
THINKING SKILLS

9694/21

Paper 2 Critical Thinking

October/November 2016

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 will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2016 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2016	9694	21

1 (a) Source A claims that “Torture and other ill-treatment were commonplace in Rappart Prison.”

(i) Suggest one factor which increases the reliability of this claim. [2]

2 marks:

- The prisoner had a good ability to know what happened, because it happened to him personally.
- The prisoner’s evidence is corroborated by the evidence of the former Prison Officer in Source B.

1 mark: Vague or incomplete version of either of the the above.

(ii) Suggest one factor which reduces the reliability of this claim. [2]

2 marks:

- The former prisoner may well have a vested interest to lie/exaggerate in order to get revenge on prison staff by getting them into trouble.
- The former prisoner may well have a vested interest to lie/exaggerate in order to claim compensation.
- This evidence is inconsistent with the claims in Source C, but this does not greatly reduce its reliability.

1 mark:

- Vague or incomplete version of any of the above.
- The former prisoner is a criminal and therefore cannot be trusted.

(b) Suggest one additional piece of evidence concerning the former prison officer which would help you assess the reliability of the evidence in Source B and briefly explain how it would affect the reliability. [3]

3 marks:

- Why he left the staff of the prison. If he was sacked, he might have a vested interest to lie in order to get the company into trouble.
- Why he left the staff of the prison. If he was sacked because of abusing prisoners, he could be trying to exculpate himself by blaming his superiors, the company or the Prison Department.
- Why he left the staff of the prison. If he resigned because he was concerned about the ill-treatment of prisoners, his reliability is increased.

2 marks:

- Why he left the staff of the prison. If he was sacked, it reduces the reliability of his evidence.
- Testimony from colleagues concerning his behaviour and attitudes.

1 mark:

- Why he left the staff of the prison.
- Corroborating testimony from colleagues about the treatment of prisoners (not referring to the former prison officer).
- Written records from the prison about the treatment of prisoners (not referring to the former prison officer)

0 marks: Whether he was telling the truth or not.

Other valid answers should be credited.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2016	9694	21

(c) Is Source C an argument? Briefly 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 a correct answer without explanation.
- 0 marks for an incorrect answer with or without explanation.

2-mark answer

No, this is not an argument. It consists of five reasons which would support a conclusion that the accusations made by the former prisoner and former officer are untrue, but that conclusion is not stated.

Accept Yes, this is an argument, because it consists of several reasons supporting the conclusion stated in the first sentence.

1-mark answers

No, this is not an argument, because it does not have a conclusion.

No, this is not an argument, because it consists only of reasons why PQR Security have not permitted its staff to abuse prisoners.

Accept Yes, this is an argument, because it consists of reasons and a conclusion.

(d) How likely do you think it is that the State Prison Department has encouraged abuse of prisoners in Rappart Prison? Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, with critical reference to the evidence provided and considering a plausible alternative conclusion. [6]

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.
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.

Indicative content

The possible explanations are:

- The alleged abuse did not happen.
- The abuse was done by the prison officers without the knowledge of PQR Security.
- The abuse was done with the knowledge/encouragement of PQR Security but without the knowledge of the State Prison Department.
- The abuse was done with the knowledge/encouragement of both PQR Security and the State Prison Department.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2016	9694	21

Source E provides the strongest evidence in favour both of abuse having happened and of approval by the State. However, it is possible that this organization is rather credulous of claims about abuse.

All of the other sources are compromised by vested interest.

If true, Sources A and B provide first-person evidence in favour of abuse having happened. Although Sources A and B corroborate one another, either might have been written after its author read the other, which would reduce the corroborative value.

If the author of Source B has no vested interest, his evidence is very significant indeed, confirming both that the abuse happened and that the company and Prisons Department encouraged it.

The first paragraph of Source D is predictable and unreliable, while the second paragraph almost defends the brutality, which suggests that the Prisons Department did know about it. The last paragraph is strictly irrelevant to the allegations made in Sources A and B, which may suggest that the Prisons Minister is trying to divert attention away from the allegations being made.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2016	9694	21

- 2 (a) Suggest and briefly explain two reasons why the evidence reported in Source A gives only weak support to the claim that drinking a bottle of water could help you “ace your big presentation today”. [4]

2 marks for a clear version of any of the following.

1 mark for a vague version of one of the following or a marginal point.

2 answers required.

- The research was based on performance in exams (*accept* in the classroom), not giving a presentation, and no evidence is given that the findings can be transferred.
- Undergraduates may not be representative of the general population somehow (e.g. age, lifestyle etc.).
- The CEO of Quantum Hydration Ltd. has a vested interest to promote his products, which presumably consist of bottled water or the equivalent.
- There is no mention of control in the research, so the improved performance may not have been caused by drinking water.

- (b) Identify the point of contradiction between Source B and Source C. [2]

2 marks: Source B claims that coffee and tea count towards the recommended daily liquid intake, whereas Source C advises drinking an additional glass of water “to compensate for each cup of tea and coffee you drink”/that tea and coffee cause dehydration.

1 mark: Source B claims that coffee and tea count towards the recommended daily liquid intake, whereas Source C says they do not.

- (c) How reliably can it be concluded from Source D that we do not need to “drink about eight cups of water per day”? [3]

Not (very) reliably [1]. The author does show that the credibility of one particular article is reduced by vested interest/because the authors are paid and the article can be considered to be an advertisement [1], but this does not mean that the claim of that article is not true [1], because the authors are still “respected doctors” [1], and this claim is consistent with “widely accepted” views [1].

Maximum 1 mark if no reference to vested interest of journal article.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2016	9694	21

(d) ‘Most people should drink more water.’

To what extent do you agree with this claim? Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, using and evaluating the information provided in Sources A–D. [6]

Level 3 5–6 marks	A reasoned argument, which uses and evaluates all or most of the evidence provided.
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 an argument which makes no reference to evidence.
Level 0 0 marks	No credit-worthy material.

Indicative content

- Source A gives reliable evidence (presented at a reputable academic conference) that drinking water may be beneficial,
- but the claims made in the report go beyond the findings of the research.
- The pseudo-scientific explanation in para 3 is seriously tainted by vested interest.
- Source B is from a popular publication, but it refers to a reputable source.
- According to this source, although hydration is essential, it does not necessarily have to come from drinking water as such.
- So it is possible that most people already consume sufficient water one way or another.
- The End Tiredness Programme clearly encourages people to drink more water than they probably do already, presumably based on evidence that doing so will help to combat tiredness,
- but in Source C they give no reasons as to why anyone should do so.
- Source D lists some of the alleged physical and mental benefits of drinking more water.
- As stated in the answer to (c), Source D to some extent undermines the credibility of one study promoting the drinking of water,
- but overall it acknowledges that the advice to drink significant quantities of water is widely accepted.
- The claim in the question is moderate (referring to “most”, not “all”).
- The evidence suggests that it is probably true but we cannot be certain.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2016	9694	21

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

2 marks: "Democracy" is (actually) a more problematic concept than most people realise.
 1 mark: "Democracy" is (actually) a problematic concept.
 OR Recognisable paraphrase of 2-mark answer.

- (b) Using the exact words from the passage as far as possible, identify three intermediate conclusions. [3]

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

- The modern system of electing a government to make decisions on behalf of the people is (therefore) not true democracy.
- Those who claim that winning the most votes in an election entitles a person or party to rule the country are either stupid or deceitful.
- The right to vote should be limited to those who have the intelligence and the education to do so responsibly.
- (This shows that) democracy does not consist of accepting whichever party receives the largest number of votes.
- (So) any government which fails to implement these popular demands has no right to describe itself as democratic.

Allow one additional element or one significant omission in each case.
 If more than three answers are offered, mark the first four only.

- (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 for a valid evaluative point, clearly expressed.
 1 mark for a weak attempt at a valid evaluative point.

Paragraph 2

- Appeal to tradition: the author assumes that the origin of a word is a reliable guide to its current/true meaning / that the meaning of concepts does not change over time (*can be expressed as an assumption*).

Paragraph 3

- The claim that people who adopt a traditional understanding of democracy are "either stupid or deceitful" is to some extent an *argumentum ad hominem*, but not entirely so, since the judgment is supported by reasoning (*credit 1 mark for ad hominem without reservations*).
- Circular argument – this rejection of the generally-accepted definition of democracy relies on the MC as well as supporting it.
- Assumption that the candidate who makes the biggest promises will not keep them.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2016	9694	21

Paragraph 4

- Conflation between ‘intelligence and education’ (line 1) and living in cities (line 5).
- Assumption: that political corruption is visible only in the capital.
- Assumption: that newspapers provide (accurate) information about corruption.
- Assumption: that bringing peace and stability is not an indicator of good government / that voting for a government which “gives...peace and stability” (line 5) does not constitute voting “responsibly” (line 1) / that peace and stability are not “real issues” / that corruption is worse than a lack of peace and stability.

Paragraph 5

- Assumption: that protesters have the right to define democracy.
- Circular argument: this rejection of the generally-accepted definition of democracy relies on the MC as well as supporting it.

Paragraph 6

- Assumption: that thousands of people constitute a majority / that proposals which gained the support of thousands of followers would be democratic.
- Assumption: that it would be possible to implement all popular demands without contradiction.

(d) ‘The first duty of governments is to suppress dissent.’

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]

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.

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

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2016	9694	21

Specimen level 3 answers

Support [93 words]

It is impossible for any government to function without the consent of the people. Dissenting minorities can do a great deal of harm to the majority by frustrating the work of government. This leads to a waste of time, energy and resources. For the good of the nation as a whole, therefore, governments need to impose their will on those who would prevent them from implementing their policies. If they do not do this, then they will be able to do nothing else. Therefore the first duty of governments is to suppress dissent.

Challenge (116 words)

One of the duties of any government is to protect the human rights of its citizens. Freedom of speech is one of those rights, and the fact that an opinion is critical of the government does not reduce the right to express it. So governments should allow people to disagree with their policies and actions.

In fact, dissent is a very valuable resource. Wise governments want to implement the best policies they can and to improve the lives of their citizens. To do this, they need a constant supply of new ideas, and inevitably those ideas begin as dissent from what is currently being done.

Therefore the first duty of governments is not to suppress dissent.