

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 series**

### **9694 THINKING SKILLS**

**9694/23**

Paper 2 (Critical Thinking), maximum raw mark 45

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 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9694	23

- 1 (a) How significant is Andy Jones' evidence that he observed Mrs Smith talking to the mother? (Source B) [3]

It is unreliable because, if he broke the vase, he has a motive to lie about this [1]. Even if true, the evidence lacks significance [1]. The implication that Mrs Smith and the mother were friends (or even knew each other) is not justified [1]. This could have just been a casual exchange of words between strangers about the length of the queue etc. [1]. There is slight significance as it is *consistent* with a friendship between the two but no more than this [1].

- (b) How useful is Mrs Smith's evidence in Source D? [3]

If Mrs Smith is a neutral witness then it gives the mother a possible alibi by suggesting she was in the queue for the toilets around the time the vase was broken [1]. However, we cannot be certain that Mrs Smith is not a friend of the mother who may be lying on her behalf [1]. A 'good relationship' does not necessarily indicate the child is well-behaved [1] though it is a reasonable inference that the mother wasn't shouting at the child etc. which, in turn, suggests good behaviour [1]. The tone of Mrs Smith's remarks suggests a certain antagonism towards museums and their attitudes to mothers and children [1].

- (c) How relevant is the evidence in Source E in assessing Jones's possible guilt? [3]

The evidence about his poor progress is of doubtful relevance [1]. One cannot infer general points about character, e.g. irresponsibility, carelessness, from this specific context [1]. However, if the evidence about late nights/partying is true he may have been tired/inattentive [1]. He may also have been stressed and distracted as he had received the letter that day [1]. The evidence about his lab work casts doubt on the view that he is clumsy as expressed in Source C [1]. However, it is possible that dexterity in the lab is not incompatible with clumsiness in the sense of walking into things because he is preoccupied etc. [1].

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>23</b>

(d) Which of the two key suspects is more likely to have caused the vase to be smashed?

Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, with critical reference to the evidence provided and considering a plausible alternative conclusion [6]

<b>Level 3</b> 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.
<b>Level 2</b> 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.
<b>Level 1</b> 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.
<b>Level 0</b> 0 marks	No credit-worthy material.

### ***Indicative content***

There are only two possible conclusions:

- The vase was broken by Andy Jones
- The vase was broken by the child

### ***Assessment of evidence regarding Jones***

His flustered state and cut hand may be consistent with responsibility for smashing the vase. The timing is also consistent with this. However, we only have the mother's word for this and she has a vested interest to deflect blame from her child. Also, the flustered state is equally consistent with having discovered such a valuable vase being smashed. The cut hand is possibly more consistent with having picked up a piece of the smashed vase rather than being responsible for smashing it. However, it is difficult to see why he would pick up a piece of the vase in this way. The cut hand may of course have nothing to do with the vase. Indeed he may be flustered because he has cut his hand in a totally unrelated incident. However, the only independent evidence on Jones from Source E does not create a favourable impression. However, it does possibly counteract the claim about clumsiness. If he is the agitated member of staff who reported the damage it suggests that he was working in this section of the museum.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>23</b>

***Assessment of evidence regarding mother/child***

The only evidence that incriminates the mother is from Jones and he has a vested interest in deflecting blame from himself. Also, he does not actually say she was in the vicinity of the vase. She also has a possible alibi from Mrs Smith though the timings do not completely rule out responsibility between 3 and 3.30. Whilst the mother does have favourable evidence from Mrs Smith, there is some doubt about her neutrality. However, there is no definite evidence which shows her to be biased towards the mother. The mother's evidence about Jones's clumsiness is somewhat contradicted by the principal's statement and looks like a remark made in order to deflect blame. However, the same could be said about Jones's statement about her talking to Mrs Smith. Even if the child was misbehaving, this does not necessarily mean he was responsible for knocking over the vase and we have no evidence that he sustained any injuries.

The judgment could go either way but it seems plausible that a tired and inattentive Jones, possibly worried about the letter from the principal fell into the vase cutting his hand in the process as he tried to steady himself. He then saw the mother and child as an easy target, especially if it was true that the child was misbehaving.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9694	23

2 (a) Is the passage in Source C an argument? Explain your answer [2]

- 2 marks for a correct answer with accurate explanation.  
 1 mark for a correct answer with vague or generic explanation.  
 0 marks for correct answer without explanation.  
 0 marks for incorrect answer with or without explanation.

No. Whilst there is reasoning that could lead to a conclusion (that street lighting does reduce actual crime) this conclusion is not actually drawn.

(b) Source A suggests that increased community pride can reduce crime. Does this give sufficient grounds for the installation of street lighting? [3]

No [1]. Whilst street lighting is one way of increasing community pride [1], given the negative features of street lighting indicated in the other Sources [1], there are likely to be better ways of increasing community pride [1] which do not have these drawbacks/do not have negative features [1].

(c) Look at Source E. Suggest four factors that could account for the decline in crime after 2003 other than the installation of street lighting [4]

- Increased policing meaning criminals were deterred from committing crime.
- Successful prosecution of criminal elements in 2002 which removed them from the neighbourhood/more severe penalties.
- Criminals moving into other types of crime (e.g. cybercrime) which would reduce the numbers of the particular crimes shown here.
- Decline in population which would mean the proportion of crimes could have remained the same or even increased.
- Other crime prevention measures (e.g. neighbourhood watch type schemes) which may have accounted for the decrease.
- Other reasons for an increase in community pride and therefore increased informal social control.
- Increased affluence which would decrease the motive for some of these crimes.
- Police/authorities may have closed/dealt with criminal 'hot spots'

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9694	23

(d) 'Good street lighting makes a major contribution to crime control'

How justified is this statement? Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, using and evaluating the information provided in Sources A–F [6]

<b>Level 3</b> 5–6 marks	A reasoned argument, which uses and evaluates all or most of the evidence provided.
<b>Level 2</b> 3–4 marks	A simple argument, which uses and/or evaluates evidence.
<b>Level 1</b> 1–2 marks	A weak answer, which makes some correct reference to evidence but consists of opinion and/or assertion rather than argument <b>or</b> a weak argument which makes no reference to evidence.
<b>Level 0</b> 0 marks	No credit-worthy material.

**Indicative content**

- In order to judge whether it would make a 'major contribution' we would need to know what proportion of total crime is committed at night.
- If crime is increasingly 'cybercrime' (identity theft etc.), street lighting would have no impact on this and therefore little overall impact on crime rate.
- Source D does give some grounds for believing that most crimes are committed at night, though this only applies to certain types of crime.
- Also, it suggests absence or presence of street lighting is not the main factor.
- There is evidence in the sources that street lighting does more harm than good (Sources B and F).
- However, only Source B offers points that suggest it is irrelevant to and/or actually encourages criminal activity. Source F only points to certain negative side effects which do not actually undermine claims that street lighting does deter crime.
- Sources A and C offer plausible arguments as to how street lighting deters crime.
- However, the 'community pride' argument shows street lighting as only a means to this end. It may be that other methods of achieving this have fewer of the harmful side effects pointed out in Source F.
- The figures in Source E only show a correlation between street lighting and a decline in crime.
- Moreover, it is rather curious that crime goes on declining suggesting something else is at play.
- The sources therefore fail to give sufficient grounds for the statement to be justified.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015	9694	23

- 3 (a) Using the exact words from the passage as far as possible, identify the main conclusion [2]

2 marks: We should regret its (satnav's) introduction.

1 mark: Whilst hailed as a key advance by technological geeks, we should regret its introduction; it is a most unwelcome invention.

1 mark: It is a most unwelcome invention.

- (b) Using the exact words from the passage as far as possible, identify three reasons which directly support the main conclusion [3]

1 mark for each of the following, to a maximum of 3 marks:

- It is a most unwelcome invention.
- Discouraging the use of satnav would make a positive contribution to road safety.
- It represents a hazard to other road users.
- Satnav frequently makes mistakes.

- (c) Evaluate the strength of the reasoning in the argument. In your answer you should consider any flaws, unstated assumptions and other weaknesses [5]

Marks for each evaluative point as follows, up to a maximum of 5 marks:

2 marks: Valid evaluative point, clearly expressed.

1 mark: Weak attempt at a valid evaluative point.

Paragraph 1

- Circular argument. Last clause does little more than express the conclusion in a different way.
- Ad hominem – “technological geeks”.

Paragraph 2

- Assumption that map reading skills are not needed in other contexts / all people are drivers. (May also be expressed as a flaw of generalisation.)
- Assumption that drivers do not look at their maps whilst driving.
- Assumption that there are no other sources of distraction. (May also be expressed as a flaw.)
- Flaw: Inconsistency – the author states that “drivers do not need to bother with maps” then goes on to suggest that they do (for safety reasons).

Paragraph 3

- Assumption that satnav is less important than other instruments. It might be better to get rid of some of the other instruments rather than satnav.
- Flaw: Inconsistency – if the instrumentation is just for show, it is difficult to see why drivers need to look at it.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Cambridge International AS/A Level – May/June 2015</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>23</b>

*Paragraph 4*

- Flaw – Confuses property of thing not working with thing itself. Most things could be rejected on the grounds that they are no good if they are not working. This is an argument for *improving* satnav rather than argument against satnav itself.
- Over-reliance on technology is not the fault of the technology but rather a fault in the way it is used by people.
- Generalises from problems with HGVs to all vehicles.

(d) 'Young people should be encouraged to travel.'

**Write your own short argument to support or challenge this claim. The conclusion of your argument must be stated. Credit will not be given for repeating ideas from the passage** [5]

<b>Level 3</b> 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.
<b>Level 2</b> 2–3 marks	A simple argument. One reason + conclusion – 2 marks. Two or more separate reasons + conclusion – 3 marks.
<b>Level 1</b> 1 mark	Some relevant comment.
<b>Level 0</b> 0 marks	No relevant comment.

*Maximum 3 marks for wrong conclusion or if conclusion is implied but not stated. No credit for material merely reproduced from the passage.*

**Specimen level 3 answers**

*Support (73 words)*

Travel has long been recognised as a mind-broadening experience. Meeting different people in different places on a day-to-day basis encourages flexibility and adaptability in the person. These are traits we need to encourage in the modern world. Dealing with the inevitable problems that will be encountered when travelling encourages resourcefulness and this is also a key personal quality, as it is crucial in building character. Therefore, young people should be encouraged to travel.

*Challenge (77 words)*

The days of travel being pleasurable and exciting have long gone. Most long distance travel involves flying. Unless one is very rich and able to afford first class (which young people are unlikely to be), flying is now generally agreed to be a most unpleasant experience. Budget airlines pack people in like sardines. Getting through security and immigration can take hours. Travel should only be undertaken when necessary. Therefore, young people should not be encouraged to travel.