

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

Paper 8030/01
Written Examination

Key messages

Candidates should ensure they read the paper carefully, looking at the key words, in order to answer the questions. This was particularly relevant in **Question 2** where candidates were required to assess the evidence given by the author rather than the argument.

The length of each answer should reflect the number of marks available. Most candidates spent an appropriate time on **Question 1**, but some spent too long on **Question 2** leaving insufficient time to fully address **Question 3**, worth the largest number of marks.

Candidates should read the questions and note the marks awarded for each in advance so that they can plan their time to allow for the complexity of **Question 3**.

To gain higher marks in **Questions 2** and **3** there should be clear development of the points made. This may relate to the impact of material in the documents on the arguments. Candidates should show that they understand **what** a strength or weakness may be, and also **how** or **why** it is a strength or weakness.

Candidates should provide brief and relevant references from the documents to support their evaluation of evidence and argument otherwise the answer is generalised, containing only assertions or claims. They should also explain strengths and weaknesses. Their explanation must go beyond general assertions like 'weakens/strengthens'. They need to explain how or why the argument is strengthened or weakened.

In **Question 3** the higher scoring responses reached a supported judgment about whether one author's argument was more convincing than the other. Lower scoring responses simply compared the content of the two documents or focused on one of the documents.

Candidates are required to respond to the stimulus material in the Insert. Candidates will not gain credit for using material from their own knowledge that is not mentioned in the documents. Equally, copying sections from the documents, without any relevant supporting comment, except when asked to identify in **Question 1(a)** will not gain credit.

General comments

In general, most candidates appeared to understand the two documents. There was occasional misreading of texts and/or questions. Some candidates did not pay careful enough attention to the wording of the questions e.g., 'Explain' in **Question 1** and 'evidence' in **Question 2**.

In **Question 3** some candidates simply compared content or repeated, without evaluation, the views of the authors.

A number of candidates clearly ran out of time. As a result, **Question 3** answers were limited. This is significant as **Question 3** attracts nearly half of the total marks.

In **Question 1(a)** where the command word is 'identify', candidates can simply take the wording of the author without paraphrasing. Simple bullet point answers were acceptable.

In **Question 1(b)** the command word is 'explain'. Explanation requires the candidate to show clear understanding of the author's meaning by interpreting and explaining it in their own words.

Many answers to **Questions 2 and 3** were not fully developed or supported by precise references to the documents. Answers were therefore generalised rather than being detailed and sustained. Stronger responses explained points clearly and illustrated them by using specific details or short quotes from the documents.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

- (a) Candidates should read the question carefully. This session the question asked the candidate to identify **historical reasons**. Candidates should simply and concisely state the words of the author without paraphrasing or expanding. **Question 1** encourages candidates to fully read and digest the detail of Document 1. The answer can be directly quoted from the document or could be a close paraphrase, but there is no need to expand on the basic points.

For example:

- 1 *'they needed everyone to work'*
- 2 *'women needed to work as hard as men to provide for the many.'*

Providing examples of successful women did not fulfil the requirement to give historical reasons.

- b) **Question 1(b)** asked candidates to *'Explain one reason why the US needs to be more like China by including more women in senior roles.'*

This question requires a reason and an explanation of that reason. Explanation requires the candidate to show clear understanding of the authors' meaning by using their own words and interpretation or paraphrasing the words of the author. The candidate should answer the question carefully.

An example of a 2-mark answer showing a developed explanation:

'Women at senior levels in industry have had a positive impact on China's business success. Therefore, the US needs to be more like China by including more women in senior roles to keep up and compete with Chinese companies.'

An example of a 1-mark answer where a relevant reason is provided but not explained:

'because companies in China are gaining more success compared to US companies.'

Question 2

This question was about the strengths and weaknesses of the author's evidence in Document 1. *'Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence the author uses in Document 1 to support their views.'*

To fully achieve on this question, candidates must assess both strengths and weaknesses of the evidence. They must explain how the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence impact the argument and whether or not they support the author's views. Also, candidates must reach an overall judgement about the evidence.

The strongest responses selected a small number of strengths and weaknesses. They gave full details, provided examples, explained why the strength or weakness was important and how it supported the author's views/claims and/or how it impacted the argument as a whole.

An example of a developed point about a weakness is:

'While it provides quality evidence and statistics, the lack of dates mentioned is a limitation to its quality. Beside the 1980 mention, which is very out of date, nowhere are date and years cited to ground the research in today's economy. A convincing research would state up-to-date sources to back up its claims in the year it was written. By taking into account the published date being 2017, it can be assumed that some data cited are now (in 2025) outdated, making the claims and conclusion weaker and not relevant to today's economy and women's role in the workplace in the US.'

Less successful responses tended to provide a large number of assertions with little or no support.

An example of a common unexplained assertion is:

'This online article has been published in 2017, so we can deduce that it is outdated'.

The assertion is correct, that we can deduce it is outdated and is making a similar point to the developed point above. However, it is not developed or explained. The candidate does not tell us whether this is a weakness, does not explain why it is a weakness or how being outdated affects the argument or the reader.

Some candidates seemed to lose track of the question and discussed other strengths and weaknesses of the argument that were not related to the evidence. One or two simply repeated all the information provided in the document without identifying any strengths or weaknesses or explaining how the information supported the views or the argument.

Question 3

This question asks the candidate to compare the two arguments. ***'The authors of Documents 1 and 2 present arguments about gender issues. To what extent is the authors' argument in Document 2 more convincing than that of the author in Document 1?'***

There was no correct answer, and candidates were free to argue that either Document 1 or Document 2 was more convincing than the other, or that both were equally convincing.

To fully achieve on **Question 3**, candidates are required to evaluate and compare the two arguments. They must illustrate the points they make with material from the two documents. They must clearly state which is stronger or weaker or whether they are equally weak or strong for each element they consider. They are expected to consider and explain both strengths and weaknesses of both documents. They should provide a clear conclusion stating what their judgement is, which document is overall more convincing and why.

Many candidates were able to pick out relevant elements of a strong argument, for example, range of research, range of sources, engaging tone and personal interest stories. Candidates achieving higher marks gave clear examples from the documents and explained their impact on the reader or the argument as a whole. Weaker work tended to make unsupported or unexplained assertions or relevant but undeveloped points about one or the other document.

Some weaker work only considered the strengths and weaknesses of Document 2 and did not mention Document 1, let alone provide detailed comparisons.

The weakest responses described what the authors wrote rather than evaluating strengths or weaknesses of the arguments.

Some candidates made incorrect assessments such as stating that Document 2 is more convincing because it provided sources for its evidence while Document 1 did not. This is not correct. Candidates should read the documents carefully and avoid making incorrect statements about them.

An example of a developed comparative evaluation of the two documents is:

'Furthermore, Document 2 provided a balanced argument considering both the pros and cons of having women in the tech industry. 'Tech positions often require long working hours and sacrifice of family time. Women tend to feel ashamed if they prioritise career over family' Whereas Document 1 argued more and mostly about the pros without acknowledging the cons, only giving positive examples such as the story of Chen Xiaohong, who coped really well with combining work and family life, which therefore leads to unbalanced arguments. A balanced argument provides readers with more viewpoints and to stimulate their thinking to form their own opinion. It makes the document seem more convincing and realistic. It also keeps readers engaged.'

An example of a judgement is:

'To sum up, I believe that Document 2 is more convincing due to its balanced structure and neutrality. The author projects an academic and professional tone which easily convinces me that it comes from expert persons, while Document 1 is more like informal and casual 'I found several...' I was surprised...' This clearly shows that she is sharing her personal opinion and reflects she may not have considered other perspectives.'

Candidates are required to engage critically with the two documents, referring to the details, rather than make generalised comments that could apply to any document.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES (MAURITIUS)

Paper 8030/02
Essay

Key messages

The key messages from this series are that candidates were able to:

- analyse and evaluate different perspectives on a global issue
- reach conclusions on the question posed.

Candidates would benefit from further guidance on:

- explaining the relevance of the HSC Pro Strand and their work placement to the issue
- evaluating sources in greater detail
- explaining examples of further research.

General comments

The Global Perspectives essay gives candidates an opportunity to investigate a global issue related to the HSC Pro Strand and their work placement using a range of primary and secondary research methods. The issue should have some global relevance, which should be carefully explained.

Candidates are expected to devise and answer a research question related to the chosen issue. As part of the conclusion and final reflection candidates are expected to explain how the research has affected their own personal perspectives on the issue and explicitly answer their question.

The quality of work and levels of achievement were very good and continue to show improvement. There were some excellent essays. In these essays candidates fully explored two different perspectives on a carefully explained research question.

The issues chosen by candidates were usually carefully related to the HSC Pro Strand and workplace. This enabled candidates to gather information and data about the issue using a range of research methods. These candidates clearly explained why the issue was chosen, and how it related to the placement and their personal experience of work within the organisation. Most candidates fully described their work at the HSC Pro Strand placement and explained the significance of the issue to the organisation using relevant examples.

As last year, most candidates are now using a range of primary methods to gather data and evidence from their placement, as well as a wide range of secondary sources, usually gathered from the internet. For example, primary research included participant observation, interviews with team members and line managers, observation, surveys, questionnaires, discussions with clients and customers, and general involvement in the life of the work placement.

Candidates are expected to evaluate both the sources used in the essay and the evidence gathered from the workplace. A discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence in the main sources is helpful. Candidates should use key concepts in critical thinking. The impact of the evaluation on the confidence attached to the evidence and the perspective should be explicitly stated.

Although a conclusion was reached by most candidates, some did not provide a clear answer to their research question and simply concluded with a general discussion of their opinion about the issue, or a summary of the main arguments already discussed.

The reflection on personal learning was a weakness for many candidates. Candidates should reflect on the impact of the work experience and their research on their own learning. They should state clearly how their own perspectives on the global issue have changed, or been reinforced, as a result.

Specific comments

This section of the report provides some guidance for teachers to help improve the quality of the essays.

1 Explaining the relevance of the HSC Pro Strand and their work placement to the issue

The mark scheme for the highest level of response for Assessment Objective 3 requires candidates to:

Describe and explain in detail the relevance of the issue to the HSC Pro Strand and the work placement context.

This is best achieved through reference to:

- the name and location of the work placement
- a description of the work placement and its main business
- the work of the department to which the candidate has been attached
- the work and tasks undertaken by the candidate
- the reasons for selecting the issue to be explored
- how the issue relates to the workplace.

An example of an appropriate description of the work placement and its role in prompting a research question about an issue of global relevance is:

'My interest in this topic emerged from my internship at the university. This is a tertiary institution that provides online and distance learning and courses as well as some traditional courses. Online learning programmes are aimed at working professionals and students requiring flexible study options. During my placement, under the supervision of Mrs. YYY from the AAA Department, I helped with course content organisation, responded to student enquiries on e-learning and observed the delivery of online modules. Through these responsibilities I learnt that many students rely heavily on e-learning platforms to balance their academic and professional commitments. ... I became increasingly aware of the benefits of e-learning from these responsibilities, especially about convenience and accessibility. However, questions from students suggested to me that e-learning also has some difficulties that need to be considered when thinking about the future of education and the use of technology. This essay will explore different perspectives on the value of e-learning and its future in education.'

An example of an appropriate reflection on personal learning related to the work placement is:

'Reflecting on the evidence from this research, I believe that e-learning will remain and become more important in education, especially in the tertiary sector. However, it will not replace in-person learning. My experience at the university, along with the opinions expressed by Mr. ZZZ during the research undertaken in my placement and the outcomes of the survey with students, highlight the strengths and weaknesses of e-learning. The strengths are accessibility, flexibility and affordability. The challenges of e-learning are isolation, low motivation and limited support for students from teachers and peers. I have come to think that technology alone does not ensure high quality education; the impact of e-learning depends on how well it is introduced and supported and then used by teachers and students. In my opinion, a blended model will offer the most balanced, adaptable and acceptable approach to education in the future. The answer to my essay question about e-learning is that it will play a crucial and central part in the future of education, but not the only part. Teachers, lecturers and students working together will always have a central part in our education, as I have seen first-hand in my university placement.'

These sections from an essay clearly describe how the candidate learnt from their work experience placement and explains how this influenced their choice of topic and issue for research.

2 Reference to further research.

Another important aspect of Assessment Objective 2 is further research. The mark scheme for the highest level of response requires candidates to:

- Describe and explain the purpose of a range of further research.

As indicated in earlier reports, candidates should describe and explain the purpose of two or three suggestions for further research.

The following is a good example of how this can be achieved:

‘This conclusion is based on the evidence gathered in my placement and from some articles about the issue. However, I could be more confident that e-learning and face-to-face learning will continue in a blended way if further research took place. I could observe students in different types of learning environment, for example lectures and practical activities like experiments, as well as working remotely at home, to see if they learn as quickly. Analysing their assignments and grades, of course with permission, could show their speed of progress. This could be compared with learning in a mixed or blended courses environment. In-depth interviews with students to ask about their preferences would also help.

The research, especially the articles on access to learning, suggest that further research about gender differences between males and females and their support for e-learning and their ability to use technology could be helpful in judging the possible speed of change. Also, interviewing educational leaders about the cost of both types of learning could explore the economic factors shaping the use of e-learning.’

This section clearly highlights how additional research methods and aspects of the issue could be explored through further research.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES (MAURITIUS)

Paper 8030/03
Presentation

Key messages

- The most successful presentations clearly explained a link to a specific idea in the pre-release booklet and showed why the topic was global.
- Effective questions create a discussion that is explored in the presentation in a balanced way.
- Good conclusions return to and answer the original question and usually include an element of compromise.
- Almost all candidates used slides to illustrate their presentation, with the most effective ones explicitly referring to detail in the slides.
- The quality of written English was generally excellent and helped candidates to convey clear and interesting ideas.

General comments

Response to the pre-release booklet

As usual, the pre-release booklet for this session had two topics. The first, in Documents 1–6, was transport, with a particular emphasis on air travel. The final two documents provided an alternative area for candidates wishing to explore transnational organisations, with a focus on the effectiveness of the United Nations.

The majority of candidates focused on the main topic of air travel, with a range of interesting questions chosen. These included discussions of whether we should fly at all given the pollution caused by air travel, whether air travel could ever become carbon neutral and whether attempting to restrict air travel would have more impact on the poor than the rich. The topic was open to being talked about globally, although some candidates could have made this more explicit. Some of the best presentations made their topic relevant to their own lives by including comments on the significance of both air travel and climate change for island nations.

A significant number of candidates chose to focus on the alternative topic of the United Nations and its effectiveness as it passed its 75th anniversary. Most candidates studied whether its successes have outweighed its failures. There were also some very thoughtful debates about whether the structure of the Security Council should be changed.

The vast majority of candidates made a clear and effective link to the pre-release booklet as the starting point for their presentation. In the better presentations, this link was to an argument or piece of evidence that was then explained, showing insight into the topic. The link was then used to generate a relevant question. Candidates who simply stated which document they were basing their presentation on, but without mentioning a specific idea in the document, tended to be less successful.

Issue and research

There has been a pleasing increase in the number of students who, having chosen a topic, then developed this by explaining the issue they would go on to debate and how it was global. A good introduction enables candidates to begin to establish the global nature of their topic, creating a focus on a question that has two or more clear perspectives that will be researched and analysed.

Establishing and staying focused on a good question is key to success and more candidates did exactly that this year. The best questions create a discussion where there are different perspectives, such as *Should taxes be used to discourage air travel?* Some candidates chose questions that lacked perspectives, such as *How does air travel contribute to climate change?* This resulted in them largely gathering information, which

limited their ability to gain high marks. A few candidates this year selected creative questions such as *The UN at 75: global peacemaker or outdated relic?* Creative questions were rarely as successful as more direct ones, as the perspectives and conclusion tended to drift away from the question.

In general, candidates undertook relevant and enquiring research to support different sides of the discussion. In the best presentations, specific articles and authors were mentioned and analysed, rather than candidates presenting every idea as if it is their own. More students are identifying the sources they have used either within the presentation or in a bibliography, which helps them to gain marks for the quality of their research. A couple of candidates whose presentations were about the United Nations relied too heavily on the pre-release documents, with very little further research.

Structure of argument and engagement with alternative perspectives

Many presentations were structured well to analyse arguments and perspectives step by step and to signal the movement from one point to the next. Words or phrases such as 'Furthermore' and 'On the other hand' at the start of a new idea help the audience to follow and show the progression of the candidate's argument.

Effective presentations emphasised new points further with an opening topic sentence that made clear what was about to be explored. Moving on to a new slide in their presentation often enhanced this further.

It was pleasing to see a further increase in the number of candidates who successfully identified perspectives on their question and studied them in a balanced way. The pre-release allowed them to choose interesting topics where differing views could be discussed, and most candidates did this well.

Conclusion

A good conclusion provides the candidate's final judgement on their question, based on the evidence and reasoning that they used during the presentation. Most candidates did this well. The most successful conclusions found at least some compromise rather than completely agreeing with one perspective. A few conclusions slightly lost track of the original question and ended up answering a slightly different one – a strong conclusion will often use words from the question to ensure that it is focused. Candidates should be reminded to keep within the ten-minute time limit: several went beyond it and unfortunately this can mean that their conclusion does not get marked.

Presentational methods

Almost all candidates used PowerPoint slides to add a visual element to their presentation, with the best presentations using slides to illustrate and emphasise key points. The candidates with the strongest presentational skills explicitly mentioned or indicated through gesture specific elements in their slides to support a point that they were making. It was good to see an increase in the number of students who chose to submit video this year, which gave them the opportunity to demonstrate more presentational skills. Many candidates used graphs and data well on their PowerPoint slides, although a few of these did not then refer to them.

Quality of written English

The written English in the transcripts submitted by candidates this year was generally of a very high standard. Most candidates used clear and very accurate English. The range and depth of the vocabulary in some transcripts was articulate and sophisticated.

Administration

We would like to take this opportunity to thank centres for the accurate and punctual submission of their students' work this year.