

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2013 series

9694 THINKING SKILLS

9694/23

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 2013 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9694	23

1 (a) How reliable is Charlotte Cruz’s evidence (Source C)? [3]

Not at all reliable [1]. She has a strong vested interest to defend herself [1] by laying the blame on Brian [1]. Her evidence contradicts that of Brian [1]: so at least one of them is lying [1]. If Source F refers to the knife, it is not true that Charlotte knows nothing about the murder [1].

Accept: This evidence is inconsistent with Charlotte’s attitude as expressed in her email (Source F) [1].

(b) How useful is the evidence of Mrs Dorothy Cruz (Source E)? [3]

Her vested interest to protect her daughter [1] makes her evidence unreliable and therefore of little direct use [1]. If true, her evidence corroborates Brian’s claim that the knife used to kill Adam Aziz came from the Cruz home [1]. However, it is possible that even her evidence about the knife is influenced by her vested interest [1]. Her evidence concerning Charlotte’s involvement with political extremism provides a possible motive for the murder [1].

(c) Explain the significance of the fact that Mrs Dorothy Cruz did not report the theft of the knife to the police. [3]

At the least, the fact that she did not report the theft means there is no corroboration of her claim that the knife was stolen on the occasion of Brian’s visit [1]. If the knife went missing the day before the murder, not on the occasion of the joint visit, Mrs Cruz would not have been able to report the theft after the visit [1]. Mrs Cruz would have had a motive to report the knife missing if Brian had stolen it, as she claimed: so he probably didn’t [1]. She probably did not suspect/accuse Brian until after the crime was committed [1]. Alternatively, if the knife really did go missing when Brian and Charlotte visited together, the most likely reason for Mrs Cruz not to report the theft is that she knew or suspected that Charlotte had taken it [1]. In either case, the fact that she did not report the knife missing makes it likely that Charlotte took it [1].

(d) How do you think Adam Aziz died? Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, with critical reference to the evidence provided and with consideration of any plausible alternative scenarios. [6]

Level 3 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.
Level 2 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.
Level 1 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.
Level 0 0 marks	No credit-worthy material.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9694	23

Indicative content

Brian's initial statement is almost certainly untrue. Not only did he subsequently withdraw it, but because, according to both him and Mrs Cruz, the knife came from the Cruz household, it is highly unlikely that it could have been in the possession of Adam Aziz. However, his second statement could easily be true. It is quite plausible that Charlotte did intend to cause violence and subsequently sheltered behind the respectability of her family in order to escape punishment. Source F strongly supports the hypothesis that Charlotte stole the knife and that they plotted violence together, although it is not certain that the knife is what she refers to as "you know what". Charlotte may have killed Adam or given the knife to Brian. Alternatively, it is possible, but unlikely, that the Cruz claim is true, and Brian stole the knife and used it to kill Adam.

- 2 (a) **Although Source A was published as a news report, it consisted of a press release from manufacturers of dietary supplements. How reliable is this report?** [4]

Unreliable/slightly reliable (neither reliable nor very reliable) [1]. The authors have a vested interest to exaggerate or even invent their findings [1], in order to promote the sales of their products [1]. However, if they exaggerate their findings too much they will be exposed for making false claims which will have a negative impact on sales [1]. Also, the stated conclusions are quite moderate [1], suggesting they may be constrained by some regulation [1].

Because the survey was based on self-reporting, the sampling is skewed [1] and the results may be untrue [1].

Maximum 3 marks if only one side considered.

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

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.

Source C is not an argument. It consists of explanations and questions, but lacks a conclusion.

Award 1 mark to answers which claim that it is an argument with an implied conclusion.

- (c) **The author of Source C suggests that it does not make sense to allege that his joints are older than he is. How reasonable is this objection to the research described in Source A?** [3]

The objection is reasonable to some extent. It is impossible for anyone's joints literally to be older than the person himself is [1]. But the claim is obviously not intended literally [1]. It is fairly clear what the proprietors of the website intend to convey by their claim [1], although it lacks precision [1]. (Answers may be couched in terms of biological/ chronological age.)

No mark for judgement.

Maximum 2 marks if only one side considered.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9694	23

- (d) 'Most people would benefit from taking fish oil supplements to reduce their 'joint age'.' 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 – E. [6]

Level 3 5–6 marks	A strong, reasoned argument, which uses and evaluates all or most of the evidence provided.
Level 2 3–4 marks	A reasonable, simple argument, which uses and/or evaluates evidence.
Level 1 1–2 marks	A weak answer, which makes some 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

There are two reasons why this claim cannot be reliably concluded from the evidence given in Source A. Firstly, only "some" people have joints which are older than they are (whatever that means), and it is therefore not possible to draw an inference about "most" people. Secondly, it has not been proved that taking fish oil supplements reduces joint age for all or most people. Source C shows that the claim made by the online questionnaire is not nearly as precise as the company would like it to appear. The suggestion in Source D that anyone taking the questionnaire should take fish oil capsules is heavily influenced by the company's vested interest to improve sales, and therefore gives only very weak support to the claim. Source E (which is neutral) indicates that fish oil supplements do not help everyone with joint problems and also that they can have unpleasant side-effects.

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

2 marks: Teachers should never punish children in any way.

1 mark: As these examples illustrate, teachers should never punish children in any way.

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

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

- All forms of punishing children go against their human rights.
- Children do not need to be punished to make them learn.
- (So) it is unjust to punish teenagers for their failure to learn.
- The teachers are the ones who should be punished.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9694	23

- (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:

- 3 marks Key evaluative point, clearly expressed.
 2 marks Key evaluative point, incompletely or vaguely expressed
or Valid evaluative point, clearly expressed but less significant than a key point.
 1 mark Weak attempt at a valid evaluative point.

Candidates who fail to achieve any marks for evaluative points may be awarded up to 2 marks for partial performance, as follows, in respect of answers which have misinterpreted the nature of the task but have shown some understanding:

- 2 marks Relevant extended counter-argument/agreement **or** multiple specific counter-assertions/agreements
 1 mark General counter/agreement **or** single specific counter/agreement.

Partial performance marks must **not** be added to one another or to marks from the main part of the mark scheme.

Indicative content

Paragraph 1

- Assumption: that children never behave in such a way as to justify punishment.
- Conflates justified school detention with false imprisonment; likewise extra schoolwork with slavery.

Paragraph 3

- The second sentence begs the question.
- The last sentence is an *ad hominem* argument.

Paragraph 4

- **[Key]** Assumption: that the personality and behaviour of children do not naturally change between infancy and teens.

Paragraph 5

- **[Key]** The first two sentences are a *non sequitur*. Another way of expressing this is to identify an assumption underlying this argument that the right to education includes the right to achieve whatever an individual chooses as a life goal.
- **[Key]** The claim that failure is the fault of teachers, not the students, restricts the options.
- **[Key]** The last sentence conflates incompetence on the part of the teacher with students gaining disappointing exam results.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2013	9694	23

(d) 'Everyone deserves an education.'

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

Indicative content (specimen level 3 answers)

Support (82 words)

Most people would probably agree that everyone is naturally entitled to a chance of leading a life which will give them some fulfilment. But without education, life choices are severely restricted. Education is the key which opens the door to fulfilling work and a reasonable income. Leisure opportunities, too, are limited without education. So it would be contradictory to accept that everyone deserves a chance for a fulfilling life without also agreeing that they deserve an education. Therefore everyone deserves an education.

Challenge (86 words)

Not everyone would benefit from being educated. Some people, through no fault of their own, lack the potential to learn any more than the basics for survival. It would be a waste of time and resources to give them more education than this. Other people refuse to cooperate with those who try to teach them. They misbehave in school and fail to do the study tasks they are set. Such behaviour causes them to forfeit their right to be educated. Therefore not everyone deserves an education.