
THINKING SKILLS

9694/21

Paper 2 Critical Thinking

October/November 2019

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 2019 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)	Quite badly (neither well nor not at all) [1]. The story does refer to an investigation into one member of Mr Popoff's team [1], but there is only one [1] and the issue seems minor/the staff member is junior [1]. The implication that there is widespread corruption in the Popoff Team is based on only Mr Gashi's claims [1]. There is also an assumption that the alleged infraction does indeed constitute corruption [1] and no proof that she is guilty [1].	3
1(b)	<p>The report of Mr Gashi's speech may well be accurate [1], because the newspaper has excellent ability to know what was said [1] and a motive to report it accurately [1]. On the other hand, the report of what Mr Gashi said could have been altered to cast him in a better light [1].</p> <p>It is possible that the alleged infraction is so minor that other media would not have bothered to report it [1], but Mr Gashi's newspaper had a vested interest to portray Mr Popoff negatively/make it seem as though something serious had occurred [1].</p> <p>Because the newspaper is owned by Mr Gashi, it is likely to be biased in his favour [1], and so may have exaggerated the size and enthusiasm of the audience [1]; this may also be why it fails to cast any doubt on Mr Gashi's allegations [1].</p>	4
1(c)	<p><i>2 marks for an accurate version of any of the following</i> <i>1 mark for a vague or unclear version (e.g. 'no evidence').</i></p> <p>Mr Gashi may not have any evidence against Mr Popoff.</p> <p>Mr Gashi knows that a case against Mr Popoff would not result in a conviction.</p> <p>Mr Gashi knows that the allegations against Mr Popoff were false</p> <p>Mr Gashi made the accusation only in order to win the election and there was no point in pursuing it once he had achieved this goal.</p> <p>Mr Gashi may fear a counter-campaign against himself.</p>	2

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>Indicative content</p> <p>The possible conclusions are:</p> <p>All politicians in Eastland, including Mr Popoff, are corrupt and Mr Gashi is looking forward to getting his own snout in the trough.</p> <p>Mr Popoff is thoroughly corrupt and Mr Gashi really does have a dossier of evidence to prove his guilt.</p> <p>One member of Mr Popoff’s team is corrupt, but Mr Popoff was not involved in the corruption and knew nothing about it.</p> <p>One member of Mr Popoff’s team committed a technical offence against the very strict electoral laws, but neither she nor Mr Popoff can reasonably be described as corrupt.</p> <p>Mr Popoff and his team are innocent of corruption and the allegation against a member of the team is unfounded/malicious/made by Mr Gashi.</p> <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 (1 or 2) sources of evidence +1 OR explicit use of all or most (3 or 4) 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)(i)	Because girls tend to mature earlier than boys [1], A level grades are not an accurate guide to their relative potential [1]. Setting lower entry requirements for boys would represent potential more accurately [1].	2
2(a)(ii)	<p><i>2 marks for accurate version of any of the following</i> <i>1 mark for incomplete or vague version</i></p> <p>More places at medical school should be created. Measures should be taken to counter the reasons why female doctors prefer part-time work/avoid shortage specialisms, e.g. better child care. Doctors should not be allowed to work part-time. Female doctors should be offered inducements to encourage them to work in shortage specialisms.</p>	2
2(b)	<p>The patients in the research programme were all aged 65 or over [1]. The outcomes of medical conditions suffered by younger patients might not be affected by the gender of the doctor [1]. Only two criteria are mentioned [1], which may not be the only criteria by which one might judge how good a doctor is [1]; for example, the likelihood of making a full recovery [1].</p>	2
2(c)	<p>To some extent (neither well nor badly)/it is consistent with the claims without supporting them [1]. It does show that amongst young doctors there are more female than male [1] and that more female than male doctors are registered in general practice [1], but there is no information about how many female doctors work part-time [1] or which specialisms female hospital doctors follow [1]. Also, the gender difference for General Practice doesn't seem to be as large as Source C suggests it might be [1]. Since the graph presumably represents all the doctors working in the country, including those who trained elsewhere, the relevance of the diagram is reduced still further [1]. <i>Maximum 2 marks if only one side covered.</i></p>	3

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> <p>The increase in the number and proportion of female doctors is documented in Source A.</p> <p>The fact that according to Source A female hospital doctors tend to specialise in obstetrics/gynaecology or paediatrics is probably welcomed by patients.</p> <p>The data in Source D suggest that at least in one country if current trends continue female doctors will come to out-number males, but does not suggest whether this will be a good or a bad thing.</p> <p>The author of Source C may be biased, because he is a man, but he does give some concrete reasons why the increase of female doctors may have disadvantages.</p> <p>Source B gives evidence that the increase in female doctors might be a good thing, at least in relation to elderly patients in a hospital setting, and the suggested explanations (if true) could be good for all age-groups and settings.</p> <p>Notes for the guidance of markers</p> <p>Simple supported conclusion 1 or nuanced conclusion 2 (if no conclusion cap at Level 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 summarizing 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)	<i>2 marks:</i> The true purpose of education is to give students a vision of what adulthood can be. <i>1 mark:</i> Paraphrase or incomplete version of the above.	2
3(b)	<i>1 mark for each of the following, to a maximum of 3 marks:</i> What they learned from their teacher as a person has proved to be of the greatest value. (So) imparting that knowledge cannot be the purpose of education. (Furthermore,) nearly everything we are taught in school is wrong. This instrumental approach to education is self-defeating. This is young people's greatest need. <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>	3

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	<p><i>Marks for each evaluative point as follows, up to a maximum of 5 marks:</i> 2 marks: <i>Valid evaluative point, clearly expressed.</i> 1 mark: <i>Weak attempt at a valid evaluative point.</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 1</i> <i>Assumption:</i> that knowledge which a person does not remember in adulthood is relatively unimportant. <i>Restriction of options:</i> that the only things one can learn from a teacher are facts or personal qualities.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 2</i> <i>Overdrawn IC:</i> The general claim in the second clause must be based on certain subjects/ages only so only weakly supports the IC. <i>Begging the question/circular reasoning:</i> The description of the knowledge gained in childhood as ‘irrelevant’ is accurate only if you accept the reasoning in this paragraph. <i>Conflation:</i> between knowledge in the first line and information in the third line. <i>Assumption:</i> what is not needed in adulthood was not needed in the past.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 3</i> <i>Rash generalisation:</i> The claim that ‘nearly everything we are taught in school is wrong’ must be based on certain subjects only. <i>Assumption:</i> that all ‘teachers and the authors of textbooks’ are aged about 50 (<i>i.e.</i> were at university thirty years ago). <i>Equivocation/exaggeration:</i> The true claim about knowledge evolving over time is interpreted as if it referred to every item which students may learn. <i>Inconsistency:</i> The last sentence claims that students at university have to unlearn <i>everything</i> they learned at school, while the first sentence claims only that <i>nearly everything</i> learned at school is wrong.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 4</i> <i>Overdrawn IC:</i> The reasonable observation that some students regard education as a period of preparation is insufficient evidence to prove that they take the same attitude to ‘any stage of life’.</p> <p><i>Paragraph 5</i> <i>Assumption:</i> That education should cater for young people’s greatest need. <i>Assumption:</i> That it is not worthwhile acquiring knowledge or skills which will last for less than a lifetime.</p>	5

Question	Answer	Marks								
3(d)	<table border="1" data-bbox="292 248 1316 741"> <tr> <td data-bbox="292 248 459 443">Level 3 4–5 marks</td> <td data-bbox="459 248 1316 443">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="292 443 459 544">Level 2 2–3 marks</td> <td data-bbox="459 443 1316 544">A simple argument. One reason + conclusion – 2 marks. Two or more separate reasons + conclusion – 3 marks.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="292 544 459 645">Level 1 1 mark</td> <td data-bbox="459 544 1316 645">Some relevant comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="292 645 459 741">Level 0 0 marks</td> <td data-bbox="459 645 1316 741">No relevant comment.</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="292 779 1249 842"><i>Maximum 3 marks for wrong conclusion or if conclusion is implied but not stated.</i></p> <p data-bbox="292 846 1062 878"><i>No credit for material merely reproduced from the passage.</i></p> <p data-bbox="292 913 657 945">Specimen level 3 answers</p> <p data-bbox="292 981 544 1012"><i>Support (94 words)</i></p> <p data-bbox="292 1016 1316 1111">People in their 20s are still discovering adulthood themselves. So they do not yet have enough experience of life to equip them to guide children into the adult world.</p> <p data-bbox="292 1146 1316 1281">Teachers in the same age-group as the parents or grandparents of students are ideally placed to guide teenagers. They are old enough to be sources of authority, but young people find it less embarrassing to discuss serious issues with them than it would be to talk to a member of their family.</p> <p data-bbox="292 1317 1265 1348">Therefore only people over the age of 30 should be employed as teachers.</p> <p data-bbox="292 1384 592 1415"><i>Challenge (117 words)</i></p> <p data-bbox="292 1420 1316 1581">Because of the rapid social changes which have occurred in recent decades, adults over the age of 30 have little idea of the issues and pressures affecting teenagers today. By contrast, the experience of younger adults enables them to meet teenagers on shared ground. So people under the age of 30 are better equipped to guide students into adulthood.</p> <p data-bbox="292 1617 1316 1751">Young people need role models. It is unrealistic to expect them to identify with adults of a similar age to their parents or even grandparents. So teachers in their 20s can play a vital part in helping their students make the transition to adulthood.</p> <p data-bbox="292 1787 1316 1818">Therefore not only people over the age of 30 should be employed as teachers.</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.									