CAMBRIDGE
International Education

# Cambridge IGCSE™

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES** **0457/12**

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 **22** printed pages.

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

**[Turn over**

GradeMax



## 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:<br><br>• the specific **content** defined in the mark scheme<br>• the specific **skills** defined in the mark scheme or in the level descriptions<br>• 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:<br><br>• marks are not deducted for errors or omissions<br>• 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<br>• 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

**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

GradeMax



## 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) | **From Source 1, identify the average loss per vehicle theft in 2020.**<br><br>Main Annotations <br><br>From Source 1, candidates are expected to identify:<br><br>• $9166<br><br>Award 1 mark for the correct answer.<br><br>*(Units must be included – $ or dollars – to be awarded the mark.)* | **1** |
| 1(b)(i) | **Identify <u>one</u> example of a generalisation from Source 2.**<br><br>From Source 2, candidates are expected to identify **one** of:<br><br>• Leads to higher insurance prices.<br>• Often it is linked to financing other international criminal activities.<br>• Car theft can only be solved if everyone works together.<br>• Theft is a significant issue.<br>• Crime also costs businesses money.<br>• Keeping a database helps reduce this crime.<br><br>Award 1 mark for a correct answer. | **1** |
| 1(b)(ii) | **Explain why the example you identified is a generalisation.**<br><br>**Indicative content**<br><br>A generalisation is a statement suggesting that something is true all of the time when it is only true some of the time; or a statement applying the characteristics of a small sample to a whole population.<br><br>Award 2 marks for a response which clearly explains why the identified example is a generalisation.<br><br>Award 1 mark if the response shows understanding of a generalisation but the relationship to the example is not clear.<br><br>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>

**From Source 2, describe the international police organisation's perspective on vehicle crime.**

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<br>• Describes a wide range of elements of the perspective.<br>• 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<br>• Describes a range of elements of the perspective.<br>• 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<br>• Describes a limited range of elements of the perspective.<br>• 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** – vehicle theft / crime and its impact.
- **value –** vehicle crime is wrong/bad/an important issue; care/support for people who are victims of vehicle crime; working together (only way to solve car theft).
- **causes** – financing international crime.
- **consequences** – higher insurance; loss of manufacturer's reputation; costs businesses money; mental health.
- **actions** – keeping a database; conferences to raise awareness; working together.

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

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

**Sources 1 and 2 suggest causes of vehicle crime.**

**Which cause of vehicle crime 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><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>4</td><td>Clear justification of an opinion<br>• The opinion is clearly explained and supported.<br>• 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<br>• The opinion is explained with some support.<br>• 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<br>• The opinion is partly explained and has minimal support.<br>• The explanation is partly related to the identified issue.</td><td>3–4</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>A limited opinion<br>• The opinion is asserted with limited explanation.<br>• 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 causes:

- Boredom
- Thrill of driving a car
- Demand for vehicle parts
- Profiteering from criminal activity
- Economic reasons, e.g. poverty
- Lack of vehicle security
- Financing international criminal activities
- Other relevant 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:<br><br>• Has greatest impact on young.<br>• Affects the most people locally, nationally or internationally.<br>• Ethically or morally most important.<br>• Has multiple negative consequences.<br>• Creates a vicious circle.<br>• Affects other aspects of life for different groups in society.<br>• Reflects expert opinion.<br>• Is the most difficult to solve.<br>• 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 EXP 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<br>• Reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points, including both strengths and weaknesses.<br>• 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<br>• Explanation of a range of evaluative points.<br>• 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<br>• A range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive with little explanation.<br>• 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<br>• A limited range of evaluative points without explanation; the research or topic in the source is only described.<br>• 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:

- Clear purpose of research which guides and directs the use of methods and gathering of relevant evidence; keeps the research on track and focused.
- The researcher has a background in law which might enable them to understand the issue.

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

GradeMax


| Question | Answer | Marks |
|---|---|---|
| 2(a) | • Research was ethical – permission was sought and given by the manager; confidentiality agreed.<br>• Primary research that is likely to produce relevant and accurate data.<br>• Interviews enable the research to gather qualitative data about personal experience, opinions and understandings.<br>• The interview was recorded so that data would be accurate and not lost.<br>• Research based on authentic personal testimony and experience of crime.<br>• Other relevant response.<br><br>Weaknesses:<br><br>• No clearly stated research question so the research may lose focus and direction.<br>• A building firm may not be a representative type of company/organisation for the research topic on vehicle crime / theft.<br>• Only one research method (interviews) – so triangulation/checking/ verification of data or results was difficult or did not take place.<br>• The interview took place in noisy café where it was difficult to hear the interviewee so data may not be complete or accurate.<br>• Small sample size of only one person/company may not be typical and representative.<br>• Interviewee may be biased or have lack of knowledge or a vested interest that makes data unbalanced/untypical/exaggerated/generalised.<br>• Presence of other people in the café may influence the responses of the interviewee – lack of confidentiality.<br>• Other relevant response. | |

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

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

**'The amount of vehicle crime is increasing nationally.'**

**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.

<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Design 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>An appropriate and fully justified research design<br>• Reasoned explanation of a wide range of methods and evidence.<br>• 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<br>• Explanation of a range of methods and evidence.<br>• 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<br>• A range of methods and/or evidence that are mostly descriptive with little explanation.<br>• 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<br>• A limited range of methods and/or evidence without explanation; the research or topic is only described.<br>• 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>

**Indicative content**

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

Methods:

- Interviews of relevant experts / victims of crime / criminals with ability to know / have experience of vehicle crime.
- Surveys of relevant groups of people, e.g. public, police, car dealers, vehicle manufacturers.

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

GradeMax



| Question | Answer | Marks |
|---|---|---|
| 2(b) | • Review of secondary sources/literature/research/documents.<br>• Internet and media searches.<br>• Questionnaires (e.g. online, postal).<br>• Case studies of people or businesses that have experienced vehicle crime to provide detailed information.<br>• Observation of areas where vehicle crime is common, perhaps using video filming.<br>• Other relevant response.<br><br>Evidence:<br><br>• Statistics/information on national vehicle crime and trends.<br>• Individual testimony or personal experience to understand personal experience and feelings.<br>• Material/documentary evidence from police authorities, insurance companies, government data that is likely to be relevant/professionally and scientifically researched/accurate.<br>• Material/documentary evidence from pressure groups/charities/ governments/national organisations concerned about vehicle crime.<br>• Primary and secondary research data/information/reports related to the issue/claim.<br>• Quantitative and qualitative research data and information related to the issue/claim.<br>• Other relevant response. | |

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>
Which argument is more convincing, Abilo's or Berta's?<br><br>
Your answer should:<br><br>
• consider both arguments<br>
• evaluate their reasoning, evidence and use of language<br>
• support your judgement with their words and ideas.<br><br>
Main Annotations J R EXP E<br><br>
Tables E and F<br><br>
Use these tables to give marks for each candidate response.<br><br>
Table E
<table>
<tr><td></td><td>Analysis (AO1)</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Level</td><td>Description</td><td>Marks</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>Consistently analytic throughout and fully supported<br>• Analyses a wide range of aspects of both arguments.<br>• Frequent use of relevant material taken from the source.<br>• Clear and explicit comparison of the two arguments.</td><td>7–8</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Mainly analytic and supported<br>• Analyses a range of aspects of both arguments.<br>• Some use of relevant material taken from the source.<br>• Clear comparison of the two arguments.</td><td>5–6</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Partly analytic and descriptive with some support<br>• Analyses a limited range of aspects of both arguments.<br>• Occasional use of material taken from the source.<br>• Implied comparison by simple juxtaposition of the two arguments.</td><td>3–4</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Descriptive and unsupported<br>• Analyses a limited range of aspects of one argument.<br>• 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><td></td><td>Evaluation (AO1)</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Level</td><td>Description</td><td>Marks</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>Consistently evaluative throughout and fully explained<br>• Reasoned explanation of a wide range of evaluative points throughout the response.<br>• Both reasoning and evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated explicitly.<br>• Clear, supported judgement consistent with the candidate’s argument.</td><td>7–8</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Mainly evaluative and explained<br>• Explanation of a range of evaluative points within most of the response.<br>• Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are evaluated.<br>• Judgement generally consistent with the candidate’s argument.</td><td>5–6</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Partly evaluative with little explanation<br>• A limited range of evaluative points that are mostly descriptive and/or asserted with little explanation.<br>• Reasoning and/or evidence within the arguments in the source are mostly described.<br>• 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<br>• One or two evaluative points that are asserted, tangential or not relevant.<br>• The topic or the arguments in the source are described.<br>• 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>

GradeMax



<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>
Use of language:<br>
• tone – emotive, exaggerated, precise, measured<br>
• clarity<br><br>
Evidence:<br>
• range of information and depth<br>
• relevance<br>
• sufficiency – sample size<br>
• source – media; internet<br>
• date – how recent<br>
• different types of information – fact, opinion, value, anecdote<br>
• testimony – from experience and expert<br><br>
Sources of bias or vested interest:<br>
• local interest<br>
• economic<br>
• personal values<br>
• experience<br><br>
Possible consequences of the ideas or actions presented.<br><br>
Acceptability of their values to others:<br>
• how likely other people are to agree with their perspective/view.<br><br>
Other relevant responses should be credited.<br><br>
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>Abilo</td><td>• Volunteers in local police department.<br>• Source of knowledge relevant to debate.<br>• Blog relevant to argument.<br>• Personal knowledge of friend finding unlocked car.<br>• Persuasive confident language.<br>• Car magazine evidence/quote.<br>• Other relevant response.</td><td>• Very assertive.<br>• Factual evidence limited, no data or information about the source.<br>• No systematic research.<br>• Tends to generalise.<br>• Anecdotal evidence.<br>• Volunteer rather than full-time police officer.<br>• Volunteer, unknown level of responsibility or access.<br>• Other relevant response.</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026 

GradeMax



<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>Berta</td><td>• Works in the motor industry so experienced/knowledgeable.<br>• Some acceptance of Abilo's perspective.<br>• Recognises a broader outlook – global issue not localised.<br>• Wider perspective of the consequences of vehicle crime.<br>• Factual evidence from reputed organisation UN.<br>• News media confirms UN findings.<br>• Other relevant response.</td><td>• Not aware of Berta's role in the motor industry.<br>• Sources of evidence not dated so may not be recent.<br>• Attributes blame and does not look at all consequences of vehicle crime.<br>• Does not acknowledge any responsibility of car owners.<br>• 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>

**A government wants to reduce the amount of vehicle crime.**

**The following actions are being considered:**

- **Provide more police to prevent vehicle crime.**
- **Fund a national vehicle crime awareness campaign.**
- **Encourage manufacturers to improve vehicle security.**

**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 J R EXP P

**Tables G, H and I**

Use these tables to give marks for each candidate response.

**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<br>• Uses a wide range of evidence and reasons to fully support the candidate's argument.<br>• 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<br>• Uses a range of evidence and reasons to support the candidate's argument.<br>• 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<br>• Uses a limited range of evidence and reasons to partly support the candidate's argument.<br>• Evidence and reasons are not always relevant to the issue in the question.</td><td>3–4</td></tr>
</table>

</td><td>20</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>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>1</td><td>Limited use of evidence and reasons to support arguments<br>• Uses one or two pieces of evidence and/or reasons and these give very little support the candidate’s argument.<br>• 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>

**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<br>• Clear, convincing and sustained lines of reasoning related to the issue in the question and the candidate’s argument.<br>• Well-structured and explicit consideration of different perspectives or actions.</td><td>7–8</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Clear reasoning<br>• Clear lines of reasoning mainly related to the issue in the question and the candidate’s argument.<br>• Structured consideration of different perspectives or actions.</td><td>5–6</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Some reasoning<br>• Lines of reasoning are difficult to follow at times and not always related to the issue in the question and the candidate’s argument.<br>• Some consideration of different perspectives or actions.</td><td>3–4</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Limited reasoning<br>• Lines of reasoning lack clarity and are often unrelated to the issue in the question and the candidate’s argument.<br>• 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>

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

**Table I**

<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>4</td><td>Judgements are fully supported<br>• 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<br>• Judgements are related to the issue, explained and consistent with the candidate's argument.</td><td>3</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Judgements are partly supported<br>• 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<br>• 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 courses 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 reducing vehicle crime – number of people affected / range of places or organisations.
- Reference to different consequences and implications for different individuals/groups/organisations.
- 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 organisations or countries over international crime and profiteering issues.
- The influence of individuals and groups on decision making or the issue, particularly business leaders, criminal gangs, law enforcement and police, politicians.
- 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, by raising taxes.

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

© Cambridge University Press & Assessment 2026

GradeMax



| Question | Answer | Marks |
|---|---|---|
| 4 | • Opportunity costs of funding actions and a focus on the issue of crime; for example, taking away resources/money for other aspects of society.<br>• 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 2026