Cambridge International AS & A Level

THINKING SKILLS **9694/42**

Paper 4 Applied Reasoning **May/June 2024**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 50

Published

This document consists of **12** printed pages.

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 descriptions 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.

ANNOTATIONS

Annotation	Meaning and use
✔	Correct response. Use when a mark has been achieved in **Q1**, **2** and **3**.
✘	Incorrect (part of a) response
NGE	Not good enough. Use when a response is partly correct but is insufficiently creditworthy for a mark to be awarded.
BOD	Benefit of doubt
S	Strand of reasoning
CON	Main Conclusion
I	Intermediate Conclusion
AE	Additional argument element in **Q1** / Argument Element in **Q4**
U	Creditworthy material in the Use of Documents skill
3	Use stamps 1–5 alongside U to indicate which document has been referenced
EVAL	Evaluation of documents
C	Comparison of or inference from documents

Annotation	Meaning and use
Q	Creditworthy material in the Quality of Argument skill
T	Treatment of counter-position
L2	Level achieved. Add annotation at the end of **Question 4** in the order of S, U, Q from left to right.
✚	Strong demonstration of a skill Higher mark within a level awarded
▬	Minor demonstration of a skill Flaw or weakness Lower mark within a level awarded
SEEN	Examiner has seen that the page contains no creditworthy material Use to annotate blank pages
Highlight	Use to draw attention to part of an answer

There must be at least one annotation on each page of the answer booklet.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	We should resist the increase in state regulation of social media.	**1**
1(b)	*1 mark for each correctly identified IC* • State regulation of social media would restrict the freedom of speech of every citizen. • If we want to have freedom of speech, we cannot have social media censorship. • (Therefore) censorship would create a perfect environment for the rise of extreme ideologies.	**3**
1(c)	*Award 1 mark for each of the following [max 3]:* CArg Many governments want to regulate social media because they are worried about the dangerous consequences of certain forms of content *(Allow 1 mark each for 'Many governments want to regulate social media' = conclusion of counterargument and 'they are worried about the dangerous consequences of certain forms of content' = counter reason)* (C)Ex (such as) misinformation, defamation, hate speech, threats to public order and terrorist incitement. RC/R But we already have laws against most of these things. C All we need to do to remove the need for regulation is to enforce more rigorously the laws we already have. A The dangerous consequences of certain forms of content are mainly as a result of inadequate law enforcement.	**3**
1	*Award 1 mark for identifying two relationships between elements, e.g.* • (C)Ex illustrates CArg • RC opposes CArg • RC opposes CArg / supports C • C is the conclusion of the paragraph • A is needed for needed to conclude C *Reference to start and end of elements must be unambiguous* *Sample 4-mark answer* 'But we already have laws against most of these things' is a reason **[1]** responding to the counter argument 'Many governments want to regulate… certain forms of content' **[1]**. This reason, together with the assumption that inadequate law enforcement is why some of the examples listed are a problem **[1]**, supports the conclusion of the paragraph **[1]**, which is 'All we need to do to remove the need for regulation is to enforce more rigorously the laws we already have' **[1]**.	**1**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	*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 [max 6]* *Paragraph 3:* • *Conflation* – of regulation with censorship • *Reliance on questionable assumption* – that every citizen needs social media to express their freedom of speech • *False dichotomy* – the last intermediate conclusion offers only 2 options – 'freedom of speech' and 'censorship' and implies that, on that basis, one ought to choose the first option *Paragraph 4:* • *Conflation* – of 'narrow information stream' with 'lack of available information' • *Slippery slope* – from 'fewer news platforms in total' to 'the rise of extreme ideologies' • *Reliance on questionable assumption* – that people feeling detached and powerless leads them to succumb to extreme ideologies • *Reliance on questionable claim* – that 'A narrow information stream would lead to an increase in prejudice' *Paragraph 5:* • *Reliance on questionable assumption* – that government regulatory guidelines would not permit offending the government • *Slippery slope* – from (social media) providers 'working within regulations' / independent news outlets struggling to exist to the 'destabilisation of the country and the fall of the government'	**6**
2(b)	The IC 'tighter regulation of social media platforms would stifle innovation and hence the economy' offers another reason in support of the MC **[1]**. Indeed, this is the only paragraph which **[1]** supports the claim in the IC of para 7 that censorship could have negative consequences for the economy **[1]** (although, the economy might be considered to be the least important of the three facets mentioned **[1]**). However, it relies on the claim that 'regulation of social media would undoubtedly reduce competition' **[1]** without offering an explanation for how this might happen **[1]**.	**3**

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	*1 mark for a version of any of the following points [max 3]* • Governments have a higher proportion of people responding 'complete' and 'a lot' combined. • There is no clarification of the meanings of 'some' or 'a lot', • so the subjective perception of the meaning of each category (or the concept of responsibility) is likely to vary between respondents. • The fact that the total number of responses for 'complete' is greater than 100 means that some respondents must have chosen this option more than once, *Or* Any respondent who selected 'complete' for one party ought to have selected 'None' for the other three, but the data shows that they did not, *[139 'votes' for 'complete' out of 400 ought to necessitate 417 votes for 'none' – which is impossible; and there are only 24]* • which casts doubt on the respondents' understanding of the meaning of 'complete' responsibility. • Respondents who didn't have an opinion may have selected one at random (that all totals are 100% implies that 'pass' was not an option), so the data may be unreliable. • As the question was asked sequentially about each party it is likely that respondents were influenced by answers they had previously given; • as the government question came last (or appears to have), this might explain why the proportion selecting 'complete' is lower than the other categories.	3
3(b)	*1 mark for a version of any of the following points [max 3]* • There are no figures after 2017 so, for a large part of the time that could be described as 'since 2013', we have no data. • The mean appears to have been calculated on the basis of both groups being of equal size, which is increasingly unlikely as time goes on. • It is likely that the proportion of 'non-users' reduced over the time period. • 'Users' is probably the larger group and the proportion option for 'more' or 'much more' regulation in this group has been decreasing. • There may have been a shift of opinion from believing there should be 'more' regulation to believing there should be 'much more' or vice versa. • The categories of 'more' and 'much more' are open to different subjective interpretations by respondents. • The data is only about 'more' and 'much more', which doesn't give full information about the broader question of 'how much' (which includes, e.g., 'a little').	3

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**'Governments should regulate the Internet.'** ***Example high-scoring answers*** *Argument to support (766 words)* We all know that, as Doc 2 states, the Internet brings great benefits to the lives of many. However, we all also know that its potential for harm is enormous. Examples of such dangers are listed in Doc 1 (although these are specifically about social media they can be applied more generally), Doc 2 and Doc 3. These dangers certainly exist; we ought, therefore, to try to do something to minimise them. The most obvious thing we can do is to regulate the Internet and the best institutions to carry this out are governments. It is impossible to protect everyone from everything. However, all societies have laws and regulations that protect people from causing harm to others – like the handbag-stealing law cited by XW in Doc 5. Few would disagree that people, particularly the vulnerable, need to be protected from such acts. In the early days of the Internet there were no specific laws against Internet-related harms, as Doc 2 implies, because they had not previously been necessary. The existing laws that help societies operate do not always apply to the sort of harmful activities that proliferate on the Internet, so we need something new and specific to that medium. The most realistic counterargument against regulation of the Internet, referenced in Doc 1 and by ZY in Doc 5, is that it would interfere with people's freedom, in particular their freedom of expression. Doc 1 tries to make this point but first conflates regulation with censorship and then tries to imply a false dilemma between censorship and freedom. Freedom, whether of information or expression, is one of the big plus points of the Internet, as illustrated by the *Washington Post* analogy in Doc 2. However, it is not necessarily a good thing that everyone has access to the same unfiltered information – a major newspaper editor is likely to have more expertise in dealing with such information. Moreover, freedom of speech does not overrule societal safety – as Doc 2 succinctly states. We regulate other aspects of life to help society function, including the flow of information via traditional media as implied by, Doc 2, Doc 3 and ZY in Doc 5. ZY says regulating one type of media doesn't not entail regulation of another but that does not mean that the other ought not to be regulated on its own merits. LK in Doc 5 supports regulation, and it could be strongly argued that the regulation of the list of historical counterexamples has greatly increased the freedom of the vast majority of individuals concerned.	**27**

Question	Answer	Marks
4	Some say it is not the job of governments to interfere in these matters – that some other agency such as those listed in Doc 4A ought to do the regulating. But who then would regulate the regulators? Ultimately website owners, for example, need to be overseen and the only entities that have the influence to do this are governments. As Doc 2 states, and the tone of NM's comment in Doc 5 implies, as far as we can glean from the documents, objections to government interference are entirely ideological. An objection to regulation that is often raised is that, because the Internet is somehow difficult to define, as Doc 3 suggests, or too big to police at all, as mentioned by ST in Doc 5, we ought not to try. However, anything new is always difficult to define and always needs new laws. RQ in Doc 5 uses a gun-law analogy but a better one might be with illegal drugs. In most counties there was once no regulation of recreational drugs. What constitutes a recreational drug is often difficult to define and they are certainly a 'big' problem. However, most countries do control them, and this control is overseen by the government. The list of example countries in Doc 3 clearly shows that some regulation is possible. Public opinion is in favour of regulation. This is stated in Doc 2 but Doc 2 offers no evidence in support of its claim. However, there is some evidence in the graph in Doc 4A. Although it is specifically about online privacy and has other weaknesses discussed in question 3, it does imply that around 90% of the UK public are at least comfortable with some kind of government responsibility for what happens online, which is consistent with D2's claim. In matters such as this, public opinion is a relevant criterion to consider and not just an appeal to popularity – governments, at least in democracies, are meant to listen to, and at least try to represent, the views of the population. Governments should regulate the Internet. *Argument to challenge (770 words)* We all know that, as Doc 2 states, the Internet brings great benefits to the lives of many. However, we all also know that its potential for harm is enormous. Examples of such dangers are listed in Doc 1 (although these are specifically about social media they can be applied more generally), Doc 2 and Doc 3. These dangers certainly exist; we ought to minimise them if we can. However, regulation of the Internet by governments is not the way forward. The Internet is a vast and freely accessible medium for sharing and gathering information – as the *Washington Post* analogy in Doc 2 implies. To regulate and control its content would diminish one of its greatest benefits; it would also be a severe infringement of freedom of speech and freedom of expression, as stated by ZY in Doc 3 and by Doc 1 concerning the example of social media but which is applicable to the Internet in general. Although Doc 1 appears to conflate regulation with censorship they are synonymous in many practical ways – if a regulation says certain content is not allowed, it must therefore be censored, whether before or after 'publication'.	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	We can all accept that there are negative aspects of an unregulated Internet. However, there are downsides to almost everything. The existence of disadvantages is not a good enough reason to say that something ought not to exist. Crime exists on the Internet and, as Doc 1 confirms, crimes exist in society. There are already laws against theft, as XY in Doc 5 implies but, occasionally elderly ladies have their handbags stolen. These same laws could be used to prosecute people guilty of theft that occurs via the Internet without resorting to regulation of the Internet itself. It seems from the description in Doc 3 that this is basically the approach taken in the USA and we have no evidence to suggest that a greater proportion of harm is done either to US citizens or from US-based Internet sources. So, this 'regulation using non-Internet laws' seems like it could work. Any further interference in the Internet by governments is not necessary and it is not the role of governments to become involved in such matters anyway, as NM in Doc 5 suggests. Any inference from the graph on Doc 4A that public opinion is in favour of government regulation can be dismissed not only because respondents seem to think that website owners and individuals are equally responsible but also because of other reasons discussed in question 3. If we ignore the egregious mean calculation (from differently sized groups) in the table in Doc 4B and look at the, presumably, correct numbers in the second column, it seems as if the opinion of all Internet users is split roughly 50/50. The credibility of the higher number apparently in favour of regulation in column 3 would seem to be weakened by a lack of expertise. Doc 2 tries to use the horrors of the industrial revolution as a parallel in favour of government regulation. However, changes to working practices came gradually and, as D2 admits, were driven from the bottom up by various interested parties. Doc 2's use of the word 'ideological' in reference to those who cry 'no government interference' is rhetorical and betrays a bias in the author of the biggest 'pro-regulation' document. If we attempt to regulate the Internet, it will be difficult. Firstly, as Doc 3 states, it is difficult to define. This does not mean impossible but ambiguous definitions cause problems of implementation. Also, as ST in Doc 5 states, the Internet is big – too big to effectively regulate. Furthermore, it spans so many international jurisdictions who all, we can glean from Doc 3, have different approaches, that the level of international cooperation needed for effective regulation would not be realistically possible. If Doc 3 is meant to be evidence that Internet regulation is possible it does not do a very good job – only 5 examples are given and the USA example seems to imply that there is little or no actual Internet-specific regulation. It is true that being difficult is not sufficient reason for not trying something but, if the difficulties clearly outweigh any potential benefits, then it is. All interventions, governmental or otherwise, cost money and when people, such as those in Doc 4, are asked if the government should step in on any issue, they are rarely asked how much they would be willing to pay for this to happen. Governments should not regulate the Internet. Existing laws and evolving user behaviours will do a less costly and more effective job.	

Level	Structure*		Use of documents		Quality of argument	
	• Conclusion (MC) • Intermediate conclusions (ICs) • Strands of reasoning • Examples or evidence • Original analogy • Hypothetical reasoning		• Reference to documents • Evaluation of documents • Comparison of documents (corroboration or contradiction) • Inference from documents		• Comprehensive and persuasive argument • Logical order of reasoning • Relevant material • Treatment of counter-positions • Absence of flaws and weaknesses • Non-reliance on rhetorical devices	
3	Excellent use of structural elements: • Precise conclusion • Multiple valid explicit ICs that support the MC • Multiple clear strands of reasoning • Some effective use of other argument elements to support reasoning	7–9	Excellent use of documents: • Judicious reference to at least three documents • Multiple valid evaluative points, clearly expressed and used to support reasoning • Some comparison of or inference from documents	7–9	Excellent quality of argument: • Sustained persuasive reasoning • Highly effective order of reasoning • Very little irrelevant material • Key counter-position(s) considered with effective response • Very few flaws or weaknesses • No gratuitous rhetorical devices	7–9
2	Good use of structural elements: • Clear conclusion • More than one valid IC • Some strands of reasoning • Some use of other argument elements	4–6	Good use of documents: • Relevant reference to at least two documents • At least two evaluative points used to support reasoning • May be some comparison of or inference from documents	4–6	Good quality of argument: • Reasonably persuasive reasoning • Unconfused order of reasoning • Not much irrelevant material • Some counter-position(s) considered with some response • Not many flaws or weaknesses • May be some reliance on rhetorical devices	4–6
1	Some use of structural elements: *There may be:* • Conclusion • Implied ICs • Some strands of reasoning • Some use of other argument elements	1–3	Some use of documents: *There may be:* • Reference, perhaps implicit, to a document • Some evaluation of a document • Some comparison of or inference from documents	1–3	Some quality of argument: *There may be:* • Some support for the conclusion • Some order to the reasoning • Some relevant material • Some counter-position(s) considered with some response	1–3
0	No creditable response	0	No creditable response	0	No creditable response	0

*Cap mark for Structure at 3 if no conclusion given