

---

**GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES & RESEARCH**

**9239/13**

Paper 1 Written Exam

**October/November 2019**

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 2019 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**

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

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(a)	<p><b>The author of Document 1 mentions the response of an Indian newspaper to complaints from various groups. Identify <u>two</u> examples of reactions from people in the art world to these responses.</b></p> <p><b>Credit 1 mark each for a correct version of up to two of the following where the answer:</b></p> <p>states the response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a war against the image/this is dangerous✓</li> <li>• shock / caused by the image being out of context✓</li> </ul> <p><b>or</b> quotes from the text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Playwright, C Gopan said ‘It’s a war against the image.’✓</li> <li>• The painter, Vattakuzhy was shocked.✓</li> </ul> <p><b>or</b> paraphrases the text correctly:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gopan felt it was an attack on pictures.✓</li> <li>• Vattakuzhy thought the intention of his image had been misunderstood.✓</li> </ul> <p><b>2 × 1</b></p>	<b>2</b>	<p><b>Where candidates give two responses from only one source, they can have only one mark.</b></p> <p><b>Note: MF Husain left India in 2006 in response to attacks, not in response to the much later newspaper apology.</b></p> <p><b>Credit 0 marks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• for a statement of an incorrect part of the text: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ M F Husain left India in 2006</li> </ul> </li> <li>• for answers taken from the candidate’s own knowledge (not part of the text)</li> </ul>

## PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1(b)	<p><b>The Indian authorities took different actions in response to groups that were offended by artwork. Identify and explain <u>two</u> different actions taken by the Indian authorities, as mentioned by the author in Document 1.</b></p> <p>Identify and explain any two of the following:</p> <p><b>Examples of 1-mark answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Indian courts ruled in Husain’s favour ✓ <b>or:</b> ruled against Bajrang Dal ✓</li> <li>The Indian state banned <i>The Satanic Verses</i> ✓ <b>or:</b> The Indian state banned <i>The Da Vinci Code</i> ✓ <b>or:</b> Ban art and literature the community found offensive ✓</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of 2-mark answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Indian courts ruled in Husain’s favour ✓ because they believed his artwork was not intended to offend Hindus ✓.</li> <li>The Indian state banned <i>The Satanic Verses</i> ✓ because they supported the view that this was offensive to Muslims ✓ <b>or:</b> The Indian state banned <i>The Da Vinci Code</i> (book/movie) ✓ because they accepted that it offended Christians, ✓ (even though it hadn’t been banned anywhere else.)</li> </ul> <p><b>Candidates may be credited the full 4 marks for a combined answer:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Indian courts ruled in Husain’s favour ✓ (I) because they believed his artwork was not intended to offend Hindus ✓ (E). However they responded differently and banned <i>The Satanic Verses</i> ✓ (I) because they supported the view that this was offensive to Muslims ✓ (E).</li> </ul> <p><b>2 × (1 + 1)</b></p>	4	<p>Accept any relevant /logical explanation</p> <p><b>Note:</b> this may include material from the text but it must be <b>used</b> by the candidate to <b>explain the authorities’ actions</b>.</p> <p><b>Credit a maximum two marks</b> where the candidate identifies <u>and</u> explains the ban on <i>The Da Vinci Code</i> book and then <i>The Da Vinci Code</i> film with no identification or explanation of any other action. <b>(Banning is the same <u>action</u>, despite different things being banned.)</b></p> <p><b>Credit a maximum one mark each</b> where the action is identified but not explained</p> <p><b>Credit 0 marks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>for a statement of an incorrect part of the text, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A newspaper ran a front-page apology for images that offended Christians and Ezhava community representatives. <i>(because this is not an action carried out by the Indian authorities)</i></li> </ul> </li> <li>for answers taken from the candidate’s own knowledge (not part of the text)</li> </ul>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p><b>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the evidence the author gives in Document 1.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content:</b> No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include some of the following:</p> <p><b><u>Strengths:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Range of relevant sources quoted:</u></b> Quotes from both sides of the issue give the impression of balance and support her argument:</p> <p><i>Indian constitution, daily newspaper, representatives of Ezhava community, Christian groups, Playwright C Gopan, painter Vattakuzhy, Hindu groups, High Court / Supreme Court</i></p> <p><b><u>Range of Perspectives:</u></b></p> <p>Includes: recent events, (newspaper and reactions of authorities) historical perspective, (Husain and 1989 bans) legal perspective (constitution)</p> <p>people from the art world: (Gopan, Vattakuzhy, Tripathi) those offended: (Christians, Muslims, Ezhava, Hindus) responses of artists under attack: (Vattakuzhy and Husain)</p> <p><b><u>Relevant examples:</u></b></p> <p>The examples of the offending artworks give context to the offence caused to <b>various</b> groups:</p> <p>sculpture of guru distorted, nudity in <i>Last Supper</i>, image of a nude distressed woman to represent a goddess.</p> <p>including foreign works of art that also offend Indian groups <i>The Satanic Verses</i> and the <i>Da Vinci Code</i> book and movie.</p>	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. Use X for Level 0. These should be placed at the end of the answer with the overall level in the right-hand margin.</p> <p>Level 3 involves the impact of the evidence upon the claim – a key characteristic.</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>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p><b>Relevant examples</b> of actions taken by press and authorities, give weight to her argument that the situation should be addressed: newspaper apology and withdrawal, cropping of picture. Ruling in favour of Husain by Courts</p> <p><b>Relevant examples</b> of actions by those offended, show the extent of the problem and in some cases, the danger of the situation: Hindu extremists, litigation, attacks on house and artworks, threats, Christians and Muslims demanding bans on artworks</p> <p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <p><b>Some sources unclear / some evidence unsourced</b> weakens support for her argument and makes the evidence less convincing:</p> <p>Salil Tripathi gives a positive description and explanation of M F Husain's drawing, but it isn't made clear who Salil Tripathi is, or when this was said.</p> <p>Historical examples are given but no source for the information stated:</p> <p>The story about MF Husain has no source.</p> <p>Information about 1989 bans is also not sourced, though both may be common knowledge in India.</p>		<p><b>Level 3 8–10 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both strengths and weaknesses of evidence are assessed.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence is sustained.</li> <li>• Assessment explicitly includes the impact of specific evidence upon the claims made.</li> <li>• Communication is highly effective – explanation and reasoning accurate and clearly expressed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2 4–7 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers focus more on either the strengths or weaknesses of the evidence, although both are present.</li> <li>• Assessment identifies strength or weaknesses of evidence with little explanation.</li> <li>• Assessment of evidence is relevant but not always linked to the argument.</li> <li>• Communication is accurate – explanation and reasoning is limited, but clearly expressed.</li> </ul>



**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p><b><u>Lack of balance:</u></b></p> <p>Evidence and examples are presented in ways that make the offended parties unsympathetic and the artists sympathetic:</p> <p>The quote from Vattakuzhy makes him sound reasonable and Husain's experiences of extremism and violence increase the view of artist as innocent victim of intolerance.</p> <p>Actions of religious groups are presented as inexplicable. There is little detail of what was offensive and why to allow the reader to sympathise with the people who are offended.</p> <p>Most evidence leads to the author's conclusion and there is little evidence to support any counter-argument.</p>		<p><b>Level 1 1–3 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers show little or no assessment.</li> <li>• Assessment, if any, is simplistic.</li> <li>• Evidence may be identified and weaknesses may be named.</li> <li>• Communication is limited - response may be cursory or descriptive.</li> </ul> <p><b>Credit 0 marks</b> where there is no creditable material. (Use X in the level summary)</p>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p><b>Both authors discuss art in an international context.</b>  <b>To what extent is the author’s argument in Document 2 stronger than that in Document 1?</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content:</b> No set answer is expected and examiners should be flexible in their approach. Candidates may include and assess some of the following:</p> <p><b><u>Stronger:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Wider range of Perspectives:</u></b>            Ghattas (Doc 2), includes a wider range of global perspectives, presenting events, examples and views from a range of Middle Eastern countries and the United States. <i>Gulf States, Saudi Arabia, Palestinian, Egyptian, Lebanese.</i></p> <p>Rathi (Doc1) concentrates on India, particularly Kerala. (Doc 1 includes passing comment on Da Vinci Code – that it has not been banned in any other country.)</p> <p><b><u>First-hand information:</u></b>            Ghattas (Doc 2) has first-hand information from interviews with Lyne Sneige and Ahmad Mater, and from visiting art exhibitions. As a Lebanese, and a BBC correspondent, we can trust that she has first-hand experience and access to information presented in her argument. This makes her argument stronger and more personal than that of Rathi (Doc 1) who only reports second-hand and whose only personal slant is her opinion.</p> <p><b><u>More relevant detailed examples of art work:</u></b> Ghattas (Doc 2) gives more detailed descriptions of a range of artworks to support her claims that art can communicate messages about life in the Middle East. This is more convincing than Rathi (Doc1), who gives minimal descriptions, so that it is less easy to understand why offence is caused.</p>	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. Use X for Level 0. These should be placed at the end of the answer with the overall level in the right-hand margin.</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>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p><b><u>More positive, balanced message</u></b> Ghattas (Doc 2) balances issues, dangers and difficulties faced by Arab artists with the positive impact of art.</p> <p>Her argument is positive overall and supports her claim that, despite barriers, artists can break through and make a difference. Misunderstanding between West and Middle East may be overcome - similarities between the two cultures are clear (the ordinariness of everyday life).</p> <p>The contrast between the treatment of Ashraf Fayad and the hope provided by Ahmad Mater, makes the argument stronger and more rounded.</p> <p>Rathi's argument in Doc 1 provides little hope and her conclusion seems unconvincing in the context of the evidence she has presented. She presents a picture of artists struggling in a system that rarely supports them and cannot protect them. It is unclear where the will to change the law may come from.</p> <p><b><u>Weaker:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Less sourced evidence / fewer quoted sources:</u></b></p> <p>Ghattas (Doc 2) provides evidence of a survey without source and depends on only two sources for quotes, both of whom agree with her view that art can aid communication.</p> <p>As a BBC correspondent, it is likely that her information about Ashraf Fayad, the Egyptian uprisings and graffiti art there, is all correct, however the argument depends on first-hand information.</p> <p>Her argument may be considered to be weaker than Nandini Rathi's (Doc 1) which refers to a wider range of sources from a range of perspectives.</p>		<p><b>Level 3 10–14 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The judgement is <b>sustained</b> and <b>reasoned</b>.</li> <li>• Alternative perspectives have <b>sustained</b> assessment.</li> <li>• Critical evaluation is of <b>key</b> issues raised in the passages and has <b>explicit</b> reference.</li> <li>• Explanation and reasoning is <b>highly effective</b>, accurate and clearly expressed.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>highly effective</b> – clear evidence of a structured cogent argument with conclusions explicitly stated and directly linked to the assessment.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2 5–9 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judgement is <b>reasoned</b>.</li> <li>• <b>One perspective</b> may be focused upon for assessment.</li> <li>• Evaluation is present but may <b>not relate to key</b> issues.</li> <li>• Explanation and reasoning is <b>generally accurate</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>accurate</b> – some evidence of a structured discussion although conclusions may not be explicitly stated, nor link directly to the assessment.</li> </ul>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p><b><u>Less structured argument:</u></b></p> <p>Ghattas (Doc 2) presents a less structured argument. The argument jumps from the Arab World to attitudes in the West.</p> <p>Her statistics about the views of young Arabs do not seem to be relevant to anything and have not been used to move the argument along. It is not clear how it connects to the Western view of the Arab world.</p> <p>This weakens the argument compared with Rathi’s argument which is presented in a clearer more connected style</p> <p><b><u>More unexplained statements:</u></b></p> <p>Ghattas (Doc 2) occasionally makes statements that are not supported or explained and which make it difficult to follow the argument. She says the uprisings forced artists to challenge politics, but does not say how or why.</p> <p>Ghattas(Doc 2) claims that this experience helped them to go to Washington and interact, but does not explain how it helped them, or make a connection between the uprisings and travel to the US.</p> <p>Though Rathi, (Doc 1) also presents some unsupported claims, these do not impact the argument as a whole or make it less clear, so her argument is easier to follow than Ghattas’.</p> <p><b><u>The same: neither stronger nor weaker</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Expertise:</u></b> both authors are journalists, one is a sub-editor and the other a correspondent for the BBC.</p> <p><b><u>Lack of counter-argument:</u></b> Neither author presents a counter-argument directly, so both arguments lack balance.</p>		<p><b>Level 1 1–4 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judgement, if present, is <b>unsupported</b> or <b>superficial</b>.</li> <li>• Alternative perspectives have <b>little or no</b> assessment.</li> <li>• Evaluation, if any, is <b>simplistic</b>. Answers may describe a few points comparing the two documents.</li> <li>• Relevant evidence or reasons may be <b>identified</b>.</li> <li>• Communication is <b>limited</b>. Response may be cursory.</li> </ul> <p><b>Credit 0 marks</b> where there is no creditable material. (Use X for Level 0)</p> <p><b>Judgement:</b></p> <p>Candidates should critically assess perspectives and the use of examples and evidence in order to reach a judgement.</p>

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p><b><u>Clear strong thread:</u></b> Though Ghattas' argument (Doc 2) contains some jumps in the argument, it is always clear what the perspective/opinion of the author is in both documents. The arguments lead straight to the conclusion.</p> <p><b><u>Positive sympathetic view of Art:</u></b> Though the arguments are considering different issues and looking at art in different contexts, they both have a positive view of art and are supportive of artists.</p> <p><b><u>Judgement:</u></b> Candidates may consider that <b><i>Rathi's argument (Doc 1) is stronger</i></b> than Ghattas' because she has presented a wider range of relevant evidence, with more examples of events that support her claims and with a wider range of sources of information. Her argument that the laws must be changed because they undermine liberal democracy, seems more realistic in that the evidence presented shows a dangerous and fragmented social and legal attitude to freedom of speech and diversity.</p> <p>Candidates may consider that <b><i>Ghattas' argument (Doc 2) is stronger</i></b> and more convincing because she has evidence and sources from the US and the Arab World who show a desire to communicate and break down barriers. Her positive, hopeful message is attractive and supported by the clear determination of young artists to survive and share their views on their region.</p> <p>Candidates may, however, decide that the strengths and weaknesses of the two arguments are <b><i>equally balanced</i></b>, though different, and that they are similar in their sympathy for art and their belief in its importance to political freedom.</p>		