates are developing an excellent understanding of the causes and consequences of global issues. They can explain their own perspectives on global issues and compare these with the viewpoints of other people. Many candidates are also demonstrating empathy towards the perspectives of others. 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 analysis and 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 or list several strengths and weaknesses of research. However, many candidates did not explain the significance of the identified strength or weakness for the quality of the research and evidence gathered.

When designing a research strategy to test a claim, candidates should explain their choice of research methods and evidence, explicitly relating their approach to the claim to be tested. Candidates should explain how the research method will gather evidence that will enable them to test the claim or answer the research question. Linking the method and source of evidence to the issue in the claim is necessary to reach the higher levels of response. Simply listing a range of methods and sources of evidence is not sufficient.

Candidates were usually able to identify potential strengths and weaknesses of sources and argument. However, these evaluative points were often simply described or listed rather than explained. When evaluating a source, candidates should fully explain the significance or impact of the identified strength or weakness on the quality of the argument. This involves describing the impact of strengths and weaknesses on the quality of the argument using critical thinking concepts like reliability, validity, accuracy, representativeness, generalisation, bias, tone, expertise and ability to know.

Candidates generally recognised that opinions should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of 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. This is helpful, but not essential, to reach the highest levels of response. It is valuable and encouraged but not essential as the examination primarily tests the ability to apply critical thinking and research skills and concepts in the analysis and evaluation of sources and perspectives. It is not necessary to have studied the specific topic or issue in the Written Exam.

Most candidates showed real interest in the topic and discussed the issues with enthusiasm. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to encourage action on global warming. 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.
- Explain the reasons for the selection of research methods and evidence to test a claim.
- Explain the strengths and weaknesses of an argument within a source.
- Justify and explain how an action will help to achieve its aim in response to the global issue.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified from Source 1 a method of non-violent, peaceful protest, and therefore gained the maximum of one mark. Candidates demonstrated an excellent ability to identify and select information from the source.

(b) (i) Due to an omission in syllabus content, full marks have been awarded to all candidates for **Question 1b(i)**, to make sure that no candidates were disadvantaged.

(ii) Due to an omission in syllabus content, full marks have been awarded to all candidates for **Question 1b(ii)**, to make sure that no candidates were disadvantaged.

Please refer to syllabus version 2 on the Schools Support Hub. The update on Page 14 clarifies which skills may be assessed in Question 1. In this examination, Questions 1b(i) and 1b(ii) tested prediction and why the example was a prediction within the context of the source. These are valid questions and can be used when preparing candidates for examination.

(c) Most candidates successfully analysed the source and were able to describe three or four aspects of the perspective of the action group working towards social justice. Candidates reaching the higher levels of response often used examples from the source to support their analysis. Some of the most effective responses used several of the following aspects of a perspective towards a global issue in the analysis of the source – issue, cause, consequence, values, aims and action.

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 main elements of the perspective.

(d) Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying and justifying from Sources 1 and 2 which global issue was the most significant, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss global warming and climate change, war and armed conflict, and unemployment and economic development.

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

- The number of people affected.
- The amount of impact.
- How long the benefit might affect individuals, the community, country and world.

- The impact on quality of life for different groups.
- The effects on life, biodiversity and the environment.
- The effects on economic development.
- The effects on health, safety and security.

The strongest responses briefly explained three or four reasons why the chosen issue was the most significant. Some candidates compared the relative significance of different issues but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

Weaker responses simply stated the issue and asserted several reasons without explanation. Candidates should be advised that the question requires candidates to *explain* briefly the reasons for thinking that the chosen issue is the most significant. Some candidates discussed several global issues; however, this is not necessary as only one issue was demanded by the question.

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, focused research question that guides the research and keeps it on track.
- a questionnaire/survey method 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.
- potentially a large sample that will give more representative data that is accurate.
- the use of random sampling reduces bias.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- a small sample in practice due to low response rate may make data less accurate and biased.
- this may be an unrepresentative sample as just one protest march in one city and one country therefore data may not be valid/reliable.
- a protest march environment may cause distraction/bias that makes results inaccurate.
- the researcher may be in danger and not safe – breaches ethical guidelines.
- some leading questions that may make responses skewed/biased.
- inadequate citation/referencing of the research that makes checking/verification difficult.

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 achieve the aim of the research and answer the research question.

(b) 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, '*Marches are often reported on national news channels*'. The methods of testing the claim suggested were clearly explained and carefully related to this claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, observation, surveys, and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example with protesters, the police, local authorities and news media personnel. Surveys of local people about protest marches and the media were also suggested.

Other methods included consultation with experts, local government, and internet-related media organisations and action groups or charities who are likely to have relevant information and ability

to know. Interviews with protesters and media personnel 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 sources 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.

The strongest responses provided reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestions, clearly and explicitly related to the claim being tested; weaker responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence but did not explain them fully or make any link to the purpose of the research i.e. the claim being tested about marches and news media reporting.

A few candidates responded to the question by describing their opinion about marches and news media 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 Aput's and Panuk's statements in a structured way. They discussed issues relating to reasoning, evidence and use of language. Most candidates suggested that Aput's statement was more convincing than Panuk's statement.

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. 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 with little clarity. These answers tended to focus on protest issues 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. These responses tended to assert evaluative points rather than explain and use evidence from the statements to support their views. Some weaker responses lacked structure and had little clarity of 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.

An example of a weaker or asserted evaluative point is:

'Panuk's argument is supported by lots of examples which is a strength, for example, 'Volunteer to work with groups ... buy products that reflect your values ... eat more vegetarian and organic food.'

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:

Aput's argument is supported by lots of examples which is a strength, for instance 'History shows us the value of peaceful protest ... Martin Luther King, Mahatma Ghandi and Greta Thunberg.' 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 Aput that change needs a mass movement and protest. Therefore, the use of examples in Aput's argument makes it more convincing than Panuk'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 for this type of question, candidates should be given frequent opportunities to compare and evaluate sources on global issues from a variety of different perspectives. This should involve a consideration of the reasons, evidence and language used to support an argument or perspective in sources of different length, complexity and quality. 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 an environmental action group to encourage action on global warming. 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 organising a peaceful protest march or promoting the issue on social media. Few candidates recommended writing to the government.

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

- The scale of impact on awareness about global warming and how to take action.
- Different outcomes or consequences of the action for different groups, for example differences between young people and the elderly in the use of social media.
- 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 protest movements.

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 attitudes and action towards global warming. 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. These responses frequently referred to the effectiveness or impact of the action on the action group's aim of encouraging action. 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. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to reduce global warming rather than explaining why one action was likely to be more effective, have greater impact and other positive consequences, and should therefore be recommended.

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 and have an impact on the issue, and therefore should be recommended, or not. Others did not focus on the action but described their views about global warming, or protest in general. These responses did not enter the higher levels of response.

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.
- Analyse a source to understand and describe the perspective of a group towards a global issue.
- Explain a judgement about a cause or consequence of a global issue.

General comments

The Written Exam consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In June 2025, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Education for All. Gender inequality in schools was the issue explored.

It is apparent that through stimulating and engaging courses, many candidates are developing an excellent understanding of the causes and consequences of global issues. They can explain their own perspectives on global issues and compare these with the viewpoints of other people. Many candidates are also demonstrating empathy towards the perspectives of others. 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 analysis and 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 or list several strengths and weaknesses of research. However, many candidates did not explain the significance of the identified strength or weakness for the quality of the research and evidence gathered.

When designing a research strategy to test a claim, candidates should explain their choice of research methods and evidence, explicitly relating their approach to the claim to be tested. Candidates should explain how the research method will gather evidence that will enable them to test the claim or answer the research question. Linking the method and source of evidence to the issue in the claim is necessary to reach the higher levels of response. Simply listing a range of methods and sources of evidence is not sufficient.

Candidates were usually able to identify potential strengths and weaknesses of sources and argument. However, these evaluative points were often simply described or listed rather than explained. When evaluating a source, candidates should fully explain the significance or impact of the identified strength or weakness on the quality of the argument. This involves describing the impact of strengths and weaknesses on the quality of the argument using critical thinking concepts like reliability, validity, accuracy, representativeness, generalisation, bias, tone, expertise and ability to know.

Candidates generally recognised that opinions should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of 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. Careful 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 material encountered in their courses to supplement material drawn from the sources. This is helpful, but not essential, to reach the highest levels of response. It is valuable and encouraged but not essential as the examination primarily tests the ability to use critical thinking and research skills in the analysis and evaluation of sources and perspectives. It is not necessary to have studied the specific topic or issue in the Written Exam.

Most candidates showed real interest in the topic and discussed the issues with enthusiasm. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to improve the education of girls. 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.
- Explain the reasons for the selection of research methods and evidence to test a claim.
- Explain the strengths and weaknesses of an argument within a source.
- Justify and explain how an action will help to achieve its aim in response to the global issue.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified from Source 1 that 129 million girls around the world were not going to school and therefore gained the maximum of one mark. Candidates demonstrated an excellent ability to identify and select information from the source.

(b) (i) Due to an omission in syllabus content, full marks have been awarded to all candidates for **Question 1b(i)**, to make sure that no candidates were disadvantaged.

(ii) Due to an omission in syllabus content, full marks have been awarded to all candidates for **Question 1b(ii)**, to make sure that no candidates were disadvantaged.

Please refer to syllabus version 2 on the Schools Support Hub. The update on Page 14 clarifies which skills may be assessed in Question 1. In this examination, Questions 1b(i) and 1b(ii) tested claim and why the example was a claim within the context of the source. These are valid questions and can be used when preparing candidates for examination.

(c) Most candidates successfully analysed the source and were able to describe three or four aspects of the perspective of the charity, Education Unlimited, on educational inequality. Candidates reaching the higher levels of response often used examples from the source to support their analysis. Some of the most effective responses used several of the following aspects of a perspective towards a global issue in the analysis of the source – issue, cause, consequence, values, aims and action.

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 main elements of the perspective.

(d) Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying and justifying from Sources 1 and 2 which benefit of educating girls was the most significant, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss improves wages and jobs for women, helps economic development and reduces rates of child marriage and pregnancy.

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

- The number of people affected.
- The amount of impact.
- How long the benefit might affect individuals, the community, country and world.

- The impact on quality of life for women.
- The empowerment of women.
- The effect on health and well-being.
- The effect on economic development and work.

The strongest responses briefly explained three or four reasons why the chosen benefit was the most significant. Some candidates compared the importance of different benefits but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

Weaker responses simply stated the benefit and asserted several reasons without explanation. Candidates should be advised that the question requires candidates to *explain* briefly the reasons for thinking that the chosen benefit is the most significant. Some candidates discussed several benefits of educating girls; however, this is not necessary as only one benefit was demanded by the question.

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:

- Reference to background research from a well-known/reliable/trustworthy organisation (UNICEF) informed the research purpose and question.
- A clear, focused research question that guides the research.
- Observation method is relevant to the research question and will gather appropriate evidence related to teacher interaction with girls and boys.
- Data gathered is measurable and can be analysed to answer the question factually/statistically in a systematic way.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- A small sample size that may not be representative or produce enough data to generalise.
- An unrepresentative sample – only three teachers in one school from two subjects so results may not reflect other subjects, schools, or countries.
- Observation based on school subjects that are often linked to males therefore may be biased or untypical.
- The presence in the classroom of a researcher may change the behaviour of teachers and candidates, leading to inaccurate results.
- The potential for bias or selective perception due to the gender of the researcher.

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 achieve the aim of the research and answer the research question.

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) 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, '*schools often discriminate against girls*.' The methods of testing the claim suggested were clearly explained and carefully related to this claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, observation, surveys, and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example with candidates, teachers, parents and senior staff in schools. Surveys of local people about gender inequality in schools were also suggested.

Other methods included consultation with experts, local government, and internet-related educational organisations and charities who are likely to have relevant information and ability to know. Interviews with candidates and teachers who have direct experience of the issue and can provide personal testimony and first-hand data were also suggested.

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

The strongest responses provided reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestions, clearly and explicitly related to the claim being tested; weaker responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence but did not explain them fully or make any link to the purpose of the research i.e. the claim being tested about discrimination against girls in schools.

A few candidates responded to the question by describing their opinion about gender inequality in schools 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 Fleur's and Dion's statements in a structured way. They discussed issues relating to reasoning, evidence and use of language. Most candidates suggested that Dion's statement was more convincing than Fleur's statement.

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. 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 with little clarity. These answers tended to focus on gender inequality issues 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. These responses tended to assert evaluative points rather than explain and use evidence from the arguments to support their views. Some weaker responses lacked structure and had little clarity of 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.

An example of a weaker or asserted evaluative point is:

'Fleur's argument is supported by lots of examples which is a strength, for example, 'We must create classroom resources designed for girls.'

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:

Fleur's argument is supported by lots of examples which is a strength, for instance 'The curriculum should not be divided into different subjects for girls and boys.' 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 Fleur that schools need to change. Therefore, the use of examples in Fleur's argument makes it more convincing than Dion'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 for this type of question, candidates should be given frequent opportunities to compare and evaluate sources on global issues from a variety of different perspectives. This should involve a consideration of the reasons, evidence and language used to support an argument or perspective in sources of different length, complexity and quality. 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 to an educational charity an action designed to improve the education of girls. Candidates were expected to justify their recommendation using reasons and material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

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 building a new school for girls in a developing country or organising teacher training on girl-friendly education. Few candidates recommended employing mentors for girls in secondary schools.

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

- the scale of impact on access to school places and education generally
- different outcomes or consequences of the action for girls and boys in school and society
- 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 teachers towards change or 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 girl's education. 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. These responses frequently referred to the effectiveness or impact of the action on the charity's aim of improving girls' education. 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. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to improve girls' education rather than explaining why one action was likely to be more effective, have greater impact and other positive consequences, and should therefore be recommended.

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 and have an impact on the issue, and therefore should be recommended, or not. Others did not focus on the action but described their views about girls' education, or schools in general. These responses did not enter the higher levels of response.

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.
- Analyse a source to understand and describe the perspective of a group towards a global issue.
- Explain a judgement about a cause or consequence of a global issue.

General comments

The Written Exam consists of compulsory questions based on a range of sources. The sources present global issues from different perspectives. In June 2025, this paper was based upon source material related to the topic of Arts in Society. The influence of the arts on attitudes towards global concerns was the issue explored.

It is apparent that through stimulating and engaging courses, many candidates are developing an excellent understanding of the causes and consequences of global issues. They can explain their own perspectives on global issues and compare these with the viewpoints of other people. Many candidates are also demonstrating empathy towards the perspectives of others. 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 analysis and 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 or list several strengths and weaknesses of research. However, many candidates did not explain the significance of the identified strength or weakness for the quality of the research and evidence gathered.

When designing a research strategy to test a claim, candidates should explain their choice of research methods and evidence, explicitly relating their approach to the claim to be tested. Candidates should explain how the research method will gather evidence that will enable them to test the claim or answer the research question. Linking the method and source of evidence to the issue in the claim is necessary to reach the higher levels of response. Simply listing a range of methods and sources of evidence is not sufficient.

Candidates were usually able to identify potential strengths and weaknesses of sources and argument. However, these evaluative points were often simply described or listed rather than explained. When evaluating a source, candidates should fully explain the significance or impact of the identified strength or weakness on the quality of the argument. This involves describing the impact of strengths and weaknesses on the quality of the argument using critical thinking concepts like reliability, validity, accuracy, representativeness, generalisation, bias, tone, expertise and ability to know.

Candidates generally recognised that opinions should be justified with reasons and evidence. Assertion and simple description of 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. Careful 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 material encountered in their courses to supplement material drawn from the sources. This is helpful, but not essential, to reach the highest levels of response. It is valuable and encouraged but not essential as the examination primarily tests the ability to use critical thinking and research skills in the analysis and evaluation of sources and perspectives. It is not necessary to have studied the specific topic or issue in the Written Exam.

Most candidates showed real interest in the topic and discussed the issues with enthusiasm. Candidates were able to explore different perspectives on the issues raised, particularly in recommending proposals to use the arts to raise awareness about global warming. 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.
- Explain the reasons for the selection of research methods and evidence to test a claim.
- Explain the strengths and weaknesses of an argument within a source.
- Justify and explain how an action will help to achieve its aim in response to the global issue.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Nearly all candidates correctly identified from Source 1 that the colour green has been used to promote the environmental movement and therefore gained the maximum of one mark. Candidates demonstrated an excellent ability to identify and select information from the source.

(b) (i) Due to an omission in syllabus content, full marks have been awarded to all candidates for **Question 1b(i)**, to make sure that no candidates were disadvantaged.

(ii) Due to an omission in syllabus content, full marks have been awarded to all candidates for **Question 1b(ii)**, to make sure that no candidates were disadvantaged.

Please refer to syllabus version 2 on the Schools Support Hub. The update on Page 14 clarifies which skills may be assessed in Question 1. In this examination, Questions 1b(i) and 1b(ii) tested opinion and why the example was an opinion within the context of the source. These are valid questions and can be used when preparing candidates for examination.

(c) Most candidates successfully analysed the source and were able to describe three or four aspects of the perspective of the environmental action group, Save the Planet, on global warming. Candidates reaching the higher levels of response often used examples from the source to support their analysis. Some of the most effective responses used several of the following aspects of a perspective towards a global issue in the analysis of the source – issue, cause, consequence, values, aims and action.

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 main elements of the perspective.

(d) Most candidates responded well to this question, identifying and justifying from Sources 1 and 2 which consequence of global warming was the most significant, in their opinion. Most candidates chose to discuss extreme weather and environmental disasters, and animals and plants being threatened with extinction.

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

- The number of people affected.
- the amount of impact on the environment globally.

- How long the benefit might affect individuals, the community, country and world.
- The impact on the ecology and biodiversity of different places.
- Is the most difficult to solve.

The strongest responses briefly explained three or four reasons why the chosen consequence was the most significant. Some candidates compared the importance of different consequences but this was not necessary to gain full marks.

Weaker responses simply stated the consequence and asserted several reasons without explanation. Candidates should be advised that the question requires candidates to *explain* briefly the reasons for thinking that the chosen consequence is the most significant. Some candidates discussed several consequences of educating girls; however, this is not necessary as only one consequence was demanded by the question.

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, focused research aim/question that guides the research.
- An experimental method is relevant to the research question and will gather appropriate evidence related to the effect of music on opinions.
- The researcher can control the environment and variables that might affect results.
- The experiment took place in a classroom that was familiar surroundings to the candidates which would make them relaxed and give truthful, accurate results.
- The data gathered is measurable and can be analysed to answer the question factually/statistically in a systematic way.

The weaknesses of the argument most often identified were:

- A small sample size that may not be representative or produce enough data to generalise.
- An unrepresentative sample – only 10 candidates from one age group that cannot be generalised to other places, age groups, and genres of music.
- The classroom environment may cause distraction/bias which makes the evidence/data inaccurate.
- The experimental conditions may not be reflected in real life so generalisation is not possible due to different conditions.
- An unpublished research report that is unlikely to have gone through peer review and been tested.

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 achieve the aim of the research and answer the research question.

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) 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, '*social media affects the opinions of young people more than older people.*' The methods of testing the claim suggested were clearly explained and carefully related to this claim.

Candidates tended to describe interviews, observation, surveys, and questionnaires with people about the issue, for example with groups of young and old people in the community or worldwide through the internet.

Surveys of local people and social media companies about the use of social media by age were suggested. Other methods included consultation with experts, local government, and internet-related organisations who are likely to have relevant information and ability to know. Interviews with young and elderly 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 to provide background information and context. Many described the types of sources that were likely to be reliable and free from bias or vested interest, for example from governments, NGOs, and United Nations organisations. Universities, senior executives of media companies and other social media experts were often mentioned.

The strongest responses provided reasoned, credible and structured explanation for their suggestions, clearly and explicitly related to the claim being tested; weaker responses often simply stated or listed several methods or sources of evidence but did not explain them fully or make any link to the purpose of the research i.e. the claim being tested about social media influence on the opinions of different age groups.

A few candidates responded to the question by describing their opinion about social media 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 Maria's and Jorge's statements in a structured way. They discussed issues relating to reasoning, evidence and use of language. Most candidates suggested that Jorge's statement was more convincing than Maria's statement.

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. 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 with little clarity. These answers tended to focus on their own opinion about the influence of music 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. These responses tended to assert evaluative points rather than explain and use evidence from the arguments to support their views. Some weaker responses lacked structure and had little clarity of 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.

An example of a weaker or asserted evaluative point is:

'Maria's argument is supported by examples which is a strength, for example, 'Famous artists and musicians can be role models and opinion leaders, like social media influencers.'

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:

Maria's argument is supported by lots of examples which is a strength, for instance, 'advertising tries to make us buy products ... the adverts use images, arts and music to get us to behave in certain ways.' This is a strength because examples help the reader to understand the argument and make it clearer. The example is also evidence that supports Maria's argument that music and the arts can create change. Therefore, the use of examples in Maria's argument makes it more convincing than Jorge'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 for this type of question, candidates should be given frequent opportunities to compare and evaluate sources on global issues from a variety of different perspectives. This should involve a consideration of the reasons, evidence and language used to support an argument or perspective in sources of different length, complexity and quality. 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 to an environmental charity an action designed to raise awareness about global warming. Candidates were expected to justify their recommendation using reasons and material drawn from the sources as well as their own experience and evidence.

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 asking a famous musician to release a protest song or a media campaign. Few candidates recommended publishing research on the impact of global warming.

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

- the scale of impact on awareness about and attitudes towards global warming
- different outcomes or consequences of the action for different groups in society
- 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

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 awareness about global warming. 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. These responses frequently referred to the effectiveness or impact of the action on the environmental charity's aim of raising awareness. 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. Arguments tended to be unsupported and asserted. These responses often simply listed ways to improve awareness of global warming rather than explaining why one action was likely to be more effective, have greater impact and other positive consequences, and should therefore be recommended.

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 and have an impact on the issue, and therefore should be recommended, or not. Others did not focus on the action but described their views about global warming, or the arts and music. These responses did not enter the higher levels of response.

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 the evidence** and individual **sources** that they use.
- Candidates should clearly **cite** all their sources.
- Candidates should **answer** their research question.

General guidance for Paper 02 Individual Report.

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 sources used. Successful candidates analyse and explain the causes and consequences of the issue identified in their question. They also 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. The strongest candidates evaluate their sources and the evidence they have used and explain their impact on the research and the argument.

Stronger 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:

- *Does increasing the minimum wage reduce poverty levels?*
- *Should mental health education be a mandatory part of school curricula?*
- *Should countries limit mass tourism to avoid environmental and social impacts, despite its economic benefits?*
- *Is AI integration in industry causing workforce displacement?*
- *Does economic globalisation promote socio-economic equality?*
- *Should stolen artefacts in museums be returned?*
- *Can growing more plant-based foods help fight food shortages?*

Some candidates posed complicated questions and were unable to control the argument or answer their question clearly.

A few reports were presented 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 arriving at their own response as a result of the research carried out

Note: Candidates are expected to conclude by answering their question, providing their own perspective on the issue and giving a clear answer. Teachers can guide their learners on the formulation of their question and should ensure that the question is simple enough for their learners to answer clearly.

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. These candidates had a clear introduction to their report. An issue can be a problem, disagreement, an ethical dilemma, conflict, damage or suffering.

Analysis of causes and consequences:

Most candidates explained the consequences of their chosen issue. Where their issue was clear, they were able to discuss causes of the issue, explaining in some detail:

Causes:

'Civil wars develop over time if they build up deep problems within a country. One of the biggest causes is political oppression. When governments are corrupt, ignore certain groups of individuals voices, or refuse to hold fair elections, people start to lose hope in peaceful change. Economic struggles like poverty, unemployment, and wars over resources can increase conflict. More divisions about ethnicity or religion can create tension in society, especially if one group of people is treated. Unfairly, in some cases, outside countries get involved in war by supplying weapons or supporting different sides. Economic burden and social divisions are serious, but they do not always lead to war unless the government fails to address them. In countries with fair leadership, people find peaceful solutions. However, violence will become more likely when the government rules through fear or refuses to listen to their people.'

Consequences:

'The consequences of civil wars are overwhelming. Countless innocent people die, in huge numbers. Economies collapse, leading to hunger, poverty and destruction. Recovery from civil war is harder if the country's buildings, roads, hospitals and schools are damaged during the war. Numerous people are forced to flee, becoming refugees in their own country or abroad. Even when the war ends, the divisions between people that caused the conflict, often remain. Hence making long term peace is difficult. A country can rebuild roads and homes, but it's much harder to recover from the death of millions of people. Without a working economy, people struggle to survive even after the war is over.'

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.

Note: 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 bring 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:

'Low-carbon and dependable nuclear energy is supported by many governments and experts as a climate solution. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) feels that the best answer to the climate issue is nuclear energy. This is so because utilising 440 reactors, nuclear power generates 10 per cent of the world's electricity producing, almost zero direct CO₂ emissions. They also highlight the fact that fifty nations around the world now use nuclear energy. Therefore, bolstering the belief that it can help address climate change.'

A national perspective is a national viewpoint on the issue presented, or an opinion/ feeling about/ attitude to the national situation. 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:

'Mongolia supports neutrality and peaceful solutions to keep the region stable. The government believes civil wars damage a country's economies, force people to flee their homes and cause long term problems. For this reason, they see diplomacy and humanitarian aid as important ways to respond. The Mongolian government has consistently promoted peacekeeping and international cooperation. Mongolia is an active participant in the United Nations peacekeeping missions, with over 18,000 Mongolian troops serving in conflict zones.'

Some weaker work did not present different perspectives on the issue, 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. Candidates are required to select a preferred option from the two courses of action they have presented and justify their choice.

Note: It is acceptable for candidates to consider courses of action that have been used elsewhere, They are not expected to invent their own solutions.

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:

'Both these methods are effective in their own ways. Awareness and education will influence the young and start healthy eating habits from a young age which leads to long term health while government policies place a firmer order and make sure these precautions are being followed. I believe WHO's stance on the matter is accurate. Government policies are more effective from the two courses of action as there are more chances of it being successful and copied by citizens. This creates a bigger impact of mitigating the effects of fast food catalysing the main priority which is healthy eating. This can be observed by Mexico back when they implemented the tax on sugary drinks and junk food, accumulating 'an average drop of 7.6 per cent. In the purchase of tax sugary drinks during 2014 and 2015' (WHO ND) proving government action successfully implements and enforces legislation aimed at mitigating fast food consumption and fostering healthier eating habits for its citizens.'

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.

Some candidates did not identify an issue – they presented general information about a topic. Without a problem, they could not suggest a course of action to address it.

Evaluation of sources and evidence:

Note: Candidates are now 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.

'I used information from statista.com to prove that animal testing was a global issue. With the help of this website, I was able to firmly establish that animal testing is carried out on a large scale, particularly in Europe, and back that up with accurate and reliable numbers presenting a precise argument. Statista is based globally and has a large collection of data from 170 various industries making the data diverse and authentic due to the fact that they are established globally.'

PETA, or People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals is an animal liberation organisation which operates globally and is aware of the issues and benefits of animal testing, mainly operating to liberate animals of the cruelty they face. I received a crucial global perspective from this organisation. Which was reliable as PETA operates globally and regularly deals with this issue. Meaning it's suitable to represent the majority's perspective on animal testing. Though I did sense a strong sense of bias in their perspective, meaning it may not be 100 per cent reliable.

The UNHCR report from 2024 states that over 122.6 million people have been forcibly displaced due to conflict. This is a highly valid source that UNHCR is a globally recognised authority on refugee issues. The statistical evidence provided by the UNHCR is crucial in illustrating the devastating humanitarian consequences of civil wars, reinforcing the argument that these conflicts extend beyond national borders and affect global stability. However, this source focuses primarily on the effects of civil wars rather than their causes. While it provides strong factual evidence of displacement, it does not address the underlying political or economic factors that lead to conflict.'

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:

Candidates are required to answer their own question explicitly. The strongest work included a clear conclusion giving an explicit answer to their question. It included reflection on the candidate's own perspective, on their research findings and on the perspectives they had explored. Strong candidates clearly explained how their own perspective had developed, been changed, or impacted by others' perspectives and by the information they had researched 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 mental health education be a mandatory part of school curricula?

Personal perspective

'Before my research, I thought that integrating mental health education into school curricula was reasonable and the most successful way to aid candidates, providing them with a safe and friendly environment. However, as I delved deeper, numerous barriers came to light. The assertion by professional Ellen Dahlke pointed out that candidates need trained mental health professionals to address their trauma. This starkly underscored the limitations of my initial perspective. Through my research, I learned that while curriculum-based mental health education can offer basic knowledge to both candidates and parents, it falls short in dealing with the complex emotions and problems faced by some candidates, revealing a significant gap in the pursuit of candidate mental health support. Additionally, at the start, I believed candidates in South Korea

and China with their great centric educational systems while most vulnerable to mental health issues. However, research showed that in the US social media harmed candidates' well-being, and in the UK, academic demands and scarce mental health resources create similar problems. This made me see mental health education as a global problem as. All countries should incorporate it into curricula to nurture a mentally resilient generation.'

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 and did not develop a central argument.

The weakest work had no clear argument and sometimes with no reflection or conclusion. Some 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 quoting directly from sources, this should be in the form of small amounts of copied work, within quotation marks and clearly attributed. 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 the form of a bibliography. This should be submitted as a separate document to the Individual Report.

References: References for books or magazines 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)**.

Please note that when candidates quote sources found within material from other sources, they do need to reference the quoted sources as well. It should be possible for the reader to find a reference for every person or organisation quoted in the essay.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 0457/03
Team Project

Key messages

- For all examination sessions from 2025 onwards, a Team must submit **one** Explanation of Research and Planning, **one** Evidence of Action, and each individual in a team must produce their own Reflective Paper.
- The Explanation of Research and Planning must 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 syllabus for Global perspectives IGCSE 2025–27 has details of the requirements for the Explanation of Research and Planning. This can be in table form.
- In the Explanation of Research and Planning document, what will be researched is the ‘plan strand’ of Table A. Individual Research findings must be reported in the Reflective Paper.
- The Evidence of Action must be **one** piece of evidence that shows that the Action took place.
- Details of how Team Project’s Reflective Papers are assessed can be found in the syllabus for Global perspectives IGCSE 2025–27 and should be shared with learners.
- Reflective Papers should evaluate the aspects of the team project (see the syllabus for details) and should **not** tell the story of the project **nor** repeat what is in the Explanation.
- Reflections on learning from Team members must be separate from 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.
- ICRCs must be completed for ALL candidates selected as the moderation sample.
- CASFs should record ALL candidates’ total mark, explaining where marks were awarded by AO and showing the results of internal moderation, (where more than one marker in a centre makes internal moderation necessary). Marks on the CASF must match those submitted to on Submit for Assessment.

General comments

Explanations of Research and Planning

The most successful Explanations of Research and Planning were in table form. Teachers are allowed to teach effective methods of presenting this work.

Evidence of Action

One piece of evidence that the Action took place is all that is needed- a photograph, a poster, a screenshot. The most successful examples showed audiences engaging with the action.

Reflective Papers

The most successful Reflective Papers were well organised according to the criteria found in the mark scheme. Teachers are allowed to teach effective ways of presenting Reflective Papers. 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 own ways of working and their work as a part of the team as they will need these details to evidence their evaluations and reflections: examples do make a difference to marks available. They 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.

Candidates need to know and understand the assessment criteria. This will help them to see where benefits are required as well as challenges of teamwork, but just two developed explanations of how effectively their Action met their aims.

Comments on specific questions

The examples below illustrate what good answers might look like. Some weaker Team Projects have been included to show specific aspects of the mark scheme. All Assessment Objectives are covered in this report, but not all criteria.

Team Elements: Explanation of Research and Planning and The Action

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

Topic	Food, Water and Agriculture
Issue	Minimising Food Waste in Colombo
Secondary research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Candidate 1 researched how other countries and areas addressed reducing food waste (the issue)</i> <i>Candidate 2 researched what happens to food waste in Colombo presently</i> <i>Candidate 3 researched what has already been done in Colombo to address the issue</i> <i>Candidate 4 researched perspectives of experts and public on the issue.</i>
Primary research	<p><i>We planned on contacting hotels and restaurants to gather primary data. While most hotels remained confidential, we found 2 hotels and a bakery which we were able to interview.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, we received answers to the questionnaire from individuals from different cultures including S's and J's personal contacts.</i></p> <p><i>We found 3 distinctive perspectives from the primary data collected:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>People's attitude is the main issue</i> <i>Food waste is inevitable in good business</i> <i>They minimise food waste strictly inside their organisation and have no interest in how waste is processed by their external suppliers.</i>
Action	<p><i>Realising the major concern of many was people's attitude towards reducing food waste, we planned to host an awareness session at a restaurant.</i></p> <p><i>However, we could find neither an expert on food waste as a speaker nor adequate resources as students to carry out the event. We decided to go ahead with our initial plan of compiling a video based on our findings and bring attention to the adversity of food waste and identify what each individual can do to help with this issue. We planned to make posters, taken from our photos, around our school premises to help students and the next generation, be more conscious of food waste.</i></p> <p><i>We divided the work between us:</i></p> <p><i>Candidate 1 took photographs of food wasted in school and interviewed the staff to find out what happened to it</i></p> <p><i>Candidate 2 asked a local market for permission to photograph after a market had closed and interviewed market owners to seek their thoughts about food waste</i></p> <p><i>Candidate 3 asked family and friends about what was done with food waste locally</i></p> <p><i>Candidate 4 investigated government and local government websites to find out about local initiatives.</i></p> <p><i>We worked as a team to plan and make the video and decide on posters and their messages.</i></p>
Evidencing Action	<p><i>To prove our initiative, we plan on submitting our photos from our awareness video and taking pictures of posters pasted in the school.</i></p>
Measurement of Success	<p><i>Utilising the Internet, we plan on sharing our video along with a Google form among a diverse audience (students, parents, teachers and restaurants), asking them to comment on whether we were successful in inspiring them to reduce food waste.</i></p>

Note: The team 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, what other places/people are doing about that issue – 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 changed their Action because of limited options available to them.

After discussing research findings, the team made a decision about an Action that can help with the local issue.

Detailed planning of that Action, including individual roles and responsibilities.

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

What evidence of their Action can be sent to Cambridge.

After the Action was completed, candidates can record any changes that had to be made. This did not happen in this case.

A Team's Evidence of Action

This is a slide from a Team's presentation. It would have been more effective if it had been part of a photograph showing candidates sharing this with their class, planting some seeds, or putting up a poster asking students to turn off the tap. Making a PowerPoint is not the Action. Sharing understanding to change people's attitudes is the team's Action.

What can students do to make a difference?

- Get involved in something related to environmental awareness
- Grow a plant, it is the least we can do.
- Look at small things and spread it. For example, when you brush your teeth close the tap water.
- Do a research

I've learned that:

1. Hydroponics 50%-90% water saving.
2. An example of food crisis: Lining up for bread during COVID19, and by shipping and closure of shipping procedure.
3. Pesticides are added in some mother milk, everything for granted.
4. Some cities are going to sink in the future.
5. We now face some frost damage to plants, and there is a company that works on nutrition and they add additives to water irrigation which will then protect the plant from frost.



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.

AO1 Research, Analysis and Evaluation

Table E: Evaluating the Action

Example, giving two developed points:

'Our actions were a visit to our local primary school to present a lesson, a survey for our audience to answer and leaflets to help them learn more. We chose these actions as it would inform a younger generation on the problems around the Lake District, in hope to minimise these problems in the future.'

'With the survey, we got some incredibly positive feedback with 4.2 out of 5 said that they found our presentation useful. Our actions went well as we had received positive feedback within our survey which proves that the students and teachers enjoyed our presentation and promised to be mindful with litter. However, I feel as though we could have made our presentation a bit more interactive with the students to'

keep them engaged. E.g. We could have asked what sort of litter they would expect before showing them our findings. Furthermore, the leaflet helped the students visualise what we talked about and learn more. All our actions helped us address our issue in a positive way but also address issues that need to be solved. Most people were surprised that fruit peelings and cores count as litter. Next time, we could have spread more awareness around our local area to notify more people about this issue. In the future, we would distribute the leaflets around our local area for more people to see them.'

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 team reflections.

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.

Table E: Evaluating own performance:

Example, giving one developed point, earning a maximum 2 marks:

'I believe that I have contributed to the outcome of the project in a positive way. I always tried to think creatively and present new ideas and suggestions of how we can improve our project. For example, I suggested we use a bright themed PowerPoint template despite the topic including unpleasant sights and pictures, to make it more attractive and easier on the eyes.'

Note: a clear example from this project.

AO2 Reflection

Table G: 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 use evidence to explain both the benefits and challenges of teamwork (**Note:** more than one of each), reflecting on the impact on the team's aim or 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 well they worked 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:

'Our teamwork was successful across various stages, but that doesn't mean that teamwork was easy. During primary research, we split tasks: I contacted the Head of Primary for permission and scheduling, A gathered materials, and C explained the task to students. By having a group, we could divide up work like this and not have to do everything ourselves. It was, however, challenging to know that you were depending on someone you didn't know very well to do their job well in order that we could all work effectively with time constraints.'

Similarly, when recording the documentary's voiceover, I secured a recording space, C handled the technical aspects, and we all co-wrote the script. This clear task division helped us work efficiently and meet tight deadlines.

However, at times we struggled with conflicting opinions. I initially proposed doing an assembly instead of a documentary, believing it would create a direct impact. This created some tension. Eventually, we had an open discussion and reached consensus. We also struggled because of having different skills. C wanted to use one media programme while A was knowledgeable about another. This led to a frustrating discussion as both wanted to be heard. This taught me the importance of compromise and the need to prioritize group unity over personal preference.'

Note: The details in the section on challenges of teamwork are quite explicit. Those supporting the benefits are weaker, but still clearly linked to this project. This is just about enough to earn 5 marks.

Table G: Reflecting on how teamwork could have been improved

Candidates are asked to consider two challenges they came across in their teamwork, and to look at either how they were overcome, or how they could be avoided in the future.

Example:

'We didn't want to have to structure our group, thinking we could work together, but we soon found some work was done twice and some not at all. We all looked for words for the front cover of the book and then got cross defending our selection, instead of voting for one. I took on the leadership role and guided the group through our work. I took that role because no one else did. I had to be flexible.'

'Something else we could have improved, is being more realistic, earlier in the project. Adding to that, we should have used the team log better, and made a long- term plan, because our plannings looked like: 'next week this part is done.' If we had thought about it we would have known what a big job the booklet was and given it more time in our plan. No-one should have had to work all through Christmas to get it done. One the same subject, another improvement we would make is to start earlier with the booklet, since we prioritised writing our novel whereby the booklet had to wait.'

Note: The team member reports improvements to two separate issues/challenges of teamwork, and two separate pieces of learning from the reflections. The improvements detailed here are linked to the challenges of teamwork, meaning that this was awarded 5 marks.

AO3 Communication

Table H: 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.

Example 1:

'From secondary research, I recognized that physical appearance was a significant cause of bullying, as they target individuals who don't fit societal appearance standards. According to WHO, children in higher weight categories are 63% more likely to be bullied (Anti-bullying Alliance, 2021). Moreover, I found mental health issues was a significant consequence of bullying- in fact, 23% of young adults who were bullied sought help for depression before turning 30 (Erban. E, 2024), this was also evident when gathering local perspectives in online survey; 39% identified it as consequence. Initially, I believed bullying was not critical at our school, but the survey revealed 53% of students noted the issue prevalent, signifying its importance. Overall research helped understand bullying's complexities.'

Note: Notice how this candidate has used learning and research findings to develop the project. This was awarded 5 marks.

Example 2:

'In order to find out about the issue, we first interviewed teachers and then parents. We visited the school to see what they thought of our plan. We carried out research on early arts skills. We spoke to our teacher to identify what tasks would be useful. We visited the local school and got permission to hold the event.'

Note: There are no research findings given. This is about research and earned 2 marks.

Table F: Learning from research

Example:

'Initially, I focused primarily on victims to support and protect them more, but after the interview with certified counsellor, my perspective shifted to consider bullies too. I learned that perpetrators come from troubled backgrounds, often abusive parenting styles (West.M and Yockey.K, 2024). I discovered bullies persecute

others to cope with their own insecurities, which made me empathize towards them. The principal's interview emphasized importance in assisting perpetrators to reflect on their own issues to prevent further bullying.'

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 planning Actions, or it could be Reflections on how the research has personally impacted the team member. Any are acceptable, providing they meet the criteria.

In this case the mark is clearly 5 marks:

Table H: 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.