

---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND RESEARCH**

**9239/13**

Paper 1 Written Examination

**May/June 2017**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 30

---

**Published**

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

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

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

This document consists of **9** printed pages.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p><b>Sometimes, a country has different views about graffiti within it.</b></p> <p><b>Identify <u>two</u> such countries, as given by the author of Document 1.</b></p> <p>Credit <b>1 mark</b> each for the following up to a <b>maximum of 2</b>:</p> <p>UK</p> <p>Australia</p> <p>Canada</p> <p>Credit <b>0 marks</b> for an answer that refers to:</p> <p>a city e.g. Melbourne (unless stated “Melbourne in Australia” credit 1 mark)</p> <p>Brazil (as only one-sided view)</p> <p>people within countries</p>	<b>2 · 1</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
1(b)	<p><b>Identify and explain the conflicting views about graffiti held by <u>two</u> individuals in Document 1.</b></p> <p>Credit <b>1 mark</b> for each correct identification and for each correct explanation, up to 4 marks.</p> <p>Accept correct versions of the following:</p> <p><b>Seen as vandalism – (Only credit <u>one</u> of these examples up to two marks.)</b></p> <p><b>Identify:</b> Judge Hardy sees graffiti street art as vandalism [1]</p> <p><b>Explain:</b> because it has defaced public property [1]</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Identify:</b> The UK street artist sees graffiti art as vandalism where there is a clash of rights [1]</p> <p><b>Explain:</b> because the rights of the owner take precedence over the rights of person painting on their property [1]</p> <p><b>Not seen as vandalism so conflicts with the above examples</b></p> <p><b>Identify:</b> American artist Elura Emerald sees graffiti street art as self-expression that should not be punished. [1]</p> <p><b>Explain:</b> because it does not hurt anyone and can be appreciated and celebrated. [1]</p>	<b>2· 1+1</b>

Question	Answer	Marks															
2	<p data-bbox="322 252 1635 284"><b>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the author’s arguments about graffiti in Document 1.</b></p> <p data-bbox="322 320 1397 352">Use the levels based marking grid below and the indicative content to credit marks.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="322 387 1921 1038"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="322 387 443 435">Level</th> <th data-bbox="443 387 573 435">Marks</th> <th data-bbox="573 387 1921 435">Descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="322 435 443 600">L3</td> <td data-bbox="443 435 573 600"><b>8–10</b></td> <td data-bbox="573 435 1921 600"> <p data-bbox="645 451 1256 483"><b>Both</b> strengths and weaknesses are assessed.</p> <p data-bbox="645 488 1704 520">Assessment of argument and evidence is <b>sustained</b> and a judgement is reached.</p> <p data-bbox="645 525 1756 557">Assessment explicitly includes the <b>impact</b> of specific evidence upon the claims made.</p> <p data-bbox="645 561 1906 593">Communication is <b>highly effective</b> - explanation and reasoning <b>accurate</b> and <b>clearly</b> expressed.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="322 600 443 826">L2</td> <td data-bbox="443 600 573 826"><b>4–7</b></td> <td data-bbox="573 600 1921 826"> <p data-bbox="586 616 1675 679">Answers focus more on <b>either</b> the strengths <b>or</b> weaknesses, although <b>both</b> are present/identified.</p> <p data-bbox="645 684 1659 716">Assessment identifies strength <b>or</b> weakness of evidence with little explanation.</p> <p data-bbox="645 721 1868 785">Assessment of argument is relevant but <b>generalised</b>, not always linked to specific evidence or specific claims.</p> <p data-bbox="645 790 1816 821">Communication is <b>accurate</b> - explanation and reasoning is <b>limited</b>, but <b>clearly</b> expressed.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="322 826 443 986">L1</td> <td data-bbox="443 826 573 986"><b>1–3</b></td> <td data-bbox="573 826 1921 986"> <p data-bbox="645 842 1339 874">Answers show <b>little</b> or <b>no</b> assessment of argument/s.</p> <p data-bbox="645 879 1061 911">Assessment if any is <b>simplistic</b>.</p> <p data-bbox="645 916 1420 948">Evidence may be <b>identified</b> and weakness may be <b>named</b>.</p> <p data-bbox="645 952 1554 984">Communication is <b>limited</b> – response may be <b> cursory</b> or <b>descriptive</b>.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="322 986 443 1038"></td> <td data-bbox="443 986 573 1038"><b>0</b></td> <td data-bbox="573 986 1921 1038">no creditable material.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="322 1050 1861 1114">There is no requirement to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the assessments made.</p>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	L3	<b>8–10</b>	<p data-bbox="645 451 1256 483"><b>Both</b> strengths and weaknesses are assessed.</p> <p data-bbox="645 488 1704 520">Assessment of argument and evidence is <b>sustained</b> and a judgement is reached.</p> <p data-bbox="645 525 1756 557">Assessment explicitly includes the <b>impact</b> of specific evidence upon the claims made.</p> <p data-bbox="645 561 1906 593">Communication is <b>highly effective</b> - explanation and reasoning <b>accurate</b> and <b>clearly</b> expressed.</p>	L2	<b>4–7</b>	<p data-bbox="586 616 1675 679">Answers focus more on <b>either</b> the strengths <b>or</b> weaknesses, although <b>both</b> are present/identified.</p> <p data-bbox="645 684 1659 716">Assessment identifies strength <b>or</b> weakness of evidence with little explanation.</p> <p data-bbox="645 721 1868 785">Assessment of argument is relevant but <b>generalised</b>, not always linked to specific evidence or specific claims.</p> <p data-bbox="645 790 1816 821">Communication is <b>accurate</b> - explanation and reasoning is <b>limited</b>, but <b>clearly</b> expressed.</p>	L1	<b>1–3</b>	<p data-bbox="645 842 1339 874">Answers show <b>little</b> or <b>no</b> assessment of argument/s.</p> <p data-bbox="645 879 1061 911">Assessment if any is <b>simplistic</b>.</p> <p data-bbox="645 916 1420 948">Evidence may be <b>identified</b> and weakness may be <b>named</b>.</p> <p data-bbox="645 952 1554 984">Communication is <b>limited</b> – response may be <b> cursory</b> or <b>descriptive</b>.</p>		<b>0</b>	no creditable material.	10
Level	Marks	Descriptor															
L3	<b>8–10</b>	<p data-bbox="645 451 1256 483"><b>Both</b> strengths and weaknesses are assessed.</p> <p data-bbox="645 488 1704 520">Assessment of argument and evidence is <b>sustained</b> and a judgement is reached.</p> <p data-bbox="645 525 1756 557">Assessment explicitly includes the <b>impact</b> of specific evidence upon the claims made.</p> <p data-bbox="645 561 1906 593">Communication is <b>highly effective</b> - explanation and reasoning <b>accurate</b> and <b>clearly</b> expressed.</p>															
L2	<b>4–7</b>	<p data-bbox="586 616 1675 679">Answers focus more on <b>either</b> the strengths <b>or</b> weaknesses, although <b>both</b> are present/identified.</p> <p data-bbox="645 684 1659 716">Assessment identifies strength <b>or</b> weakness of evidence with little explanation.</p> <p data-bbox="645 721 1868 785">Assessment of argument is relevant but <b>generalised</b>, not always linked to specific evidence or specific claims.</p> <p data-bbox="645 790 1816 821">Communication is <b>accurate</b> - explanation and reasoning is <b>limited</b>, but <b>clearly</b> expressed.</p>															
L1	<b>1–3</b>	<p data-bbox="645 842 1339 874">Answers show <b>little</b> or <b>no</b> assessment of argument/s.</p> <p data-bbox="645 879 1061 911">Assessment if any is <b>simplistic</b>.</p> <p data-bbox="645 916 1420 948">Evidence may be <b>identified</b> and weakness may be <b>named</b>.</p> <p data-bbox="645 952 1554 984">Communication is <b>limited</b> – response may be <b> cursory</b> or <b>descriptive</b>.</p>															
	<b>0</b>	no creditable material.															

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>Indicative content:</b></p> <p>No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p><b>Strengths</b></p> <p><b>Strong structure</b> – 2 clear conclusions ‘as a society, we seem to be a little mixed-up when it comes to graffiti.’ and ‘whilst graffiti can be an art form, it becomes also a crime if the owner whose property has been used for this artistic expression. Considers it to be vandalism’. Both conclusions have relevant views quoted to support them.</p> <p><b>Measured conclusion</b> – The conclusion is balanced and specific, recognising the possibility both of artistic merit and of being a crime in the specific circumstance of the property owner feeling their rights violated.</p> <p><b>Includes counter argument throughout</b> – The argument constantly counter-poses the views which see graffiti street art either as a crime or an act of artistic expression. This gives balance to the argument leading to a measured judgement.</p> <p><b>Range of strong relevant</b>, clear examples of different perspectives - The argument includes a number of international examples of attitudes and the laws e.g. from Canada, Brazil, Australia, UK, and US.</p> <p><b>Credible &amp; relevant sources of perspectives</b> – The argument includes relevant views of important professionals and individuals such as Judge Hardy, the artist Elura Emerald, the curator and street artist, who have experience in the area.</p> <p><b>Perspectives are directly quoted</b> – This limits the potential for exaggeration and increases accuracy of the views given.</p> <p><b>Author’s relevant expertise</b> – Paul Vallely as a professor in public ethics has the relevant expertise to come to a judgement about graffiti street art which involves social ethics.</p> <p><b>Author’s lack of motive</b> – As a professor of public ethics, Vallely doesn’t appear to have a motive to exaggerate or be selective with the views given.</p> <p><b>Author’s professionalism</b> – As a professor of public ethics he would have a vested interest to be accurate and representative in his claims, to present a credible case and to maintain public confidence in his academic standing.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <p>No sources of evidence – No sources are given for the events or views, which limits their credibility.</p> <p>Narrow global range of examples. Mostly Western, developed countries attitudes addressed.</p> <p>Some emotional language – The selection of the Judge’s words "a wholesale self-indulgent campaign to damage street property on an industrial scale" may be seen as a ploy by the author to sway judgement towards the criminal aspect of graffiti street art.</p>	

Question	Answer		Marks	
3	<p><b>To what extent is the author’s argument in Document 2 about graffiti more convincing than that of the author in Document 1?</b></p> <p>Use the levels based marking grid below and the indicative content to credit marks.</p>		14	
	Level	Marks		Descriptor
	L3	10–14		<p>The judgement is <b>sustained</b> and <b>reasoned</b>.            Alternative perspectives have <b>sustained</b> assessment.            Critical evaluation is of <b>key</b> issues raised in the passages and has <b>explicit</b> reference.            Explanation and reasoning is <b>highly effective</b>, accurate and clearly expressed.            Communication is <b>highly effective</b> - clear evidence of a structured cogent argument with conclusions explicitly stated and directly linked to the assessment.</p>
	L2	5–9		<p>Judgement is <b>reasoned</b>.  <b>One perspective</b> may be focused upon for assessment.            Evaluation is present but may <b>not relate to key</b> issues.            Explanation and reasoning is <b>generally accurate</b>.            Communication is <b>accurate</b> - some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment.</p>
	L1	1–4		<p>Judgement, if present, is <b>unsupported</b> or <b>superficial</b>.            Alternative perspectives have little or no assessment.            Evaluation, if any, is <b>simplistic</b>. Answers may <b>describe</b> a few points comparing the two documents.            Relevant evidence or reasons may be <b>identified</b>.            Communication is <b>limited</b>. Response may be cursory.</p>
		0		no creditable material.
<p><b>There is no requirement to use technical terms to access any level and candidates will NOT be rewarded for their use unless they link them directly to the assessments made.</b></p>				

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>Indicative content:</b></p> <p>No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p><b>Less convincing</b></p> <p><b>Narrower perspective and evidence</b> – Brodzinsky (Doc 2) narrates events in one particular country, Colombia, whereas Vallely (Doc 1) looks at views from around the world to determine his conclusion, making his argument broader and more convincing.</p> <p><b>Generalises from one country</b> – Brodzinsky draws a conclusion generalising from the situation in Colombia to graffiti street art in general, when the situation in Colombia may not be typical of other countries. This limits the significance of the argument in Doc 2. In comparison, Vallely’s conclusion (Doc 1) is drawn from an ethical discussion of a range of views and attitudes around the world, making it more convincing.</p> <p><b>More documentary than reasoning</b> – Brodzinsky’s (Doc 2) argument draws a conclusion from a <b>series of events</b> with comments on consistency and relevance, whereas Vallely (Doc 1) brings out the significance of a <b>variety of views</b>, which makes a stronger argument.</p> <p><b>Less discussion of a counter argument</b> – Brodzinsky (Doc 2) argues from a train of events and only mentions at the end the counter views of the street artist who highlights the drawbacks of legitimising graffiti street art. However, Brodzinsky does not respond to this. However, Vallely (Doc 1) cites views on both sides throughout, providing a more convincing balanced discussion.</p> <p><b>Weaker support for the conclusion</b> – Brodzinsky ignores the counter argument about the drawbacks of legitimising graffiti street art, which makes her argument less convincing than that of Vallely. His argument draws a conclusion that takes into account the aspect of vandalism.</p> <p><b>Greater use of emotional persuasion</b> – Brodzinsky (Doc 2) <b>appeals to the plight</b> of the Colombian graffiti street artists and their impassioned fight for legitimising their graffiti, rather than Vallely’s approach is of a neutral philosophical argument which relies upon the correctness of reason to persuade, which makes the latter more logically persuasive.</p>	



Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>Greater possible vested interest</b> – As an author documenting human rights crises, Brodzinsky (Doc 2) may have a vested interest to be selective with the events chosen to raise awareness about human rights. This may weaken the significance of her argument when compared with that of Valley (Doc 1), who as a professor of public ethics, appears to have more vested interest to make an accurate representation of views, in order to maintain his professionalism.</p> <p><b>More convincing</b></p> <p><b>Greater use of emotional persuasion</b> – Brodzinsky (Doc 2) appeals to the plight of the Colombian graffiti street artists rather than Valley's approach in Doc 1 of a neutral philosophical argument, which relies upon the correctness of reason to persuade. Although this makes the latter more logically persuasive, readers may be more readily convinced by the passion of Brodzinsky's argument.</p> <p><b>Different (neither more or less convincing)</b></p> <p>Different perspectives – The authors approach the same issue from different perspectives. Valley uses a philosophical approach of opposing views to draw a conclusion, whereas Brodzinsky uses a train of events to justify her conclusion. Each has their merits.</p>	