
THINKING SKILLS

9694/21

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) | (Very) reliable [1]. The World Bank has a good reputation [1]. The World Bank and its investigators are not biased/do not have vested interest [1]. The investigators have relevant expertise [1] and sufficient ability to see [1]. Their findings are plausible in the light of / are corroborated by the information about corruption in Markovia in Source A [1]. They are unlikely to lie about their findings, because their claims can easily be verified [1]. | 3 |
| 1(b) | <p><i>For each of two answers: 2 marks for a valid, complete answer 1 mark for a vague, incomplete or marginal answer.</i></p> <p>If he and/or his family or friends were involved in the corruption, he may have wished to control the investigation in order to protect them from prosecution/from being expected to repay any money. He may have wanted to hide evidence of corruption in order to protect the reputation of his country and of himself as its leader. Since a large sum of money was given to finance the investigation, he may have wished to acquire part of that money for himself. He may have wanted to create a good impression of his opposition to corruption in order to increase his chances of being re-elected. He may have wanted to prosecute some innocent scapegoats, to create the impression that corruption has been dealt with so that he could continue being corrupt in peace / to suppress some political opponents.</p> | 4 |
| 1(c) | <p><i>2 marks for a valid, complete answer 1 mark for a vague, incomplete or marginal answer.</i></p> <p>If improved policing or judicial processes or the work of the Anti-Corruption Commission is bringing more corruption to light / increasing the conviction rate (rather than corruption increasing). If publicity about the increased number of cases will deter potentially corrupt people and thereby eventually reduce the amount of corruption.</p> | 2 |

| Question | Answer | | Marks | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| 1(d) | <table border="1" data-bbox="320 248 1310 846"> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 248 512 450">Level 3 5–6 marks</td> <td data-bbox="512 248 1310 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="320 450 512 613">Level 2 3–4 marks</td> <td data-bbox="512 450 1310 613">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="320 613 512 748">Level 1 1–2 marks</td> <td data-bbox="512 613 1310 748">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="320 748 512 846">Level 0 0 marks</td> <td data-bbox="512 748 1310 846">No credit-worthy material.</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="320 882 1310 1055">The possibilities are: Corruption was never a serious problem in Markovia. Corruption remains a serious problem in Markovia. Corruption used to be a serious problem in Markovia, but the government is succeeding in reducing it.</p> <p data-bbox="320 1090 1310 1122">The second of these may be the most likely.</p> <p data-bbox="320 1158 1310 1189">Indicative content</p> <p data-bbox="320 1225 1310 1984">Source A describes how the political and social structures of Markovia provide opportunities for corruption. In particular, it shows that political power is a way of acquiring personal property and wealth. The fact that little progress has been made in improving the water supplies in the capital city (Source B) is consistent with misappropriation of funds. The paucity of evidence reported in Source B could imply that money has been misappropriated, but it could be due to poor record-keeping. If Source C is taken at face value, it shows that the Prime Minister is determined to eradicate corruption from Markovia, but the fact that the Prime Minister has personally taken charge of the Anti-Corruption Commission may suggest he is determined to protect himself and his family and friends from being shown to be corrupt. The evidence of the other sources makes it highly probable that the report of the Anti-Corruption Commission announced in Source D is a 'whitewash'. The increase in the number of convictions for corruption announced in Source E is probably an indication of improvement, unless these cases are a way for the Prime Minister to consolidate his power and wealth by neutralising political/commercial opponents.</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 |
|----------|---|-------|
| 1(d) | <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) | <p>People who have those skills may enjoy the games more [1], and therefore spend more time playing them [1]. Playing video games may reduce stress [1] and thereby improve performance in the tests [1]. It may be that a third factor is responsible for some people being both inclined to play video games and equipped to perform well in the tests [1]; for example, a certain personality trait [1].</p> <p><i>1 mark for answers which rely on coincidence. 0 marks for answers which suggest causes of skill <u>only</u>, with no reference to time spent playing video games.</i></p> | 2 |
| 2(b) | <p><i>For each of two answers: 2 marks for a valid, complete answer 1 mark for a vague, incomplete or marginal answer.</i></p> <p>*The improvement observed refers to performance on the game only [1], and cannot necessarily be applied to other skills [1]. Even if the improvement does relate to a wider range of mental skills [1], *it does not necessarily indicate that the brain has been 'regenerated' [1]. *These elements can be combined to constitute a 2-mark answer. People who practice a game do get better at it [1]; so the improvement at the game does not necessarily indicate any kind of mental improvement [1] The improvement could only be temporary [1], in which case it would not be evidence that the brain had been regenerated [1]. There is no information about how much practice at the game the 'much younger players' had had [1], so the comparison is not meaningful [1]. Older people are likely to have driving experience [1], which may be the reason why they perform better in the game than younger people [1].</p> <p><i>1 mark: The claim that brains are being regenerated is weakly supported.</i></p> | 4 |

| Question | Answer | Marks | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|---|-----------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------|----------------------------|---|
| 2(c) | <p><i>1 mark each for up to three of the following:</i></p> <p>The evidence refers to inexperienced surgeons only. The evidence is based on certain kinds of video game only. The improvement refers to performance on the simulator, not actual surgery. The experiment refers to only one kind of surgery ('keyhole').</p> | 3 | | | | | | | | |
| 2(d) | <table border="1" data-bbox="320 510 1308 1003"> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 510 512 607">Level 3 5–6 marks</td> <td data-bbox="512 510 1308 607">A reasoned argument, which uses and evaluates all or most of the evidence provided.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 607 512 703">Level 2 3–4 marks</td> <td data-bbox="512 607 1308 703">A simple argument, which uses and/or evaluates evidence.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 703 512 904">Level 1 1–2 marks</td> <td data-bbox="512 703 1308 904">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="320 904 512 1003">Level 0 0 marks</td> <td data-bbox="512 904 1308 1003">No credit-worthy material.</td> </tr> </table> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Source A suggests that there is some cognitive benefit in playing some video games, but only some games and only some skills. Source B suggests that elderly people can improve their performance on certain tasks with practice, but there is no evidence that this improvement can be transferred to more useful skills. Source C suggests that playing video games may have dangers, but this claim may be biased/part of a general attack on modern culture. Source D gives a specific case of skills required in adult life which can be developed by playing video games, but this applies to only a small and very specialised category of people.</p> <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> | 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> The scope of Health & Safety protection needs to be extended more widely.</p> <p><i>1 mark: Recognisable paraphrase or significantly incomplete version of the above.</i></p> | 2 |
| 3(b) | <p><i>1 mark for each of the following, to a maximum of 3 marks:</i></p> <p>Raising awareness of Health & Safety outside work settings will have similar benefits.</p> <p>So all householders should be required by law to conduct a risk assessment of their homes.</p> <p>The requirement to undertake risk assessments should be extended to all activities (involving groups or individuals).</p> <p>Every home should also have someone qualified in First Aid.</p> <p>they [parents] should be forced to do so [have detailed policies on health and safety and be trained in what to do in an emergency].</p> <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> <p>Causal flaw: there are other possible causes of the improvements in workplace safety, apart from H&S regulation. <i>This point can alternatively be expressed as an assumption.</i></p> <p>Equivocation: the final sentence moves illegitimately from ‘healthy and safe’ (in the everyday sense) to ‘Health & Safety’ (referring to programmes of regulation). <i>(This point can alternatively be expressed as an assumption.)</i></p> <p>Conflation: between ‘raising awareness’ in para 1 and requiring by law elsewhere in the argument.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 2</i></p> <p>Assumption: the reasoning in this paragraph relies on the assumption that private citizens have a duty not to endanger themselves and their families, analogous to the duty of employers towards their workers.</p> <p>Assumption: that homes are comparably dangerous to workplaces.</p> <p>Restriction of options: there are intermediate policies between abolishing Health & Safety in workplaces and applying it by law to the home.</p> <p><i>Non-sequitur</i>: just because we would not ‘want to go back to the bad old days’ in the workplace, it does not follow that we should introduce H&S at home.</p> <p>Appeal to emotion: the reference to workers risking their lives is exaggerated.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 3</i></p> <p>Conflation/Assumption: the reasoning in this paragraph relies on the assumption that lacking a risk assessment and being unprotected are equivalent. <i>(Likely to be expressed in various ways – including absurdity of risk assessments for ‘all activities involving individuals’.)</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 4</i></p> <p>Assumption: this section of the reasoning relies on the implausible assumption that it is necessary to be ‘qualified in First Aid’ in order to apply a sticking plaster or give someone an aspirin.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 5</i></p> <p>Emotive language: the expression ‘take the trouble’ gives the unrealistic impression that parents who do not have detailed policies on health and safety and are not trained in what to do in an emergency are being irresponsible and lazy.</p> <p>Assumption: that formal policies and training are needed to protect children from harm.</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 (122 words)</i></p> <p>Many years ago, most employers regarded profit as the sole aim of their business, and their workers as morally equivalent to physical raw materials. But workers have the same moral status as those who employ them. So employers should treat their workers as ‘persons’, with their own legitimate goals and interests. They should ensure that workers have opportunities to pursue those interests, for example by providing sports clubs and time off to attend competitive events. Policies of this kind also benefit the employers indirectly, since healthy, happy workers are more committed to the success of their labours than those who work under compulsion or feel they are being exploited. Therefore employers’ duty of care for their workers should extend beyond the workplace.</p> <p><i>Challenge (136 words)</i></p> <p>It may seem a good thing that in days gone by a few enlightened employers built model villages for their workers and provided institutions such as schools and libraries for their welfare. Yet the underlying convictions which motivated those company owners were based on inequality. We now realise that all persons are born equal. So workers should not be under the power of their employers, whether that power is exercised kindly or exploitatively. Workers are not children, and therefore they do not need wiser people to make decisions on their behalf. The only obligation of employers is to pay their workers a fair wage. The workers themselves are capable of choosing how to spend it, and must be allowed to do so. Therefore employers’ duty of care for their workers should not extend beyond the workplace.</p> | | |