

**MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2011 question paper  
for the guidance of teachers**

**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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2011 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9694

1 (a) How reliable is Dr Gould's evidence (Source B)? Justify your answer.

*Credit up to three of the following points:*

**Reliable:**

Dr Gould's long friendship with Henry Burns means he is in a very good position to know about his character (good ability to see) [1].

He has a vested interest to speak the truth, because if he were caught actually lying he might lose his job [1].

**Unreliable:**

Dr Gould has a vested interest to misrepresent the truth in favour of Henry Burns, because he is a close friend and colleague [1].

He also has a vested interest to misrepresent the truth because he does not want to endanger the Government or his own job [1].

He is unlikely to have been present at any of the events which have been alleged (poor ability to see) [1].

Overall, therefore, Dr Gould is probably bending the truth as far as he can in favour of Henry Burns without actually lying [1]; his evidence is somewhat/not very reliable [1].

*Maximum 2 if only one side considered.*

*Award 1 mark for judgment if judgments for both sides are included, even if there is no summative judgment.*

(b) How useful is Flora Nosworth's evidence (Sources C and D)? Justify your answer. [3]

*Credit up to three of the following points:*

**Useful:**

Since she took the call, FN has good ability to know what was said [1].

FN's evidence corroborates the claims made in Source A [1].

FN's evidence states that allegations of bullying have been made against the PM [1], but not whether they were true or not [1].

**Not useful:**

Since this item appeared on the website after Source A was published, it could have been based on that report [1].

She does not give any details of the allegations [1].

The fact that the helpline is confidential means that there is no way of proving whether FN is telling the truth or not [1].

Even if someone claiming to be a member of the PM's staff has telephoned the helpline, there is no proof that they really are who they claim to be [1].

Since the definition of bullying used by the helpline is entirely subjective, the claim may say more about the complainant's personality or mental state than about what actually happened [1].

Overall, therefore, the evidence is of some use, but not much (neither decisive nor trivial) [1].

*Maximum 2 if only one side considered.*

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9694

- (c) How reasonable is Hilary Askam's claim that "anyone who is being bullied should not contact this helpline, because there is a real danger that their identities will be revealed" (Source D)?

*Credit up to three of the following points:*

**Reasonable:**

The information which has been divulged does constitute a breach of confidentiality [1], and it would probably not be too hard to discover the identities of the complainants [1].

**Unreasonable:**

The actual names of the complainants in this case have not been revealed [1]. There is no reason to believe that FN would be similarly indiscreet in cases of less public interest [1].

Overall, therefore, Hilary Askam has identified a real issue, but has over-stated it [1].

*Maximum 2 if only one side considered.*

- (d) How likely is it that Henry Burns has bullied members of his staff? Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, with critical reference to the evidence provided and considering plausible alternative scenarios. [6]

<b>Level 3</b> 5–6 marks	A strong answer, which provides a reasoned argument including thorough evaluation of the evidence to support an acceptable conclusion in terms of probability and evaluates the plausibility of at least one different possible course of events.
<b>Level 2</b> 3–4 marks	A reasonable answer, which evaluates the evidence, draws an acceptable conclusion in terms of probability and may mention the plausibility of at least one different course of events.
<b>Level 1</b> 1–2 marks	A weak answer, which refers to 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.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9694

**Indicative content**

- It is likely that Henry Burns has engaged in behaviour which can at least be interpreted as bullying, although he may genuinely not have interpreted it in that way himself. The accusation that he threw dangerous objects and the admission that he threw a newspaper could represent different perspectives on the same incident(s), being over- and under-stated respectively.
- However, it is possible that he really has behaved very badly and some people are attempting to cover it up or that the allegations are entirely malicious and untrue.
- The tone of Source A suggests that The Daily News or its proprietor is opposed to the Government, in which case it has probably made the most of the allegations, and may even have invented them.
- Flora Nosworth's claim that at least one person claiming to be a member of the PM's staff had telephoned the helpline is likely to be true, unless – as Hilary Askam alleges – she has personal or political animosity towards the Prime Minister which has caused her to invent false accusations against him. Her claim is corroborated by Source A, but the corroboration is weak since she had read that report before making her own claim. There was presumably no way of verifying the identity of the callers.
- Hilary Askam's statement focuses on the breach of confidentiality, not on the truth of the allegations. This may imply that the PM is unable to deny the charges.

- 2 (a) **According to the evidence presented in Source A, how reasonable is the claim that humans are “the biggest cause of extinctions”?** [3]

*Credit up to three of the following points:*

The article states that there is a correlation between extinctions and the growth of population and wealth [1], by which it is probably seeking to imply a causal relationship [1]. Although it is quite plausible that the correlation does have a causal basis [1], nothing in this document proves it [1].

So overall, the title is relevant to the intention and contents of the article, but overstates its conclusion [1].

- (b) **How well does Source B support its claim that “By 2022, 22% of all species will be extinct if no action is taken”?** [3]

*Credit up to three of the following points:*

The prediction is based on the assumption that current rates of extinction will continue to rise at the same rate as at present [1]; the trend is scarcely credible, since it appears that if the graph were to be extended beyond 2022, all species would be extinct very soon [1]. The prediction is not based on a direct measurement of extinctions, but on a calculation derived from measurement of habitat loss [1]. However, an approximate correlation between habitat loss and extinctions is plausible [1]. The last sentence of the article shows that estimates of the number of species and extinction rates are entirely hypothetical. [1]. The overall support for the claim is poor [1].

It is not necessary for candidates to refer to Sources A or C to answer this question, but valid points based on either of them should be credited.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9694

(c) 'Extinction is part of the constant evolution of life.'

To what extent does this statement contradict the claim of Source D that the world is "in the midst of an irreversible large-scale extinction of species"?

Credit up to three of the following points:

The statement does not contradict this claim [1], although it does reduce its impact to some extent [1]. Source D recognises that a rhythm of species development and extinction has always been part of life [1], but it claims that the rate of extinction is currently much higher than in previous eras [1] because of the influence of humans [1] and that it is "irreversible" [1].

(d) 'Urgent action is required to prevent an irreversible large-scale extinction of species.'

Write a short, reasoned argument to support or challenge this claim, using and evaluating the information provided in Sources A – D. [6]

<b>Level 3</b> 5–6 marks	A strong, reasoned argument, which uses and evaluates all or most of the evidence provided.
<b>Level 2</b> 3–4 marks	A reasonable, simple argument, which uses and/or evaluates evidence.
<b>Level 1</b> 1–2 marks	A weak answer, which makes some reference to evidence but consists of opinion and/or assertion rather than argument <b>or</b> an argument which makes no reference to evidence.
<b>Level 0</b> 0 marks	No credit-worthy material.

*Indicative content*

- The rate of extinctions seems to be high, but probably not as high as the documents would have us believe.
- The global rate of extinction referred to in Source C is doubly hypothetical, extrapolating from a much smaller number (869 extinctions since 1500).
- If a lot of those extinctions consist of plants, fungi and insects (as implied by Source D), and if a high proportion are of species which have not yet been observed, described or identified (as Sources B, C and D admit), then arguably they will not be much loss. Alternatively, it may be argued that all species are equally valuable and that their value is independent of human observation.
- Source D cites only the highest figure estimated by the IUCN, rather than a more moderate figure. No reasons are given as to why the rates of extinction should have "almost certainly increased" since 2004.
- Some of the causes of extinction identified in Source D are beyond human control, although we could in principle reduce the destruction of habitats and global warming.
- All the sources seek to persuade the reader that a large number of species are in danger of becoming extinct, but none of them gives reasons why anyone should do anything about it.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2011	9694

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

2 marks: This view [The view that a right to health is one of the fundamental human rights] seriously mistaken.

1 mark: recognizable paraphrase of the above.

1 mark: It is very widely accepted that a right to health is one of the fundamental human rights, but this view is seriously mistaken.

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

- It is impossible for us to have a duty to preserve health.
- A right to health would claim too much.
- They [all the kinds of welfare provision that support health] are too diverse to be brought together as a single entitlement.
- That [the UNIC's definition of the right to health] is ridiculous.
- They [governments] do not infringe anyone's rights when they limit their spending on health.

(c) Evaluate the reasoning in the argument. In your answer you should consider any strengths, weaknesses, flaws and unstated assumptions. [5]

<b>Level 3</b> 4–5 marks	Evaluation of strength of argument with critical reference to strength/weakness, including some of: flaws, support given by reasons to intermediate conclusions, use of evidence, inconsistency, analogies, assumptions.
<b>Level 2</b> 2–3 marks	Relevant extended counter-argument (3 marks). Specific counter-assertions/agreements (2 marks) Single point of evaluation <b>only</b> (2 or 3 marks)
<b>Level 1</b> 1 mark	Discussion of the topic without specific reference to the passage <b>or</b> general counter-assertion/agreement <b>or</b> weak attempt at evaluation.
<b>Level 0</b> 0 marks	No relevant comments. Summary/paraphrase of the passage.

*Indicative content*

- The example in para 1 effectively illustrates the point being made.
- The argument in para 1 depends on the controversial assumption that rights exist only where some specific person or institution has a corresponding duty.
- The argument in para 1 also depends on the assumption that it is impossible for anyone to have a duty to do something which they are not capable of doing ("ought implies can"), but this is not controversial.
- The argument in para 2 is probably based on a straw person – the right to health which the UN and others allege probably refers to major, long-term, disabling diseases, not minor temporary afflictions such as colds.
- The argument in para 3 depends on the assumption that diverse goods cannot be the object of a human right, but no argument is offered to support this assumption.
- The examples given at the end of para 4 strengthen the claim that governments have many calls on them which are not obviously inferior to the support of health.

(d) 'The first priority of any government should be preserving the health of its citizens.'

Write your own short argument to support or challenge this claim. The conclusion of your argument must be stated.

<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 & c 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 if conclusion is implied but not stated.*

*Maximum 3 marks if argued to wrong conclusion.*

*No credit for material merely reproduced from the passage.*

*Indicative content (specimen 5-mark answer)*

It can scarcely be doubted that preserving the health of its citizens is an important task of government, within the limits of the resources available. However, it should not necessarily be their first priority.

Philosophers such as Thomas Hobbes and John Locke have argued that the most basic duty of a government is to provide security. It protects against internal threats by providing a police force and against external enemies by means of an army. Governments which fail to protect their citizens in these ways have lost validity. Health therefore cannot be the first priority of a government, since security is.

It can also be argued that education is even more important than health, because whereas health is temporary, the benefits of education are long-term. Governments often have to make hard choices between competing calls on their resources, and in doing so they should take the long view. Providing primary education to all of their citizens and opportunities for higher education to those who can benefit from it should be a core strategy.

Important though it is, therefore, preserving the health of its citizens should not be any government's first priority.