
THINKING SKILLS

9694/21

Paper 2 Critical Thinking

May/June 2018

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 45

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 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

IGCSE™ is a registered trademark.

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.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<i>2 marks for a valid answer, clearly explained</i> <i>1 mark for a vague, incomplete or marginal answer</i> <i>Indicative developed answers</i> • The special audit may suggest that someone was trying to find evidence against Mr Anson, in order to give a reason for removing him from the investigation into Eastshire Police. It is a reason to suspect that the allegation used as a basis for his suspension may have been fictitious. • The fact that Mr Anson was cleared may have indicated that a more sophisticated plot would be needed in order to remove him from the inquiry into Eastshire Police. • The fact that Mr Anson was cleared re-emphasises his reputation as someone of impeccable honesty and thereby might have provided a motive to replace him as leader of the inquiry into Eastshire Police by someone more open to being influenced.	2
1(b)	<i>3 marks: two valid answers, at least one of which is developed</i> <i>2 marks: either one developed valid answer or two undeveloped valid answers</i> <i>1 mark: one undeveloped valid answer</i> <i>0 marks: no valid answer</i> <i>Indicative developed answers</i> • The lawyers have a vested interest to win the case / exonerate their client, which may lead them to emphasise Mr G's innocence / the remoteness of the relationship between Mr A and Mr G if they can plausibly do so. <i>Indicative undeveloped answer:</i> The lawyers have a vested interest to lie in order to win the case / in order to earn their fee. • The lawyers have no independent ability to see, and are therefore simply saying what they have been told to say. • Mr A has a vested interest to protect his own career, and is therefore likely to emphasise his friend's innocence / the remoteness of the relationship if he can plausibly do so. • If Mr A really is a close friend of Mr G, he has a vested interest to protect him by emphasising his friend's innocence if he can plausibly do so. • Mr A's claim that he does not know Mr G well and has no business dealings with him means that he would have poor ability to see if Mr G were involved in illegal activities.	3

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	<i>2 marks each for up to two valid answers, clearly explained</i> <i>1 mark for a vague, incomplete or marginal answer</i> <i>Indicative developed answers</i> • His experience in the area might give him good ability to see, which would enhance the reliability of his report. • *Mr Curtis may well have friends who were involved in / accused of malpractice, which would give him a vested interest to cover it up. • *Mr Curtis himself may well have been involved in malpractice, which would give him a vested interest to cover it up. • *Mr Curtis is likely to be biased in favour of his old force, and would therefore not want to damage its reputation. <i>*If two of these answers are amalgamated into a single answer, credit them separately.</i>	4

Question	Answer		Marks
1(d)	Level 3 5–6 marks	A strong answer, which provides a reasoned argument including thorough evaluation of all or most of the evidence to support an acceptable conclusion in terms of probability and evaluates the plausibility of at least one alternative conclusion.	6
	Level 2 3–4 marks	An answer which evaluates some of the evidence, draws an acceptable conclusion in terms of probability and may mention the plausibility of at least one alternative conclusion.	
	Level 1 1–2 marks	A weak answer, which refers to some of the evidence, possibly including a simple evaluative comment. The conclusion may be unstated or over-stated.	
	Level 0 0 marks	No credit-worthy material.	
	The possibilities are: • Mr Guero was guilty, and Mr Anson knowingly broke the Police Code of Discipline by having a close friendship with a criminal. • Mr Guero was guilty, but Mr Anson did not know it and their relationship was entirely innocent. • Mr Guero was genuinely under suspicion, and Mr Anson’s suspension was bona fide, although both were actually innocent. • The accusations against Mr Guero were fabricated in order to give grounds for removing Mr Anson from the investigation into Eastshire Police and replacing him with someone more likely to cover up any wrong-doing in Eastshire. The last of these may be most likely. Indicative content • Source A strongly suggests that serious misconduct is endemic in the Eastshire Police and that Mr Anson will succeed in revealing and eradicating it. • The announcements and evidence in Source B are equally consistent with significant misconduct by Mr Anson • and an attempt to remove him from the Eastshire Inquiry. • Source C is consistent with an entirely innocent interpretation of the evidence referred to in Source B, • but on the other hand if Messrs Anson and Guero were involved in financial misconduct, their lawyers would make exactly the same statement. • The announcement in Source D that the Inquiry into Eastshire Police has found only minor irregularities is surprising in view of the background described in Source A, • but it could be genuine. • The fact that no action will be taken against Messrs Guero and Anson is reported in Source E in terms which hint that they have got off lightly, • but it is equally consistent with the allegations having been totally spurious, • which may be inherently more likely.		

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	<i>Notes for the guidance of markers</i> Simple supported conclusion 1 (if no conclusion cap at Level 2) + simple consideration of alternative +1 AND reasoned rejection of alternative +1 + explicit use of some (3 or fewer) sources of evidence +1 OR explicit use of all or most (4 or more) sources of evidence +2 + critical evaluation of evidence +1 or (more than one case) +2 + good inferential reasoning +1 or (more than one case) +2	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	Because the article is taken from an ‘Advertising Feature’ [1], the author is presumably seeking to sell sauna equipment [1], which gives him/her a vested interest to exaggerate the benefits of saunas/omit any negative aspects of taking a sauna [1].	2
2(b)	<i>1 mark each for up to 3 of the following:</i> The claim would be challenged if: • the pattern were different for other age groups. • the pattern were different for women. • other locations showed different results. • those who were old/ill were less inclined to take saunas / healthy people were more inclined to take saunas. • the sample was not evenly distributed: more of those who took frequent saunas happened to be at the lower end of the age group. • sauna users tended to be fitter than average, because (eg) they used a sauna located in a gym. • people who can afford to buy a sauna can also afford good health care. <i>Do <u>not</u> credit:</i> • <i>information supplied in the other sources</i> • <i>criticisms of the evidence (e.g. may be correlation not causation)</i> • <i>trivial points (e.g. the lead researcher may admit that he lied/made a mistake).</i>	3

Question	Answer	Marks
2(c)	<i>2 marks each for up to two valid answers, clearly explained</i> <i>1 mark for a vague, incomplete or marginal answer</i> • All sorts of everyday things are dangerous if not used appropriately, but manufacturers and users can take appropriate precautions. • *The author generalises from the single example of the man who fell onto a stove. <i>1 mark answer:</i> *The example of a man who fell onto a stove is only one case. • The dangers of ‘excessive’ use do not constitute a reason to avoid moderate use. • The dangers of dehydration can be easily avoided by drinking water. • The fact that some saunas in Turkey are allegedly connected to insanitary water supplies does not constitute a reason not to use saunas in countries with reliable potable water or to take bottled water. <i>1 mark answer:</i> People are not going to drink the sauna water. • The fact that people with cardiac conditions are advised not to use a sauna does not mean they are dangerous to healthy people. <i>1 mark answer:</i> Because saunas pose risks to people with cardiac conditions, they should avoid them. • The person who died after plunging into cold water could have reduced the risk by using the sauna without plunging into cold water. • <i>1 mark answer: (post hoc fallacy)</i> The man who died <u>after</u> plunging into cold water did not necessarily die <u>because</u> of plunging into cold water. • An isolated example from two decades ago is not strong evidence. • *The author generalises from the single example of the man who had a heart attack after plunging into cold water. <i>1 mark answer:</i> *The example of a man who had a heart attack after plunging into cold water is only one case. <i>* Credit only one of these answers.</i>	4

Question	Answer		Marks
2(d)	Level 3 5–6 marks	A reasoned argument, which uses and evaluates all or most of the evidence provided.	6
	Level 2 3–4 marks	A simple argument, which uses and/or evaluates evidence.	
	Level 1 1–2 marks	A weak answer, which makes some correct reference to evidence but consists of opinion and/or assertion rather than argument or a weak argument which makes no reference to evidence.	
	Level 0 0 marks	No credit-worthy material.	
	Indicative content • Source A supports this claim, by explaining the benefits of saunas, • but the source has a clear vested interest and is therefore biased. • These claims are disputed by Source C, • which also draws attention to some risks. • Source B suggests that more saunas may have greater health benefits than fewer, • but the benefits may apply only to people who are accustomed to the use of saunas. • The second point of Source D indicates a risk of which everyone should be aware; • the other points do not apply to most people, • but they do suggest that ‘Everyone’ in the claim is an over-statement. • Source B is probably based on medical expertise, and Source D may be • but the expertise of Dr Linz (Source C) is in a different speciality. Notes for the guidance of markers Simple supported conclusion 1 or nuanced conclusion 2 + <u>use</u> of 1 or 2 sources +1 or <u>use</u> of all or most (3 or more) sources of evidence +2 <i>not just mentioning or summarising or comprehension</i> + critical evaluation of evidence +1 or (more than one case) +2 + good inferential reasoning +1 or (more than one case) +2 <i>not speculation</i> + personal thinking +1		

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<i>2 marks:</i> The committed women ((and a few brave men)) who campaign for gender equality should focus their attention on professional sport. <i>1 mark:</i> <i>Recognisable paraphrase or significantly incomplete version of the above.</i>	2
3(b)	<i>1 mark for each of the following, to a maximum of 3 marks:</i> • it is (therefore) unacceptable to discriminate between the genders in any way. • It is unfair that sportswomen get paid less than men. • The myth that women are weaker than men has no physical basis. • Contracts for televising sport should couple women's competitions with men's, (so that both receive equal prominence). • Sport should cease to be an exception to the social rules against gender-based abuse. <i>Allow <u>one</u> significant omission or addition in each case.</i> <i>If more than three answers are supplied, mark only the first <u>four</u>.</i>	3

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	<i>Marks for each evaluative point as follows, up to a maximum of 5 marks:</i> <i>2 marks: Valid evaluative point, clearly expressed.</i> <i>1 mark: Weak attempt at a valid evaluative point.</i> <i>Paragraph 1</i> • <i>Ad hominem:</i> The reference to opponents as ‘dinosaurs’ seeks to undermine their reasoning by means of a personal attack. • Appeal to popularity / assumption: the IC relies on assuming that this claim is true because nearly everyone accepts it is true. • Assumption / Exaggerated inference: the IC goes further than justified by the reasoning. Any discrimination based on a biological difference would be justified by this reasoning. <i>Paragraph 2</i> • Assumption: that female competition winners are ‘doing the same job’ as the winners of male competitions. <i>Paragraph 3</i> • Fallacy of division: a generalisation which is true for most members of a category (men and women in this case) is not contradicted by the existence of some exceptions. <i>Paragraph 4</i> • Restriction of options: the alleged vicious circle relies on unrealistically denying that there are other reasons why men’s sport is more popular than women’s and also other reasons why it is given more television coverage. <i>Do <u>not</u> credit circular reasoning (mentioned in the passage) as a criticism.</i> • Assumption: the last sentence relies on the implausible assumption that if equal television coverage were given to women’s sport, equal numbers of people would watch it. <i>Paragraph 5</i> • <i>Non sequitur:</i> the anecdote about the football commentators does not support the claim that such jokes are tolerated, since the commentators lost their jobs (<i>can be expressed as inconsistency/contradiction</i>). • Irrelevant example: the comment by Amir Khan does not constitute ‘gender-based abuse’.	5

Question	Answer		Marks
3(d)	Level 3 4–5 marks	Developed, coherent argument. Reasons strongly support conclusion. Development may include intermediate conclusion or apt examples. Simply structured argument – 4 marks. Effective use of IC etc. – 5 marks.	5
	Level 2 2–3 marks	A simple argument. One reason + conclusion – 2 marks. Two or more separate reasons + conclusion – 3 marks.	
	Level 1 1 mark	Some relevant comment.	
	Level 0 0 marks	No relevant comment.	
	<i>Maximum 3 marks for wrong conclusion or if conclusion is implied but not stated.</i> <i>No credit for material merely reproduced from the passage.</i> Specimen level 3 answers <i>Support (114 words)</i> There should be limits to inequality of incomes in society, because it is morally offensive to estimate the value of one person as thousands or even millions times greater than another. The finest sportspeople deserve to be paid well, because they give a lot of pleasure to many people, but the current excessive wages are distorting the nature of sport, because competitions have become about who can pay most, instead of who can play best. In almost all sports, the most successful performers acquire great wealth before they have the maturity to use it responsibly. So these high salaries are wasted on them. Therefore top sports stars are paid more than they are worth. <i>Challenge (123 words)</i> Watching and supporting sport is the main leisure activity of very large numbers of ordinary people. They expect to pay for their pleasure, and they want most of this money to go to the stars whose skills, dedication and efforts provide the entertainment. Although the finest sportspeople are paid very high salaries, there are not many of them and they do not stay at the top for long. So the rewards they receive seem less excessive if averaged out over a lifetime. In addition, many high-earning sportspeople cannot be said to have wasted their wealth, because they have invested it into developing their sports and giving opportunities to disadvantaged young players. Therefore top sports stars are not paid more than they are worth.		