
THINKING SKILLS

9694/21

Paper 2 Critical Thinking

October/November 2017

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 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

© IGCSE is a registered trademark.

This document consists of **7** printed pages.

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|---|-------|
| 1(a)(i) | <p>She has a vested interest to protect her job [1] by portraying herself in a good light / portraying Charlie negatively / making out that she has not contravened the bullying policy [1].</p> <p>Jane's account of Charlie's reason for objecting to her is second-hand [1].</p> | 2 |
| 1(a)(ii) | <p>He was not there at the time [1], so had no ability to see what happened [1].</p> <p>He may well be biased against Jane [1], since her email made clear that she would be coming in with a tough attitude towards the staff / since she describes him as a trouble-maker in Source E [1].</p> <p>If Jane's comment in Source E is true [1], Alan has a reputation as a trouble-maker [1].</p> <p>Alan's account of Charlie's complaint about Jane is second-hand [1].</p> <p>Alan's description of Charlie's improved happiness is subjective [1].</p> | 2 |
| 1(b) | <p>This is an example of Jane's behaviour towards a resident [1]. The threat she admits making towards Charlie in the final sentence of her report [1] constitutes bullying according to Source B [1].</p> <p>Alan's report could be evidence of Jane's bullying of a resident [1], if his account is true and if Charlie's description of Jane's behaviour is fair [1].</p> <p>Source C is not relevant to bullying of staff [1].</p> | 2 |
| 1(c) | <p>(Very) badly [1]. She does not attempt to answer the allegation [1], but instead attacks the person who made it/makes counter-allegations [1]. This is an <i>ad hominem</i> argument [1].</p> | 3 |

| Question | Answer | Marks | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------|
| 1(d) | <table border="1" data-bbox="316 248 1319 813"> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 248 483 450">Level 3 5–6 marks</td> <td data-bbox="483 248 1319 450">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.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 450 483 584">Level 2 3–4 marks</td> <td data-bbox="483 450 1319 584">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.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 584 483 719">Level 1 1–2 marks</td> <td data-bbox="483 584 1319 719">A weak answer, which refers to some of the evidence, possibly including a simple evaluative comment. The conclusion may be unstated or over-stated.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 719 483 813">Level 0 0 marks</td> <td data-bbox="483 719 1319 813">No credit-worthy material.</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="300 846 558 880">Indicative content</p> <p data-bbox="300 913 692 947">The possible conclusions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="414 965 1319 1032">Jane does bully residents and staff, and Alan is right to accuse her of doing so. <li data-bbox="414 1037 1319 1104">Alan has made a false accusation against Jane, because he resents not being allowed to continue to be lazy at work. <li data-bbox="414 1108 1319 1176">The allegation arises from a genuine clash between different philosophies of care work and of management style. <p data-bbox="300 1205 783 1238">Notes for the guidance of markers</p> <p data-bbox="300 1272 1129 1305">Simple supported conclusion 1 (if no conclusion cap at Level 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="300 1339 815 1373">+ simple consideration of alternative +1 <li data-bbox="300 1377 834 1411">AND reasoned rejection of alternative +1 <li data-bbox="300 1444 1058 1478">+ explicit use of some (3 or fewer) sources of evidence +1 <li data-bbox="300 1482 1145 1516">OR explicit use of all or most (4 or more) sources of evidence +2 <li data-bbox="300 1550 1121 1583">+ critical evaluation of evidence +1 or (more than one case) +2 <li data-bbox="300 1588 1075 1621">+ good inferential reasoning +1 or (more than one case) +2 <p data-bbox="300 1641 384 1675"><i>Max 6</i></p> | 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. | 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. | | | | | | | | | |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|----------|
| 2(a) | <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>2-mark answer</i> Yes, this item is an argument. The conclusion is “Expenditure on college education is a wise long-term investment,” which is supported by three reasons (“it is re-paid several times over in increased lifetime earnings”, “There is also a correlation between education and improved health and longevity” and “People who have been to college have a reduced likelihood of suffering from various diseases which would reduce their quality of life.”). <i>Only the conclusion needs to be quoted for 2 marks.</i></p> <p><i>1-mark answer</i> This is an argument, because it includes a conclusion supported by several reasons.</p> | 2 |
| 2(b) | <p>Not very well (neither quite well nor not at all) [1]. Source B suggests some relationship between ‘satisfaction with health’ and length of education [1], but this is self-reported / not objective [1] and ‘satisfaction with health’ is not the same as ‘health’ [1]. It does not address longevity at all [1].</p> <p><i>If final point only given, do not award judgment mark.</i></p> | 3 |
| 2(c) | <p><i>For each of 2 answers: 2 marks for a developed, valid answer 1 mark for a vague, undeveloped or marginal answer</i></p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Countries that can afford to provide post-primary education to most of the population can probably also afford to give them good health care. Well-educated individuals probably earn more and therefore can afford good health care. Well-educated individuals probably earn more and therefore can afford to live in a healthier environment. Well-educated individuals are less likely to be employed in dangerous jobs and therefore less likely to suffer from industrial injuries or diseases.</p> <p><i>Other plausible answers should be credited.</i></p> | 4 |

| Question | Answer | Marks | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------|----------------------------|----------|
| 2(d) | <table border="1" data-bbox="316 248 1318 712"> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 248 483 349">Level 3 5–6 marks</td> <td data-bbox="483 248 1318 349">A reasoned argument, which uses and evaluates all or most of the evidence provided.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 349 483 450">Level 2 3–4 marks</td> <td data-bbox="483 349 1318 450">A simple argument, which uses and/or evaluates evidence.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 450 483 613">Level 1 1–2 marks</td> <td data-bbox="483 450 1318 613">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.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="316 613 483 712">Level 0 0 marks</td> <td data-bbox="483 613 1318 712">No credit-worthy material.</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="300 748 555 779">Indicative content</p> <p data-bbox="411 815 1329 1272">Source A supports the claim, by stating that college-graduates tend to have improved health and increased longevity, although the increased longevity is actually very small Source B suggests some correlation between education and health, but it does not appear actually to measure ‘health’ very well and Source B does not discuss longevity. Source C supports a link between education and improved chances of survival from a particular life-threatening medical condition, but this is probably because wealthy people or residents of wealthy countries are more likely to receive the best treatments. Source D supports the claim by identifying several significant medical conditions which are less common amongst better-educated people and by suggesting a plausible explanation for the link.</p> <p data-bbox="300 1303 783 1335">Notes for the guidance of markers</p> <p data-bbox="300 1370 703 1435">Simple supported conclusion 1 OR nuanced conclusion 2</p> <p data-bbox="300 1471 1046 1574">+ <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 data-bbox="300 1610 1118 1641">+ critical evaluation of evidence +1 or (more than one case) +2</p> <p data-bbox="300 1677 1074 1742">+ good inferential reasoning +1 or (more than one case) +2 <i>not speculation</i></p> <p data-bbox="300 1778 592 1809">+ personal thinking +1</p> <p data-bbox="300 1845 384 1877">Max 6</p> | 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 a weak argument which makes no reference to evidence. | Level 0 0 marks | No credit-worthy material. | 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 a weak argument which makes no reference to evidence. | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 0 0 marks | No credit-worthy material. | | | | | | | | | |

| Question | Answer | Marks |
|----------|--|----------|
| 3(a) | <p><i>2 marks:</i> (So the principle we should follow is actually that) we should tell the truth to anyone who has a right to it. <i>1 mark:</i> recognisable paraphrase of the above.</p> | 2 |
| 3(b) | <p><i>1 mark for each of the following, to a maximum of 3 marks:</i></p> <p>There are many reasons why people should in principle not tell lies. Even “white lies” (, told for good motives) can do more harm than good. (However,) lying is not always wrong. We are (therefore) entitled to refuse to answer such intrusive questions. (So) she [an applicant who hopes to be married or to have children] should lie.</p> <p><i>Allow one additional element or one significant omission in each case. If more than three answers are offered, mark the first four only.</i></p> | 3 |
| 3(c) | <p><i>Marks for each evaluative point as follows, up to a maximum of 5 marks:</i></p> <p><i>2 marks:</i> Valid evaluative point, clearly expressed. <i>1 mark:</i> Weak attempt at a valid evaluative point.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 1</i></p> <p>The last sentence of this paragraph is an exaggerated generalisation.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 2</i></p> <p>The second sentence relies on the assumption that you rely entirely on another person’s comments to evaluate your own work. The third sentence relies on the assumption that other people will share the husband’s opinion of the dress. The last sentence of this paragraph is a slippery slope argument / poorly supported appeal to emotion.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 3</i></p> <p>Assumption: that is always possible in practice to establish if any particular person has a right to know the truth. The first half of the final sentence begs the question / is a circular appeal to authority, since agreeing with the author on this point is apparently the criterion for being regarded as one of the “finest” moral philosophers. The second half of that sentence is an ad hominem argument.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 5</i></p> <p>The last line relies on the assumption that lying is not wrong if it does not harm anyone. This use of the word “harm” is inconsistent with the use in para 2. The two halves of this sentence are also a non sequitur.</p> | 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. | |
| | <p><i>Maximum 3 marks for wrong conclusion or if conclusion is implied but not stated.</i></p> <p><i>No credit for material merely reproduced from the passage.</i></p> <p>Specimen level 3 answers</p> <p><i>Support (104 words)</i></p> <p>People are clever at making excuses for their own bad behaviour. They can usually find a reason for making an exception in their own favour if they want to do something which appears to go against a moral rule. The only way to prevent them getting themselves into trouble is to allow no exceptions to moral rules.</p> <p>Clear and absolute moral principles also prevent disagreement and inconsistency. There is no point in having moral rules if people cannot agree on how to apply them to particular situations. So principles which include the possibility of exceptions are useless.</p> <p>Therefore moral principles should have no exceptions.</p> <p><i>Challenge (87 words)</i></p> <p>Situations requiring moral choices are often complex. Sometimes, two or more moral principles lead in opposite directions. So in such situations, it is necessary to break at least one moral principle.</p> <p>The virtuous life is based on love, not on rules. Moral rules should be used as guides to how love should work out in concrete situations, but love must be primary. So when love and a moral principle point in different directions, it would be wrong to follow the principle.</p> <p>Therefore moral principles should have exceptions.</p> | | |