

---

**THINKING SKILLS**

**9694/41**

Paper 4 Applied Reasoning

**May/June 2017**

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><i>Award marks from any evaluative point, to a maximum of 5.</i></p> <p>Correlation does not imply causal link [1], because a third factor could be behind change in both divorce rate and ice cream consumption [1] or divorce could have effect on ice cream consumption [1] – for example, because recently-divorced people are eating it as a comfort food [1]. <i>Max 4</i></p> <p>The rates refer to different populations [1] – divorcees can only be formerly-married adults, while ice-cream eaters can be of any age/marital status [1]. So the fall in ice cream eating could be all in the under-10s, and not even correlated to the couples' eating habits [1].</p> <p>Invalid comparison of divorce data from only one province with ice cream consumption from whole country / Norland might not reflect nationwide pattern [1] <i>with stated reason</i> [1]. <i>Allow:</i> data about divorce in Norland is generalised to a claim that implies ice cream causes divorce across the whole country or more globally [1].</p> <p>The data is self-reported and so might be inaccurate [1]; it would take only small inaccuracies to destroy the impression of correlation [1].</p> <p>2001–2010 might not be typical of previous/subsequent decades [1].</p> <p>Within large sets of data coincidences will occur [1]. One apparent case of correlation from 200 questions is not remarkable [1].</p> <p>The closeness of the trends shown in the graph is accentuated by the choice of units [1].</p>	5

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><i>1 mark for each element (maximum 4 if MC not identified).</i></p> <p><b>CA</b> – Pride in one’s country, usually referred to as patriotism, is widely seen as a good thing.</p> <p><b>IC</b> – (However, if we examine the implications of patriotism) it does not seem so universally beneficial.</p> <p><b>MC</b> – What we need is less patriotism, not more of it.</p> <p><b>IC</b> – (So) patriotism causes hatred.</p> <p><b>IC</b> – The rise of nationalism around the globe is a real threat to peace.</p> <p><b>CA</b> – (It is often said that) patriotism is good because it discourages treason</p> <p><b>IC</b> – (In some cases,) treason might be just what the country, or the world, needs.</p> <p><b>IC</b> – All the pride that patriotism fosters is unsupportable.</p> <p><b>IC</b> – Those who promote patriotism tend to have a vested interest to do so.</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 2</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selective use of one dictionary definition, possibly in order to close down the debate</li> <li>• Assumption: that if your country is different it must be better / Conflation of ‘different from’ with ‘better than’</li> </ul> <p><i>Paragraph 3</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption: that identity of definition implies identity of concept</li> <li>• The reference to ‘any student of history’ is an attempt to undermine those who take up a contrary position on the basis of their imagined lack of expertise and could be described as <i>ad hominem</i>.</li> <li>• Slippery slope: a sentiment leads inevitably to war / “One minute it’s “our cheese is tastier than your cheese” the next it’s “pass the ammunition”</li> <li>• The author has not shown a causal link between patriotism and hatred, merely asserted it; so the IC is unsupported / the author has conflated war and hatred</li> </ul> <p><i>Paragraph 4</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption: that racism threatens peace</li> <li>• Assumption: that (these) 50 million would not have died if the National Socialist Party had not come to power / As it is expressed in the passage, this could be seen as a post hoc flaw: the causal link has not been established here</li> </ul> <p><i>Paragraph 5</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The whole paragraph rests on a strange/confused definition of treason, and so constitutes something of a straw man argument; it is likely that there are ways other than treason to combat bad decision-making by governments.</li> <li>• Assumption: that questioning by the population is necessary for good decision-making by the government.</li> </ul>	9

**PUBLISHED**

Question	Answer	Marks
	<p><i>Paragraph 6</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Possible) Inconsistency: of “Ancient battles in which some now-dead people who happened to live in one area, defeated some now-dead people who happened to live in another area are irrelevant to the world today”, with the use of the example from WW2 in paragraph 4 (depends on one’s interpretation of ‘ancient’)</li> <li>• Assumption: that one cannot be legitimately proud of any achievement which is not your own</li> <li>• Overdrawn IC: “All the pride that patriotism fosters is insupportable.” The paragraph provides some examples of where patriotic pride is unjustified but does not establish that all patriotic pride is insupportable</li> </ul> <p><i>Paragraph 7</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>ad hominem</i>: “Those who promote patriotism tend to have a [greed-driven] vested interest to do so.”</li> <li>• Much of the reasoning rests on the confusion of the terms patriotism and nationalism (and possibly even racism). While the author has shown that there is some overlap in meaning, their being sufficiently synonymous to support the author’s argument has not been demonstrated. This could be expressed as a straw man.</li> </ul>	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p><b>‘All the countries of the world should unite as one.’</b></p> <p><b><i>Specimen Level 4 Answers</i></b></p> <p><i>Support (896 words)</i></p> <p>The world currently operates as a collection of independent states of varying size and influence. For a number of reasons, this is not a good system.</p> <p>It is out-dated. Nation states emerged when people grouped together for protection. They grew larger but remained necessarily small because of communication issues. In an age of instant global communication, operating as such a small level is no longer necessary. Even Doc 2, which supports nationalism and the existence of competing nations, admits that there has been widespread acceptance that borders are an anachronism and globalism is the future. The irrelevance of nationalism today is backed up by Document 3J. Borders are always changing, so to get excited about which side of an artificial line you were born on seems rather childish, (Einstein in Doc 4 would agree). Doc 2 states that nationalism is popular but that, in itself, is an irrelevant appeal to popularity.</p> <p>Document 3H states that nationalism creates competition and technological innovation but it is certainly not necessary for these things to occur. Any unified world would have to be sub-divided for the purposes of administration and a healthy rivalry would facilitate competition. Albert Einstein was not lacking in innovation and he described nationalism as an ‘infantile disease’.</p> <p>Most of the documents focus on the relative merits of patriotism/nationalism – even Doc 2, which seems to run counter to the idea of unification, admits that the two terms are interchangeable. A quick glance at the first 4 documents tells us that there is widespread agreement that countries do, and for their own gain should, foster patriotism: From the simple “our cheese is tastier than your cheese” of Doc 1, through group loyalty assisting in ease of governance and “each democracy needs just enough nationalism... to unify its people” in Doc 2, to Doc 3A’s “We need to quit defining ourselves by our nationality” and Mark Twain’s “Loyalty to country, always” in Doc 4. Whatever the rights or wrongs of patriotism it is clear that it is encouraged by the very existence of countries.</p> <p>Patriotism itself is a bad thing. It creates ill feeling and mistrust of foreigners. This is the main focus of Doc 1. Although Doc 1 is flawed, most of its weaknesses are related to conflation of terms and, even the opposition (Doc 2) admits a degree of synonymy between patriotism and nationalism. Doc 1 is backed up by Doc 3C’s reference to ethnic nationalism encouraging unpleasantness and the reference to ‘deep emotions’ being stirred in Doc 3D. The main thrust of Doc 2 is in favour of nationalism but the author admits that nationalism can become pernicious and ‘too much’ nationalism can result in hostility to outsiders.</p>	30

**PUBLISHED**

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
	<p>This hostility promotes war. Documents 1, 3, 4 and, arguably 5 all make reference to the propensity for patriotism to start wars. The Hitler example in Document 1 is clichéd but true, and it is no generalisation to state that this type of nationalism has led to frequent wars throughout history. Document 3D implies that patriotism can be used as a tool to encourage citizens towards war. Several of the quotes in Document 4 reference war: Jefferson's 'blood of patriots', Russell's 'willingness to kill and be killed for trivial reasons' and even Indira Gandhi's preference for starvation (i.e. death) over selling the national honour. Doc 5 could be used to support a claim that the number of countries in the world correlates with the number of wars but the evidence from this document is weak. We do not know if the number of members of the UN is the same as the number of independent states, nor we do know the scale of the wars. However, if taken at face value there seems to be a correlation between number of UN countries and wars, the apparent lack of correlation after 1991 could be explained by the one-off ending of the Cold War.</p> <p>It is reasonable to state as a point of principle that wars are a bad thing. Nationalism causes wars therefore nationalism is a significant contributor towards what is universally acknowledged to be a bad thing. The burden of proof is on those who support nationalism to show that its positives outweigh its negatives.</p> <p>It has been stated, by Document 2, that nations and nationalism are necessary for effective government. However, Document 3I contradicts this by stating that (most) countries are too big for anyone to feel a real connection to a government. Of course there has to be local accountability, but that can be done within the framework of a larger entity, just like the subsidiarity of the EU or, indeed, states within the US.</p> <p>Others might worry that local culture would be lost in a one-state world. However, cultures vary within existing states and there is no reason to suppose state-wide cultures could not be supported by subsidiarity. Indeed, Doc 3C supports the idea that state nationalism suppresses minority cultures within those states so, if anything, a one-state world might be good for local culture.</p> <p>In summary, wars are bad, nationalism causes wars, nationalism and patriotism are the same thing and there are no definite benefits of nationalism at a global level. Therefore patriotism should be discouraged. The existence of independent states encourages patriotism and independent states are not necessary for effective government. Therefore all the countries of the world should unite as one.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
	<p><i>Challenge (799 words)</i></p> <p>The current way in which the world is run is not perfect – nobody would deny that. However, perfection is unobtainable and there is no evidence that a one-state world would be better. In fact, it would not work.</p> <p>We have had several attempts to unite countries together under one banner. Up to a point some of these have worked, but most didn't. Those that have worked – Germany, Italy, the UK, for example – have shared, at least to a large extent, a culture and language. When bigger groupings have been attempted they have universally failed. All of the great empires of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and before collapsed, many leaving war, poverty and famine in their wake. One reason for their break up, as referenced in Doc 2 and 3G, is nationalism. Like it or loathe it, it is deep-rooted and not going away. The variety of quotes in Doc 4, such as Mark Twain's, "Loyalty to country – always", suggests that it is something that is part of the human condition. Although Doc 3J might be technically correct about changing borders, most borders do not change within a human lifetime; so people are born, raised and die within one country and feel part of it; just because emotions do not have a rational basis does not mean they are not real emotions. People can feel loyalty or patriotism towards a small unit of people with whom they perceive a shared culture, language or history, but they are not going to feel the same way about 'the world'. It could be argued that the problem of local nationalism could be addressed by the subsidiarity mentioned in Doc 2, but, as Doc 2 states, it does not work particularly well in the EU.</p> <p>It could be said that Document 2's reference to the increasing popularity of nationalism is just that – an appeal to popularity. But in this particular case popularity is important. Governance depends, at least in part, on the willingness of the population to go along with it. Popularity helps in that regard.</p> <p>Patriotism is a fact of life. And it helps. Productivity is increased by competition, as mentioned in Docs 2, 3F and 3H. Football teams always try that bit harder when playing against their local rivals. Workers in one country try that bit harder when they think they are in direct competition with a company from the country next door. So the economic prosperity of the world as a whole is raised by competing nation-states.</p> <p>The argument, proposed by Doc 1, that nationalism causes unpleasantness leading to war is a slippery slope but many argue that it is the case. The belief that a one-country world would stop conflict, or indeed nationalism, is misleading on two counts. First, it could be strongly argued that nationalism is not the great evil that it is portrayed as and most wars are, in fact, caused by religion, greed or struggles against oppression. Doc 5 supports this idea in as much as the vast majority of conflicts since WW2 have been civil wars, not between countries but within them. Even if, in some hypothetical utopia, nationalism disappeared, people would find some other reason for unpleasantness. Second, if the world were one country, local nationalism and grievances would still be there. Doc 2 refers to lines drawn on a map by past imperial powers with no regard for local sensibilities. The same would be true for a one-state world, however well-intentioned it would be. Conflicts, perhaps inspired by nationalism, overthrew these imperial powers; it seems likely that the same would happen here.</p>	



<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
	<p>No great change happens without great cost. A change in world government on this scale would have enormous costs, both financial and human. If such a change is to be proposed then the burden of proof must be on those advocating a change to the status quo. None of the documents directly addresses the idea of a one-state world. Doc 1 and some of the comments in Doc 2 and some of the quotes in Doc 4 seem to dislike nationalism but no document provides strong evidence that one state would rid the world of nationalism. Doc 5 could be used as evidence that the number of states correlates with the number of wars. However, correlation does not imply causation and we cannot be sure that 'countries in the UN' is the same as 'independent countries'. Furthermore, there is only a correlation between 1946 and 1991, it then stops abruptly and we have no information about pre-1945. One cannot arrive at a firm conclusion based on only 45 years of human history. Since the burden of proof that world unification is desirable has not been met we should go with the status quo. All the countries of the world should not unite as one.</p>	

**PUBLISHED**

Level	Structure	Max 8	Quality of argument	Max 8	Use of documents	Max 8	Treatment of counter positions	Max 6
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 sources and draw a precise inference.</p>	7–8	<p>Consideration of key counter arguments and effective responses to these. Use of own ideas in response to counter arguments. Effective use of valid critical tools to respond to counter arguments. Effective use of appropriate terminology.</p>	5–6
3	<p>Clear conclusion that is more than “I agree”. 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 between or within 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	<p>Conclusion stated but may be “I agree”.</p> <p>Sufficient clarity for meaning to be clear throughout.</p> <p>Structure may be easy to follow but brief or a longer argument which has a less clear structure.</p> <p>Uses reasons.</p> <p>Some appropriate use of vocabulary of reasoning.</p>	3–4	<p>A reasoned stance which attempts to answer the question which was asked.</p> <p>Some support for the conclusion. (Although there may be considerable irrelevance or reliance on dubious assumptions.)</p> <p>Some thinking/own ideas about the issue.</p> <p>Use of rhetorical questions and emotive language.</p> <p>Some significant gaps or flaws.</p>	3–4	<p>Some relevant use of documents to support reasoning, but some documents used indiscriminately.</p> <p>Some comparison between or within documents <b>or</b> some critical evaluation of documents <b>or</b> reasoned inference drawn from document.</p>	3–4	<p>Inclusion of counter argument or counter assertion.</p> <p>Response is direct but weak or taken entirely from documents.</p>	2
1	<p>Attempt to construct an argument.</p> <p>Unclear conclusion, multiple conclusions or no conclusion.</p> <p>Disjointed, incoherent reasoning.</p> <p>Use of examples in place of reasoning.</p> <p>Possibly a discourse or a rant.</p> <p>Reasons presented with no logical connection.</p> <p>Documents considered sequentially.</p> <p>Substantial irrelevant material.</p>	1–2	<p>Attempt to answer the general thrust of the question.</p> <p>Attempt to support their view.</p> <p>Excessive use of rhetorical questions and emotive language.</p> <p>Ideas which are contradictory.</p>	1–2	<p>Some, perhaps implicit, use of documents.</p> <p>No attempt at critical evaluation.</p> <p>No comparison of documents.</p>	1–2	<p>Inclusion of counter argument or counter assertion.</p> <p>Response is direct but ineffective.</p>	1