



Cambridge International AS & A Level

THINKING SKILLS**9694/43**

Paper 4 Applied Reasoning

October/November 2023

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 October/November 2023 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

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.

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

PUBLISHED

Annotation	Meaning and use
	Creditworthy material in the Use of Documents skill
	Use stamps 1–5 alongside U to indicate which document has been referenced
	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.
	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
	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)	The time has come for the Parthenon Marbles to be returned to Greece.	1
1(b)	<i>1 mark for each correctly identified IC (max 2)</i> • (so) any Greek artefacts in Britain should be returned to Greece. • The marbles were obtained illegally. • The marbles belong in a museum in Athens, not in London.	2
1(c)	<i>1 mark for either correctly identified CA (max 1)</i> (It is often said that) more people get to see the marbles in their current location in London, as the British Museum averages 6 million visitors a year. (Some say that) history is in the past so we should leave these artefacts where they are now and move forward together.	1

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	<i>Award 1 mark for each of the following [max 3]:</i> R Ancient Greek civilisation is part of the culture and identity of modern Greece. IC1 So it is not surprising that local residents look up at the Parthenon and feel proud that their ancestors built it. IC2 It would mean more to modern Athenians to have the marbles in their city than it means to have them in a city whose culture has no basis in Ancient Greece. C So moving the marbles from London to Athens would increase happiness. A1 The culture of London has no basis in Ancient Greece. A2 The increase in happiness of Athenians would outweigh the happiness obtained by having the marbles in London.	3
	<i>Award 1 mark for identifying two relationships between elements, e.g.</i> • R supports IC1 and/or IC2 • IC1 supports IC2 • IC2 supports C • A1 is needed for IC2 to support C • A2 is needed for IC2 to support C <i>Reference to start and end of elements must be unambiguous.</i> <i>Sample 4-mark answer</i> ‘Ancient Greek ... modern Greece’ is a reason [1] supporting the IC ‘So it is not surprising ... ancestors built it’ [1], which, in turn, supports the IC ‘It would mean more to modern Athenians ... Ancient Greece’ [1] [1], which in turn supports the conclusion of the paragraph, ‘So moving the marbles from London to Athens would increase happiness’ [1].	1

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 3:</i> • <i>Contradiction</i> – the existence of Greece in the Ottoman Empire contradicts the implication in paragraph 2 that Greece was in the British Empire at the time the marbles were removed <i>Paragraph 4:</i> • <i>Inconsistency</i> – the IC that the marbles belong in a museum in Athens is inconsistent with the claim that they are best viewed in their original context • <i>Reliance on questionable assumption</i> – that things belong in the place they are best viewed • <i>Weak support</i> – the reasoning supports a conclusion that the marbles should be returned to the surface of the Parthenon, rather than to a museum <i>Paragraph 5:</i> • <i>Reliance on questionable assumption</i> – that the culture of London has no basis in Ancient Greece • <i>Conflation</i> – of meaningfulness with happiness <i>Paragraph 6:</i> • <i>Ad hominem</i> – the reader is encouraged to dismiss the views of people who take a counter-position on the basis of other opinions such people might hold (<i>Credit if described as a straw man</i>) • <i>Inadequate support</i> – no part of the reasoning supports the time having come for anything to happen	6

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	<i>Award marks for any of the following [max 3]</i> Paragraph 2 appears to offer some support for the MC, by stating that the marbles were stolen [1]. However, support for the MC is weakened because describing the Marbles as ‘stolen’ begs the question [1]. The principle in the second sentence might be persuasive [1]. ‘Greece is no longer part of the British Empire’ is given as a reason to support the conclusion, but is irrelevant in applying the principle that all stolen artefacts should be returned [1]. According to paragraph 3, Greece was not part of the British Empire at the time the marbles were removed [1] so the stated principle does not apply in this case anyway [1]. ‘Any Greek artefacts’ is too broad, and could cover trivial things like holiday souvenirs [1]. It does not offer any support for the MC claim that ‘the time has come’ [1].	3

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<i>Award marks for any of the following [max 2]</i> • data is for 2018 only while the claim appears to be about average annual attendance • visitors may have come to see attractions other than the Elgin marbles • if the same people visit on more than one occasion, the number of visitors could be significantly lower than attendance figures	2
3(b)	<i>Award marks for any of the following [max 4]</i> • there is no information about the usual number of visitors to be able to judge the significance of 100 000 • seasonal variations might make the annual figure lower than 4 × the 3-month figure • people might have visited during the 3-month period because of the small window of opportunity so a permanent exhibition might result in less frequent visits • if people tend to visit such exhibits only once, then there are up to 100 000 people who are unlikely to come again • the apparent correlation between the exhibition in 2013 and a good year for traders could be coincidental or for an unrelated reason • it is likely that any year will be the best ever for some businesses, so 2013 not necessarily special • if the impact of the exhibition was so significant, one would expect more than just ‘some’ traders to have had their best year ever • unless these traders constitute a substantial proportion of the city’s economy, there isn’t much support for the idea that the economy of the city as a whole will get a big boost	4

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
4	‘Culturally significant artefacts should be returned to their country of origin.’ <i>Example high-scoring answers</i> <i>Argument to support (873 words)</i> Many museums, particularly in the West, contain culturally significant artefacts sourced from around the world. The methods by which most such artefacts were removed from their countries of origin would be considered illegal by today’s standards. Until the early 20th Century, it was considered acceptable for a developed nation to invade and rule over a less developed one. Such practices now seem abhorrent. Doc 1 displays a certain bias but nevertheless contains some truth, such as when it describes items appropriated by empires as ‘stolen’. Some suggest that the removal of certain items was ‘legal’, such as that of the Elgin marbles described in Doc 2. However, in this case the ‘legality’ is disputed, as mentioned in Doc 1, but also in the apparently neutral Doc 5B. It is interesting that Docs 1 and 2 cite completely different passages from, presumably the same, legal document, the original of which appears to have been lost! In any case, the legal processes described were drawn up at a time when empires were considered legal; so, in the same way that any documents about, e.g., serfdom, would not be considered valid today, any such ‘legal’ documents about artefact transfer should be treated with disdain. The moral case is that any artefacts obtained illegally by today’s standards should be returned. Items displayed close to their site of origin will have more significance for local people and increase the overall level of enthusiasm and appreciation, both cultural and historic. To take the example of the Elgin Marbles, Doc 1 mentions their importance to the people of Greece. The average Greek’s appreciation of the marbles is likely to be higher than the average Briton’s, an idea consistent with Kilkenny’s comment about the Lindisfarne Gospels in Doc 4. Those who suggest that Greeks can still appreciate them in a distant museum miss the point that people are much less likely to travel to distant museums; they might, however, go to one in their hometown, as the, admittedly incomplete, visitor figures for Doc 4 imply. Doc 2 suggests that artists and historians have been inspired by the presence of the Marbles in London, but this claim is based on the questionable assumption that the likelihood of budding artists and historians who visit London museums visiting an Athenian museum would be less than the likelihood of similar Greek types visiting a London museum. Claims that more people get to see these artefacts in their present position rely entirely on figures such as those on Document 5A. We don’t have much information in the documents about visitors to artefacts that have been repatriated, but the notion of even more people visiting them in their place of origin is at least consistent with the figures in Doc 4 and it does seem likely that people might well travel to these more remote locations to see them. Such increased numbers are likely to give more remote economies a boost, as the example in Doc 4 suggests, with little impact on the economies of their current host cities; consistent with a low impact on current locations is the interesting observation that the artefacts listed in Doc 5B are, for the most part, not housed at the world’s most popular museums, as listed in Doc A. If there is a demographic of as yet uninspired artists and historians out there, one had better hope, on the evidence of all the Docs, and Doc 5 in particular, that they live within easy visiting distance of a few large European or US cities, or Beijing.	27

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
4	The orderly return of such artefacts is an entirely feasible undertaking. Doc 3 describes a Dutch museum with a considered programme of potential returns and paragraph 1 of the same document suggests that other items have been successfully returned. Old arguments about less wealthy countries being unable to look after returned artefacts properly are exactly that: old. What might have been true in 1832, when Greece first asked for the return of the Elgin marbles, according to Doc 2, is not true now. Doc 2's subsequent point about pollution assumes an outdoor display for the marbles, which, although confusingly discussed by Doc 1, is unlikely. Doc 3 also mentions the potential organised return of the Benin Bronzes to Nigeria. These artefacts are listed in Doc 5B, along with what seems to be the benchmark for returning artefacts, the Elgin Marbles. If returning one of the items on this list is feasible, the possibility must be considered that the others on the list could also be returned without much pain to their current host and with great benefit to their home country. The return of culturally significant artefacts to their country of origin is likely to increase the happiness of many in the country to which it is being returned. A decrease in happiness of the population of the current host country is likely to be minimal, as Docs 1 and 4 suggest. So, the principle of returning artefacts is likely to increase overall happiness. This might, in turn, bring a benefit to the current host countries in terms of goodwill, which could bring decreased conflict and increased prosperity. Everyone's a winner! Therefore, culturally significant artefacts should be returned to their country of origin. <i>Argument to challenge (875 words)</i> Culture belongs to the world, not to individual, transient, political entities. Important artefacts should be where they can best be appreciated by the highest number of people. Doc 5A shows visitor numbers at a range of museums. Although we do not have much of a frame of reference, these figures seem high, and the size of the British Museum figure is corroborated by Doc 1, which is biased in favour of returning artefacts. The only comparable figure we have for returned artefacts, in Doc 4, is not really comparable without knowing numbers for similarly transient exhibitions in Durham, but it seems likely that artefacts in smaller museums would get fewer visitors. While it is conceivable that the occasional budding artist or historian might be able to travel the world visiting artefacts one by one, over many years, it is much more likely that, as Doc 2 implies, such a person would make one trip to soak up all the cultural impetus that a city such as Paris had to offer. The idea of returning artefacts to a particular country seems questionable since the 'country' that exists now is rarely the same country from which the artefact originated. The Elgin marbles seem to have been created in the city state of Athens, according to Doc 2, taken to Britain from the Ottoman Empire, according to Docs 1, 2 and 5 and their return to the modern state of Greece is now being demanded, according to the same documents. Doc 4 mentions an artefact from part of the UK that was a different country at the time, and the presence of a Kingdom of Benin within modern Nigeria, mentioned in both Doc 3 and 5, seems to be another example of the changing nature of political boundaries. Political maps are ever-changing.	

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
4	People used to arrange themselves into tribes, then kingdoms; for a while, empires were all the rage. Now the fashion seems to be for linguistically defined nation states; but who knows what the future will bring? The idea that London and Athens might end up in the same country in 200 years' time is not so ridiculous. The very notion of empires is now anathema, and the deeds of empires are particularly unpopular. Hence, anything done in the name of an empire, such as the removal of historical artefacts, is often seen as wrong <i>per se</i>. This point is expressed in Doc 1 and implied in Doc 5B. The Elgin Marbles, mentioned in both Docs, are often used as the poster boy for artefact return. However, Doc 2 tells us that the Marbles were carved and displayed in their original position to glorify an empire. Thus, the view that the exploits of empire were universally bad seems to apply only to recent empires. The Greek and Roman Empires were very unpopular at the time so there does not seem to be much basis for treating their exploits with any more respect than those of the British, French, Dutch, or other, empires. The artefacts are part of history and history has brought them to their current location: we are where we are. History might see them move in the future but history itself should not be cited as a reason for their movement. Appeals by popular but transient celebrities, such as those in Doc 1, are irrelevant. Any attempt to have a fair and consistent system for returning artefacts that satisfies most people is likely to be near impossible. Even the progressive museum described optimistically by Doc 3 has not yet returned any artefacts under its heralded programme. Any returns cited have been <i>ad hoc</i>. Let's examine the Elgin Marbles' case. The 'stolen by imperial forces from defenceless locals' argument does not apply because it seems to have been a transfer from one Empire to another, and the 'removed illegally' argument is possible but disputed, as referenced in Docs 1, 2 and 5. All that is left is the 'everything should go back to where it came from' argument and that just doesn't seem feasible. In the case of the Marbles, they would likely be returned to a museum, not the face of the Parthenon, about which Doc 1 seems confused. On the basis of this 3rd argument, we could see the return of 180 000 artefacts from the museum described in Doc 3 and, if other museums have a similar percentage of 'returnable' objects, we could see a wholesale emptying of our most famous museums. This might please some people, but it would make visiting a range of inspiring artefacts more difficult and much more expensive. There is a real alternative to permanent return that would satisfy all but the most nationalistic counter positions mentioned in Docs 3 and 4: temporary loans. These would undoubtedly increase visitor numbers, whatever the relative significance of those figures in Docs 4 and 5A, it would also answer any contextual arguments such as those espoused by Docs 1 and 4 and alluded to in Doc 2. If in doubt, it is always best to stick with the status quo. Unless we are absolutely sure returning artefacts would be for the best, we should keep them where they are. Therefore, culturally significant artefacts should not be returned to their country of origin.	

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 (may be implied) - 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