

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

## **MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2014 series**

### **9694 THINKING SKILLS**

**9694/21**

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 October/November 2014 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 – October/November 2014	9694	21

- 1 (a) How useful is Source B in deciding whether Mr Perez was injured deliberately or by accident? Justify your answer. [3]

Of little or no use [1]. There is no suggestion that the game would not be played fairly: the question is whether two players intended to injure a teacher [1]. Even if two players had conspired to injure Mr Perez, the team captain would not necessarily have known [1]. Even if the team captain had known of a conspiracy to injure Mr Perez, he probably would not have admitted it [1].

- (b) How significant would it be if the two boys who injured Mr Perez were not the ones mentioned in Source A? [2]

It would make it **less** likely that he was injured deliberately [1], but would not make it **unlikely** [1].

- (c) How reliable is the Deputy Headteacher's claim in Source C that two players in the school team had deliberately injured Mr Perez? [4]

He has a vested interest to prove to the Headteacher that he was right in his original allegation/bias against the boys/predisposition to interpret events in the light of what he had been told [1], and he admits that he did not see exactly what happened [1]. Since he is not a PE specialist, he probably lacks the expertise to judge on the matter [1], but not necessarily [1].

However, he was present and therefore had fairly good ability to see [1]. The fact that he distinguishes carefully between what he did and did not see adds to his reliability [1]. His admission that Mr Perez did not agree with him increases his reliability [1]. The allegation is plausible in the light of the Deputy Head's warning in Source A and Mr Perez's unpopularity with senior students [1].

*No mark for judgment.*

*Maximum 3 marks if only one side covered.*

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9694	21

- (d) How do you think Mr Perez was injured? 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**

- It is plausible that the two boys did injure Mr Perez deliberately.
- It could have been an unintended consequence of participating in a rough game involving physical contact,
- or conceivably somewhere between these two extremes (i.e., playing more violently than usual towards a particular opponent, but not a premeditated attack).

That the injury was deliberate is especially likely **if** they were also the two boys who according to Source A had allegedly told fellow-students previously that they were planning to injure him. However, there is not enough evidence to prove that the injury was not an accident.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9694	21

- 2 (a) The professor in Source A claims that sleeping too little causes health problems. Suggest two alternative explanations for the evidence given in Source A. [4]

*2 marks for each clear, valid answer. 1 mark for each vague, incomplete or marginal answer. 2 answers required.*

*2-mark answers*

Some health problems compromise the patient's ability to sleep.

The stressful lifestyle described by the professor may cause **both** the sleeplessness and the health problems.

*1-mark answers*

The sleeplessness and the health problems may be coincidental.

Correlation does not necessarily imply causation.

The post hoc fallacy.

- (b) Is Source C an argument? Briefly justify your answer. [2]

*2 marks for a correct answer with accurate explanation.*

*1 mark for a correct answer with vague, incomplete or generic explanation.*

*0 marks for correct answer without explanation.*

*0 marks for incorrect answer with or without explanation.*

*2-mark answer*

Source C is not an argument. It reports evidence resulting from research, but does not draw a persuasive conclusion from it.

*1-mark answers*

Source C is not an argument, because it does not include a persuasive conclusion.

Source C is not an argument. It reports evidence resulting from research.

- (c) How effectively does the comment from Dr Neil Stanley in Source D challenge the claims in Source C? Justify your answer. [3]

Not at all effectively [1]. The fact that many people who sleep for less time than average are obese is quite compatible with the fact that some of them are of normal size – or even smaller than average [1]. Source C does not deny that “Not everybody needs a lot of sleep” [1]. The number of examples quoted is too small to challenge the claims effectively [1]. It is not clear whether the example of Winston Churchill supports or challenges the claim that people who sleep for less time than average are more likely to be obese [1].

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9694	21

(d) 'We should all sleep more, in order to live longer.'

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]

<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**

- Source A does claim that **some** people would have a longer life-expectancy if they slept more,
- and Source B supports the claim that people who sleep significantly less than 7 hours have reduced life-expectancy,
- although it is far from clear how the relative risks were calculated
- and the results show that it makes little difference whether you sleep for 6, 7 or 8 hours.
- Sources A and/or B also show that sleeping more than the average is associated with poor health
- (although not necessarily as cause and effect).
- Source C gives a possible explanation to support this link between low amounts of sleep and increased risk of death,
- on the assumption that obesity is linked to reduced life expectancy.
- But Source D shows that this does not apply to everyone.

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

2 marks: (but in fact) organisations of all kinds should prioritise public relations and advertising.

1 mark: Some people think that employing people to work in public relations or advertising is a waste of money, but in fact organisations of all kinds should prioritise public relations and advertising.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9694	21

**(b) Using the exact words from the passage as far as possible, identify three reasons used to support the main conclusion. [3]**

- The most effective investment which manufacturers can make is to advertise more.
- They should just spend money on advertising.
- It [publicity] is (therefore) the first concern of all politicians.
- (So) police forces should reduce the number of police officers and concentrate their efforts on public relations.

**(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*

- The conclusion is a generalisation. The sub-arguments are actually examples. However, it could be argued that these examples are comprehensive enough to support the generalising conclusion quite well.

*Paragraph 2*

- Assumption: that the principal task of manufacturing is to make money rather than to produce goods which meet a need.
- Assumption: that the product is already satisfactory.
- Restricting the options: there are other possible ways of investing money, apart from advertising and improving the product (e.g. lowering the price).

*Paragraph 3*

- Assumption: that potential clients are more likely to hear from advertisers than personal recommendation.

*Paragraph 4*

- Begins with an *ad hominem* attack on “impractical idealists”.
- Confuses the means of politics (winning an election) with the end.

*Paragraph 5*

- The argument depends crucially on the claim “public safety is a state of mind”, but this claim is controversial and extreme.
- *Allow (1 mark only)* Assumption: that conviction rates will be high and crime rates will be low.
- Assumption: that benefits gained by employing one public relations officer can be extrapolated to larger numbers.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2014	9694	21

(d) 'Advertising should be controlled by law.'

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 [97 words]*

There is an imbalance of power between advertisers and the public. Since protecting the public is the core task of governments, they have a duty to protect people from being misled by the claims of advertisers.

The only people who are disadvantaged by controls on advertising are companies which wish to trick people into buying goods or services which are not what they claim to be. Companies of this kind do not deserve to be protected, and there is therefore no good reason to allow dishonest advertising to take place.

Therefore advertising should be controlled by law.

*Challenge [94 words]*

Sane adults have the right to make their own choices and to spend their money however they think fit. Because controls would restrict the information made available to them, they would compromise their freedom of choice.

Controls on advertising impose a further burden on manufacturers and retailers, who are already hampered by laws regarding safety at work, employment rights and a host of other topics. It is the duty of governments to promote economic growth. So they should remove as many of these restrictions as possible.

Therefore advertising should not be controlled by law.