

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2015 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 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	23

1 (a) Suggest two reasons why the evidence of the security officer (Source A) is reliable. [3]

3 marks for two plausible reasons, at least one of which is developed.

2 marks for one developed reason or for two undeveloped/marginal reasons.

1 mark for one undeveloped/marginal reason.

Indicative developed answers

- Having discovered the shirts in Breslau’s bag, he has a vested interest to claim that he saw him put them there in order to help secure conviction; but he does not do so.
- He had good ability to see the behaviour of Dr and Mrs Breslau and the contents of their shopping bag.
- He has expertise in watching for shoplifters and so is likely to know what behaviour to look out for.

Indicative undeveloped/marginal answers

- He told the truth about not seeing Dr Breslau putting the shirts in his bag.
- As a security officer, he has expertise about shoplifting.
- He had some good ability to see.
- He has a vested interest to tell the truth, because if he was found to be lying he might lose his job.
- There is no reason to believe he has a personal bias against Dr.
- Some of the information he gives is corroborated by Source B.

(b) Suggest two reasons why the evidence of Dr Cameron (Source C) is not very useful. [3]

3 marks for two plausible reasons, at least one of which is developed.

2 marks for one developed reason or for two undeveloped/marginal reasons.

1 mark for one undeveloped/marginal reason.

Indicative developed answers

- He has a vested interest to support Dr Breslau because he is a friend.
- He was not present at the incident and is therefore unable to say anything about it.
- His evidence about Dr Breslau’s professional life is irrelevant to this case.

Indicative undeveloped/marginal answers

- He has a vested interest to lie.
- He has a vested interest to support Dr Breslau.
- He was not present at the incident.
- His knowledge is out of date.

(c) How significant is the police report (Source D)? [3]

Very/quite significant [1]. The fact that Mrs Breslau has been a suspect in several cases of theft suggests that she might be a kleptomaniac [1]. If she had not been so respectable, she would probably have been prosecuted on at least the first of these occasions [1]. So it is quite plausible that she may have stolen the shirts [1]. The lack of any previous suspicion against Dr Breslau supports his denial on this occasion [1].

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9694	23

(d) How do you think the shirts got into Dr Breslau’s shopping bag?

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.

Indicative content

- Because Dr Breslau says he did not want the shirts (Source B),
- it is unlikely that he stole them because he wanted them
- or that he intended to buy them and forgot to pay.
- It is equally unlikely (although perhaps just possible) that the shirts fell into the bag by accident.
- It is much more likely that either Dr or Mrs Breslau is a kleptomaniac and stole them under an inner compulsion.
- Source D hints that Mrs Breslau may have this problem.
- So, she probably put them into the bag without her husband noticing.
- Another possibility is that a shoplifter planted the shirts in Dr Breslau’s bag, thinking it easier to steal them from him outside of the shop and so avoid risking getting caught by the security guard.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9694	23

2 (a) Does Source A contain an argument? Briefly justify 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.

2-mark answer:

Yes, the main part of this advertisement (i.e., excluding the introductory rhetorical questions) is an argument. The conclusion is the imperative, “contact us now”, which is supported by four reasons (“You may be eligible...”, “You will probably not even...”, “In other cases...”, and “You will not pay us...”).

1-mark answer:

This does contain an argument, because it includes a conclusion supported by several reasons.

(b) Suggest and briefly explain two reasons why Source C gives only weak support for the claim that Bradiloxx causes heart disease. [3]

3 marks: Two reasons, at least one of which is developed.
 2 marks: One developed reason **or** two undeveloped reasons.
 1 mark: One undeveloped reason.
 0 marks: No credit-worthy material.

Indicative developed answers

- Charles Crane’s poor diet and lack of exercise, leading to obesity, are far more likely causes of heart disease than medication that was intended to avoid or alleviate the condition.
- CC was taking medication for a range of serious medical conditions. It could easily have been one or more of these illnesses which killed him.
- Even if medication was a contributory factor to Charles Crane’s death, it could have been any of the drugs he was taking, and not necessarily Bradiloxx.
- CC is an isolated case. It would indicate a problem with Bradiloxx only if this case constituted part of a pattern.

Indicative undeveloped answers

- Charles Crane’s death was probably caused by his poor diet.
- CC was probably killed by one of his illnesses.
- Any of the drugs he was taking could have killed him.
- CC is an isolated case.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9694	23

- (c) (i) Suggest one factor which strengthens the reliability of Professor Drek's evidence (Source D). Briefly explain your answer. [2]

2 marks for a developed answer.

1 mark for an incomplete or marginal answer.

- As a professor of cardiac medicine, he has good expertise in heart disease.
- As a practising consultant cardiologist, he sees many patients with heart disease and therefore has very good ability to see.
- As a professor and consultant, he has a good reputation, which he would not want to lose by giving false evidence.

- (ii) Suggest one factor which weakens the reliability of Professor Drek's evidence (Source D). Briefly explain your answer. [2]

2 marks for a developed answer.

1 mark for an incomplete or marginal answer.

- As a paid consultant to the manufacturers of Bradiloxx, he has a vested interest to portray it in as good a light as possible.
- As a paid consultant to the manufacturers of Bradiloxx, he is biased in favour of it.

- (d) How likely is it that Bradiloxx causes heart disease?

Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, using and evaluating the information provided in Sources A–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

- It is not likely.
- The advertisement from a firm of lawyers (Source A) tries to persuade people to claim for compensation,
- but does not imply that Bradiloxx is actually dangerous.
- The case recorded in Source B is consistent with Bradiloxx being dangerous,
- but certainly does not prove that it is.
- The case recorded in Source C is consistent with Bradiloxx being dangerous,
- but certainly does not prove that it is.
- Although Prof Drek's vested interest may have caused him to emphasize the benefits of the drug and downplay any risks,
- his evidence is unlikely to be actually false.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9694	23

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

2 marks: (So) the best thing to do with the police force is to abolish it.

1 mark: paraphrase of the above.

- (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 any of the following, to a maximum of 3:

- (In fact,) the breaches of the right to privacy by the police are far worse than anyone could have foreseen at that time.
- This [handing over the right to self-defence] is too big a sacrifice.
- (By removing many opportunities for criminal activity,) the abolition of the police would make the world a safer place.
- Some governments have tried to solve these problems, but without success.
- There are also strong economic arguments for abolishing police forces.

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

2 marks: Valid evaluative point, clearly expressed.

1 mark: Weak attempt at a valid evaluative point.

Paragraph 1

- The last phrase is an exaggeration, but it does not weaken the argument much.

Paragraph 2

- This paragraph relies on the assumption that the police are not more effective in defending members of the public than they would be themselves.

Paragraph 3

- The argument moves illegitimately from “some” in the second sentence to “all”, implied in the final sentence.
- The intermediate conclusion relies on the implausible assumption that the abolition of the police force would not create more opportunities for criminals than it would remove.

Paragraph 4

- The main conclusion relies on an assumption that the benefits of having the police do not outweigh the problems which governments have failed to solve.
- Restriction of options: other governments might be more successful in solving the problems, if they tried.

Paragraph 5

- The second sentence begs the question and/or is self-contradictory. Arguably, whatever it costs to ensure the loyalty of the police is by definition what they are worth.
- The argument relies on the implausible assumption that the increase in crime caused by the abolition of the police would not cost at least as much as the money which would be saved.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge International AS/A Level – October/November 2015	9694	23

(d) 'Everyone has the right to keep personal information private.'

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 (105 words)

Our identity as individuals consists of our innermost experiences, hopes and fears. If they were laid bare to general scrutiny, there would be nothing left to make us special. When we want to enter into a relationship of intimacy with someone, we do so by revealing aspects of ourselves which are kept private from the rest of the world. The whole point of intimacy is that it excludes others. Furthermore, if we were to put all our thoughts into words, we would embarrass ourselves and other people, and so we keep some of them private. Therefore everyone has the right to keep personal information private.

Challenge (102 words)

The popularity of social media websites, such as Facebook and Twitter, shows that most people like to share their experiences, thoughts and feelings. The only people who want to preserve privacy are those who have something to hide. In those cases, the general good overrides the right to privacy. For example, burglars do not want the police to know where they go at night, but it is in the public interest for such information to become known. This is why surveillance cameras have been introduced so widely, with general approval. Therefore everyone does not have the right to keep personal information private.