



Cambridge International AS & A Level

THINKING SKILLS

9694/23

Paper 2 Critical Thinking

October/November 2020

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 50

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 2020 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **11** printed pages.

Generic Marking Principles

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently, e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Annotations

	In Qs 1, 3 and 4 use to indicate where marks have been awarded. In questions where responses are undeveloped or developed (as defined within the scheme), use 1 tick for undeveloped and 2 ticks for developed.
	Use to indicate an element of an answer that looks as though it should be credited but is in fact wrong.
	In Qs 2 and 5 use to indicate 'conclusion'. Use twice to indicate nuanced conclusion in q 2.
	In Qs 2 and 5 use to indicate creditworthy intermediate conclusion.
	In Qs 2 and 5 use to indicate creditworthy appropriate argument element.
	In Q2 use to indicate creditworthy inferential reasoning. In Q5 use to indicate creditworthy reason used to support a conclusion.
	In Q2 use to indicate creditworthy use of source.
	In Q2 use to indicate creditworthy evaluation of source.
	In Q2 use to indicate creditworthy personal thinking.
	In appropriate cases, use to indicate significant omission.
	Not good enough.
	Benefit of doubt.
	Use in answers when no other annotations have been used. Use on blank pages. In appropriate cases, use to indicate answers which appear as if they might deserve credit but are incorrect or irrelevant.
Highlight	Use to indicate answers which are not being considered. Where helpful, use to identify the part of the answer to which another stamp pertains.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	2 marks for a correct answer with accurate explanation 1 mark for a correct answer with vague, incomplete or generic explanation 0 marks for correct answer without explanation 0 marks for incorrect answer with or without explanation 2-mark answer Source A is not an argument. It describes dowsing and suggests an explanation for it, but does not support that with reasoning/draw a conclusion. 1-mark answers Source A is not an argument, because it does not include a persuasive conclusion supported by reasons. Source A is not an argument. It describes dowsing and suggests an explanation for it.	2
1(b)(i)	1 mark for a valid positive evaluation of Humphrys 1 mark for a valid negative evaluation of Humphrys <u>Positive</u> - Humphrys had good ability to see (<i>accept</i> expertise), because he was present. <i>Accept</i> As a 'veteran broadcaster', Humphrys has a good reputation. <i>Accept</i> Humphrys has a vested interest to report truthfully, in order to maintain his reputation / the reputation of the BBC. <u>Negative</u> - Humphrys has no apparent expertise in geology, psychology or any other relevant discipline. <i>Accept</i> Humphrys has a vested interest to exaggerate his claims in order to make an interesting programme.	2
1(b)(ii)	1 mark for a valid positive evaluation of Wiseman 1 mark for a valid negative evaluation of Wiseman <u>Positive</u> - Wiseman has a good reputation, because he is a professor. - Wiseman has good expertise in 'challenging claims about the paranormal' (<i>accept</i> in psychology). <u>Negative</u> - Wiseman is biased (<i>accept</i> has vested interest) against believing claims about unusual experiences/skills. - Wiseman has no apparent expertise in geology, etc. <i>Accept</i> Wiseman has apparently not witnessed successful/unsuccessful dowsing (no ability to see).	2

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)(i)	<i>2 marks for a developed valid answer</i> <i>1 mark for an undeveloped or marginal answer</i> <i>2-mark answer</i> This proportion of apparently good results could plausibly be expected to occur by chance. <i>1-mark answer</i> The apparent success may have occurred by chance.	2
1(c)(ii)	<i>2 marks for a precise valid answer</i> <i>1 mark for a vague or marginal answer</i> <i>2-mark answer</i> If the dowzers who performed well were able to replicate their success in further tests. <i>1-mark answers</i> If similar results were obtained by tests on different people. If people who do not claim to be dowzers were to achieve a significantly lower success rate.	2
1(d)	Of some use (neither useless nor useful) [1]. As a national geological institute, the source is reputable [1] and has relevant expertise (in geology) [1], but also a vested interest in dismissing dowsing in order to encourage the employment of professional geologists [1]. The source does offer a plausible explanation for the success of dowsing [1]. However, the source is inconsistent [1] because in paragraph 1 it suggests there is a significant and expensive risk of drilling a dry well, but in paragraph 2 it states that any well is likely to have water [1]. The source relies on its own concept of a 'usable' water supply [1], but if those found by dowzers were not usable then people would not 'often ask dowzers for help' [1].	4

Question	Answer		Marks							
2	<table><tr><td>Use of sources</td><td>2 marks: accurate use of 3 or 4 of the sources provided 1 mark: accurate use of 1 or 2 of the sources provided 0 marks: no accurate use of sources</td></tr><tr><td>Evaluation of sources and/or inferential reasoning from sources</td><td>Up to 2 marks for evaluation of sources Up to 2 marks for inferential reasoning <i>These marks can be combined to a maximum of 3.</i></td></tr><tr><td>Supported conclusion</td><td>2 marks: nuanced (e.g. balanced or qualified) supported conclusion 1 mark: simple supported conclusion 0 marks: conclusion unstated or unsupported</td></tr><tr><td>Argument elements</td><td>Up to 2 marks for use of intermediate conclusion and/or other argument elements Up to 2 marks for personal thinking <i>These marks can be combined to a maximum of 3</i></td></tr></table>	Use of sources	2 marks: accurate use of 3 or 4 of the sources provided 1 mark: accurate use of 1 or 2 of the sources provided 0 marks: no accurate use of sources	Evaluation of sources and/or inferential reasoning from sources	Up to 2 marks for evaluation of sources Up to 2 marks for inferential reasoning <i>These marks can be combined to a maximum of 3.</i>	Supported conclusion	2 marks: nuanced (e.g. balanced or qualified) supported conclusion 1 mark: simple supported conclusion 0 marks: conclusion unstated or unsupported	Argument elements	Up to 2 marks for use of intermediate conclusion and/or other argument elements Up to 2 marks for personal thinking <i>These marks can be combined to a maximum of 3</i>	8
Use of sources	2 marks: accurate use of 3 or 4 of the sources provided 1 mark: accurate use of 1 or 2 of the sources provided 0 marks: no accurate use of sources									
Evaluation of sources and/or inferential reasoning from sources	Up to 2 marks for evaluation of sources Up to 2 marks for inferential reasoning <i>These marks can be combined to a maximum of 3.</i>									
Supported conclusion	2 marks: nuanced (e.g. balanced or qualified) supported conclusion 1 mark: simple supported conclusion 0 marks: conclusion unstated or unsupported									
Argument elements	Up to 2 marks for use of intermediate conclusion and/or other argument elements Up to 2 marks for personal thinking <i>These marks can be combined to a maximum of 3</i>									
Indicative content • Source A strongly implies that there is a significant amount of evidence for the success of dowsing. • Source A offers a plausible explanation for the success of dowsing for water, • which could be interpreted either for or against the claim. • In Source B John Humphrys gives personal testimony in support of dowsing. • Professor Wiseman says that apparent success of dowsing is due to chance • and explains why claims of success are more prominent than admissions of failure. • According to Source C, a team of researchers believed they had established that some dowsers really do have an ability to locate running water, • but they may have been biased • and their claims are weak. • Source D explains why people may want dowsing to be a genuine skill, • but avoids saying whether it is or not. • Source D offers a possible explanation for the apparent success of dowsing, • but this could be interpreted for or against the claim. • Source D claims that professionals are more successful than dowsers, • but only at locating 'usable' supplies.										

Question	Answer	Marks
2	Annotate answers as follows: C To indicate 'conclusion'. Use twice to indicate nuanced conclusion. S To indicate creditworthy use of source. EVAL To indicate creditworthy evaluation of source. R To indicate creditworthy inferential reasoning. P To indicate creditworthy personal thinking. I To indicate creditworthy intermediate conclusion. AE To indicate creditworthy appropriate argument element.	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<i>2 marks for an exact answer</i> <i>1 mark for a paraphrase, or for one additional element or omission</i> There should (also) be a maximum age for voting.	2
3(b)	<i>For up to 3 of the following:</i> <i>2 marks for an exact answer</i> <i>1 mark for a paraphrase, or for one additional element or omission</i> • they [people who have lost their memory and their ability to think clearly/ people who are incapable of voting in a rational manner] should not be allowed to vote. • (so) they [the younger generation] alone should make those decisions [decisions that are made today]. • People who have chosen to live in the past should play no part in making such choices [between alternative futures]. • They [pensioners] therefore no longer deserve to be involved in political decision-making. • (So) their [old people's] votes will be based on prejudice rather than on engagement with current issues and debates. <i>If more than three answers are offered, mark the first four only.</i>	6
3(c)	Examples [1] of 'the consequences of the decisions that are made today' [1] .	2
3(d)	<i>2 marks for an exact version of any of the following</i> <i>1 mark for an incomplete or vague version of any of the following</i> • Voting should be based on engagement with current issues and debates. • Political convictions ought to adapt to new conditions. • Political convictions are the same thing as prejudices. • People who are not 'old people' do not base their votes on prejudices. • Political convictions formed long ago are significantly different from opinions based on engagement with current issues and debates. • Current issues and debates are significantly different from those of the past.	2

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	The reference to 'many people towards the end of their life' [1] is interpreted as if it meant everyone over a certain age [1]. <i>Accept for up to 2 marks answers which focus on <u>either</u> many/everyone <u>or</u> near the end of their life/over a certain age.</i> <i>Accept for 2 marks if expressed as a flaw of sweeping generalisation</i> <i>Accept for 1 mark if expressed as counter.</i> <i>Allow for 1 mark any criticism of the parallel between minimum and maximum age for voting</i>	2
4(b)	Grandparents are conflated with old people [1], but that does not weaken the reasoning much, because the reasoning focuses on old people and the reference to grandparents is merely illustrative [1]. Enjoying talking about the past is conflated with living in the past [1]: this weakens the reasoning considerably, because it prevents the IC from following from the claim [1].	4
4(c)	<i>2 marks for a valid answer, clearly expressed.</i> <i>1 mark for a weak attempt at a valid answer (e.g. expressed as counter).</i> • <i>Either:</i> The argument has the invalid form (Denying the Antecedent) <i>if p then q; not p; therefore not q</i>, where <i>p</i> = contributes to the cost of running a country and <i>q</i> = deserves to have a voice in deciding how their money will be spent. <i>Or:</i> The first sentence expresses a sufficient condition for having a political voice, but the IC interprets it as a necessary condition. <i>Allow for 1 mark:</i> The reasoning is based on confusing sufficient and necessary conditions. • There is a <i>false dichotomy</i> between contributing and being dependent. • The claim that pensioners do not contribute is a <i>sweeping generalisation</i>, to which there are many exceptions.	2

Question	Answer		Marks
5	Supported conclusion	1 mark for a precise, supported conclusion that meets the requirement of the question.	8
	Reasons	1 mark for each use of a reason supporting a conclusion, up to a maximum of 3.	
	Inferential reasoning	1 mark for each use of an intermediate conclusion, up to a maximum of 3.	
	Argument elements	1 mark for each use of appropriate argument elements (counter with response, example, evidence, analogy, hypothetical reasoning), up to a maximum of 3.	
	<i>Maximum 6 marks for wrong conclusion or if conclusion is implied but not stated.</i> <i>0 marks for answer unrelated to the claim given.</i> <i>No credit for material merely reproduced from the passage.</i> Annotate answers as follows: C To indicate main conclusion. I To indicate creditworthy intermediate conclusion. R To indicate creditworthy reason used to support a conclusion. AE To indicate creditworthy appropriate argument element. Example 8-mark answers <i>Support (143 words)</i> Retired people have time to give to family and friends. Many adults are under great pressure from their jobs, and if they also have family responsibilities it is almost inevitable they will not be able to take time to share the joys and listen to the problems of those who are dear to them. So elderly people make valuable contributions to the life of families and neighbourhoods. Some people say that elderly people have no wisdom to offer to younger generations, because they do not use the latest technology and are not involved with social media. This is a superficial view. The range of experience on which elderly people can draw enables them to stand back from the immediate issues and discern underlying principles. So the wisdom of the elderly should not be rejected. Therefore elderly people are an important part of society.		

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<i>Challenge (109 words)</i> People are living longer, and an increasing number of them are out-living their ability to care for themselves. This has caused the cost of caring for elderly people to rise beyond an affordable level. So the elderly have become a burden which economies can no longer sustain. Some elderly people imagine that the extent of their experience gives them insights and wisdom into such contemporary issues as education and relationships, but this belief is an embarrassing delusion. Because the world has changed so radically since they were young, their reminiscences and advice have no value for the present generation. Therefore elderly people are not an important part of society.	