

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2015 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 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], 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 2015	9694	21

1 (a) Sources A, B and D are taken from a newspaper published outside Mancunia.

In each part, award 2 marks for a clear, correct answer, 1 mark for a vague, incomplete, marginal or speculative answer.

(i) Suggest one way in which this strengthens the reliability of the reports. [2]

The newspaper does not have a vested interest to write what the Mancunian government wants written.
The proprietor, editor and journalists do not need to fear being punished if they print the truth.

1 mark for The newspaper is neutral/unbiased.

(ii) Suggest one way in which this weakens the reliability of the reports. [2]

The newspaper has a relatively poor ability to see what happens in Mancunia.

(b) The claim of Mr Joe Vos in Source C that the presidential election had been rigged relies on several unstated assumptions. Identify two of these assumptions. [3]

3 marks: statements of two of the following, at least one of which is precise.

2 marks: a precise statement of one of the following or vague, incomplete or partially inaccurate statements of two of the following.

1 mark: a vague, incomplete or partially inaccurate statement of one of the following.

No credit for anything which is stated in Source C.

- The results of opinion polls are a reliable indication of the voting in the election.
- The additional voting papers inserted into the ballot boxes were in favour of the President.
- All or most of the votes cast in Mr Vos's own home area were in favour of an opposition candidate.
- The villagers voted at all (or at least more than one) of the polling stations where the lorries stopped.
- The soldiers told the villagers to vote for the President.

(c) The international observers (Source E) suggest that the presence of armed guards helped to prevent irregularities in the voting and counting. Suggest an alternative explanation for the presence of the armed guards. [2]

They may have been intended to intimidate voters [1] into voting for the President [1].

1 mark less significant answer, e.g. for crowd control

0 marks speculative answer

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9694	21

(d) Do you think that the President of Mancunia won the election legitimately?

Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, with critical reference to the evidence provided and considering a plausible alternative conclusion. [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.

There are broadly three possible answers, and candidates may legitimately argue in favour of any of them:

- The election was fair, and the President won the election legitimately.
- There were irregularities in the election, but the President really did win.
- An Opposition candidate would have won the election if significant irregularities had not occurred.

Indicative content

- The sources provide a lot of evidence to support Joe Vos’s claim that the election was rigged,
- but all the points are susceptible of an innocent explanation
- and/or come from a source with a vested interest to interpret the facts against the President.
- So it is possible to claim that the election was fair and that the allegations of electoral fraud are false.
- The evidence of the international observers supports the judgment that the election was fair,
- but their ability to see was limited.
- If Mr Vos’s allegations were true, the observers would probably not have seen these abuses happen.
- Perhaps the most likely judgment is a middling one, namely that the election was not entirely fair but the President really did win it.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9694	21

- 2 (a) How well does the evidence in Source A support its claim that “sleeping on your back is best”? [4]

Not very well/moderately well [1]. The judgment is supported by an appeal to expertise (“many doctors”) [1], and there is a plausible explanation of how this posture benefits the spine and neck [1], **but** the author admits that this posture is uncomfortable [1], it can cause people to stop breathing (!) [1], people who sleep on their back tend to sleep badly [1], and sleeping on the side is more popular, probably because it is more comfortable [1]. The article advises readers “to do what feels right” [1].

Maximum 2 if only one side covered.

- (b) The survey in Source C was conducted among customers from the hotels. Briefly explain how this might have affected the finding that “over 10% of couples argue over who should sleep on which side of the bed.” [3]

The finding should refer to “10% of couples who are staying away from home...” [1]. It is intuitively unlikely that many couples “argue over who sleeps on which side of the bed” in their own homes [1] once they have made that choice at the beginning of their relationship [1]. So the true proportion of couples who argue over this is probably lower than 10%/the finding probably overstates the proportion [1].

- (c) The last paragraphs of Source B and of Source C are similar to one another. What do they suggest about the company’s motive in conducting the research? [2]

The company probably wanted to promote its hotels [1] by providing newspapers with free stories [1] which would incidentally advertise their hotels [1] and broadcast the fact that they have upgraded their rooms [1] in order to try to tempt any previous guests who have been less than impressed with the beds/pillows to give them another try [1].

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9694	21

(d) ‘Everyone should spend time and thought planning their sleeping arrangements.’

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–C. [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 shows that different postures can affect the quality of sleep,
- and common sense suggests that sleeping well or badly can have a significant influence on both happiness and behaviour during the day.
- In turn, the influence on behaviour (e.g. performance at work) can have major consequences for other aspects of life (e.g. income).
- But the specific advice for and against specific postures in Source A is speculative
- and the concluding advice goes against the claim in the question.
- The evidence in Sources B and C is unreliable, because its authors have an overwhelming ulterior motive.
- The claim in Source B that people who sleep on the left are “far better off” than those who sleep on the right is weakly supported by the remainder of the document.
- The rest of the evidence in B and C is about familiarity rather than any intrinsic difference between the two sides.
- Overall, therefore, the support for the claim in these sources is really weak.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9694	21

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

2 marks: It is quite right that many countries have introduced laws forbidding parents to hit their children.

1 mark: We now realise that previous generations got this the wrong way round.

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

1 mark for each of the following, to a maximum of 3:

- It is (therefore) far better to teach children by example to resolve disputes by means of reason, discussion and negotiation.
- When children behave badly, parents should explain calmly what was wrong with what they have done.
- (So) adults should show that they have been hurt and appeal to the child's love for them.
- The only way to achieve this [a world in which disputes between individuals and nations are settled peacefully] is by transforming individual persons.
- The people who can do most towards this goal [a world in which disputes between individuals and nations are settled peacefully] are parents.

- (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 claim that "previous generations got this the wrong way round" is inconsistent with the rest of the argument, which does not consider it "perfectly acceptable" for children to hurt parents.

Paragraph 2

- The argument relies on the implausible assumption that misbehaviour by a child can appropriately be interpreted as an "argument" or a "dispute".

Paragraph 3

- The identification of rationality as the defining quality of humans is based on an appeal to authority which has some plausibility but may be disputed by many people as being out of date or incomplete.
- The argument is based on equivocation regarding the word "rational". By virtue of being human, babies and young children have a rational nature and have the potential of being influenced by rational argument, but the ability to reason and to be influenced by reasoning is developed gradually during childhood.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9694	21

Paragraph 4

- The claim “Children do not really want to hurt their parents” is a generalisation, to which there may be some exceptions.

Paragraph 5

- The argument uses an appeal to emotion to distract attention from some important gaps.
- The first half of the second sentence restricts the options.
- The second half of the second sentence relies on the assumption that slapping children cannot be part of the process of “transforming” them.

(d) ‘Improved parenting skills are the key to a better world.’

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]**

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.

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.

Specimen level 3 answers

Support (117 words)

The ills of the world are caused by flawed people, and the only way to make the world a better place is to eliminate those flaws. Psychological counselling may help people resolve the personality problems they already have, but a better way would be to prevent those problems from arising.

Psychological flaws are almost always caused by bad parenting. Previously, parents did not know how to avoid passing on problems to future generations. But now the expertise exists to stop this cycle. Prospective parents should take the trouble to learn some simple techniques, so that they will avoid passing their own flaws on to their children.

Improved parenting skills are therefore the key to a better world.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9694	21

Challenge (114 words)

There is more understanding about child psychology now than ever before. We have greater recognition of parenthood as a skill which needs to be learnt, and books, television programmes and self-help groups are readily available to help parents. Since parenting skills are almost certainly better now than they have ever been, it seems ridiculous to argue that they need to be improved.

In addition, there are severe limits on what individuals can do to improve the world, because they are powerless in the face of governments and multinational corporations. So developing better people will not produce a better world.

For these two reasons, improved parenting skills are not the key to a better world.