GradeMax

CAMBRIDGE
International Education

Cambridge IGCSE™

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES **0457/13**

Paper 1 Written Exam **October/November 2025**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 70

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2025 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptions for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

GradeMax

Social Science–Specific Marking Principles (for point–based marking)

1 Components using point–based marking:

- Point marking is often used to reward knowledge, understanding and application of skills. We give credit where the candidate's answer shows relevant knowledge, understanding and application of skills in answering the question. We do not give credit where the answer shows confusion.

From this it follows that we:

a DO credit answers which are worded differently from the mark scheme if they clearly convey the same meaning (unless the mark scheme requires a specific term)

b DO credit alternative answers/examples which are not written in the mark scheme if they are correct

c DO credit answers where candidates give more than one correct answer in one prompt/numbered/scaffolded space where extended writing is required rather than list–type answers. For example, questions that require *n* reasons (e.g. State two reasons …).

d DO NOT credit answers simply for using a 'key term' unless that is all that is required. (Check for evidence it is understood and not used wrongly.)

e DO NOT credit answers which are obviously self–contradicting or trying to cover all possibilities

f DO NOT give further credit for what is effectively repetition of a correct point already credited unless the language itself is being tested. This applies equally to 'mirror statements' (i.e. polluted/not polluted).

g DO NOT require spellings to be correct, unless this is part of the test. However spellings of syllabus terms must allow for clear and unambiguous separation from other syllabus terms with which they may be confused (e.g. Corrasion/Corrosion)

2 Presentation of mark scheme:

- Slashes (/) or the word 'or' separate alternative ways of making the same point.
- Semi colons (;) bullet points (•) or figures in brackets (1) separate different points.
- Content in the answer column in brackets is for examiner information/context to clarify the marking but is not required to earn the mark (except Accounting syllabuses where they indicate negative numbers).

3 Calculation questions:

- The mark scheme will show the steps in the most likely correct method(s), the mark for each step, the correct answer(s) and the mark for each answer
- If working/explanation is considered essential for full credit, this will be indicated in the question paper and in the mark scheme. In all other instances, the correct answer to a calculation should be given full credit, even if no supporting working is shown.
- Where the candidate uses a valid method which is not covered by the mark scheme, award equivalent marks for reaching equivalent stages.
- Where an answer makes use of a candidate's own incorrect figure from previous working, the 'own figure rule' applies: full marks will be given if a correct and complete method is used. Further guidance will be included in the mark scheme where necessary and any exceptions to this general principle will be noted.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

GradeMax

4 Annotation:

- For point marking, ticks can be used to indicate correct answers and crosses can be used to indicate wrong answers. There is no direct relationship between ticks and marks. Ticks have no defined meaning for levels of response marking.
- For levels of response marking, the level awarded should be annotated on the script.
- Other annotations will be used by examiners as agreed during standardisation, and the meaning will be understood by all examiners who marked that paper.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

Annotations guidance for centres

Examiners use a system of annotations as a shorthand for communicating their marking decisions to one another. Examiners are trained during the standardisation process on how and when to use annotations. The purpose of annotations is to inform the standardisation and monitoring processes and guide the supervising examiners when they are checking the work of examiners within their team. The meaning of annotations and how they are used is specific to each component and is understood by all examiners who mark the component.

We publish annotations in our mark schemes to help centres understand the annotations they may see on copies of scripts. Note that there may not be a direct correlation between the number of annotations on a script and the mark awarded. Similarly, the use of an annotation may not be an indication of the quality of the response.

The annotations listed below were available to examiners marking this component in this series.

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Correct, creditworthy point
	Incorrect point
	Unclear point
EXP	Explanation
EVAL	Evaluation
E	Evidence (from source or own knowledge)
J	Judgement
M	Methods of Research
P	Perspective
R	Reason/Reasoning
BOD	Benefit of doubt given
^	Omission mark, more required
	Not Relevant
REP	Repetition
NAQ	Not Answered Question
SEEN	Page or response seen by examiner
Highlighter	Identification of a point

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**According to Source 1, which food type has the highest percentage of food wasted?** Main Annotations From Source 1, candidates are expected to identify: • Fruits and Vegetables Award 1 mark for the correct answer.	**1**
1(b)(i)	**Identify <u>one</u> example of a generalisation from Source 2.** Main Annotations From Source 2, candidates are expected to identify **one** of the following: • Wasting food is wrong. • There is a growing trend around the world to throw away 'ugly' food. • They are edible. • This will have positive environmental impacts. • Fertilisers and transportation … produce significant emissions which contribute to global warming. • Other reasonable response. Award 1 mark for a correct answer.	**1**
1(b)(ii)	**Explain why the example you identified is a generalisation.** Main Annotations **Indicative content** A generalisation looks to make broad statements or universal truths about an issue or problem based on a small number of specific cases. Award 2 marks for a response which clearly explains why the identified example is a generalisation. Award 1 mark if the response shows understanding of generalisation but the relationship to the example is not clear. Award 0 if there is no credible response. ***Further Guidance*** 1 If Question 1(b)(i) is incorrect, it is very unlikely that 1(b)(ii) will be awarded more than 1 mark; the mark is most likely to be awarded for showing understanding of the nature of generalisation.	**2**

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>1(c)</td><td>

From Source 2, describe the environmental group's perspective on food waste.

Main Annotations 

Table A

Use this table to give marks for each candidate response.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Analysis of issues and perspectives (AO1)</th><th></th></tr>
<tr><th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Clear analysis of the source
• Describes a wide range of elements of the perspective.
• Frequent use of relevant material and examples taken from the source.</td><td>5–6</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Some analysis of the source
• Describes a range of elements of the perspective.
• Some use of relevant material and examples taken from the source.</td><td>3–4</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Limited analysis of the source
• Describes a limited range of elements of the perspective.
• Little or no use of material and examples taken from the source.</td><td>1–2</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>No creditable response</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table>

Indicative content

Candidates may describe the following elements of the perspective:
- Issue – food waste has increased rapidly, and it is damaging the environment.
- Values – food waste is wrong / throwing away 'ugly food' is wrong and unsustainable.
- Cause – rejection of 'ugly' food / overproduction.
- Consequence – reducing food waste will also positively impact other environmental factors and food shortages.
- Action – reach the UN Sustainability Goals for food / reduce wasting food during production, processing and consumption.
- Other relevant response.

</td><td>6</td></tr>
</table>

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>1(d)</td><td>
Sources 1 and 2 suggest some consequences of food waste.

Which consequence of food waste do you think is the most significant? Explain why.

Main Annotations R EXP J

Table B

Use this table to give marks for each candidate response.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Analysis of issues and perspectives (AO1)</th><th></th></tr>
<tr><th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>Clear justification of an opinion
• The opinion is clearly explained and supported.
• The explanation is credible and clearly related to the identified issue.</td><td>7–8</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Some justification of an opinion
• The opinion is explained with some support.
• The explanation is mainly credible and related to the identified issue.</td><td>5–6</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Partial justification of an opinion
• The opinion is partly explained and has minimal support.
• The explanation is partly related to the identified issue.</td><td>3–4</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>A limited opinion
• The opinion is asserted with limited explanation.
• Any explanation may be general, tangential to the issue and lacking credibility.</td><td>1–2</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>No creditable response</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>8</td></tr>
</table>

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	**Indicative content** Candidates may identify one of the following consequences: • Food shortages • Global warming • Production of resources, e.g. fertilisers • Saving water • Reducing emissions • Reduces processing of waste • Reduces transportation. Candidates may give the following reasons to justify their opinion: • Scope and impact of the consequence • Impact on life, health, wellbeing • Environmental impact • Financial impact • Other relevant response.	

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>2(a)</td><td>

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

Main Annotations EVAL EXP

Table C

Use this table to give marks for each candidate response.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Evaluate research into current global issues (AO1)</th><th></th></tr>
<tr><th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>Consistently evaluative
• Reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points, including both strengths and weaknesses.
• Explanations are credible, supported and clearly related to the purpose of the research.</td><td>7–8</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Mainly evaluative
• Reasoned explanation of a range of evaluative points.
• Explanations are mostly supported, credible and related to the purpose of the research.</td><td>5–6</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Partly evaluative
• A range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive with little explanation.
• Explanations are partially supported and may lack some credibility or partly related to the purpose of the research.</td><td>3–4</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Limited evaluation
• A limited range of evaluative points without explanation; the research or topic in the source is only described.
• Evaluative points are asserted and/or not credible and/or not related to the purpose of the research.</td><td>1–2</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>No creditable response</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table>

</td><td>8</td></tr>
</table>

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	**Indicative content** Candidates may identify the following strengths and weaknesses of the research. Strengths: • Primary research undertaken (interview, survey and observation). • Spoken to cafeteria directly involved in the school about the issue under study. • Different stakeholder groups involved. • Research is relevant to the scope of the study the student is undertaking as it is locally focused. • Two-week study undertaken. • 75% response rate (from all students in the school) / good sample size. • Other relevant response. Weaknesses: • Survey asks for some data that is orientated / vested interest led and therefore not reliable. • Whilst a representative survey response, unsure as to the validity of the responses. • Interview conducted in a busy canteen with lots of interruptions. • Other relevant response.	

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>2(b)</td><td>

'Many schools recycle waste food.'

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

Main Annotations EXP M

Table D

Use this table to give marks for each candidate response.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Design research into current global issues (AO1)</th><th></th></tr>
<tr><th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>An appropriate and fully justified research design
• Reasoned explanation of a wide range of methods and evidence.
• Explanations are credible and clearly related to testing the claim / purpose of the research.</td><td>7–8</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>An appropriate and justified research design
• Reasoned explanation of a range of methods and evidence.
• Explanations are credible and mostly related to testing the claim / purpose of the research.</td><td>5–6</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>A partly justified research design
• A range of methods and/or evidence that are mostly descriptive with little explanation.
• Explanations may lack some credibility and/or are partly related to testing the claim / purpose of the research.</td><td>3–4</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Limited research design
• A limited range of methods and/or evidence without explanation; the research or topics are only described.
• Methods and evidence are not credible and/or not related to testing the claim / purpose of the research.</td><td>1–2</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>No creditable response</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table>

</td><td>8</td></tr>
</table>

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	**Indicative content** Candidates may discuss the following ways to test the claim stated in Source 3. Methods: • Interviews of relevant experts • Further methods of primary testing and observation • Observation • Review of secondary sources / literature / research / documents • Internet and media search • Questionnaires • Surveys • Case studies of people involved in the topic • Other relevant response. Evidence: • Statistics / information on food waste • Individual testimony or personal experience • Material from relevant online organisation • Material from pressure groups / charities / governments / international organisations concerned about food supply • Primary and secondary research data and information • Quantitative and qualitative research data and information • Research reports • Other relevant response.	

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>
Which argument is more convincing, Dara's or Mirna's?

Your answer should:

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

Main Annotations J R EXP E

Tables E and F

Use these tables to give marks for each candidate response.

Table E
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Analysis (AO1)</th><th></th></tr>
<tr><th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>Consistently analytic throughout and fully supported
• Analyses a wide range of aspects of both arguments.
• Frequent use of relevant material taken from the source.
• Clear and explicit comparison of the two arguments.</td><td>7–8</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Mainly analytic and supported
• Analyses a range of aspects of both arguments.
• Some use of relevant material taken from the source.
• Clear comparison of the two arguments.</td><td>5–6</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Partly analytic and descriptive with some support
• Analyses a limited range of aspects of both arguments.
• Occasional use of material taken from the source.
• Implied comparison by simple juxtaposition of the two arguments.</td><td>3–4</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Descriptive and unsupported
• Analyses a limited range of aspects of one argument.
• Little or no use of material taken from the source.</td><td>1–2</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>No creditable response</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>16</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Table F
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Evaluation (AO1)</th><th></th></tr>
<tr><th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>Consistently evaluative throughout and fully explained
• Detailed and reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points throughout the response.
• Both reasoning and evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated explicitly.
• Clear, supported judgement consistent with the candidate’s argument.</td><td>7–8</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Mainly evaluative and explained
• Reasoned explanation of a range of evaluative points within most of the response.
• Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated.
• Judgement generally consistent with the candidate’s argument.</td><td>5–6</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Partly evaluative with little explanation
• A limited range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive and/or asserted with little explanation.
• Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are mostly described.
• Judgement lacks some clarity and may be partly inconsistent with the candidate’s argument.</td><td>3–4</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Descriptive without explanation
• One or two evaluative points that are asserted, tangential or not relevant.
• The topic or the arguments in the source are described.
• Judgement is unclear and inconsistent with the candidate’s argument or may not be included.</td><td>1–2</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>No creditable response</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

Question	Answer	Marks
3	**Indicative content** Candidates are expected to evaluate the arguments presented in Source 4. They should make a supported judgement with some explanation about which person has the most convincing argument. Candidates may support their judgement by considering some of the following aspects of the arguments. Strength of reasoning: • logic • structure • balance • claims Use of language: • tone – emotive, exaggerated, precise, measured • clarity Evidence: • range of information and depth • relevance • sufficiency – sample size • source – media, internet • date – how recent • different types of information – fact, opinion, value, anecdote • testimony – from experience and expert Sources of bias or vested interest: • local interest • economic • personal values • experience Possible consequences of the ideas or actions presented. Acceptability of their values to others: • how likely other people are to agree with their perspective / view. Other relevant responses should be credited.	

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Examples of evaluative points candidates are likely to discuss are outlined as follows.
<table>
<tr><th>Argument</th><th>Strengths</th><th>Weaknesses</th></tr>
<tr><td>Dara</td><td>• Personal experience.
• Statistics used (3 billion people, 1/3 of food produced is wasted).
• Emotive tone to engage reader.
• Other relevant response.</td><td>• Vested interest being a farmer.
• Emotive.
• No reference for the statistics.
• Other relevant response.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mirna</td><td>• Lots of statistics.
• More of a balanced view.
• Personal experience.
• Solutions are more grass roots level.
• Logical arguments.
• Other relevant response.</td><td>• Vested interested in selling own books.
• Only own perspective given.
• Other relevant response.</td></tr>
</table></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>AO1 Analysis</td><td>8</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>AO1 Evaluation</td><td>8</td></tr>
</table>

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**A government wants to reduce food waste in their country.** **The following actions are being considered:** • **Provide education on how to reduce and reuse leftovers.** • **Increase the price of food to make people buy less.** • **Tax restaurants and supermarkets for wasting food.** **Which <u>one</u> 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.** Main Annotations EXP P R J **Tables G, H and I** Use these tables to give marks for each candidate response.	**20**

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>Table G
<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Use evidence and reasons to support arguments (AO1)</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Level</td><td>Description</td><td>Marks</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>Effective use of evidence and reasons to support arguments
• Uses a wide range of evidence and reasons to fully support the candidate’s argument.
• Evidence and reasons are clearly relevant to the issue in the question.</td><td>7–8</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Mainly uses evidence and reasons to support arguments
• Uses a range of evidence and reasons to support the candidate’s argument.
• Evidence and reasons are relevant to the issue in the question.</td><td>5–6</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Some use of evidence and reasons to support arguments
• Uses a limited range of evidence and reasons to partly support the candidate’s argument.
• Evidence and reasons are not always relevant to the issue in the question.</td><td>3–4</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Limited use of evidence and reasons to support arguments
• Uses one or two pieces of evidence and/or reasons and these give very little support to the candidate’s argument.
• Evidence and reasons are tangential or not relevant to the issue in the question.</td><td>1–2</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>No creditable response</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

GradeMax

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>Table H
<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Develop a line of reasoning (AO1)</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Level</td><td>Description</td><td>Marks</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>Convincing and clear reasoning
• Clear, convincing and sustained lines of reasoning related to the issue in the question and the candidate’s argument.
• Well–structured and explicit consideration of different perspectives or actions.</td><td>7–8</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Clear reasoning
• Clear lines of reasoning mainly related to the issue in the question and the candidate’s argument.
• Structured consideration of different perspectives or actions.</td><td>5–6</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Some reasoning
• Lines of reasoning are difficult to follow at times and not always related to the issue in the question and the candidate’s argument.
• Some consideration of different perspectives or actions.</td><td>3–4</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Limited reasoning
• Lines of reasoning lack clarity and are often unrelated to the issue in the question and the candidate’s argument.
• Little or no consideration of different perspectives or actions.</td><td>1–2</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>No creditable response</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**Indicative Content** Candidates are expected to make a judgement about the recommended course of action using reasons and evidence to justify their choice. Candidates may use and develop material found in Sources 1 to 4 but should go beyond simply repeating or recycling without interpretation. Other material may be introduced but is not necessary to gain full marks. Candidates may consider some of the following: • Reference to scale of impact on food waste. • Reference to different consequences and implications for individuals / groups / government. • How long it might take to make a difference. • Barriers to change. • The power of collective action, e.g. Cooperation between different groups over food waste issues. • The influence of individuals and groups on decision making. • The role of vested interests and power differences. • Potential conflicts of interest. • Difficulties in planning and coordinating improvements. • Cost and access to resources to implement change. • Other reasonable response.	
	AO1 Use evidence and reasons to support arguments	8
	AO1 Develop a line of reasoning	8
	AO1 Judgements about perspectives and action	4

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2025