Cambridge International AS & A Level

THINKING SKILLS	**9694/43**
Paper 4 Applied Reasoning	**May/June 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 May/June 2023 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

[Turn over

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
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)	(and) the system [of having a hereditary monarch] needs to change.	**1**
1(b)	*1 mark for each correctly identified IC (max 2)* *Mark only the first two answers given* • (So) when you get a bad one you are stuck with them for life. • (so) there is no point in their existence. • The cost of maintaining the Royal Family is staggeringly high. • If we don't want to continue to waste this much money, we must abolish the hereditary monarchy.	**2**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	*Award one mark for each of the following [max 3]:* R1 The existence of the Royal Family reinforces the idea of an elite ruling class. R2 This influences the way people vote in elections *(Credit as an IC)* Ev one only needs to consider the number of recent UK prime ministers that have come from wealthy, privileged backgrounds. C So the monarchy perpetuates social inequality. A1 That this influence on how people vote is in favour of an elite ruling class. A2 That the election of people from a privileged background represents/promotes social inequality.	3
	Award one mark for identifying two relationships between elements, e.g. • R1 supports C • R2 supports C • R1 and R2 support C jointly • Ev is evidence that supports R2 • A1 is needed in order for R2 to support C • A2 is needed in order for Ev to support C *Reference to start and end of elements must be unambiguous.* *Sample 4-mark answer* The conclusion of the paragraph is 'So, the monarchy perpetuates social inequality' **[1]**. This is supported by the reasons 'The existence of… an elite ruling class' **[1]** and 'This influences the way people vote in elections' **[1]**. 'One only needs… from wealthy, privileged backgrounds' is evidence **[1]** used to support the conclusion **[1]**.	1
1(d)	(Those who say that) the Royals attract a lot of overseas tourists	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.* *Paragraph 1* • *Appeal to novelty* – the existence of monarchy is rejected on the basis of its having been long-established *Paragraph 2* • *Straw man* – by presenting heads of state as having power and influence the author makes it easier to argue against their being hereditary (could be phrased as conflation) • *Appeal to popularity* – in order for the paragraph to support the argument as a whole one must assume that the system in the majority of countries is the less ridiculous option merely on the basis of the system being more popular • *Reliance on questionable assumption* – that history is not full of a similar number of examples of evil non-hereditary heads of state • *Reliance on questionable assumption* – that modern monarchs are likely to behave as monarchs of old did • *Conflation* – of being difficult to remove from office with being in office for life *Paragraph 3* • *Inconsistency* – the claim that the role of the UK monarch is uncertain is effectively contradicted by the following two sentences, in which the role is either clarified or dismissed as 'having no point'. • *Reliance on questionable assumption* – that the sole purpose of a head of state is to be able to create or change laws • *Reliance on questionable assumption* – that a proposed arbiter of government that was appointed by members of that government would be as free from political bias as a (hereditary) monarch • *Inconsistency* – the claim in this paragraph that monarchs have little or no power undermines the significance of the concerns in paragraph 2 about malevolent monarchs *Paragraph 4* • *Equivocation* – the word 'cost' is being used to mislead the reader into thinking it means a net cost, when in fact this cost might be outweighed by associated revenue • *Reliance on questionable assumption* – that maintaining an alternative head of state would be less expensive / that £40 million is a large sum of money • *Restriction of options* – the author presents two alternatives, maintained waste or abolition, as if no others are available. One could, for example, reduce the number of residences. • *Begging the question* – that royal expenditure is a waste of money	**6**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(b)	*Award marks from the following lines of explanation [max 3]* The MC refers to the need for a change and this paragraph does recognise the existence of viable alternatives **[1]**; as such it provides some support to the MC **[1]**. However, this paragraph does not directly give reasons for rejecting monarchy **[1]**. The paragraph addresses one potential counter-position **[1]** [the worrying possibility of a US-style president], which could strengthen the argument **[1]**, if this counter-position has much weight – but this depends on how much of a concern it actually is **[1]**.	3

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	*1 mark for a version of either of the following points* • If the average population of monarchies is lower (or significantly higher) than that of non-monarchies, then this claim would not be true. • Just because these citizens live under a monarchy does not mean they are happy to do so.	1
3(b)	*1 mark each for a version of any of the following points [max 3]* • It is likely that examples have been cherry-picked to compare relatively expensive presidencies (with relatively cheap monarchies) • 'by some estimates' implies that the lowest available may have been chosen • The variations in cost might be a result of the size / security problems associated with these particular countries and not directly related to whether the head of state is a monarch or a president. • It is likely that the figures quoted are not directly comparable, e.g. in terms of the source of money (direct taxation or other sources), or in the proportion of government costs attributed to a head of state. • It isn't clear whether 'cost' means expenditure or net cost.	3
3(c)	*1 mark each for a version of any of the following points [max 2]* • It is possible that of the 63% who did not want to abolish the monarchy, not all would prefer a monarchy to a republic. • Some might have answered 'don't know' (or some other option offered).	2

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**'Hereditary monarchy is good for a country.'** ***Example high-scoring answers*** *Argument to support (788 words)* No system of government is perfect but there are advantages to being a monarchy. Countries with a monarch have a better economy. Doc 2 quotes some figures from the World Bank for the financial success of monarchies and these figures appear to be corroborated by the table in Doc 5, which increases the figures' credibility. If Doc 3 had given a source for its list, the credibility might have been even higher, particularly if the source was a respected institution other than the World Bank. Both Documents state that 5 out of the 10 top-performing economies have a monarch as head of state. One would expect 2 or perhaps 3 monarchies in the list if there were no correlation between type of head of state and economic success. Doc 2 suggests that this economic prosperity might result from a combination of factors related to stability, brand perception and tourism. Comments on internet discussion forums are not known for their credibility but they can sometimes provide illustrative examples. RG does just that, with regard to the estimated net contribution to the economy of 3 European monarchs; and the figure given with regard to the UK over 4 years is consistent with the $750 million per year quoted in Doc 2. Monarchs also allow countries to flourish in other ways. The lower table in Doc 5 again shows that a larger proportion of prosperous countries are monarchies than would be expected by chance. It is also noteworthy that none of the 10 least prosperous countries has a monarch. The measures of prosperity used in this table, again with no source, are varied but are likely to include political stability and absence of corruption. Doc 2 quotes some evidence from a credible source with some expertise that monarchies are less corrupt and explains this with the plausible suggestion that politicians are inherently more prone to avoiding the truth and being open to bribery. AS in Doc 4 provides some evidence to support Doc 2s claim about corruption. RM mentions the idea that monarchies provide stability, particularly during potentially hazardous changes of government and Doc 2 illustrates this idea with the reference to North Africa and the Middle East. RB tries to make the same point, although the example is almost certainly cherry-picked, and the main inference assumes rather a lot. Claims that monarchs are expensive tend to focus attention on a few very wealthy monarchies, such as Saudi Arabia or the UK, while avoiding discussion of the lower-cost monarchies mentioned in Doc 2; and such arguments fall flat when the benefit to cost ratio, at least in most monarchies, is considered. The author of Doc 1 appears to be claiming that monarchies are anachronistic but there is something of an appeal to progress about this point. The article in Doc 3 which describes a country ditching their queen could be used to support a position that there is something progressive and natural about moving away from monarchy. However, the pace of change does not seem to be great.	27

Question	Answer	Marks
4	Only 3 countries appear to have made the decision to remove the Queen in the last 50+ years, while 15 others have not. Although there may be other reasons for these decisions, the evidence does not scream a wholesale rejection of monarchy.	
	Those who suggest that monarchies are fundamentally wrong because they are not democratic miss the point. Monarchs do not need to have real power; the author of Doc 1 admits this while contradicting his or her own argument. Indeed, a quick glance at Doc 5 shows that the vast majority of monarchs have a ceremonial role. No one is suggesting that executive monarchy is the way forward. A ceremonial, apolitical monarch, as Doc 2 suggests, can represent all of the country, not just the people who voted for them.	
	The best type of monarchy is a hereditary one. It would, of course, be possible to elect a king or queen for life but this approach would have certain disadvantages. The same opportunities for political corruption would arise and anyone elected democratically might feel empowered to exercise more authority than would be in the best interests of the country. Doc 1 claims, wrongly, that monarchs are impossible to remove. Many non-hereditary heads of state, some elected, have become despotic rulers who it has been as difficult, if not more difficult, than a monarch to remove. Furthermore, a hereditary monarchy can prepare for the role from birth so that, by the time they arrive on the throne, he or she has lots of expertise and, while not necessarily being perfect for the job, is more likely to be better at it than an elected figure with minimal training or preparation time.	
	Therefore, hereditary monarchy is good for a country.	
	Argument to challenge (842 words)	
	Having a king or queen is expensive. It is often said that some presidents cost more than some monarchs – the pro-monarchy Doc 2 uses some, probably extreme, examples to illustrate this point. Doc 1 suggests that pro-monarchists often cite the US presidential system as the most likely alternative to monarchy and this point could be dismissed as a straw man. However, the inclusion of the US president as the first of three examples in Doc 2 suggests that Doc 1 may be correct in its interpretation of the counter-position. In any case, the figures quoted in Doc 2 have no meaning without some indication of the cost per citizen. In fact, there is no information in the documents about the relative cost per citizen of different styles of head of state. Royalty, however, is intentionally expensive. Part of the point is that their clothing, transport and housing looks expensive to the general public, as illustrated by KU in Doc 4. Furthermore, most monarchies seem to support a wider family. Doc 1 explores this a little in the context of the UK but it is likely to be similar in other monarchies. Therefore, the average cost of a monarch is very probably higher than the average cost of the head of a republic. Some, such as RG in Doc 4, say that monarchies provide a net financial benefit, but such things are difficult to determine. The point Doc 1 makes about tourism is a reasonable one – if people want to pay to visit Buckingham Palace they could do so more easily if it was not occupied by a king or queen most of the time.	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	The examples RG quotes are likely to be cherry-picked to support RG's conclusion. The figure for Spain, therefore, seems insignificant; if Spain has a population of 33 million, this amounts to $3 per person per year – hardly worth it if there are other drawbacks. Arguments about monarchy economies performing better than others don't stack up. Doc 2's statistic from the World Bank and the information in the upper table in Doc 5 suggest a connection between having a monarchy and being a wealthy country. However, it would be a *cum hoc* fallacy to conclude a causal relationship on the basis of a correlation – wealth might encourage monarchy retention or facilitate monarchy funding. More likely, wealthy countries might have been established for longer and hence are more likely to retain a monarch as a relic of tradition. Additionally, the relatively small sample size of states with a royal family – Docs 3 and 5 combine to tell us that one single queen is head of 15 of the 44 monarchies – means that any conclusions drawn from such lists are questionable. Doc 2 and AS in Doc 4 believe that monarchy provides stability and offer some corroborative statistics in support. However, to draw such a conclusion from an apparent association is, again, a *cum hoc* fallacy. The evidence in Doc 2 might originate from a Swedish university but the conclusion that follows probably does not. The happiness claims in Doc 2 are meaningless without some indication of the relative contentedness of citizens in non-monarchies. We do not know the relative proportions of the world's ceremonial and executive heads of state but, if one considers the lower table in Doc 5 one could draw the inference that a country's prosperity is the result of having a head of state with only ceremonial duties, be they monarch or president. Monarchies are an anachronistic relic of the feudal societies we used to inhabit. KU makes the point that monarchies slow political progress and Doc 1 suggests that this is because it reinforces the idea of an elite ruling class which, however subconsciously, influences the way people vote in elections. To say that most countries don't have a monarchy and expect people to infer that they are a bad idea, as the admittedly biased Doc 1 does, is not an appeal to popularity. Monarchies are becoming less common because people don't like them and because they cannot survive in the modern world. The pro-monarchy Doc 2 quotes the number 44 as if it was large (and therefore significant) but it is less significant than the figure of 151 for non-monarchies. The hereditary principle is a bad one. Democracy is imperfect but has the advantage over any alternatives. Doc 1 makes the point about heredity producing unsuitable heads of state and, although democracy occasionally throws up such individuals, it is less likely to do so and such individuals are easier to remove. Doc 2 suggests that a monarch can unite a country in a way that a politician cannot. However, Doc 2 conflates 'political' with 'non-hereditary'. The alternative to 'royal' is not necessarily 'politician'. I'm sure David Attenborough as president would unite the UK more than the Queen does. Ideas about heredity reinforce social divisions and, as already discussed, political elites. There is nothing special about having 'royal' ancestors, as JN in Doc 4 illustrates. All ceremonial royal duties could easily be done by someone elected or appointed so hereditary monarchy is not good for a country.	

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 (may be implied) • 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