
GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH

9239/11

Paper 1 Written Exam

October/November 2018

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 International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **13** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**Generic Marking Principles**

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

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

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

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

PUBLISHED**Note**

The mark scheme cannot cover all points that candidates may make for all of the questions. In some cases candidates may think of very strong answers which the mark scheme has not predicted. These answers should be credited according to their quality. If examiners are in any doubt about an answer they should contact their Team Leader or Principal Examiner. For answers marked by levels of response:

- (a) Mark 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 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

Assessment Objectives for Global Perspectives

<p>AO1 Research, analysis and evaluation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • analyse arguments to understand how they are structured and on what they are based • analyse perspectives and understand the different claims, reasons, arguments, views and evidence they contain • synthesise relevant and credible research/text in support of judgements about arguments and perspectives • critically evaluate the strengths, weaknesses and implications of reasoning in arguments and overall perspectives • critically evaluate the nature of different arguments and perspectives • use research/text to support judgements about arguments and perspectives
---	--

Coverage of Assessment Objectives:

1.a	Q1(a), Q1(b), Q2, Q3
1.b	Q2, Q3
1.c	Q2, Q3
1.d	Q2, Q3
1.e	Q2, Q3
1.f	Q2, Q3

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	<p>Identify two examples of organisations that have recently changed their attitude to tattoos, as mentioned by the author in Document 1.</p> <p>Credit 1 mark each for a correct version of up to two of the following where the answer:</p> <p>names the service:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marines ✓ • Army National Guard/US Army ✓ • UK Police (Officers/Force) ✓ <p>Or, for example, quotes from the text, if the armed service is mentioned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Marines ✓ and the Army National Guard ✓ have recently banned visible tattoos <p>or paraphrases the text correctly, naming the armed service e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Marines ✓ and the Army National Guard ✓ are banned from having tattoos • American armed services ✓ are banned from having tattoos • The UK Police are calling for the ban on tattoos to be lifted. ✓ <p>Credit 0 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for a statement of an incorrect part of the text e.g. Fire, Military, police (if not linked to UK) • for answers taken from the candidate's own knowledge (not part of the text) 	2 × 1	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)	The author mentions that there is a gap in attitudes to tattoos.		
1(b)(i)	<p>Identify two opposing attitudes to tattoos mentioned in Document 1.</p> <p>For each attitude: Credit one mark: (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for correctly identifying an attitude mentioned in the text. <p>plus</p> <p>Credit a second mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for correctly identifying an opposing attitude mentioned in the text. <p>Examples of a 2-mark answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members of these professions (especially the armed services) were tattoo enthusiasts✓. For many leaders of these services, tattoos still mean ‘unprofessional.’✓ • a generation gap in attitudes to tattoos and body art/ Where youth✓ admire tattoos and other body modifications, older Americans✓ dislike them. <p>also accept</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some say tattoos have social benefits✓/ others that there is a long-standing connection between tattoos and deviance*. (<i>*behaviour that does not follow society’s rules</i>)✓ <p>also accept – both attitudes are opposed to tattoos (not each other)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For many leaders of these service tattoos still mean unprofessional✓ and older Americans dislike tattoos because of the long connection between tattoos and deviance✓ 	2	<p>Candidates may identify conflicting attitudes, rather than the groups holding those views.</p> <p>Credit a maximum one mark where two attitudes mentioned are identified, but they are not opposing.</p> <p>Credit 0 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for a statement of an incorrect part of the text e.g. • all classes and racial groups/women • for answers taken from the candidate’s own knowledge (not part of the text)

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)(ii)	<p>Explain one of these attitudes.</p> <p>Credit 2 marks for any attitude explained in the candidate's own words;</p> <p>Or 1 mark for partial achievement: an explanation simply lifted from the passage with none of the candidate's own explanation:</p> <p>Examples of 2 marks answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Older Americans do not like tattoos because they think that people with tattoos must be criminals or low class ✓ so likely to behave in an unacceptable manner. ✓ • Older Americans don't like tattoos because they have a bad impression of the kind of person who has a tattoo. ✓ They believe people with tattoos must be bad in some way. ✓ <p>Example of a 1 mark answer:</p> <p>Tattoos have social benefits – they can break down barriers with the public. ✓</p>	2	<p>Credit up to 2 marks for any logical explanation of one of the attitudes mentioned in the text</p> <p>Note: this may include material from the text but it must be used by the candidate to explain the attitude to tattoos.</p> <p>Credit maximum 1 mark for a logical explanation that is just a lift from the passage.</p>

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>How convincing is the author’s argument about tattoos and body art in Document 1?</p> <p>In your answer you should assess strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>Indicative content: No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <p>The following make the author’s argument more convincing:</p> <p>Expertise/Authority + Evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The author is a university lecturer in Sociology and so likely to have the knowledge and expertise to comment on social issues such as tattoos. • Use of Academic References throughout to support views presented. • Much evidence is sourced with Academic References. <p>Perspectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A range of perspectives are presented, some supporting his views and some opposing: police chairman, members of American services, leaders of services, youth, older Americans. <p>Examples: Views presented are supported by clear examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • examples of banning of tattoos in forces: police in UK, Marines and Army National Guard • examples of the contrast between older Americans’ beliefs (sign of criminality) and the mainstream cultural embrace of tattoos.(books, magazines, blogs) 	10	<p>Use the levels based marking grid below and the indicative content in the left-hand column to credit marks.</p> <p>For each bullet give a level (that can include split levels e.g. L2/L1) to inform the overall level and mark within the available range. These should be placed at the end of the answer with the overall level in the right-hand margin. (Use X for Level 0)</p> <p>Note: Level 3 involves the impact of the evidence upon the claim – a key characteristic 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> <p>Level 3 8–10 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both strengths and weaknesses are assessed. • Assessment of argument and evidence is sustained and a judgement is reached. • Assessment explicitly includes the impact of specific evidence upon the claims made. • Communication is highly effective – explanation and reasoning accurate and clearly expressed

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>Clarity of views:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author's views are clearly-expressed and it is easy to understand what he thinks about tattoos. Clarity needs to be explained with reference to the text. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>Gaps in the argument/patchy evidence: These make his argument less convincing because the argument does not hang together.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author presents the view that attitudes are changing, but only presents evidence that some groups embrace tattoos and others do not. The author does not give evidence of any change in groups as a whole. This makes his argument less convincing. Support for the author's views is weakened because he calls for a change in attitudes to tattoos, but, has not presented an argument to tell us why it is important to change attitudes, or what the effects of prejudice against tattoos may be. <p>Some unexplained statements: Lack of explanation or detail makes his argument less convincing because unexplained statements leave the reader in doubt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author does not spell out how tattoos can break down barriers between the police and public. He does not give details about the 'difficult history' of tattoos in the American services. He does not tell us what the 'Tattoo Renaissance' was. 		<p>Level 2 4–7 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers focus more on either the strengths or weaknesses, although both are present/identified. Assessment identifies strength or weakness of evidence with little explanation. Assessment of argument is relevant but generalised, not always linked to specific evidence or specific claims. Communication is accurate – explanation and reasoning is limited, but clearly expressed <p>Level 1 1–3 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Answers show little or no assessment of argument/s. Assessment if any is simplistic. Evidence may be identified and weakness may be named. Communication is limited – response may be cursory or descriptive. <p>Credit 0 marks where there is no creditable material. (Use X in the level summary)</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>Both authors discuss changing cultural attitudes to tattoos.</p> <p>To what extent is the author’s argument in Document 2 stronger than that in Document 1?</p> <p>Indicative content: No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include and assess some of the following:</p> <p><u>Stronger argument:</u></p> <p>Author’s stronger personal experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author of Doc 2, (Ozongwu), writes from personal experience, her background, experience of friend’s attitudes and experience of living in a country among both traditional and modern people. This strengthens her argument, whereas (Strohecker), Doc 1, has little or no evidence of his own experience; whether he has tattoos himself and what their impact is. <p>Wider range of Perspectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doc 2 (Ozongwu)’s argument is strengthened by a range of perspectives, historical background, legal perspective, issues of heritage, attitudes to beauty, modernisation, Westernisation, whereas Doc 1 (Strohecker) has a limited range of perspectives, pro- and anti-tattoo. <p>Personal voice/emotive language:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doc 2 (Ozongwu)’s argument is strengthened by her use of the personal and her clearly expressed attitudes. ‘They do not represent us’ ‘our “beauty” can affect’ ‘we do not need to cling’ ‘or blindly follow’. Doc 1 (Strohecker) is more impersonal, drawing on academic research rather than his own feelings. 	14	<p>Use the levels based marking grid below and the indicative content in the left-hand column to credit marks.</p> <p>For each bullet give a level (that can include split levels e.g. L2/L1) to inform the overall level and mark within the available range. These should be placed at the end of the answer with the overall level in the right-hand margin. (Use X for Level 0)</p> <p>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> <p>Level 3 10–14 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The judgement is sustained and reasoned. Alternative perspectives have sustained assessment. Critical evaluation is of key issues raised in the passages and has explicit reference. Explanation and reasoning is highly effective, accurate and clearly expressed. Communication is highly effective – clear evidence of a structured cogent argument with conclusions explicitly stated and directly linked to the assessment.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>More detailed examples/narrative content giving balance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The first-hand experience and detailed consideration of what may lie behind other's practices: 'Do they find them beautiful?'; 'they didn't choose to mark themselves'; gives a more balanced impression than Doc 1 where opposing views are not considered in much detail. <p>Clearer argument with a clearer conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author's first-hand evidence and explanations support her conclusion that Africa should leave its tradition of tattooing behind, for its own benefit and not to fit in with the West's views. Doc 1 is less clear only presenting a range of views and a recommendation. <p><u>Weaker argument:</u></p> <p>Weaker evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doc 2 depends on first hand observation of others' experience with no sources for much of the information provided. Doc 1 has clear referenced sources for many of the points stated and evidence provided. No statistics, data or hard evidence provided in Doc 2, weakening the argument and making it less convincing. Doc 1 has some evidence, including statistics about prevalence of tattooing, supported by references. <p>Narrative tone and personal view</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ozongwu's argument is weakened by the lack of investigation or real research. The author takes a view of what the women with facial markings may think or feel, but seems to have made no attempt to find out from them or from any other research, what they actually feel or think. Doc 1, however, provides much less of a personal view and uses research findings to strengthen the argument. 		<p>Level 2 5–9 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgement is reasoned. One perspective may be focused upon for assessment. Evaluation is present but may not relate to key issues. Explanation and reasoning is generally accurate. Communication is accurate – some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment. <p>Level 1 1–4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgement, if present, is unsupported or superficial. Alternative perspectives have little or no assessment. Evaluation, if any, is simplistic. Answers may describe a few points comparing the two documents. Relevant evidence or reasons may be identified. Communication is limited. Response may be cursory. <p>Credit 0 marks where no creditable material. (Show as X on the levels summary)</p>

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>Sweeping statements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The argument in Doc 2 is weakened by unsupported generalised statements ‘the African who refuses to progress’; ‘Like most fashions, these will be a passing trend.’ presenting an assumption or personal view as fact. Doc 1, however, has more support for most of the statements he makes. <p>The same, neither stronger nor weaker</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Neither author provides much factual or statistical evidence. Both passages have a tendency to be one-sided/opinionated and not to give much credence to opposing perspectives. Both have a strong view of what should happen in future. Both are clear in their views. There is never any doubt about what the perspective of the author is. <p>Judgement:</p> <p>Candidates may come to any supported judgement. Credit should be given to any logical judgement on the basis of the assessment and reasoning.</p> <p>Candidates may conclude that Ozongwu’s argument (Doc 2) is stronger because it is more balanced, with a greater range of perspectives and a clear conclusion. Alternatively, they may conclude that, despite Strohecker’s (Doc 1) lack of first-hand evidence, he is less emotional and presents a stronger argument, supported by a range of credible sources.</p>		<p>Judgement:</p> <p>Candidates should critically assess perspectives and the use of examples and evidence in order to reach a judgement.</p>