GradeMax

CAMBRIDGE
International Education

Cambridge IGCSE™

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES **0457/11**

Paper 1 Written Exam **May/June 2026**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 70

Published

This mark scheme contains the instructions and marking guidance that our examiners used to mark candidate responses for this component.

Before they start marking, examiners complete a standardisation process. They review a range of candidate responses and discuss the mark scheme in detail to agree which answers can and cannot be accepted. Examiners award marks where it is clear that candidate responses have met the requirements of the mark scheme. These requirements may vary between different components or different versions of the same component, depending on the exact requirements of the question and the candidate responses seen during the standardisation process.

Sometimes, our mark schemes may allow marks to be awarded to responses which contain elements that are factually incorrect or for content not covered by the syllabus. We do this in response to the demands of a specific question to support candidates and make sure that our assessments are fair. However, these allowances should not be used as a guide for teaching and learning.

We cannot discuss the mark scheme with schools, and we recommend that schools read the mark scheme together with the assessment material and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

This document consists of **21** printed pages.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

[Turn over

General marking principles

All examiners must apply these marking principles when marking candidate responses.

1	Examiners must award marks for each response in line with: • the specific **content** defined in the mark scheme • the specific **skills** defined in the mark scheme or in the level descriptions • the **standard of response** required as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.
2	Examiners must award **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).
3	Examiners must award marks **positively**. This means that: • marks are not deducted for errors or omissions • marks are awarded for correct/valid answers as defined in the mark scheme and also for **other valid answers** which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme referring to your team leader as appropriate • the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar are judged **only** when the mark scheme indicates that these features are **specifically assessed** in the question. However, the meaning of all responses must be unambiguous.
4	Examiners must **consistently** apply the requirements of the mark scheme and any rules for what to do when candidates have not followed instructions correctly.
5	Examiners must use the **full range of marks** defined in the mark scheme, unless limited by the quality of the candidate responses seen.
6	Examiners must award marks according to the mark scheme and **must not** award marks with grade thresholds or grade descriptions in mind.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax

Social Sciences-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 2026

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.

PapaCambridge papacambridge.com

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax

Assessment objectives

AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation

- design, carry out and evaluate research into current global issues, their causes and consequences and possible course(s) of action
- use evidence to support claims, arguments and perspectives
- identify and analyse issues, arguments and perspectives
- analyse and evaluate the evidence and reasoning used to support claims, arguments and perspectives
- analyse and evaluate sources and/or processes to support research, arguments and perspectives
- develop a line of reasoning to support an argument, a perspective or course(s) of action.

Introduction

Most questions are marked holistically using levels of response mark schemes. The marks awarded for an answer are usually based on a judgement of the overall quality of the response, rather than on awarding marks for specific points and accumulating a total mark by adding points.

Inevitably, the mark scheme cannot cover all responses that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases candidates may make very strong responses which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should nevertheless be credited according to their quality.

Levels of response

For answers marked by levels of response, the following is intended to describe the quality of the response required (level of skill that should be demonstrated) for the award of marks at different points in the mark range for the question.

In the levels of response mark scheme positive achievement is being rewarded.
For answers marked by levels of response:

a. Marking grids describe the top of each level.
b. **To determine the level** – start at the highest level and work down until you reach the level that matches the answer.
c. **To determine the mark within the level**, consider the following:

Descriptor	Award mark
Consistently meets the criteria for this level	At top of level
Meets the criteria but with some slight inconsistency	Above middle and either below top of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
Just enough achievement on balance for this level	Above bottom and either below middle of level or at middle of level (depending on number of marks available)
On the borderline of this level and the one below	At bottom of level

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	**According to Source 1, how many cooperatives are there in the world?** Main Annotations  From Source 1, candidates are expected to identify: • Three million or 3 000 000 or 3×10^6 Award 1 mark for the correct answer.	1
1(b)(i)	**Identify <u>one</u> example of a value from Source 2.** From Source 2, candidates are expected to identify **one** of: • It is important for workers/customers/community to have a stake in the business. • It is right that everyone in the business is involved in making decisions. • Co-ops are fair / promote fairness. • Co-ops treat people as equals. • Our co-op values people. • Encourages participation. Award 1 mark for a correct answer.	1
1(b)(ii)	**Explain why the example you identified is a value.** **Indicative content** A value is a moral or ethical view or principle of right or wrong, fair or unfair, or importance applied to a person's opinion and stance on a given issue. Award 2 marks for a response which clearly explains why the identified example is a value. Award 1 mark if the response shows understanding of a value but the relationship to the example is not clear. Award 0 if there is no creditable response.	2

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

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

Describe the perspective of the cooperative in Source 2.

Main Annotations ✔

Table A
Use this table to give marks for each candidate response.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Analysis of issues and perspectives (AO1)</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Level</td><td>Description</td><td>Marks</td></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 – cooperative structures in business are being promoted.
- Values – people should have a stake in the business; fair and equal treatment of people; involvement in decision-making; encourages participation; values people / people are important.
- Cause / reasons – to create ownership, motivation, and hard work.
- Consequence – business will be successful; share profits equally.
- Action – join the company/business; join the cooperative movement.
- Other relevant response.

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

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

Sources 1 and 2 identify benefits of cooperatives.

Which benefit of cooperatives do you think is the most significant? Explain why.

Main Annotations J R EXP

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>

Indicative content

Candidates may identify one of the following benefits:

- People have a stake in the business because they own part of it.
- People work hard.
- People are more motivated and loyal.
- Cooperatives are successful and make a profit.
- Provide employment, goods and services in all sectors of the economy.
- Everyone has a say in how the business is run.
- People are treated fairly and equally.
- Cooperatives have clear values.
- Meeting shared needs, e.g. economic, social and cultural.
- Provide employment for many people.
- Other reasonable response.

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	Candidates may give the following reasons to justify their opinion: • Has greatest impact on people's lives, individually, locally, nationally, and globally. • Affects the most people locally, nationally, or internationally. • Most popular reason. • Ethically or morally most important. • Has multiple positive consequences. • Creates a virtuous circle. • Affects other aspects of life for different groups in society. • Reflects expert opinion / research. • Other relevant response.	

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

<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><td></td><td>Evaluate research into current global issues (AO1)</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Level</td><td>Description</td><td>Marks</td></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
• 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>

Indicative content

Candidates may identify the following strengths and weaknesses of the research.

Strengths:

- Research question is clear and enables the research to be relevant/focused/on track.
- Large sample that is likely to be representative and so valid/accurate.
- Method is relevant to the research question – questionnaires will produce data that could fulfil the aim of finding out about motivation/hard work.

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	• Data is qualitative and can be analysed to show impact of cooperative structure on levels of work. • Clear outcome described that answers the research question directly. • Valid evidence as drawn directly from questionnaire responses with cooperative workers. • Wide range of information/data is likely to be reliable and representative. • Ethical as permission from management was given. • Reasonably up to date so both relevant and timely as the situation is likely not have changed. • Other relevant response. Weaknesses: • Questions are not known and may be unclear or leading. • Researcher bias / error in the interpretation of responses. • People may not answer honestly due to manager supervision so data may not be valid or reliable. • Managers may edit the questionnaire responses. • Managers may have vested interest/bias that may influence the research results. • Researcher is unknown/not cited fully, therefore expertise/ability to know uncertain and may be unreliable. • Only one type of evidence gathered so lack of verification. • Other relevant response.	

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

2(b) **'Sharing profits makes people work harder.'** **8**

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

Main Annotations M EXP

Table D

Use this table to give marks for each candidate response.

	Design research into current global issues (AO1)	
Level	**Description**	**Marks**
4	**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.	**7–8**
3	**An appropriate and justified research design** • Explanation of a range of methods and evidence. • Explanations are credible and mostly related to testing the claim/purpose of the research.	**5–6**
2	**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.	**3–4**
1	**Limited research design** • A limited range of methods and/or evidence without explanation; the research or topics is only described. • Methods and evidence are not credible and/or not related to testing the claim/purpose of the research.	**1–2**
0	**No creditable response**	**0**

Indicative content

Candidates may discuss the following ways to test the claim stated in Source 3.

Methods:

- Interviews of relevant experts in worker behaviour/management and leadership, e.g. business consultants, managers and business leaders.
- Interviews with workers about their views/attitude to work in a range of organisations.
- Review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents about worker motivation and commitment in cooperatives and other structures.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	• Internet and media search on cooperatives and motivation. • Questionnaires and surveys of workers about their working life. • Case studies of cooperatives. • Other relevant response. Evidence: • Statistics/information on cooperative profits, output levels, business success and survival. • Individual testimony or personal experience. • Documentary material from pressure groups/charities/governments/ international organisations focused on work and cooperatives. • Primary and secondary research data and information. • Quantitative and qualitative research data and information. • Research reports from relevant organisations with expertise and ability to know about cooperatives. • Other relevant response.	

PapaCambridge
papacambridge.com

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

GradeMax

<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>

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

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>
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.

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>Carl</td><td>• Passionate about subject
• Uses many reasons and relevant examples to give clarity and explain
• Clear, logical argument
• Focus on rewarding hard work and talent
• Other relevant response.</td><td>• Not much evidence, mainly opinion
• Some assertion
• Some exaggeration
• A negative tone focusing on potential problems
• Little statistical evidence
• No balance or discussion of counterarguments
• Few specific actions proposed
• Other relevant response.</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>
<table>
<tr><th>Argument</th><th>Strengths</th><th>Weaknesses</th></tr>
<tr><td>Luna</td><td>• Uses many relevant examples
• Clear, logical argument
• Frequent reference to research evidence
• Refers to reputable organisations/people, e.g. UN, New Zealand, professor Smith with expertise/ability to know
• Has some citation/referencing to verify research data/evidence
• Other relevant response.</td><td>• Some assertion
• Little respect for Carl’s perspective
• Harsh language at times
• Some exaggeration
• 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 2026

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>

'More organisations should become cooperatives.'

Do you agree with this statement?

In your answer, you should:

- **state your opinion**
- **give reasons and evidence to support your opinion**
- **use the material in the sources and/or any of your own ideas**
- **consider different arguments and perspectives.**

Main Annotations J R EXP P

Tables G, H and I

Use these tables to give marks for each candidate response.

Table G

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Use evidence and reasons to support arguments (AO1)</th><th></th></tr>
<tr><th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Marks</th></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 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>20</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>

Table H

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Develop a line of reasoning (AO1)</th><th></th></tr>
<tr><th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Marks</th></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>

Table I

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Judgements about perspectives and action (AO1)</th><th></th></tr>
<tr><th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>Judgements are fully supported
• Judgements are clearly related to the issue, clearly explained and consistent with the candidate’s argument.</td><td>4</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Judgements are supported
• Judgements are related to the issue, explained and consistent with the candidate’s argument.</td><td>3</td></tr>
</table>

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>
<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Judgements about perspectives and action (AO1)</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Level</td><td>Description</td><td>Marks</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Judgements are partly supported
• Judgements are partly related to the issue, partly explained and not consistent with the candidate's argument.</td><td>2</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Asserted judgements
• Judgements are asserted and not explained.</td><td>1</td></tr>
<tr><td>0</td><td>No creditable response</td><td>0</td></tr>
</table>
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 worker satisfaction, motivation, work rate and quality of work.
• Reference to scale of impact on business and organisational success.
• Reference to different consequences and implications for different individuals/groups/organisations/government.
• Timescale and how long it might take to make a difference.
• Barriers to change which make actions difficult to achieve.
• The power of collective action, e.g. cooperation between different groups or organisations over cooperative movement growth.
• The role of bias, vested interests and power differences.
• Potential conflicts of interest and political implications, e.g. protest.
• Difficulties in planning and coordinating action.
• Cost and access to resources to implement change; for example, for training and to implement change in established organisations.
• Opportunity costs of funding/managing cooperative growth and development, for example taking away resources/money from other aspects of an organisation/community/business.
• Other reasonable response.
</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>AO1 Use evidence and reasons to support arguments.</td><td>8</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>AO1 Develop a line of reasoning.</td><td>8</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>AO1 Judgements about perspectives and action.</td><td>4</td></tr>
</table>

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026