Specimen Paper Answers – Component 1

Cambridge IGCSE™
Global Perspectives 0457
Cambridge O Level
Global Perspectives 2069

For examination from 2025

Contents

Introduction

These specimen answers have been produced by Cambridge ahead of the examination in 2025 to exemplify standards for those teaching Cambridge IGCSE / O Level Global Perspectives. We have provided responses for all questions from Specimen Paper 1, Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4.

The marks given are for guidance only and are accompanied by a brief commentary explaining the strengths and weaknesses of the answers. Comments are given to indicate where and why marks were awarded, and how additional marks could be obtained.

The mark schemes and inserts are available to download from the School Support Hub.

2025 Specimen Paper 01

2025 Specimen Paper Mark Scheme 01

2025 Specimen Insert 01

Past exam resources and other teaching and learning resources are available on the School Support Hub.

Details of the assessment

The syllabus for Cambridge IGCSE / O Level Global Perspectives 0457 / 2069 is available at
www.cambridgeinternational.org

Component 1 – Written Exam

Written paper, 1 hour 25 minutes, 70 marks

This component is an externally set assessment, marked by Cambridge International.

Component 1 contains four compulsory questions. Candidates answer **all** the questions.

The Written Exam is based on a global issue related to one of the topics from the topic list.

The questions are based on source documents provided with the question paper. The sources provide background information and different perspectives about the global issue chosen for the exam. Sources may be taken from a variety of subject backgrounds and media, and may include images. The number of sources may vary from exam to exam.

Candidates are expected to read and study the sources carefully before attempting the questions. Time for reading is included in the overall time available for the paper.

Candidates will answer on the question paper. The source materials will be presented separately in an insert.

Question 1 (18 marks) is a structured question based on several sources. There will be three or four parts to the question. Candidates are required to read the sources and analyse the information, arguments and perspectives presented about the global issue.

Question 2 (16 marks) is a structured question based on a source that describes some research or evidence about the global issue. There will be two parts to the question. Candidates evaluate the research or evidence and suggest ways to research or test a claim related to the global issue.

Question 3 (16 marks) is a question based on a source that presents different arguments about the global issue. Candidates answer by writing an extended response. Candidates are required to analyse and evaluate the arguments and make a reasoned judgement about the quality of the arguments.

Question 4 (20 marks) is a question based on all sources in the insert. Candidates answer by writing an extended response. Candidates are required to assess actions in response to the global issue and explain their judgements with reasons and evidence.

In the Written Exam, candidates are assessed on the skills of research, analysis and evaluation. Candidates are not assessed on their prior knowledge and understanding of the topic or global issue presented in the source material.

Question 1

Study Sources 1 and 2.

(a) According to Source 1, how many people regularly suffered from hunger and poor nutrition in 2021?

Specimen answer 1

In 2021, 800 million people suffered from hunger and poor nutrition.

Mark awarded = 1 out of 1

Examiner comment

From Source 1, the correct answer of 800 million people is identified.

Specimen answer 2

800 million

Mark awarded = 1 out of 1

Examiner comment

This answer gains maximum marks since it correctly identifies the number of people regularly suffering from hunger and poor nutrition in 2021 from Source 1.

Common errors and general guidance for candidates

- It is important that candidates include a reference to 'millions' in their answer.
- Candidates do not need to write a full sentence for their answer. Simply writing '800 million' is sufficient to be awarded the mark.
- Candidates must identify the answer from Source 1.

(b)(i) Identify **one** example of a generalisation from Source 2.

Specimen answer 1

An example of a generalisation from Source 2 is, 'We must have compassion and care for

everyone.'

Mark awarded = 1 out of 1

Examiner comment

The response correctly identified an example of a generalisation from Source 2, as listed in the mark scheme.

Specimen answer 2

'When people come together and demand change, extraordinary things happen' is a

generalisation.

Mark awarded = 1 out of 1

Examiner comment

This answer gains maximum marks since it correctly identifies a generalisation from Source 2.

Common errors and general guidance for candidates

- Candidates should quote the example identified from the source so that their answer is clear.

- Although candidates may describe or paraphrase the identified generalisation in their own words, the answer must be clear and unambiguous in order to be awarded the mark.

- Candidates do not need to write a full sentence for their answer. Simply quoting the generalisation is sufficient to be awarded the mark.

- Candidates must identify the answer from Source 2.

- Although there are several examples of generalisations in the source, candidates only need to give one example. Additional examples are not credited.

(b)(ii) Explain why the example you identified is a generalisation.

Specimen answer 1

'We must have compassion and care for everyone' is an example of a generalisation because the food charity claims that we should care for all people and look after everyone. However, a charity can only care for some people. Therefore, the claim is not true for everyone all the time and only applies to some people and situations, so it is a generalisation.

Mark awarded = 2 out of 2

Examiner comment

The response shows understanding of the meaning of generalisation as a statement that suggests something is true all the time when it is only true some of the time. The response clearly explains why the identified example is a generalisation.

Specimen answer 2

The example above is a generalisation because the author implies that this is always true, however, this can only be tested in small sample groups and the author can never be sure that this applies in every situation all of the time.

Mark awarded = 2 out of 2

Examiner comment.

This answer gains full marks as it contains clear reasons, (it is always true, and it applies in every situation), as the author cannot be sure of this and that it can only ever be tested in a sample, it is seen as a generalisation.

Common errors and general guidance for candidates

- Candidates must explain the generalisation identified from Source 2 in Question 1(b)(i).
- Candidates should refer explicitly to the example identified from the source so that their answer is clear.
- Candidates may describe or paraphrase the identified generalisation in their own words.
- Candidates should show understanding of the meaning of generalisation and explain why the identified example is a generalisation.

(c) From Source 2, describe the food charity's perspective on hunger.

Specimen answer 1

The food charity believes that it is our duty to help people in the world who are hungry and do not have enough food. They say that we should give money to help feed starving people and campaign for a fair distribution of food for everyone. The charity claims that many people, especially children, do not grow properly and are unhealthy because of food shortages. The charity sees this as wrong and unfair and that governments must do something about it.

Mark awarded = 5 out of 6

Examiner comment

The question tested the ability to analyse perspectives within sources.

The response clearly described the perspective of the charity, frequently using material taken from the source. The response shows that the source has been analysed and that a wide range of elements of the charity's perspective have been identified. These include:

- the duty of caring for others and helping people in need, especially those that are hungry

- practical action in giving money to charities

- campaigning for a fairer distribution of food

- providing examples and evidence of the impact of hunger to persuade us to help.

The response therefore entered Level 3 of the mark scheme.

Specimen answer 2

The food charity perspective on hunger is that this is a worrying, global issue that has serious impacts and consequences on the population that experience hunger. For example, they state that it stops people 'growing and thriving' and that it 'destroys health, education and employment'. The text is written very emotively as it attempts to encourage readers to donate to the UN world Food Programme in the last paragraph. This is another organisation that aims to end hunger and it makes sense that this charity would look to their work. The food charity adds this link as they believe that hunger can be solved if people work together.

Mark awarded = 5 out of 6

Examiner comment

The response provides clear analysis of the source material to provide a structured response using examples from the source (such as 'growing and thriving' and that it 'destroys health, education and employment'). The response identifies that the charity sees the issue of hunger as a global challenge and that consequences arise from this.

Moreover, the values of the charity can also be identified, if not stated as such, with the idea of 'worrying' and the hint at emotive language to appeal to the reader. This latter point could have been proven with examples from the text (e.g., 'Together, we can build a better world') which would have secured the top of Level 3 response.

Common errors and general guidance for candidates

- Candidates should analyse the source and identify the main elements of the perspective and describe these in their own words. Simply copying the source is not appropriate.

- Responses should refer to examples and material from the source and may quote short phrases to support their analysis.

- Candidates are not expected to explain or justify the perspective.

- Candidates should use the material in the Source to describe the perspective and should not describe their own views on the issue in general.

(d) Which cause of hunger do you think is the most significant? Explain why.

Specimen answer 1

Poverty is the most significant cause of hunger. It affects many millions of people in the world. If people live in poverty or do not have work, then they often have very little money. This means that they will not be able to afford to buy food. Many people in poverty grow their own food because they can't afford market prices. Growing food may not be easy. Sometimes crops fail and animals die because of bad weather and natural disasters. The United Nations says that the average world poverty line is an income of about $2.15 per day. If a person only has this amount of money to live on, then they are in extreme poverty and cannot afford much food. This causes hunger. Also, people in poverty can only buy poor quality food that is very cheap. Cooking food may also be a problem because you can't afford energy. As a result, poverty means poor nutrition. Poverty is therefore the most significant cause of hunger because people cannot afford to buy or grow food easily. As the charity in Source 2 says, poverty and hunger have a bad effect on other aspects of life, like education and health, and cause more problems which are difficult to solve.

Mark awarded = 7 out of 8

Examiner comment

This question tested the ability to justify an opinion or personal perspective using reasons and evidence.

In the first sentence of the response, poverty as the cause of hunger is clearly identified, which they thought is the most significant. This opinion was then clearly explained and supported. Then they justified the choice in terms of the number of people affected, 'many millions worldwide'.

The response also referred to level of income, affordability, and availability of food for those in poverty to justify this view. Evidence from the United Nations and the example of crop failure was used to support the explanation. In addition, further explanation of the impact of poverty on nutrition and energy for food preparation and cooking was presented. The additional impact of poverty and hunger on education and health was mentioned. As a result, the explanation was clearly related to the chosen cause of hunger, and credible. The response therefore entered Level 4 of the mark scheme.

Specimen answer 2

I believe that food shortages from Source 1 is the most significant cause of hunger. This is because food shortages can be seen as the result of numerous other causes, such as war and conflict which disrupt trade links, meaning that food cannot be delivered as it once was; as well as extreme weather and climate change which impacts the growing of many crops. Furthermore, unfair international trade sees an unfair distribution of food shortages in developing countries with an oversupply of products in more developed countries which then creates mountains of food waste.

As a result of these food shortages prices rise for food due to a supply and demand model, resulting in the fact that those experiencing unemployment or living in poverty are the first to be impacted by hunger – unemployment has been impacted by the pandemic which means that more are vulnerable now to the effects of food shortages around the world.

Mark awarded = 7 out of 8

Examiner comment

The response makes a judgement that food shortages are the most significant cause of global hunger and then argues that this is a vicious circle that is created through other causes (war and conflict, extreme weather and climate change and unfair trade linked to distribution).

The explanation is clearly related to the issue and is credible. The explanation and link to the other causes supports the judgement/opinion and explains this view further. The response might also have discussed other evidence from the sources, for example that food programmes help millions of people every year and 25% of children do not get the food they need. These could have been linked to food shortages and the explanation of the judgement/opinion provided. The response reaches Level 4 at the lower level.

Common errors and general guidance for candidates

- To answer the question, candidates should clearly identify the cause that they think is the most significant and give a range of reasons and evidence to justify and support this point of view.

- Candidates should choose and discuss only one cause of hunger, carefully giving reasons why they think that it is the most significant cause. Discussion and comparison of more than one cause is a complex task that candidates find difficult to achieve successfully within the space available. However, candidates may be able to show the impact of their chosen cause of hunger on other causes listed in the source material.

- Candidates are encouraged to use examples and material from the sources, and may quote short phrases from the sources, to support their explanation and justify their choice.

- Candidates may also introduce background information to justify and support their opinion, though this is not necessary or expected, as candidates are not required to bring prior knowledge of the topic or issue into their responses within the written exam.

Total marks awarded for Question 1 (Specimen answers 1) = 16 out of 18
Total marks awarded for Question 1 (Specimen answers 2) = 16 out of 18

Question 2

Study Source 3.

(a) Explain the strengths and weaknesses of the research outlined in Source 3.

Specimen answer 1

The main strength of this research is that it was primary research done by the person using interviews. This makes the evidence first-hand and therefore more accurate. This is also shown by the way that the researcher took notes of the answers given by Mrs Blum and did not rely on memory. Another strength was the clear purpose of the research, although there should have been a clearly stated research question to guide the work so that the interviews did not stray off track and waste time. The student doing the research got permission from Mrs Blum. This was good because it made the collection of data ethical and did not involve any deception.

A weakness of the research was the very small number of people interviewed. This was only one person. The person may not be representative of other people who have different views and perspectives. She may be biased and have a vested interest as she works for an action group, a local food project. She may not be completely honest and give only one side of the story to make her work look successful. Finally, the research may be unethical because the interview could be heard by other people. It was not confidential.

Mark awarded = 8 out of 8

Examiner comment

The question tested the ability to evaluate research into current global issues.

The response was consistently evaluative and provided reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points, including both strengths and weaknesses. The explanations were credible, supported, and clearly related to the purpose and methods of the research, which was to 'learn about action to end world hunger' through a case study. The response discussed the purpose, sample, methods, and context of the research, as well as ethical Issues. The response also used concepts in research and critical thinking to evaluate the research, for example permission, confidentiality, sample size, bias, and vested interest. Each evaluative point was explained briefly and supported with material and examples taken from the source. There was very little assertion. The response is therefore comfortably in Level 4 of the mark scheme and reaches the top mark.

Specimen answer 2

The strengths of the student's research undertaking are that this is primary research conducted in an interview. This has the advantage that the student was able to speak directly to the manager of the city farm, Mrs Blum, at the location allowing them to observe the farm for themselves, but also ask clarifying questions during the interview should anything have been unclear. The student was also then able to collect direct quotes from Mrs Blum which help support the reasons why the organisation exists as well as their mission.

That said, it seems from the source that the student based their whole research project on this one source which does not allow for balance to be developed. There is the danger that Mrs Blum may be biased in her views due to her own vested interests. Furthermore, the student highlights a weakness of their own research method in saying that 'At other times the gardeners could also hear our conversation' – this could have impacted how open and honest the interview was. Of course, conducting an interview in such noisy, city settings could also have led to misunderstandings.

Mark awarded = 7 out of 8

Examiner comment

This is a consistently evaluative response (Level 4 response) in which both strengths (paragraph 1) and weaknesses (paragraph 2) of the source are highlighted and evaluated. The response has supported their analysis of the source with examples and direct quotes from the source itself, however at times, this development is lacking. For example, it is stated that 'Mrs Blum may be biased in her views due to her own vested interests.' However, this does not highlight or define understanding of vested interest. The response could have explained that the city farm is Mrs Blum's employer and therefore Mrs Blum would need to ensure that it is seen positively as the success of the farm is necessary for her own security. A similar comment could have been made about the 'gardeners could also hear our conversation', meaning that Mrs Blum felt that she had to give certain answers related to the farm. Evaluation and use of the source material are clear and well used, however the response would benefit from greater explanation, putting it at lower Level 4.

Common errors and general guidance for candidates

- Candidates should discuss both strengths and weaknesses of the research described in the source.
- Each evaluative point should be carefully explained and not simply asserted.
- Some responses describe the research without explaining why the aspect highlighted is a strength or weakness. Using key concepts in research and critical thinking help candidates to explain the reasons why different aspects of the research are identified as strengths or weaknesses.
- Some responses misinterpret the question about assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the research undertaken by discussing their own opinion about the topic being studied.
- Using examples and referring to material taken from the source to support explanations is to be encouraged.

2(b) 'Most people enjoy growing their own food.'

Explain how this claim could be tested. You should consider the research methods and evidence that could be used.

Specimen answer 1

The best way to test this claim is to do some primary research. The purpose is to find out about people's views on growing their own food. I would first do a survey of many people using a written questionnaire and ask open-ended questions to learn about their attitudes to gardening and growing food. The sample size would be very large, about 100 people, to ensure that the results were representative. Different groups would need to be included, like males and females and old and young. That way the data collected would reflect 'most people'.

To check the data collected from the survey was accurate, I would then do some interviews. This would also help me to understand the reasons why people enjoyed growing food. This should involve people who claim they like, and those who dislike, growing their own food to get a balanced understanding of different points of view. I would use questions about the amount of time people give to growing food and what types of plants, as well as the benefits and problems of growing food.

Finally, I would look at secondary data from research reports and experts in food production and gardening. Reports and statistics from government and university agricultural departments and gardening associations would be relevant to the topic. They would need to be recent and up to date to be accurate and reliable. Reports from experts in food production are important as they have experience and the ability to know about people's attitudes to growing food.

If the evidence from all these methods shows that the majority of people like growing food, then the claim could be verified as true.

Mark awarded = 8 out of 8

Examiner comment

The question tested the ability to design research into current global issues.

The response described an appropriate and fully justified research design clearly related to the claim that 'most people enjoy growing their own food'. A wide range of methods (surveys, questionnaires, interviews, sampling, primary, secondary) were identified and briefly described. Similarly, different types of evidence were suggested, including expert testimony, survey data, interview responses and statistics. Reasoned explanation for the choice of methods and evidence was clearly presented and frequently related to the purpose of the research. The explanations were credible and revealed understanding of research design.

The response is therefore comfortably in Level 4 of the mark scheme and reaches the top mark.

Specimen answer 2

I would start by undertaking secondary research to give me a better idea of the extent of the issue and what has been done so far by other researchers. I would look into the trend in the number of allotments that have been taken up in the city in recent years – if the number is rising, this could point towards more people using the facilities of the city to grow their own food. This information could be gathered from local council sources.

Once I have an idea of the general trend of increased popularity of growing your own food, I would conduct primary research to further help me test this. I would start by asking a random sample of people in my local area about growing their own food. The sample would have to be quite large to get meaningful results which I would then present visually to help show the extent of the interest. From the results, I would also use those people that do grow their own food to help me understand more about the motivations and reasons for this as well as how long they have been doing this for. This would use mini-interviews to be able to provide qualitative data about the issue which will help complement the quantitative data of the random sample short survey, as well as the secondary data which is likely to show more figures. This should result in a balanced test of the claim but may need to be repeated in different areas that I might not have access to.

Mark awarded = 7 out of 8

Examiner comment

The response shows appropriate and justified research design using both secondary (council record research) as well as primary (survey and interview) methods. Whilst a range of methods are given, the response is slightly unbalanced – more could have been made of the secondary research by looking at magazine publications and readership figures for such topics, or number of YouTube videos released with this as a topic of the video. As such the range cannot really be classed as 'wide'. The response relates the methods chosen back to the claim and purpose of the research, but more could be done in developing the reasoning for such decisions. For example, the answer ends with repeating this method in different areas, an explanation of why could have been helpful here. On balance, the bottom of Level 4 has been awarded.

Common errors and general guidance for candidates

- Candidates should explicitly relate their research design to the claim to be tested, and frequently refer to the topic and issue that forms the background to the claim.
- Each method and type of evidence should be carefully explained and not simply asserted.
- Some responses describe or list a range of research methods and types of evidence without relating them to the claim or providing an explanation for their selection. This does not provide sufficient justification for the selection of the research methods and evidence. The methods need to be applied to the purpose of the research.
- Some responses misinterpret the question about testing the claim and discuss their own opinion about the topic being studied.
- Using key concepts in research helps candidates to explain the reasons why different aspects of the research are identified as appropriate to testing the specific claim.
- Using examples and referring to material taken from the sources to support explanations is encouraged.

Total marks awarded for Question 2 (Specimen answers 1) = 16 out of 16

Total marks awarded for Question 2 (Specimen answers 2) = 14 out of 16

Question 3

Study Source 4.

Which argument is more convincing, Grace's or Seth's?

Your answer should:

- consider both arguments
- evaluate their reasoning, evidence and use of language
- support your judgement with their words and ideas.

Specimen answer 1

In my opinion Seth has the more convincing argument.

Seth is very clear about his perspective when he states that, 'industrial farming is not the solution to hunger'. His argument flows from this idea in a logical way, presenting the problems of industrial farming, then the reasons for change with evidence, then examples of action, like eating ethically. This makes his argument easy to understand and follow and is very convincing. However, Grace is not always clear and mainly lists examples and new ideas without any evidence. For example, she introduces the idea of human rights without explaining how this relates to the problem of food production and solving hunger. This is not convincing.

Seth uses evidence from reputable organisations like the United Nations and New Internationalist. His case studies provide detailed evidence from real people who have experience and expertise. They know what it is like to create change and provide realistic testimony that is true. Grace uses examples but not much evidence. She refers to her father who is a farmer, but he might be biased and have a vested interest in increasing food production on his farm to make more money. The evidence Grace uses is therefore not credible and convincing.

Finally, although Seth argues enthusiastically, his actions would not be supported by everybody, and he is not balanced. His tone is also quite harsh, and he generalises when he says, 'everyone can help by eating ethically – eat enough!' He does not consider counterarguments and other perspectives, weakening his argument. Grace does think about other points of view, for example the rich and the poor.

In conclusion, Seth is more logical, provides more evidence to support his argument and is passionate about creating a sustainable future for food production for all, rather than Grace's one-sided argument. Overall, he is more convincing.

AO1 Analysis = 7 out of 8
AO1 Evaluation = 7 out of 8

Examiner comment

The question tested the ability to analyse and evaluate arguments.

The answer is consistently analytical throughout the response and fully supported. The response analyses a wide range of aspects of both arguments, frequently using relevant material taken from the Source 4. For example, it discusses the logic, evidence, language and tone of both arguments. It also uses quotations from the source to support the argument very well. The opinion about which argument is more convincing is therefore clearly explained with reason and evidence. Each paragraph in the response provides explicit comparison of the two arguments.

The response is consistently evaluative, with detailed and reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points throughout the response. Reasoning and evidence within both arguments in the source are evaluated explicitly. The evaluation of the arguments is informed by critical thinking concepts like expertise, balance, counter argument, and generalisation. The judgement is clear and consistent with the argument, as revealed in the introduction and conclusion to the response.

The response therefore entered Level 4 of the mark scheme.

Specimen answer 2

Whilst Grace makes a number of interesting and valid comments using the benefit of her background and connections (her father is a farmer) showing experience, I believe Seth makes the more convincing argument.

As already stated, Grace has personal involvement in food production with her father being a farmer. This could be seen as a vested interest in the further development of food along such industrial lines as presumably her family would be able to profit from any further technological progress in this field. Furthermore, despite making some logical and well-known claims (advancements in technology, trade being unfair), Grace does not back her statements up with any form of research or citation. As such, the audience is not able to verify Grace's claims and it does not help convince. Finally, Grace's general structure of the argument is a little confusing as it evolves from new technologies are the answer to food shortages to large companies make huge profits which is 'unfair'. This confuses the argument but still seems to argue that a top-down approach is the answer.

Meanwhile, Seth takes the opposite approach in arguing for a bottom-up approach, which I personally agree with more, saying that everyone has a role to play in how we select our food and if more people were to demand local, organic food, more would be done to produce this. This is an argument that everyone can relate to — they all eat so the advice that we can all have an impact is logical. Furthermore, Seth has supported his comments with research from the New Internationalist and also refers to the UN. This allows people to verify his claims and also shows that he has taken the time to read around the topic. All listeners to the radio debate would be able to relate to the UN further adding weight to the argument.

Whilst both Grace and Seth rely heavily on opinions, and Seth's call to action could make some people question his motivations, I believe Seth's logical argument as well as the use of research means listeners would be more convinced by his claims.

AO1 Analysis = 8 out of 8

AO1 Evaluation = 7 out of 8

Examiner comment

The response achieves a clear Level 4 as it provides a clear judgment on the reasoning of the two individuals in the source (Seth's argument is more convincing), as well as giving examples and arguments to support the claim. The response provides a supported explanation of both Grace and Seth's strengths and weaknesses. (Grace has a vested interest, which is explained, and does not use research, Seth uses research and links to well-known organisations but could be seen as a little too emotive.) Moreover, the answer tries to show what the impact of these strengths and weaknesses has on the audience. A conclusion is given, the justification of this is a little lacking however, therefore the bottom of Level 4 has been awarded (applied from Table F: Evaluation for the clear, supported judgement consistent with the argument).

Common errors and general guidance for candidates

- Candidates should compare both arguments in the source explicitly, analysing and evaluating the reasoning and evidence of each person.

- The candidate's evaluation and judgement about which argument is most convincing should be supported with material taken from the source used as evidence.

- Some candidates tend to describe each argument or assert a strength or weakness of the arguments without explanation. The evaluative points need to be explained giving reasons.

- Candidates should be encouraged to use critical thinking concepts in the evaluation of the arguments in the source.

- Some candidates lose focus and describe their own opinions on the issue. Responses should analyse and evaluate the arguments in the source and not attempt to justify alternative points of view.

Total mark awarded for Question 3 (Specimen answer 1) = 14 out of 16

Total mark awarded for Question 3 (Specimen answer 2) = 15 out of 16

Question 4

A government wants to reduce hunger for people living in poverty.

The following actions are being considered:

- Provide free food in areas of poverty.

- Invest in new farming technologies.

- Train people to grow and sell food in local areas.

Which **one** of these actions would you recommend to the government, and why?

In your answer, you should:

- state your recommendation

- give reasons and evidence to support your choice

- use the material in the sources and/or any of your own ideas

- consider different arguments and perspectives.

Specimen answer 1

To reduce hunger for people living in poverty I would advise the government to train people to grow and sell food in their local areas.

Training people provides a long-term solution to the problem of hunger and helps people to help themselves — it is sustainable. Training gives people the skills they need to grow food and ensure that their families and the local community will have access to food every year. In addition, people will be able to grow more food than they need and sell the surplus to others in the local market. This will create wealth for the growers and bring them out of poverty at the same time as increasing the local supply of food to those who cannot grow their own food. As the saying goes, 'give someone a fish and feed them for a day; teach them how to fish and feed them for life.'

This action also has the most impact because the training can be related to the local culture and environment, making it more acceptable in each community. When people see its success, they will share their experience and train others, spreading skills. They will also teach their own children and the knowledge will be available for future generations. Seth in Source 4 agrees with this approach when he says, 'farming should be given back to local people who grow native food crops that reflect local cultures.'

The government will also benefit because there will be no need to pay for food aid. If people escape poverty and sell produce, they will be able to pay taxes. Children can go to school healthy and learn, fulfilling their potential, as the food charity claim in Source 2. They can

then get better jobs and pay more taxes to the government as the economy improves. The additional income can be spent on other services to improve and develop the country. It becomes a 'virtuous circle'!

Investing in new industrial farming technologies takes a long time and will not necessarily work in all places and environments. For example, growing food in a desert will always be very expensive and use precious water. It is also very expensive, requires continuing maintenance and high-level technical skills that are difficult to teach.

Providing free food is also very expensive, it only has a short-term impact and does not provide a practical way to solve the problem. It creates dependency on others and more inequality because the problem is not solved by tackling the cause. Training people to grow and sell food tackles the cause of hunger.

So, I believe that the best action is to train people how to grow food. It is more effective and follows the United Nations' plans to create a more sustainable future that reflects local needs and reduces worldwide poverty by action at a local level.

AO1 Use evidence and reasons to support arguments = 7 out of 8
AO1 Develop a line of reasoning = 7 out of 8
AO1 Judgements about perspectives and action = 4 out of 4

Examiner comment

The question tested the ability to develop a line of reasoning to support an opinion or judgement using reasons and evidence.

The response recommended that training people to grow and sell their own food in local areas is the best action for the government to reduce hunger for those living in poverty. The response demonstrated effective use of evidence and reasons to support this recommendation.

A wide range of evidence and reasons were used to support the argument. For example, reference to the food charity in Source 2 and Seth's view in Source 4 are cited, as well as United Nations, and the use of relevant examples to explain points. Reasons were given, including reference to size of impact, likelihood of success, a long-term and sustainable solution, local action, economic factors, and relevance to local culture.

The evidence and reasons were generally relevant to the issue in the question. These were related to the main aspects of the question, *government action* to reduce *hunger* caused by *poverty*, and the recommended action, *training* people to *grow and sell* food *locally*. Occasionally material that was tangential to the issue was introduced, for example on water shortages in deserts in paragraph 5.

The argument was clear and well-structured in distinct paragraphs. It was convincing and had sustained lines of reasoning related to the issue in the question and the argument. The recommended action was justified well. The response frequently referred to the issue so that the line of reasoning was generally clear.

Several perspectives were discussed, that of people in poverty and the government. All three possible actions were also discussed, although the rejected options in less detail.

Overall, judgements were supported, clearly related to the issue, clearly explained and consistent with the argument. This was shown in the introductory sentence and the concluding paragraph.

On balance, the response therefore entered Level 4 of the mark scheme.

Specimen answer 2

Whilst providing free food in places of extreme poverty could help in times of desperate need such as in winter or following a natural disaster such as flood or drought, this is not a sustainable method and should only be used as a short-term measure. The danger of making this a long-term solution is that people may become dependent and reliant on the program.

Therefore, I would rather suggest that that the government train people to grow and sell food in local areas. This is much more in line with Seth's bottom-up approach and an action in which many people can be included. For that reason, support and buy-in to the scheme is likely to take hold relatively quickly producing results as early as the next harvest season.

Whilst investments into large scale farming would be possible, the initial costs for such an initiative would be huge and would also see the production of food held in the interests of a handful of businesses making profit, the main focus rather than the greater good. For this reason, the focus may be on the exploitation of resources for maximum short-term gain for the businesses' shareholders.

Moreover, training people to produce and sell food locally will also relieve the stress on the soil from over-farming and reduce the risks of diseases and sicknesses to the plants. It will allow certain regions to specialise in specific crops that perform best for their conditions.

Of course, there are a number of hurdles that would need to be overcome by individuals that grow and sell their own food. I know from my parents who plant a number of vegetables throughout the year that it is time-consuming and they often spend evenings and weekends caring for the garden. They enjoy it, but some may find this boring. Also, in the summer with hosepipe bans and rising water costs, it can get quite expensive. Mum argues that it is a small price to pay to know what we eat and where it comes from. Others may object to the result that such a plan would mean that we need to eat seasonally and regionally. This would mean no more strawberries in the winter (which is not necessarily a bad thing considering the fuel used to get them here), but no more bananas ever as they don't grow here, that would be difficult.

AO1 Use evidence and reasons to support arguments = 8 out of 8
AO1 Develop a line of reasoning = 7 out of 8
AO1 Judgements about perspectives and action = 3 out of 4

Examiner comment

The response makes a clear judgement (the government should train people to grow and sell their own food locally) and supports this by assessing the weaknesses of the other two options. This results in a balanced response with a number of perspectives (that of shareholder concerns, dependency of those receiving food parcels as well as personal experience and views of planting their own food). This puts the response in Level 4 of Table G (Use of Evidence and Reasons).

A line of reasoning is developed, though the structure could possibly be seen as a little confusing as it develops from providing food to government training to industrial scale farming and back to government training. That said, explanations are generally well developed and support the argument. Different perspectives are explicitly discussed. As such, Level 4 has been awarded for Table H (Develop a line of reasoning).

A judgement is reached: governments should train people to grow and sell food locally. However, the conclusion of the response does not have this clearly in focus – rather the problems of keeping food local and is, in its personal perspective, a little tangential to the main discussion. For this reason, the response was awarded at Level 3 in Table I (Judgements).

Common errors and general guidance for candidates

- Candidates should explain their recommended action and use a wide range of reasons and evidence to support their opinion. Several perspectives should be introduced. These may be personal, local, national, or global. The perspectives of different social or interest groups could also be discussed.

- Candidates are expected to use material drawn from the sources to provide reasons and evidence. Prior knowledge of the topic and issue is not expected. However, candidates may introduce relevant background information if they wish.

- It is not necessary for candidates to discuss all three possible actions and different perspectives for all three possible actions. This is a complex approach that is not necessary, and candidates generally find this difficult to achieve in the time available and therefore lose focus.

- Candidates should structure the argument in paragraphs, frequently refer to the recommended action and explain why the action addresses the issue in the question.

- It is helpful for candidates to summarise their judgment in a concluding paragraph.

Total mark awarded for Question 4 (Specimen answer 1) = 18 out of 20

Total mark awarded for Question 4 (Specimen answer 2) = 18 out of 20