

---

**THINKING SKILLS**

**9694/41**

Paper 4 Applied Reasoning

**May/June 2019**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 50

---

**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 May/June 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **12** 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**

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><i>1 mark for any of the following:</i></p> <p>there does not appear to have been a control group in this ‘study’ / no account taken for confounding variables in the absence of a control group, 15 seems like a small enough number such that only one or two keen individuals could skew the results of the whole group</p> <p>the passage implies that weight loss and distance able to run are independent, when in all likelihood they are not the volunteers in the study might not be representative of the target market in that, as they have volunteered, they might be more inclined to simultaneously seek to improve their fitness / lose weight</p> <p>the reference to distance ‘overtaking’ body mass is meaningless / day 40 as the point of intersection has no significance...</p> <p>...because it is solely a result of the scales chosen on the y-axes</p> <p>how far volunteers ‘felt able’ to run is a very subjective and imprecise measurement on which to base a claim</p> <p>feeling able to run a particular distance is not the same as physical fitness, which could include a range of other factors</p>	<b>5</b>
2	<p><i>1 mark for each element (maximum 5 if MC not identified).</i></p> <p><b>CA</b> (It is accepted wisdom that) democracy is the best system of government available.</p> <p><b>CA</b> This might seem fair,</p> <p><b>MC</b> (but on closer inspection) it [democracy] creates a raft of problems.</p> <p><b>IC</b> Democracy leads to bad decisions</p> <p><b>IC</b> The will of the majority is not always in the best interest of all the citizens.</p> <p><b>IC</b> The outcome of many elections is, in effect, decided by a small number of unelected, out-of-touch newspaper owners.</p> <p><b>IC</b> Election campaigns are won or lost as a result of some catchy newspaper headlines.</p> <p><b>IC</b> Regular elections create two problems.</p> <p><b>IC</b> (This) political short-termism means that we will never be able to tackle the big issues of the future</p> <p><b>CA</b> (It is often said that) democracy leads to prosperity and that democratic nations are among the wealthiest.</p> <p><b>IC</b> (However,) this belief [that democracy leads to prosperity] hides massive inequality.</p>	<b>6</b>

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>2 marks for a developed version of any of the following points. 1 mark for a weak or incomplete version of any of the following points.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 1</i></p> <p>There is circular reasoning here: the author describes consultation of the people as the ‘major benefit’ of democracy, when it is rather its definition (<i>may be couched in terms of a straw man argument</i>)</p> <p><i>Paragraph 2</i></p> <p><i>Assumption</i> – that the opinion of a well-informed, far-sighted, public-spirited citizen should be of more value than that of an ignorant, narrow-minded and selfish individual. <i>Assumption</i> – that ill-informed people are not able to choose an effective representative. <i>Assumption</i> that decisions made on the basis of the views of an ‘ignorant majority’ will be bad decisions. <i>Restricting the options:</i> either people make their own decisions or the right decisions are made.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 3</i></p> <p><i>Assumption</i> – that voters will vote solely on the basis of religious or ethnic identity. The journey from harmless decisions to persecution and extermination is a <i>slippery slope</i> argument.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 4</i></p> <p><i>Assumption</i> – that the decision makers in a non-democracy get their information from a wider or more balanced range of sources. <i>Assumption</i> – that voters are influenced by newspaper headlines as opposed to content. <i>Assumption</i> – that newspaper owners directly influence newspaper headlines. <i>Contradiction</i> – the emphasis on newspaper owners being unelected contradicts the argument against democracy.</p>	9

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
3	<p><i>Paragraph 5</i></p> <p><i>Assumption</i> – that democracy requires a system in which politicians are (regularly) re-elected.  <i>Conflation</i> of keeping the public happy (which could be a long term goal) with making the public feel good (in the short term) /            False dichotomy between keeping the public happy and tackling long-term issues.            In order for the IC to support the MC one must <i>assume</i> that progress is a good thing.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 6</i></p> <p><i>Assumption</i> – that other forms of government do not lead to greater inequality.  <i>Contradiction</i> – the author’s suggestion that people suffer poverty because they rarely vote appears to contradict the claim that democracy causes poverty.            That some people rarely vote is treated by the author as a problematic feature of democracy itself, rather than of its implementation.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p><b>‘Government decisions should represent the will of the people.’</b></p> <p><i>Support (797 words)</i></p> <p>For moral and economic reasons, government decisions should represent the will of the people.</p> <p>Although it can be difficult to know exactly what the ‘will of the people’ is – for example, Doc 3 describes people casting their votes for reasons other than the question they are being asked – this does not mean that we should not strive to understand the people’s will and act upon it.</p> <p>From a moral point of view, it is difficult to argue against the will of the people. Few would support the idea that some people are more important than others. The argument often cited against this is that the opinions of some people, perhaps a majority, are less thoughtful or well informed than others. This argument is used in Doc 1 and can be illustrated by quotes in Doc 4 from Winston Churchill – ‘The strongest argument against democracy is a five-minute discussion with the average voter.’ and the similarly-themed quote from Asimov. However, quotes are merely illustrative soundbites; they do not provide strong evidence. Counter-quotes can always be found. There are well-established systems to ensure that the effects of voter ignorance are lessened and well-informed decisions, still based on the people’s will, are taken. Most countries operate as representative democracies, as described in Doc 2. Thus, the problems of voter ignorance or non-cooperation during referendums, described by Doc 3 can be simply dismissed either by not having single-issue referendums or by referendums being advisory-only. Furthermore, Doc 1 states that voters get their information from a narrow range of ‘newspapers’. The use of this word implies a somewhat out-dated view of information and society. There are many more sources of information in the modern world and the more sources there are, the less one source can be influence by a single viewpoint.</p> <p>Doc 1 suggests that democracy can lead to decisions that produce immoral results for minority groups and twice cites the example of Nazi Germany; this example is further cited in Doc 3 and illustrated by the quote in Doc 4 about two wolves and a lamb voting on what to have for dinner. However, famous though the example is, one cannot generalise from 1930s Germany to all consultations of the people. Many bad things have happened when the people were not consulted and it is possible to put in place safeguards, like those described in Doc 2, or proportional representation systems to ensure that decisions by the majority are not at the expense of the minority.</p> <p>Although not mentioned in the documents it is widely known that democratic countries rarely go to war with one another. So, arguments about the negative long-term consequences of decisions influenced by voter-ignorance can be countered by the positive long-term effect of lack of global conflict, which, most people would agree, is morally a good thing. Indeed, it might have some bearing on the other great reason why consulting the will of the people is a good thing – economic success.</p>	30

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>If we assume that democracies are based on the will of the people, which seems reasonable, the graph in Doc 5 can be used to make some inferences about said will. On that basis, consulting the will of the people has become increasingly common since 1990, and it seems from personal experience that the global economy has also increased. This is corroborated by Doc 1, despite its anti-democratic bias. The point raised by Doc 1 about inequality within democratic systems could equally be applied to non-democratic countries and is, therefore, irrelevant.</p> <p>Doc 1 states that governments that are in thrall to the peoples' will find it difficult to make rapid progress, but slower, more thoughtful, progress seems equally likely to benefit long-term prosperity. The big 'global' issues that Doc 1 refers to do need to be tackled but the international agreements that these issues need are more likely to be achieved if countries are not at war. If government based on the will of the people does lead to fewer conflicts, which seems reasonable, then, with better international cooperation, we might be even better at dealing with the big issues.</p> <p>In conclusion, most of the arguments that government based on the will of the people is bad are focussed on the use of binding referendums. Representative democracies are much more popular and practical and failure to consult the will of the people is immoral and no guarantee of success. As mentioned earlier, quotes offer little in the way of strong support for a conclusion and are often irrelevant appeals to authority. The Churchill quote mentioned earlier is often used to attack consultation of the people. However, Doc 4 shows that he also said, 'democracy is the worst form of Government except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time.'</p> <p><i>Challenge (832 words)</i></p> <p>Doc 5 shows an increase in the number of democracies in recent years – many cite this as proof that democracy is the way forward but this is nothing more than an appeal to popularity. For moral and economic reasons, government decisions should not necessarily represent the will of the people.</p> <p>It is difficult, if not impossible, to know exactly what the 'will of the people' is. Doc 3 describes people casting their votes to protest against the government – i.e. for reasons other than the question they are being asked. Doc 3 also states that many referendums ask 'yes' or 'no' questions. Studies have shown that respondents are heavily inclined to answer 'yes' in such circumstances. It may be said that it is better to try to discover the people's will than simply to ignore it. However, if there really is no way of knowing then trying to find out is a waste of resources, and we know from Doc 3 that referendums, and presumably, therefore, democracy in general is very expensive.</p>	



**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>Many argue in favour of democracy from a moral point of view. Pro-democracy arguments are based on the right of all citizens' opinions to be heard. This view is parodied by the Isaac Asimov quote in Doc 4. Quotes are merely illustrative soundbites; they do not provide strong evidence. Counter-quotes can always be found. However, the minor moral 'good' of asking someone's opinion is far outweighed by the negative moral consequences of doing what the people 'want'. The fact is that the opinions of some people are less thoughtful or well informed than others and it is better that important decisions are taken by those that are well-informed. Doc 1 and Doc 3 cite examples of poor decisions taken by people in elections and there are many more. The Nazi Germany example illustrates the points being made in both documents and the point is not weakened by repetition of the same example – its use by more than one source suggests it is a good example.</p> <p>It is claimed that democracies have systems to ensure that the effects of voter ignorance are lessened and well-informed decisions, still based on the people's will, are taken but the recent referendums cited in Doc 3 suggest that these systems are not effective. Representative democracies, as described in Doc 2 could be a partial solution. However, having representatives with an eye on re-election leads inevitably to the short-sighted 'crowd pleasing' decisions mentioned in Doc 1. Corruption is often claimed to be the major problem with non-democratic systems: a small controlling elite are more open to bribery and external influence. This view is illustrated by the Shaw quote in Doc 4. However, most representative democracies end up with a small controlling elite of equally corrupt and bribable politicians. Thus, democracy does not win the moral argument.</p> <p>Some argue that the will of the people leads to greater economic success. Doc 1, despite its anti-democracy stance, admits this and Doc 5 could be used to support such a claim. (If we assume that democracies are based on the will of the people, the graph in Doc 5 can be used to make some inferences about said will. On that basis, consulting the will of the people has become increasingly common since the 1980s, and it seems from personal experience, that the global economy has grown also.) However, all Doc 5 really tells us is that democracies have become more common since 1990. Even if there has been a contemporary increase in economic success one cannot reliably infer that the former caused the latter. Many of the changes since 1990 can be explained by a single event – the break-up of the Soviet Union. Moreover, the early part of the graph shows a rise in both democracies and autocracies, during which time, presumably, wealth increased. No other document even hints at economic issues so it cannot be concluded from the documents that democracy leads to economic success. Even the example of hyper-democratic and successful Switzerland discussed in Docs 2 and 3, can be dismissed as a generalisation or <i>cum hoc</i> fallacy. So we cannot say democracy leads to prosperity.</p>	

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
4	As stated in Doc 1, democracy leads to poor decision-making, persecution of minorities and slow progress. According to Doc 2 democracy is very expensive. Most of the arguments that government based on the will of the people is the best form of government are focussed on democracy being morally superior and economically more successful. Neither case is supported strongly by the documents. Non-democracies have the potential to be much more efficient. Therefore, we should question the supremacy of democracy. As mentioned earlier, quotes do not strongly support any conclusion and are often, as in this case, irrelevant appeals to authority but they can be illustrative. The Churchill quote mentioned earlier is often used to support consultation of the people. However, Doc 4 shows that he also said, 'The strongest argument against democracy is a five-minute discussion with the average voter.'	

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Structure</b>	<b>Max 8</b>	<b>Quality of argument</b>	<b>Max 8</b>	<b>Use of documents</b>	<b>Max 8</b>	<b>Treatment of counter positions</b>	<b>Max 6</b>
4	<p>Precise conclusion and accomplished argument structure with consistent use of intermediate conclusions. Likely to include at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>strands of reasoning</li> <li>suppositional reasoning</li> <li>analogy</li> <li>evidence</li> <li>examples</li> </ul> <p>Argument is structured so the thought process is made clear. Uses vocabulary of reasoning appropriately and effectively to support argument.</p>	7–8	<p>Cogent and convincing reasoning which answers the question which was asked. Subtle thinking about the issue. Use of relevant own ideas and ideas from documents. Very few significant gaps or flaws.</p>	7–8	<p>Perceptive, relevant and accurate use of documents to support reasoning. References 3+ documents. Sustained and confident evaluation of documents to support reasoning. (Two or more valid <b>evaluative</b> references to documents). Able to combine information from two or more documents and draw a precise inference.</p>	7–8	<p>Consideration of key counter arguments and effective response to these. Use of own ideas in response to counter arguments not mentioned in the documents. Use of valid critical tools to respond to counter arguments. Effective use of appropriate terminology.</p>	5–6
3	<p>Clear conclusion that matches the question. Clear argument structure, which may be simple and precise or attempt complexity with some success. Appropriate use of intermediate conclusions. Use of other argument elements to support reasoning. Generally makes thinking clear. Appropriate use of vocabulary of reasoning.</p>	5–6	<p>Effective and persuasive reasoning which answers the question which was asked. (Although there may be some irrelevance or reliance on dubious assumptions.) Use of own ideas and ideas from documents. Few significant gaps or flaws.</p>	5–6	<p>Relevant and accurate use of documents which supports reasoning. References 3+ documents. Some evaluation <b>and</b> comparison of documents to support reasoning. Inference drawn from at least 1 document.</p>	5–6	<p>Consideration of key counter arguments and effective response to these. Response uses own ideas or is developed from documents. Some use of appropriate terminology.</p>	3–4

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Structure</b>	<b>Max 8</b>	<b>Quality of argument</b>	<b>Max 8</b>	<b>Use of documents</b>	<b>Max 8</b>	<b>Treatment of counter positions</b>	<b>Max 6</b>
2	Conclusion stated but may be 'I agree'. Sufficient clarity for meaning to be clear throughout. Structure may be easy to follow but brief or a longer argument which has a less clear structure. Uses reasons. Some appropriate use of vocabulary of reasoning.	3–4	A reasoned stance which attempts to answer the question which was asked. Some support for the conclusion. (Although there may be considerable irrelevance or reliance on dubious assumptions.) Some thinking/own ideas about the issue. Use of rhetorical questions and emotive language. Some significant gaps or flaws.	3–4	Some relevant use of documents to support reasoning, but some documents used indiscriminately. Some comparison of documents <b>or</b> some critical evaluation of documents <b>or</b> reasoned inference drawn from document.	3–4	Inclusion of counter argument or counter assertion. Response is direct but weak or taken entirely from documents.	2
1	Attempt to construct an argument. Unclear conclusion, multiple conclusions or no conclusion. Disjointed, incoherent reasoning. Use of examples in place of reasoning. Possibly a discourse or a rant. Reasons presented with no logical connection. Documents considered sequentially. Substantial irrelevant material.	1–2	Attempt to answer the general thrust of the question. Attempt to support their view. Excessive use of rhetorical questions and emotive language. Ideas which are contradictory.	1–2	Some, perhaps implicit, use of documents. No attempt at critical evaluation. No comparison of documents.	1–2	Inclusion of counter argument or counter assertion. Response is direct but ineffective.	1