



Cambridge International AS & A Level

THINKING SKILLS

9694/41

Paper 4 Applied Reasoning

May/June 2022

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 2022 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 **16** 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.

PUBLISHED**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 Qs 1 to 3	Meaning and use
	Correct response. Use when a mark has been achieved in Q1, 2 and 3.
	Not good enough. Use in Q1, 2 and 3 when a response is partly correct but is insufficiently creditworthy for a mark to be awarded.
	Benefit of doubt
	For material which is incorrect.

Annotation Q4	Meaning and use
	Creditworthy material in the Structure skill
	Main Conclusion
	Intermediate Conclusion
	Argument Element
	Creditworthy material in the Use of Documents skill
	Use stamps 1–5 alongside U to indicate which document has been referenced

Annotation Q4	Meaning and use
	Evaluation of documents
	Comparison of or inference from documents
	Creditworthy material in the Quality of Argument skill
	Treatment of counter-position
	Level achieved. Add annotation at the end of Question 4 in the order of S, U, Q from left to right.
	Elevated demonstration of a skill Higher mark within a level awarded
	Diminutive demonstration of a skill Flaw or weakness Lower mark within a level awarded
	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.

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	(so) they [actors] should stick to what they have been trained to do and let professional politicians run things.	1
1(b)	<i>1 mark for each correctly identified IC (max 2)</i> <i>Mark only the first two answers given</i> • (In this way,) actors cannot hope to represent the people they would be supposed to represent. • (This could mean that,) if a popular actor holds a dangerous opinion, that opinion is likely to gain support based on the actor's popularity, rather than the content of the opinion itself. • (so) [such an actor] would have an unfair advantage over professional politicians.	2

PUBLISHED

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] <i>Paragraph 1:</i> • <i>Equivocation</i> – shift in meaning of the word ‘duty’. • (Accept: <i>Rash generalisation</i> – from three examples to a widespread problem.) • <i>False dichotomy</i> – between entertaining and influencing how society works / <i>Stipulative definition</i> of ‘the duty of actors’. • <i>Invalid deduction</i> – Even if politicians should not become actors, it does not logically follow that actors should not become politicians. <i>Paragraph 2:</i> • <i>Sweeping generalisation</i> – the fact that some, or even most, actors may well have issues that mean they would not make ideal politicians, does not mean that those actors who choose to enter politics would suffer the same hindrances to a political career. • <i>Conflation</i> – of child stars with all actors. • <i>Slippery slope</i> – from actors, some of whom might have health issues, being in charge to disastrous consequences. <i>Paragraph 3:</i> • <i>Reliance on questionable assumption</i> – that actors on enormous salaries have not had experience of living without an enormous salary. • <i>Reliance on questionable assumption</i> – that politicians from a different professional background are more likely to have experience of poverty / that politicians from a different professional background are not rich. • <i>Rash generalisation</i> – from the most well-known actors to actors in general. • <i>Begging the question</i> – the reader is encouraged to take it for granted that a degree of wage parity is necessary for empathy or the ability to represent. • <i>Equivocation</i> – there is some movement in meaning of represent from ‘typify’ to ‘speak for’. <i>Paragraph 4:</i> • <i>Reliance on questionable assumption</i> – that support for a non-acting politician’s opinions are not based on popularity of the politician. • <i>Reliance on questionable assumption</i> – that professional politicians are not skilled at using their tone of voice and body language to manipulate emotions. • <i>Inconsistency</i> – the example represents what most would regard as a positive influence, not a ‘dangerous opinion’.	6

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	The paragraph gives a persuasive reason why, in some cases, the political process could be undermined [1]. Voters having a false perception of an actor's actual character and capabilities seems plausible [1]. However, such examples are not likely to be common and so the support provided to the MC is not strong [1]. However, the reasoning assumes that no actor can have any political expertise [1], and that people from other professions – including politics – do have political expertise [1]. As with all the other strands of reasoning, this point if true might apply only to a few actors [1], so the paragraph does not resolve the central weakness of the argument as a whole [1]. The movement from a single actor to a government filled with people with no expertise represents a slippery slope [1] so this aspect of the reasoning provides little support for the MC but does not undermine the support given elsewhere [1].	3

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<i>1 mark each for a version of any of the following points [max 2]</i> • We do not know the usual rate of voter registration in the run up to such elections so the significance of 213 000 is uncertain. • If 213 000 represents a real increase, there could have been many causes unrelated to Taylor Swift's message. • It seems likely that newly-registered voters would belong to a younger age group as older people might have registered already. Thus the claim about most voters being in the 18–24 category seems unremarkable. • The proportion of people in the 18-24 age group that are fans of Taylor Swift is unknown.	2
3(b)	<i>1 mark each for a version of any of the following points [max 4]</i> • The data is about where people think political views come from, not where they actually come from • which is practically impossible to correctly ascertain. • The data about people's own views is unreliable because it is self-reported. • The data about other people's views is unreliable because it lacks ability to see, • and in any case the celebrity influence in other people is perceived to be similar to the influence of politicians. • The difference between perceptions of one's own views and the views of others illustrates the unreliability of using opinion as evidence. • Respondents are likely to have given answers which they thought would impress the person administering the survey. • Individuals' perception of the scope of the categories will vary subjectively, • particularly as there is likely to be a significant degree of overlap between categories.	4

PUBLISHED

4	‘Celebrity involvement is bad for politics.’ <i>Example high-scoring answers</i> <i>Argument to support (750 words)</i> The involvement of celebrities in politics is clearly nothing new. There is a list of historical examples in Doc 3, and Docs 2 and 4 cite different examples from the 1960s. Most of this involvement seems to have been in the form of endorsements or voicings of opinion but celebrities have been becoming actual politicians since at the least the 1960s as we can see from an easily verifiable claim about Ronald Reagan in Doc 2. However, the long existence of celebrity involvement in politics does not imply that this is a good thing. On the contrary, celebrity involvement is bad for politics. The skills of celebrity and those of politics are not as compatible as people often suggest. There are many references in the documents to politics and acting needing similar skills. This is mentioned in Doc 1, Doc 2 and by US in Doc 4. They overlap in one respect but, in many ways, they are not compatible. Some of these are touched upon in Doc 1 but the issue of mental health, treated lightly in Doc 1, is also mentioned in Doc 4. Quotes on an internet forum are not, in themselves, strong evidence but the point raised by PJ is well-documented. People of a creative disposition, just the types to become celebrities, are much more likely to suffer from various forms of mental illness than the general population (and than traditional politicians). This might not be a disadvantage when they are being creative, but politics is not the same as art. There are strong and obvious reasons why it is important that people in charge of the direction of the lives of others and our planet are mentally stable. Although the warnings towards the end of the somewhat biased Doc 1 about the dire consequences of celebrity involvement in politics are exaggerated and the causal link in the final paragraph has not been established, there are reasons why celebrities, by their very nature, make unsuitable politicians.	27
---	--	----

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
	Celebrity involvement changes the public perception of what politics is about, and this undermines democracy. Politics is about good governance, but the involvement of celebrities can shift the public's perception of the meaning of politics from governance to a form of entertainment. Doc 3 mentions the dumbing down of politics, a point that is consistent with RM's comment in Doc 4. Doc 2, which seems supportive of celebrity involvement in politics, suggests that its increase is a consequence of increased public distrust of politicians, since both phenomena are contemporary. However, it is equally likely to follow that public distrust of politicians is a result of increasing celebrity involvement – sowing a seed in the minds of a credulous public that there is a 'more trustworthy alternative' to politicians.	

PUBLISHED

4	Where the skills of politicians and celebrities, particularly actors, do overlap is in the ability to deceive the public. This is mentioned in three documents. This ability is desirable in celebrities. In politicians, this skill may well be essential to get elected, but it does not make for benign and effective governance. Celebrities are good at winning elections, but they are not good at running things. Docs 1, 2 and 3 provide a long list of celebrity politicians and there are not enough data to weigh the good against the bad. However, it is interesting that the pro-celebrity-involvement Doc 2 cites Joseph Estrada and in the same sentence admits that he was impeached and tried. It is likely that if better examples were available, Doc 2 would have used them. Doc 2 also claims celebrities have made politics fun, but that is not the point of politics. It is meant to be effective, not fun. Being able to deceive the public might explain why celebrities get elected – they are even better at deceiving the public than politicians; but having politicians whose main achievement is having fooled large sections of the public is not good for society. Doc 5 suggests that celebrity influence might not be as large as some people worry it is. Although the survey presented in the graph might have some credibility, in that it is from a large representative sample in a range of countries, it suffers from the major weakness of its subjectivity. People can delude themselves about how much they are influenced. Indeed, it is possible that the projected opinions on other people might be closer to the real figure. However, as ability to know here is zero, we cannot be complacent about the extent of celebrity influence. <i>Argument to challenge (737 words)</i> The involvement of celebrities in politics is clearly nothing new. There is a list of historical examples in Doc 3, and Docs 2 and 4 cite different ones from the 1960s. Most of this involvement seems to have been in the form of endorsements or voicings of opinion, but celebrities have been becoming actual politicians since at the least the 1960s as we can see from an easily verifiable claim about Ronald Reagan in Doc 2. It is not an appeal to tradition to suggest that because we have had celebrities in politics, we ought not to worry about them now. Global heating aside, the world has not been becoming noticeably worse over that time; indeed, Doc 2 suggests that many credit	
---	--	--

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
	Reagan with ending the cold war. So, the slippery slope prediction and <i>post hoc</i> fallacy towards the end of document 1 are not consistent with the evidence. It is not obvious that the involvement of celebrities in politics has negative consequences. There is a suggestion from Doc 5 that the influence that celebrities have on the voting intentions of the public might not be as large as some people worry. Although the subjective evidence from the graph is weak, the claims from the Universities of Maryland and Michigan in paragraph 1 have a little more credibility. It is likely that these claims have been peer reviewed by people with a lot of expertise and ability to know, and whose reputation for veracity is important to their careers. These highly credible academics then go on to suggest that the most influential celebrities are those who take a real interest in politics, rather than those who just chip in occasionally. It is likely that the more consistent commentators have more genuine interest and therefore knowledge and perhaps a degree of understanding that is equivalent to 'real' politicians. So, the evidence that celebrities have a disproportionately negative influence on politics is not strong.	

PUBLISHED

4	It is often claimed that celebrities dumb down politics. This claim is referenced in Doc 2 and is consistent with Doc 1's suggestion that the distinction between fact and fiction can become blurred. However, this view assumes a golden age of democracy where the majority of voters considered the pros and cons of politicians' views and skills rationally and in depth. Such a view is itself fiction. Most people make voting decisions on the basis of gut feeling, tribalism, mood, physical appearance and a range of other less than rational reasons, and they always have. All the counter-arguments about the unsuitability of celebrities in politics are not celebrity-specific. Doc 1 claims that many actors have mental health issues but so do large numbers of non-celebrities. Quotes on an internet forum are not strong evidence but, even if the point raised by PJ is true, the public would be unlikely to vote someone like Van Gogh into a position of power, so the absurd hypothetical examples offered by PJ do not tell us anything. Likewise, the claim in Doc 1 that the enormous salaries of actors make them out of touch with the general public can equally be applied to most 'traditional' politicians. In fact, it is perhaps more likely that a celebrity was not always as rich and so might, on average, have more experience of what it is like to live on a low income than a traditional politician. Celebrity involvement might actually solve one or two issues with democracy. Democracy relies on the participation of a representative proportion of the public. Traditionally, fewer young people vote, as stated in Doc 2. Doc 2 hints that celebrities might be more likely to encourage interest in the young; Doc 3 gives some detail about Taylor Swift increasing young-voter registration – an example corroborated by Doc 5. It is possible, therefore, that celebrities could make the voting public more representative of the general public. Doc 2 also suggests that celebrities make politics more interesting in general; if they encourage more people to take an interest, then there will be a higher proportion of the population engaging with democracy. As democracy relies on public engagement, this increase, however slight, must be seen as a good thing. (If we agree that democracy is a good thing.)	
---	---	--

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
	There is no strong case that celebrity involvement is bad for politics. There exists the possibility that it might actually be good. So, we cannot conclude that celebrity involvement is bad for politics.	

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: 7–9 - 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	Excellent use of documents: 7–9 - 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	Excellent quality of argument: 7–9 - 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
2	Good use of structural elements: 4–6 - Clear conclusion - More than one valid IC - Some strands of reasoning - Some use of other argument elements	Good use of documents: 4–6 - 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	Good quality of argument: 4–6 - 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
1	Some use of structural elements: 1–3 <i>There may be:</i> - Conclusion - Implied ICs - Some strands of reasoning - Some use of other argument elements	Some use of documents: 1–3 <i>There may be:</i> - Reference, perhaps implicit, to a document - Some evaluation of a document - Some comparison of or inference from documents	Some quality of argument: 1–3 <i>There may be:</i> - Some support for the conclusion - Some order to the reasoning - Some relevant material - Some counter-position(s) considered with some response
0	No creditable response 0	No creditable response 0	No creditable response 0

*Cap mark for Structure at 3 if no conclusion given