
THINKING SKILLS

9694/23

Paper 2 Critical Thinking

October/November 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 October/November 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **9** 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) | It significantly reduces the reliability of the report [1]. The Government has a vested interest to put itself in a good light [1], which may have influenced the reporting of the incident [1]. The TV station has a vested interest to portray the government in a good light [1] and a bias in favour of Eastland [1], which means that even if the soldiers had used undue force the TV station would probably have claimed they had acted in self-defence [1]. | 3 |
| 1(b) | It suggests that at least some Eastish politicians are willing to support a Westish party in the interests of national unity [1]. Because of this, it suggests that Mr Horak’s victory was due partly to people from Eastland voting for him [1] because they believed his pledge to end sectarianism [1]. This means that he has a mandate to govern in the interests of national unity and not of Westland only [1]. The reference to “the hostility between the two provinces” corroborates the reports of discrimination in Source A [1]. | 3 |
| 1(c) | This action was most likely a sectarian act and abuse of power by the new government against their traditional enemies/rivals [1]. Alongside Source D, this is further evidence that President Horak and his cronies have reneged on his promise to govern in the interests of national unity [1] and are consistently acting against Eastland [1]. It makes it more likely that the allegations against Mr Jalin are false / motivated by sectarianism [1]. | 3 |

| 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. | |
| | <p>The possibilities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Before being replaced as President, Mr Jalin maintained power by murdering and terrorising any political opponents. • On Mr Jalin’s orders, the army used the minimum force necessary in order to maintain order and protect government buildings during the demonstrations and to prevent a coup d’état. • The soldiers acted in self-defence when violently attacked by demonstrators. • Mr Jalin tried unsuccessfully to prevent the army from abusing its power by murdering and terrorising political opponents. • Mr Jalin is entirely innocent, and the charges against him are due entirely to sectarianism and revenge on the part of Mr Horak. <p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The political background described in Source A suggests that if anyone from the province of Westland were ever to secure political power, it would probably be abused. • The report in Source B shows that demonstrators were certainly killed, • and although this could have occurred as a legitimate act of self-defence on the part of the military, • it is quite possible that the deaths were an act of political repression, • since the government-controlled TV station would not say so if it were true. • The formation of a new political party, announced in Source C, is ostensibly intended to work for national unity, • but there is reason to believe that it is actually a ploy to achieve political power for a Westish politician. | | |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 1(d) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source D gives multiple evidence that President Horak is going to govern in the interests of his own people and gain revenge on Eastish leaders, • which confirms that his promises about working for national unity were untrue. • The allegations reported in Source E presumably relate to the events reported in Source B. <p>Notes for the guidance of markers</p> <p>Simple supported conclusion 1 (if no conclusion cap at Level 2)</p> <p>+ simple consideration of alternative +1 AND reasoned rejection of alternative +1</p> <p>+ 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</p> <p>+ critical evaluation of evidence +1 or (more than one case) +2 + good inferential reasoning +1 or (more than one case) +2</p> | |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|----------|
| 2(a) | (Quite) reliable [1]. The researchers had excellent ability to see, because they examined a very large number of records over a long period of time [1]. The researchers would have good expertise in analysing statistical data [1]. The data itself would almost certainly be free from bias [1]. However, the conclusion generalises from evidence referring to the US only [1]. | 3 |
| 2(b) | To some extent (neither well nor badly) [1]. The first part of the nurse's explanation refers to patients already in hospital, who are not mentioned by Source A [1]. She does not explain why more people develop life-threatening conditions over the holiday period, which is the main focus of Source A [1]. But the second half of her letter may explain why more patients die in the emergency room before being admitted to the hospital [1], and if some people are discharged who would normally have remained in hospital, that may contribute to the number dying or being taken seriously ill at home [1]. | 4 |
| 2(c) | <p><i>2 marks for an accurate version of the following.</i> <i>1 for a weak or incomplete but recognisable version of the following.</i></p> <p>The minister has to assume that the cause of the problem is something that it is possible to eliminate.</p> | 2 |

| 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. | |
| | <p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since two studies from the US and one other report all agree that deaths spike at Christmas and New Year, it seems highly probable that this is true, • at least in those countries. • But the explanations are mostly speculative. • Source A implies that the main problem is more people being taken ill over the holiday period, rather than the treatment they receive. • The comment from the Health Minister in Source D is probably based on the idea that staffing is partly responsible for the problem. • The second part of the nurse’s letter in Source B supports the Health Minister’s view • on the basis of relevant expertise. • However, the second half of her letter offers a plausible reason why more patients might die over the holidays without it being a matter of concern, • and the explanations in Source C also do not rely on issues of under-staffing in hospitals over the holiday period. • The last sentence of the nurse’s letter implies that an increased number of deaths may be the price we have to pay for allowing medical staff acceptable conditions of working. • So overall it seems likely that increasing the number of senior staff on duty over the holiday period would to some extent reduce, but certainly not eradicate, the spike in deaths. | | |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|-------|
| 2(d) | <p>Notes for the guidance of markers</p> <p>Simple supported conclusion 1 or nuanced conclusion 2</p> <p>+ <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></p> <p>+ critical evaluation of evidence +1 or (more than one case) +2</p> <p>+ good inferential reasoning +1 or (more than one case) +2 <i>not speculation</i></p> <p>+ personal thinking +1</p> | |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|----------|
| 3(a) | <p>2 marks: (But) aiming to achieve ‘the greatest good for the greatest number’ is not the best basis for making moral choices.</p> <p>1 mark: <i>Paraphrase of the above or including a significant addition or omission.</i></p> | 2 |
| 3(b) | <p>1 mark for each of the following, to a maximum of 3 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You cannot expect anyone not to give preference to their own interests when deciding what to do. • Everyone should (also) give priority to the needs of their own family. • It is senseless to base moral judgements on consequences. • Obeying a simple set of rules is a more realistic way of making moral choices. • It is (therefore) impossible to justify such actions on the basis of their consequences. <p><i>Allow <u>one</u> significant omission or addition in each case.</i></p> | 3 |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|----------|
| 3(c) | <p><i>Marks for each evaluative point as follows, up to a maximum of 5 marks:</i></p> <p><i>2 marks: Valid evaluative point, clearly expressed.</i> <i>1 mark: Weak attempt at a valid evaluative point.</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumption: the penultimate sentence relies on the assumption that ‘you cannot expect’ people to act contrary to what is ‘natural’. • Assumption: that doing the best thing never overlaps with what would please oneself. <p><i>Paragraph 2</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumption: that strong family units are not possible without prioritisation. • Inconsistency: the reasoning in this paragraph argues on the basis of consequences against arguing on the basis of consequences. • False dichotomy: many parents can give to charity as well as providing an acceptable (but not luxurious) quality of life for their children. <i>This point may be expressed as an assumption.</i> <p><i>Paragraph 3</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflation/inconsistency: this section of the reasoning argues against assessing moral choices on the basis of actual consequences, but para 1, which sets the agenda for the argument as a whole, refers to ‘probable’ consequences and ‘aiming to achieve’. <p><i>Paragraph 4</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Straw man: those who support the policy of achieving ‘the greatest good of the greatest number’ do not argue that every decision should be subjected to exhaustive calculation of consequences: so the author is arguing against a position which no one holds. <i>Allow expression of this point as a slippery slope.</i> • Restriction of options: living by a set of rules is not the only alternative to extreme consequentialism, since moderate/ intermediate policies are available. <p><i>Paragraph 5</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Ad hominem</i>: although the author does address this CA to some extent, his main response is to reject the sincerity of those who put it forward. • Conflation: the author moves from ‘motives’ to ‘results’ without justifying the transition. • Begging the question: people who believe that actions should be judged on the basis of consequences do not accept that ‘Some actions are simply wrong.’ | 5 |

| Question | Answer | | Marks | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|----------|
| 3(d) | <table border="1" data-bbox="320 248 1310 745"> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 248 512 450">Level 3 4–5 marks</td> <td data-bbox="512 248 1310 450">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.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 450 512 551">Level 2 2–3 marks</td> <td data-bbox="512 450 1310 551">A simple argument. One reason + conclusion – 2 marks. Two or more separate reasons + conclusion – 3 marks.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 551 512 647">Level 1 1 mark</td> <td data-bbox="512 551 1310 647">Some relevant comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 647 512 745">Level 0 0 marks</td> <td data-bbox="512 647 1310 745">No relevant comment.</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="316 779 1278 846"><i>Maximum 3 marks for wrong conclusion or if conclusion is implied but not stated.</i></p> <p data-bbox="316 846 1090 880"><i>No credit for material merely reproduced from the passage.</i></p> <p data-bbox="316 913 683 947">Specimen level 3 answers</p> <p data-bbox="316 981 587 1014"><i>Support (113 words)</i></p> <p data-bbox="316 1032 1318 1196">There is a close connection between behaviour and personality. Nice people behave nicely, while generous, unselfish behaviour gradually moulds people into the kind of person everyone wants to know and to spend time with. So trying to benefit others is a good strategy for the purpose of personal development.</p> <p data-bbox="316 1234 1318 1397">Unselfish behaviour almost always also benefits the giver, because those who receive help from others tend to reciprocate. Everyone has some skills and talents, but lacks others. If everyone helps each other, each person's talents and those needs can mesh with one another. Therefore it is indirectly in our own interests to behave unselfishly.</p> <p data-bbox="316 1435 1058 1469">So everyone should do their best to benefit other people.</p> <p data-bbox="316 1503 619 1536"><i>Challenge (132 words)</i></p> <p data-bbox="316 1554 1310 1718">Many of us were told by our parents or teachers that we should do to other people whatever we would like them to do to us. But this is not good advice, because people's likes and dislikes vary. You might not like the same things as me. So the most efficient way of meeting everyone's wishes is for each individual to look after his or her own interests.</p> <p data-bbox="316 1756 1310 1919">Aiming to benefit other people can also result in unfairness. It would work more or less effectively if everyone co-operated, but some people would probably give more than their fair share to benefit others, while others would be content to receive without contributing. The fairest policy is for everyone to look after themselves.</p> <p data-bbox="316 1957 1106 1991">So everyone should not do their best to benefit other people.</p> | | 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. | 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. | 5 |
| 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. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | | | | | |