

Cambridge International AS & A Level

THINKING SKILLS**9694/04**

Paper 4 Applied Reasoning

For examination from 2028

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 50

Specimen

This document has **14** pages.

Generic Marking Principles

All examiners must apply these general marking principles when marking candidate responses. Examiners must apply them alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptions for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme must 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 descriptions for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptions 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 descriptions.

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 descriptions in mind.











Annotations guidance for centres









Examiners use a system of annotations as a shorthand for communicating their marking decisions to one another. Examiners are trained during the standardisation process on how and when to use annotations. The purpose of annotations is to inform the standardisation and monitoring processes and guide the supervising examiners when they are checking the work of examiners within their team. The meaning of annotations and how they are used is specific to each component and is understood by all examiners who mark the component.

We publish annotations in our mark schemes to help centres understand the annotations they may see on copies of scripts. Note that there may not be a direct correlation between the number of annotations on a script and the mark awarded. Similarly, the use of an annotation may not be an indication of the quality of the response.

The annotations listed below were available to examiners marking this component in this series.

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Correct response. Use when a mark has been achieved in Q1 , 2 and 3 .
	Incorrect (part of a) response
	Not good enough. Use wherever such a judgment has been made.
	Benefit of doubt
	Strand of reasoning
	Main Conclusion
	Intermediate Conclusion
	Additional argument element in Q1 / Argument Element in Q4
	Creditworthy material in the Use of Documents skill
	Use stamps 1–5 alongside U to indicate which document has been referenced

Annotation	Meaning
	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
Highlighter	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)	<p>State the main conclusion of the argument.</p> <p>(However,) the public adulation of this teenager [Greta Thunberg] is misguided and dangerous</p>	1
1(b)	<p>Identify two intermediate conclusions in paragraphs 2 to 3.</p> <p><i>1 mark for each correctly identified IC (max 2)</i> <i>Mark only the first two answers given</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The opinions of young people should not determine government policy. • Teenagers are particularly unqualified to comment on politics. • (So) the fact that large numbers of young people support a political cause adds little to its merits. 	2

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	<p>Analyse the structure of the reasoning in paragraph 4 by identifying the argument elements and explaining their function.</p> <p><i>Award 1 mark for each of the following [max 3]:</i></p> <p>IC Greta herself is a very unusual teenager. R1 She frequently refers to herself as a ‘child’. R2 This [referring to oneself as a child] is something most 16-year-olds would never do. C (So) it is probable that her views don’t even represent the majority of teenagers. A1 The views of unusual individuals are probably not representative of the views of their peers.</p> <p><i>Award 1 mark for identifying two functional relationships between elements, or 2 marks for identifying three functional relationships between elements, e.g.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>R1 supports IC</i> • <i>R2 supports IC</i> • <i>R1 and R2 support IC jointly *</i> • <i>IC supports C</i> • <i>A1 is needed for IC to support C</i> <p><i>Reference to start and end of elements must be unambiguous.</i></p> <p><i>* credit joint support as two relationships, in which case those individual relationships do not gain additional credit for being repeated</i></p> <p><i>Sample 5-mark answer</i></p> <p>‘So it is probable ... majority of teenagers’ is the conclusion of the paragraph [1] that is supported by the IC, ‘Greta, ... unusual teenager.’ [1] This IC is supported by two reasons: the first is ‘She frequently refers to herself as a “child”’ [1][1r]; the second is ‘This is something most 16-year-olds would never do.’ [1][1r]</p>	5

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	<p>Identify one unstated assumption in paragraph 5 upon which the reasoning relies.</p> <p><i>2 marks for an exact version of the following; 1 mark for an incomplete or vague version of the following:</i></p> <p>That this teenager's transatlantic journeys were made by air</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p>Identify and explain three fallacies and/or weaknesses in the reasoning in paragraphs 2 to 3.</p> <p><i>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></p> <p><i>Paragraph 2:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Straw man</i> – the paragraph argues against an implied counter-position (that the opinions of young people should determine government policy) which is more extreme than the realistic counter-position • <i>Appeal to tradition</i> – the objection that too much weight is given to the views of children is based on the idea that traditionally they were ignored • <i>Conflation</i> – of 'children' with 'young people' • <i>Conflation</i> – of 'young people' with 'those who shout loudest' <p><i>Paragraph 3:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Reliance on dubious assumption</i> – that most non-teenagers have had enough education and experience to form valid opinions • <i>Rash generalisation</i> – from 16-year-olds to teenagers in general • <i>Personal attack (ad hominem)</i> – the reader is encouraged to dismiss the views of teenagers because their hormones make them angry / they have spent a lot of time playing on their phones • <i>Reliance on dubious claim</i> – that a lot of teenagers' formal education has been spent 'playing on their phones' 	6
2(b)	<p>Explain the inconsistency between paragraphs 3 and 4.</p> <p><i>2 marks for a developed version of the following; 1 mark for an incomplete or vague version of the following:</i></p> <p>Paragraph 3 dismisses the views of typical teenagers merely because they are typical teenagers, but in paragraph 4 the views of Greta are dismissed on the grounds that she is not a typical teenager.</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
2(c)	<p>Identify and explain the counter-attack (<i>tu quoque</i>) fallacy in paragraph 5.</p> <p>The author suggests that, because of Greta's assumed use of air travel, others should ignore her advice not to fly [1]. The author is encouraging the reader to ignore potentially valid advice purely on the grounds that an opponent might be not always follow their own advice [1].</p>	2

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p>Suggest three reasons why the support given by the graph is weak.</p> <p><i>1 mark for each of the following [max 3]:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the information is specific to Sweden but the claim implies people in general the possible downward trend might not be as a result of any action taken by Greta Thunberg* 'passengers' could mean the number of people, not the number of journeys; in which case there might be fewer people flying, but those people could be flying more 'fly less' might mean flying less distance in total, which the graph doesn't give us any information about we don't know by how much passenger numbers typically vary from year to year, so cannot say anything about the extent of any perceived decrease in the data provided the figures from January 2018 to July 2018 in fact show an increase or no change compared to 2016, not a decrease we have only 3 (<i>allow 2</i>) data points for each month, which is not enough to establish a trend the data cover a period of only three years the only plausible sign of a significant decrease compared with 2016 is during September, October and November, which is only 3 months out of 12 <p><i>* credit this point once only, for any broad version of it</i></p>	3

Question	Answer	Marks
3(b)	<p>Suggest three reasons why the support given by the table is weak.</p> <p><i>1 mark for each of the following [max 3]:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the claim is about groups but the data is about individuals these individuals might be unrepresentative of the groups they purport to represent arguably, 64% for the Pope is not significantly lower than 67% for Greta there is no information about degree of trust, merely the number of people whose trust levels exceeded an imagined threshold the threshold required for trust to be established seems very subjective it is not clear if the people asked knew who all these people were – if you don't know who someone is you are unlikely to rate them as trustworthy 	3

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>‘Teenage political activism is a force for good.’</p> <p><i>Example high-scoring answers</i></p> <p><i>Argument to support (809 words)</i></p> <p>It is hard to deny that teenagers have, on average, more life to look forward to than older generations. This means they have more invested in the successful future running of the world – they have more to lose if it all goes wrong. The statistic at the end of Doc 2, although it does not present a category for teenagers, is at least consistent with this view. Stereotypical generalisations about teenagers, such as those in Docs 1 and 4, are irrelevant in this debate because most teenagers that get involved in political activism are likely to be atypical.</p> <p>Teenagers becoming involved in politics is likely to encourage other teenagers to do the same. If you believe that the more people who vote the better, which most democracies claim is their goal, then increased election turnout among a group who, according to Doc 4, are unlikely to vote in elections must be a good thing.</p> <p>The general public does seem to take an interest in teenage political activists, whether they are for them or against them. All the documents, including the newspaper report about a radio show in Doc 2, are examples of the media talking about teenagers in politics. The cover of a well-known magazine, e.g. <i>Time</i> cited in Docs 1 and 4, is likely itself to be a conversation point. Public interest in this area is clear – Greta and Malala would probably not have been on the front of a wide circulation magazine from another country had they not been teenagers. Even if one does not agree with the views of the particular teenager being discussed, it seems probable that teenagers discussing politics in the media will get others discussing politics at home, at work or in social situations. More people discussing politics is likely to make people better informed, which might mean votes in elections are cast more thoughtfully. It could be argued that public political engagement depends on the issue rather than the personality, but Doc 2 tells us that Sir David Attenborough, with all his credentials, was ignored 20 years earlier when he said the same things as Greta.</p> <p>We should not be worried about teenagers’ perceived lack of expertise. The claim from the table in Doc 5 infers a lot from five individuals but it is comforting (and plausible) that people would trust specific technical information more if it came from a broadcaster with relevant expertise, even compared to a concerned teenager. Those, such as the author of Doc 1, that suggest that teenagers should keep quiet on issues they don’t fully understand miss the important point that most adults are severely ill-informed about most issues. Although by no means necessarily ‘experts’, teenagers have had a more recent and therefore, ideally, a more politically relevant education than most adults. Learning about the causes of World War 1 might not be as relevant to today’s politics as understanding the issues surrounding climate change. Teenagers are likely to know more than the older generation about the latter.</p>	24

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>Doc 3 appears to highlight a problem with teenage political activism by reporting an example that, one assumes, most would disagree with. However, the issue is not about the relative merits of individual teenagers. There are 4 teenagers mentioned across 5 documents (most in Doc 4). We would not expect them all to have the same view – adult politicians do not all have the same view. So we should not only accept, but encourage, a spectrum of opinions that are open for discussion. In any case, the example in Doc 3 does seem somewhat unusual in that, for all the others we have some background, in Doc 4 and Doc 2, that might have shaped the individual's views and a reason for their fame. One gets the impression from Doc 3 that the apparent fame of the teenager concerned might have been orchestrated, by wealthy corporations with a vested interest, as an answer to Greta Thunberg. It could be that this atypical example illustrates the benefit of other teenagers becoming involved in politics.</p> <p>Nor should we be worried about extreme teenage opinion making adult voters do silly things. There are still a lot of adults out there who are capable of making rational decisions based on what the media reports a prominent teenager as having said. Teenage activist opinion can be filtered by credible broadcasters. The fact that the BBC is comfortable with their flagship news programme being influenced by a teenager, and the fact that David Attenborough is happy to endorse her on an issue on which he has such credibility, support our being comfortable with the presence of this teenager in political debate. Other teenagers whose opinions merit consideration should be welcomed also; it is likely that only those with merit-worthy opinions will be given mainstream media platforms.</p> <p>Therefore, teenage political activism is a force for good.</p> <p><i>Argument to challenge (761 words)</i></p> <p>Although some individual examples of teenagers in politics might bring benefits, on the whole, teenage political activism is not a force for good.</p> <p>Teenagers have a disproportionately high influence, not just on the opinion of other teenagers, but on the opinions of the wider public. All of the documents exist as a result of people in the media writing and talking about teenagers in politics. Teenagers' political activism sells papers. As far as I know, <i>Time</i> magazine, mentioned in Docs 1 and 4, is read primarily by adults and not teenagers but both of the individuals mentioned in the documents in connection with that magazine are teenagers, a group that makes up only 16% of the population, according to Doc 1. The weighty BBC news programme mentioned in Doc 2 is not likely to have much of a teenage audience, particularly if the claim about teenage voting in Doc 4 is to be believed. So here is another example of a teenager's opinions reaching an adult audience. It could be said that disproportionately high media appearance is not the same as disproportionate influence, but the comment by David Attenborough in Doc 2, combined with the, albeit somewhat overdrawn, inference drawn from the graph in Doc 5A, rather contradicts this.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>One could see a disproportionately high teenage influence as a good thing. But it is not. Teenagers lack experience and expertise in most areas of politics, however earnest their feelings are. It is true that many adults don't know much about politics either, but these uninterested adults and similarly uninterested teenagers tend to stay out of politics. That leaves teenagers and adults who have an interest in politics. Within these subgroups, the adults have the greater experience and expertise. Doc 5B does not tell us much from people's opinion of 5 individuals, and anyway, some comfort can be derived from the fact that people said they would trust a science broadcaster more than a teenage girl. However, it is worrying that a teenage girl, however well-intentioned, is trusted more than 3 very different adults; we have no reason to suppose that any of these adults have less climate change expertise than Greta Thunberg, and at least one of them is a politician with a clear interest in such matters. It is, on the basis of the information we have, unlikely that Greta Thunberg knows more about climate change than Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez. Further evidence of disproportionate influence comes from David Attenborough's comment in Doc 2 that nobody took any notice of him when he said the same things as Greta Thunberg.</p> <p>Predictably, people are likely to consider disproportionate influence a good thing if the influence being given chimes with their own view. However, many disagree with Greta and not all teenage political activists are of the same mind. Doc 3 cites a teenager whose influence might not be welcomed by the very same people who champion Greta Thunberg. Teenage activism is often conflated with climate change activism but other teenagers have other opinions. Doc 4's optimistic tone suggests that it is not likely to have listed teenagers whose views are not sufficiently 'woke'. Indeed Doc 4 made no mention of Naomi Seibt. So it is possible that Doc 4 has presented a unrepresentatively benign selection of teenage activists.</p> <p>There are those who say that teenagers have a vested interest to make the world better as they are the ones who will have to live with whatever future they inherit, but that view of human nature is cynical at best. Most adults care about the lives of people other than themselves. We are motivated by more than short-term self-interest. David Attenborough is clearly old but also obviously cares deeply about the future of the planet. Adults have as much interest in the generations that follow them as teenagers do. The oft-cited charge that adults have made a mess of things thus far, and illustrated by the Greta quote in Doc 4, is meaningless because have no way of knowing what situation the world would be in if teenagers had had a bigger hand in running it for the last 200 years.</p> <p>Many people, including David Attenborough, might be happy about the presence of Greta Thunberg in the political arena. But she is an individual and we should not generalise on the basis of 'one good teenage political activist' to 'all teenage political activism is good'. If an influential teenager were to arrive with an opinion that Sir David did not share, we might not be as comfortable with the idea of teenage political activism.</p>	

Level	Structure*	Marks	Use of documents	Marks	Quality of argument	Marks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusion (MC) Intermediate conclusions (ICs) Strands of reasoning Examples Original analogy Hypothetical reasoning 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to documents Evaluation of documents Comparison of documents (corroboration or contradiction) Inference from documents 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive and persuasive argument Relevant material Treatment of counter-positions Absence of flaws and weaknesses Non-reliance on rhetorical questions 	
3	Excellent use of structural elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustained persuasive reasoning Very little irrelevant material Key counter-position(s) considered with effective response Very few flaws or weaknesses No gratuitous rhetorical questions 	5–6
2	Good use of structural elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear conclusion More than one valid IC Some strands of reasoning Some use of other argument elements 	4–6	Good use of documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonably persuasive reasoning Not much irrelevant material Some counter-position(s) considered with some response Not many flaws or weaknesses May be some reliance on rhetorical questions 	3–4
1	Some use of structural elements: <i>There may be:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conclusion Implied ICs Some strands of reasoning Some use of other argument elements 	1–3	Some use of documents: <i>There may be:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference, perhaps implicit, to a document Some evaluation of a document Some comparison of or inference from documents 	1–3	Some quality of argument: <i>There may be:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some support for the conclusion Some relevant material Some counter-position(s) considered with some response 	1–2
0	No creditable response	0	No creditable response	0	No creditable response	0

* Cap mark for Structure at 3 if no conclusion given