Cambridge International AS & A Level

Cambridge Assessment International Education
Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

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.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)(i)	• 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]**. • Jane's account of Charlie's reason for objecting to her is second-hand **[1]**.	**2**
1(a)(ii)	• He was not there at the time **[1]**, so had no ability to see what happened **[1]**. • 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]**. • If Jane's comment in Source E is true **[1]**, Alan has a reputation as a trouble-maker **[1]**. • Alan's account of Charlie's complaint about Jane is second-hand **[1]**. • Alan's description of Charlie's improved happiness is subjective **[1]**.	**2**
1(b)	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]**. 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]**. Source C is not relevant to bullying of staff **[1]**.	**2**
1(c)	(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 *ad hominem* argument **[1]**.	**3**

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)		**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.

Indicative content

The possible conclusions are:

- Jane does bully residents and staff, and Alan is right to accuse her of doing so.
- Alan has made a false accusation against Jane, because he resents not being allowed to continue to be lazy at work.
- The allegation arises from a genuine clash between different philosophies of care work and of management style.

Notes for the guidance of markers

Simple supported conclusion 1 (if no conclusion cap at Level 2)

+ simple consideration of alternative +1
AND reasoned rejection of alternative +1

+ 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

+ critical evaluation of evidence +1 or (more than one case) +2
+ good inferential reasoning +1 or (more than one case) +2

Max 6

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	*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.* *2-mark answer* 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."). *Only the conclusion needs to be quoted for 2 marks.* *1-mark answer* This is an argument, because it includes a conclusion supported by several reasons.	**2**
2(b)	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]**. *If final point only given, do not award judgment mark.*	**3**
2(c)	*For each of 2 answers:* *2 marks for a developed, valid answer* *1 mark for a vague, undeveloped or marginal answer* ***Indicative content*** • 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. *Other plausible answers should be credited.*	**4**

Question	Answer	Marks
2(d)		**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.

Indicative content

- 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.

Notes for the guidance of markers

Simple supported conclusion 1
OR nuanced conclusion 2

+ use of 1 or 2 sources +1
OR use of all or most (3 or more) sources of evidence +2
not just mentioning or summarising or comprehension

+ critical evaluation of evidence +1 or (more than one case) +2

+ good inferential reasoning +1 or (more than one case) +2
not speculation

+ personal thinking +1

Max 6

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	*2 marks:* (So the principle we should follow is actually that) we should tell the truth to anyone who has a right to it. *1 mark: recognisable paraphrase of the above.*	**2**
3(b)	*1 mark for each of the following, to a maximum of 3 marks:* • 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. *Allow one additional element or one significant omission in each case.* *If more than three answers are offered, mark the first four only.*	**3**
3(c)	*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 last sentence of this paragraph is an exaggerated generalisation. *Paragraph 2* • 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. *Paragraph 3* • 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. *Paragraph 5* • 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.	**5**

<table>
<tr><th>Question</th><th>Answer</th><th>Marks</th></tr>
<tr><td>3(d)</td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Level 3
4–5 marks</td><td>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>Level 2
2–3 marks</td><td>A simple argument. One reason + conclusion: 2 marks.
Two or more separate reasons + conclusion: 3 marks.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 1
1 mark</td><td>Some relevant comment.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Level 0
0 marks</td><td>No relevant comment.</td></tr>
</table>
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 (104 words)

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.
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.
Therefore moral principles should have no exceptions.

Challenge (87 words)

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.
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.
Therefore moral principles should have exceptions.
</td><td>5</td></tr>
</table>