Students did not sit exam papers in the June 2020 series due to the Covid-19 global pandemic.

This mark scheme is published to support teachers and students and should be read together with the question paper. It shows the requirements of the exam. The answer column of the mark scheme shows the proposed basis on which Examiners would award marks for this exam. Where appropriate, this column also provides the most likely acceptable alternative responses expected from students. Examiners usually review the mark scheme after they have seen student responses and update the mark scheme if appropriate. In the June series, Examiners were unable to consider the acceptability of alternative responses, as there were no student responses to consider.

Mark schemes should usually be read together with the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers. However, because students did not sit exam papers, there is no Principal Examiner Report for Teachers for the June 2020 series.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the June 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™ and Cambridge International A & AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **12** printed pages.

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

Questions 1 to 3

Annotation	Meaning and use
✔	Correct response. Use when a mark has been achieved in Q1, 2 and 3.
NGE	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.
0	No marks awarded in question
∿∿∿	Underline. For material which prevents a mark from being awarded.

Question 4

Annotation	Meaning and use
S	Creditworthy material in the Structure skill
CON	Main Conclusion
I	Intermediate Conclusion
AE	Argument Element
U	Creditworthy material in the Use of Documents skill

Annotation	Meaning and use
EVAL	Evaluation of documents
C	Comparison of or inference from documents
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.
✚	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
SEEN	Examiner has seen that the page contains no creditworthy material Use to annotate blank pages
Highlight	Where helpful, use to identify the part of the answer to which another stamp pertains.

There must be at least one annotation on each page of the answer booklet.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	Social media platforms should be discouraged from doing it [fact checking of newsfeed].	1
1(b)	*Award one mark for each of the following [max 5]:* • Identification and/or description of 'Throughout history, governments have used whatever news media were available… in order to promote their own agenda' as a reason. *(Credit only if examples not included)* • Identification and/or description of 'royal proclamations nailed to trees' and 'crackly radio broadcasts' as examples. • Identification of 'not all of this information has been factual' as a reason. • Recognition that the above two reasons support the IC in the third sentence. • Description of the third sentence as the conclusion of the paragraph and/or an IC supporting the MC of Document 1. • Description of the fourth sentence as a IC or reason supporting the previous sentence. • Identification of the unstated assumption that something having ever been thus is reason enough not to worry about it. *Reference to start and end of elements must be unambiguous.* *Sample 5 mark answer* The examples, 'royal proclamations nailed to trees to crackly radio broadcasts' illustrate the reason **[1]**, 'Throughout history, governments … to promote their own agenda' **[1]**. 'not all of this information has been factual' is another reason **[1]**. Both of these reasons support the IC **[1]**, 'It has ever been thus' **[1]**. This IC supports the further IC and conclusion of the paragraph, 'The fact that some of the information we receive is not true should not worry us' **[1]**.	5
1(c)	*1 mark for each correctly identified IC* *Mark only the first two answers given* • Fake news' is just a scary-sounding' term invented by traditional media outlets to discredit newer, mostly politically conservative news providers. • This [censorship of the news] is what we should really worry about.	2

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]* *Paragraph 2:* • *Reliance on false assumption* – that most of our information (still) comes from the government rather than alternative sources. • *Appeal to history* – the dynamics of information have changed so much that historical precedents are irrelevant. *Paragraph 3:* • *Inconsistency* – the attempt to dismiss the term 'fake-news' as a tool of opponents of President Trump is weakened by the subsequent referents to the term's use by President Trump himself. *Paragraph 4:* • *Straw man argument* – the assertion that mainstream media outlets are seeking to censor the news misrepresents their position in order to argue more easily against it. • *Circular argument* – the assertion that 'fact-checking' is censorship is based entirely on the claim that it looks like censorship. *Paragraph 5:* • *Conflation* – of newsfeed and press • *Reliance on questionable assumption* – the MC relies upon the questionable assumption that censorship is a bad thing; as this has not been demonstrated, the MC is overdrawn. • *Reliance on questionable assumption* – In order for the implied unfairness of fact-checking in paragraph 5 to support the MC it must be assumed that no fair or balanced process of fact-checking could be devised.	6
2(b)	*Award marks from any <u>one</u> of the following lines of explanation [max 3]* *Paragraph 1:* • The author's stipulative representation of the opposition's definition of fake news **[1]** is chosen as one which is easier to counter and, as such, is a straw man **[1]**. There are other plausible definitions that might lead to a different conclusion **[1]**. Other parts of the argument rely on this definition / the IC of paragraph 1 relies entirely on this definition **[1]** so the strength of the argument as a whole is reduced significantly **[1]**. • Reference to a 365% increase could be from a very small baseline and, hence, still represent a very small number **[1]**. However, the MC does not rely on there being a large increase in 2016 **[1]** and so this potential weakness does not undermine the strength of the argument as a whole **[1]**.	3

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	*1 mark for identifying either of the following* • 16 000 is a reasonably large sample size • There does seem to be a spread of countries surveyed in terms of continent and developmental status	**1**
3(b)	*Award up to three marks each from any two of the following lines of explanation. [Max 5]* • The limited 2010 information does not mention fake news or worries **[1]** so an increase cannot be inferred **[1]**. It is possible that figures for e.g. 2016 (or even 2010) might have shown higher levels of 'worry' **[1]**. • In 2010, 51% of respondents thought the internet should never be regulated while in 2017 this figure had risen to 58% **[1]**. This suggests a decrease in worries about the internet **[1]** and so contradicts the conclusion **[1]**. • Greece was not included in 2010, but was the most hostile (84%) to regulation in 2017 **[1]**. If Greece provided a significant proportion of the data, and their attitudes had not changed, then one might infer that the figure of 51% hostile to regulation in 2010 would have been higher if Greece had been included **[1]**, in which case the inclusion of Greece in 2017 has caused a misleading increase in the overall figure **[1]**. • There is no information about the number of people surveyed in each country **[1]** – it is possible that many of the 16 000 in 2017 were from Brazil (or another populous country such as China) **[1]** and hence a large majority of worried people in China and Brazil could mask high proportions of unworried people from other countries **[1]**. • There is little information about the people surveyed in the two years which makes any inferences unreliable **[1]**. We don't know e.g. how many people from each country, whether or not this was similar in the two years, whether the people surveyed in the two years represented a similar profile of respondents etc. *1 mark for an example and 1 mark for explaining its impact.*	**5**

Question	Answer	Marks
4	**'We should not be worried about fake news.'**	**27**
	Example Level 4 answers	
	Argument to support (749 words)	
	At first glance the concept of 'fake news' seems like a worrying phenomenon but there are several reasons why I'm not worried.	
	The evidence that it is a bigger *problem* than it used to be is weak. False news masquerading as the truth has always been around. Doc 1 states as much and Doc 3 provides some interesting historical examples: the King Charles and the coffee-shops example, although interesting, is not necessarily relevant, being about the suppression of anti-establishment discussion rather than fake news *per se*, but the other quoted examples, doing back to 1924 are relevant. There is generally more information around nowadays than there used to be. Much of this information is false. However, there is no real evidence that the *proportion* of false news has increased to levels significantly higher than in the past. It is entirely possible that there was a big increase in internet searches for 'news' in general in 2016 – it was a US election year.	
	Nor is there any real evidence that the *impact* of false news has been bigger than in the past. Internet searches for the term 'fake news' merely reflect the use of a term. Fake news existed in 1924, and probably much earlier - I don't imagine the 'Let them eat cake' quote from Marie Antionette was rigorously fact checked, but it was not called 'fake news'. As Doc 1 demonstrates, with its reference to 'opinion diversity', calling something a new name does not change the nature of the named thing – a rose by any other name would smell as sweet. The headline in Doc 5 is that more people are worried about fake news but the support given by the statistics to this claim is weak, as discussed in question 3. So, the evidence from the documents that fake news is rapidly increasing and, therefore, something to be worried about is not strong. The inference one might draw from Doc 5: that, because 79% of respondents worry, we ought to encourage further worrying, can be dismissed as an irrelevant appeal to popularity.	
	Worrying costs time and effort and we only really need to worry about something if there is no solution. Charles II clearly thought that restricting the coffee shops would be an effective strategy to supress unwanted discussion (fake or otherwise). We don't know from the documents whether it worked or not but, since his relative, Queen Elizabeth II, is still on the throne, it could well have done. Similarly, there is something we can do about fake news today: fact check. This could be by the news providers themselves, as mentioned in Docs 1 and 4 or, in a more adversarial model of checks and balances, by political parties, as appears from Doc 2 to be happening in Germany. Counter claims that modern technology makes the problem worse can be dismissed on the basis that modern technology could also afford the solution in terms of ease of fact checking.	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	The consequences of fake news are unknown and are as likely to be good as bad. People often cite cataclysmic political events as reason enough to worry about fake news. The biased Doc 1 explores this idea but one of his or her central points is sound enough: only people who do not like Trump think that the influence of fake news on the recent US election was a bad one. One might claim that the election of Donald Trump to the US Presidency (mentioned in Docs 1 and 4 and the UK's leaving the EU were good things. As the author of Doc 1 states, 'One person's balanced news is another's extremist propaganda'. More seriously, there could be universally beneficial consequences. The media and public attention surrounding fake news has highlighted to a previously credulous public that there is a lot of false information out there. This might, as Doc 4 hopes, lead to the resurgence of the career of journalism – Doc 4 is hardly neutral but the point still stands. It might also lead to a public appetite for education, in particular, for the acquisition of more critical thinking skills, which can only be a good thing. Fake news, by whatever name, has always been with us. We don't know that the consequences are all bad – they might, indeed, be good. There are also ways of dealing with fake news if it gets out of hand. For these reasons we should not be worried about fake news. *Argument to challenge (765 words)* Documents 1 and 3 tell us that fake news has always been around. Doc 1 uses this to imply that it is, therefore, of no concern. This is, of course, an irrelevant appeal to tradition. Doc 3 rightly points out the major differences between then and now: the sheer volume of fake news out there is much bigger than before and the impact it appears to be having is also greater. Nearly all documents agree that there is more fake news around than there used to be, if only because of the availability of digital media platforms from which fake news can spread. Although the evidence from Doc 5 is about perceived worry rather than fake news itself and even the evidence that there has been an increase in perceived worry is not particularly strong, it seems self-evident that 79% of people would not be worrying if it were not a bigger issue than it once was. If there is more of it around, the number of instances of its having a negative effect is likely to be higher. Document 2 suggests that the modern consequences of fake news could be more devastating – that it is being used as a weapon in a new cold war. Doc 2 comes from Germany but it is reasonable to assume that such concerns are generalizable to other countries – while most of the examples mentioned might be Germany-specific the ideas are not. Doc 3 partially supports Doc 2 but many of the examples in Doc 3 are historic, which does not seem to support the idea of more to worry about nowadays. However, the examples in Doc 3 are global and over a long period of time. Doc 2 has listed several, recent, German examples. One can reasonably infer, therefore, that there are many more recent examples of fake news in other countries having a big influence on politics, if not war.	

Question	Answer	Marks
4	Documents 2, 3 and 4 state that the arrival of fake news has blurred the distinction between fact and fiction (and Doc 5 implies that, even if there is a distinction, it is hard for the public to spot). This is a worrying phenomenon. Few would argue that the truth does not matter. Deliberate lying is morally wrong. Docs 2 to 4 agree that fake news is lying, although this is expressed explicitly only in Doc 4. The only source that disputes this is Document 1, which seems to be arguing that there is no objective truth. However, Doc 1 is biased and extensively flawed (as discussed in question 2) so its credibility is low. The author's use of the phrase 'enemies of the people' is identical to the Stalin quote in Doc 3, which further undermines the author of Doc 1's credibility. Most countries operate a democratic system of government and these systems rely on the fact that there is a factual base for decision making both by the electorate and the elected politicians. If there is not an agreed set of facts, then democracy is undermined. Doc 2 states that 'In the last days of the 2016 US election, the top 20 fake news stories were more frequently shared on social media than the top 20 serious news reports' and Doc 3 gives further examples of where fake news had large effects on supposedly democratic elections. One could add the '£350 million a week' claim used by the successful campaign for the UK to leave the EU as another example. If there was an easy solution to the problem of fake news distribution I would not be so worried. Doc 2 thinks that the resources available to combat fake news will not keep up with the fake news sources themselves: 'The dynamics of the net against the sluggishness of the available responses is an unequal struggle.' Doc 3 wonders if fact-checking and journalism is the answer but Doc 3 is written by a professional journalist and his confidence in the resurgence of that profession and its ability to solve all our problems seems like special pleading. There is no easy solution without severe internet regulation which would be technologically difficult and morally questionable. Some voluntary fact-checking by the social networks might reduce the problem slightly but it will be rather like putting a sticking plaster on an amputated limb. Fake news promotes lying and is immoral, in that it questions the very idea of truth and undermines democracy. It is more common and potentially more damaging than ever before and there seems no easy way to counter it. We should be worried about fake news.	

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 6 if no conclusion given