



Cambridge International AS & A Level

THINKING SKILLS

9694/21

Paper 2 Critical Thinking

October/November 2023

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 2023 series for most Cambridge IGCSE, Cambridge International A and AS Level components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

This document consists of **13** 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.
	Use to indicate an answer or element that is wrong.
	Not good enough. Use wherever such a judgment has been made.
	Benefit of doubt.
	In Q5 use to indicate creditworthy other argument element. In Q3 use to indicate 'significant additional element'.
	In Qs 2 and 5 use to indicate 'conclusion'.
	In Qs 2 and 5 and in short questions where indicated, use to indicate that marks have been capped because an essential element of the answer is absent.
	In Q2 use to indicate creditworthy evaluation of a source.
	In Q5 use to indicate creditworthy intermediate conclusion.
	In Q2 use to indicate creditworthy personal thinking. In Q3 use to indicate paraphrase.
	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 a source. In Q5 use to indicate distinct strand of reasoning.
	In appropriate cases, use to indicate significant omission. In Q3 use to indicate 'significant omission'.
	In Q5 use when a type of argument element has already been credited in the same strand of reasoning. Use in answers when no other annotations have been used. Use on blank pages.
Highlight	Use to draw attention to part of an answer.

There must be at least one annotation on each page of the answer booklet.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>Neither well nor badly [1].</p> <p>The claim is quite modest, such that any number of people choosing the dog would support ‘some people’; so the statistics given do support this [1]. In any case, 40% is a substantial proportion and supports the claim quite strongly [1]. Even if people would act differently in a real situation, the claim that they ‘appear’ to value the lives of animals more than other human beings is still supported [1]. Dogs are animals, so the findings do offer some support [1].</p> <p>However, it is possible that different experiments focusing on other animals would yield different findings [1]. Also, paragraph 2 talks about sympathy, which is not the same things as valuing a life [1].</p> <p><i>Do not credit judgment only. One mark for weakly supported judgment. No mark for judgment unless both sides considered.</i></p>	4
1(b)	<p><i>1 mark for identifying and 1 mark for explaining one weakness. For example,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It does not state how many times each version was seen [1]. It is possible that the 358 donations for the dog represented a lower proportion of the people seeing the dog version than the corresponding figure for the child [1]. • It does not mention any control over the type of person seeing each version [1]. If most people seeing the campaign for the dog happened to be highly sympathetic towards dogs, then this could explain the higher number of donations and could not be generalised to everyone [1]. • There is no information about the total value of the donations [1]. Although fewer people donated to the child, they may have donated more on average, which could be considered more generous [1]. • We don’t have any information about the average wealth of the donors to each version [1]. If those donating to the dog were wealthier on average then their donations could be considered less generous [1]. 	2

Question	Answer	Marks
1(c)	<p><i>2 marks for a correct answer with accurate explanation</i> <i>1 mark for a correct answer with vague, incomplete or generic explanation</i> <i>0 marks for a correct answer without explanation</i> <i>0 marks for an incorrect answer with or without explanation</i></p> <p><i>2-mark answer (3 ticks)</i> Source C is not an argument ✓. It consists of several explanations why ‘experiments continually appear to show that we care more about animals than about our fellow human beings’ ✓, but there is no (persuasive) conclusion ✓.</p> <p><i>1-mark answers (2 ticks)</i> Source C is not an argument ✓, because it does not include a (persuasive) conclusion ✓. Source C is not an argument ✓. It consists of several explanations why ‘experiments continually appear to show that we care more about animals than about our fellow human beings’ ✓.</p> <p><i>0-mark answer (1 tick or 0 ticks)</i> Source C is not an argument ✓, because it does not include two contrasting opinions.</p>	2
1(d)	<p>Partly reliable. The survey respondents have good ability to know their own feelings about dogs [1], and the club has good ability to perceive the survey results [1]. There is a greater potential for bias (resulting in the animals being viewed as akin to human family members) [1]. Also, the magazine possibly has a VI to select the most favourable results / exaggerate the significance of the findings, as this is likely to please its readers [1], but given the likelihood of this bias it probably doesn’t need to do this [1].</p> <p><i>No credit for judgment.</i> <i>If only one side argued, cap at 2 marks.</i></p>	3

Question	Answer	Marks
1(e)	<p><i>1 mark for each plausible reason, for example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They know that their choices will not have any real consequences*. • They are not under the pressure of being held responsible for their actions*. • They are unlikely to think their choice through as carefully as they would in a real situation*. • They don't have any/much emotional investment in the imaginary scenario*. <p><i>* Accept 'they wouldn't take it seriously' as a version of any <u>one</u> of these four points.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are more likely to say what they would like to think they would do, for the benefit of their self-esteem. • They might say whatever they think will impress the researchers (or whoever poses the imaginary scenario). • They might choose differently when they have time to think, compared with a real situation where they had to act quickly and on instinct. • In a real situation, they might act differently because adrenaline affects their actions. • In a survey, only the questioner hears your response. In real life there may be a lot of witnesses, so your actions may be more influenced by the attitude of others. • In an imaginary scenario, people might overestimate their ability to do certain things. 	2

Question	Answer	Marks										
2	<table border="1" data-bbox="312 248 1316 808"> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 248 579 349">Conclusion</td> <td data-bbox="579 248 1316 349">1 mark for an explicit supported conclusion <i>Cap at 7 if conclusion is absent or implicit</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 349 579 450">Use of sources</td> <td data-bbox="579 349 1316 450">2 marks for use of at least 4 sources 1 mark for use of at least 1 source</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 450 579 580">Evaluation of sources</td> <td data-bbox="579 450 1316 580">1 mark for each valid evaluation of the credibility or quality of reasoning in sources <i>Maximum 3 marks</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 580 579 710">Inferential reasoning from sources</td> <td data-bbox="579 580 1316 710">1 mark each <i>Maximum 3 marks</i> <i>Source must be mentioned for this to be credited</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="312 710 579 808">Personal thinking</td> <td data-bbox="579 710 1316 808">1 mark each <i>Maximum 2 marks</i></td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="312 846 724 880">Annotate answers as follows:</p> <p data-bbox="312 913 1316 947">CON To indicate ‘conclusion’. Use twice to indicate nuanced conclusion.</p> <p data-bbox="312 981 943 1014">S To indicate creditworthy use of source.</p> <p data-bbox="312 1048 1031 1081">EVAL To indicate creditworthy evaluation of source.</p> <p data-bbox="312 1115 1031 1149">R To indicate creditworthy inferential reasoning.</p> <p data-bbox="312 1182 991 1216">P To indicate creditworthy personal thinking.</p> <p data-bbox="312 1249 959 1283">C To indicate that mark has been capped.</p> <p data-bbox="312 1317 563 1350">Indicative content</p> <ul data-bbox="312 1384 1316 1942" style="list-style-type: none"> • Source A describes two academic experiments, the findings of which suggested that people sometimes appear to prioritise dogs over other people when considering healthy and safety. • Both experiments in Source A specifically involved fictitious scenarios. • Source B described an experiment that purports to support the claim that people are more likely to donate money to help an injured dog than an injured child; • however, the data cited as evidence to justify this claim is inadequate. • Source C gives an explanation by a professional psychologist as to why we may not always favour our own species when allocating help to others, • claiming that (a) we are sometimes swayed by the perceived vulnerability of domesticated animals, and (b) in some cultures dogs are viewed almost as family members, • although the source acknowledges that this is certainly not true universally. 	Conclusion	1 mark for an explicit supported conclusion <i>Cap at 7 if conclusion is absent or implicit</i>	Use of sources	2 marks for use of at least 4 sources 1 mark for use of at least 1 source	Evaluation of sources	1 mark for each valid evaluation of the credibility or quality of reasoning in sources <i>Maximum 3 marks</i>	Inferential reasoning from sources	1 mark each <i>Maximum 3 marks</i> <i>Source must be mentioned for this to be credited</i>	Personal thinking	1 mark each <i>Maximum 2 marks</i>	8
Conclusion	1 mark for an explicit supported conclusion <i>Cap at 7 if conclusion is absent or implicit</i>											
Use of sources	2 marks for use of at least 4 sources 1 mark for use of at least 1 source											
Evaluation of sources	1 mark for each valid evaluation of the credibility or quality of reasoning in sources <i>Maximum 3 marks</i>											
Inferential reasoning from sources	1 mark each <i>Maximum 3 marks</i> <i>Source must be mentioned for this to be credited</i>											
Personal thinking	1 mark each <i>Maximum 2 marks</i>											

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Source D gives some data gathered from a survey of members of a national dog owners' club, which illustrates just how strongly some people feel about their pet dogs. • There are various factors either enhancing or undermining the reliability of this source. • Source E outlines the results of a psychological study that limits the value of experiments involving hypothetical scenarios, • by showing that people often behave differently in real-life situations from how they said they would when participating in such an experiment. <p>Example 8-mark answer (241 words)</p> <p>Sources A and B appear to provide evidence that some people place more value on the lives of dogs than on those of human beings. Although the academic experiments described in Source A could reasonably be expected to have been conducted with a high level of expertise in psychological research, Source A refers merely to 'Some people', and hence is making a significantly weaker claim than one that might allow us to infer that people in general overvalue the lives of animals. Also, the findings in Source B have weak statistical support.</p> <p>Source C explains why people sometimes seem to value the lives of animals in general more than those of other humans. However, it is important to note that, as the source points out, in many cultures dogs are not accorded the respect and affection that they are in countries such as the US.</p> <p>The results of the survey described in Source D appear to support the claim, but it is likely that they are undermined by both bias and vested interest.</p> <p>Source E suggests that in real-life situations people often act differently from how they said they would when asked by researchers about hypothetical situations. Therefore, it is likely that when faced with a real-life choice, people would not choose the health or safety of a dog over that of a human being.</p> <p>Overall, the evidence available does not support the claim that people overvalue the lives of dogs.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
<p>In Q3, annotate as follows:</p> <p>AE Significant additional element</p> <p>A Significant omission</p> <p>P Paraphrase</p> <p><i>In Q3(a), (c), and (d), if two answers are given, one of which is correct, award 1 mark.</i></p> <p><i>In all parts of Q3, apply guidance relating to additional material only if it constitutes an additional part of an answer or an alternative answer.</i></p>		
3(a)	<p><i>2 marks for an exact answer 1 mark for a paraphrase, or for one additional element or omission</i></p> <p>mountain rescue should always be a free service.</p>	2
3(b)	<p><i>For up to 2 of the following: 2 marks for an exact answer 1 mark for a paraphrase, or for one additional element or omission If more than two answers given, mark the first three only</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would be unfair to charge for mountain rescues • Charges would damage the economies of mountain areas. • Unless rescue services are free, tourists will not visit • (hence) the income gained from tourism will be lost. <p><i>1 mark only when third and fourth points given together as a single response.</i></p>	4
3(c)	<p>An example [1] of ‘Such cases’ occurring/someone who would refuse to accept help if cost were a factor [1].</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Evidence [1] supporting the claim that ‘Such cases have occurred’/people would refuse to accept help if cost were a factor. [1].</p> <p><i>If both example and evidence stated, along with one of the reasons, award both marks.</i></p>	2
3(d)	<p><i>2 marks for an exact version of either of the following 1 mark for an incomplete or vague version of either of the following</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People who have been rescued have paid taxes (in the country where they were rescued). • Rescue teams receive all of their funding from tax revenue. • The amount any walker has paid is a fair contribution towards the cost of their rescue. 	2

Question	Answer	Marks
4(a)	<p>The last sentence of paragraph 2 (citing the historic unwillingness of lifeboat crews and mountain rescue workers to charge for their services) [1] is an appeal to tradition [1].</p> <p><i>Accept for full credit:</i> appeal to consistency / fairness.</p> <p><i>Accept for 1 mark:</i> appeal to emotion (fear) / pathos, when accompanied by reference to 'pride' or 'danger'.</p>	2
4(b)(i)	<p>The paragraph offers a choice between <u>either</u> having free mountain rescue services <u>or</u> tourists not visiting (thereby losing income for local businesses).</p>	1
4(b)(ii)	<p>The flaw partially weakens the support paragraph 3 gives to the overall argument [1]. However, other paragraphs provide support, so the impact of the flaw is reduced [1].</p> <p>Charges may reduce the number of visitors [1]. However, it may be possible to levy some charges without discouraging tourists from visiting [1]; for example*, by limiting rescue charges to a modest level, or only charging where tourists were grossly negligent [1]. Some tourist attractions levy charges without any detrimental effect on numbers of visitors [1]. Furthermore, it is unlikely that all visitors wish to walk or climb up mountains [1]. Therefore, charges would not necessarily have such a harmful effect on local income [1].</p> <p><i>Do not credit judgment only.</i> <i>One mark for weakly supported judgment.</i> <i>*Accept any reasonable example.</i></p>	3
4(c)	<p>There is a rash* generalisation in paragraph 4 [1]. 'Such cases' may refer to only a handful of instances where cost has deterred people in distress from using the rescue services [1]. The example of the young woman lost on a mountain is almost certainly very unusual [1]. However, the reasoning suggests (and requires) / relies on the unstated assumption that this problem would be widespread, if not necessarily universal [1].</p> <p><i>*Accept 'hasty' or any other suitable synonym.</i></p>	2
4(d)	<p>Not (very) effective [1]. The author does not respond to the counter that is actually stated (that reckless behaviour would be encouraged) [1], but to a different one that is not stated (that people who need rescuing should pay because it is their own fault) [1]. If it is only occasionally 'hard to draw a line between foolish behaviour and inexperience', then in most cases it must be relatively clear-cut [1].</p> <p><i>Do not credit judgment only.</i> <i>One mark for weakly supported judgment.</i></p>	3

Question	Answer		Marks								
5	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%; padding: 5px;">Reasons</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">2 marks for three or more reasons supporting conclusions 1 mark for one or two reasons supporting conclusions</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Inferential reasoning</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">1 mark for each use of an intermediate conclusion or chain of intermediate conclusions <i>(including if used in a response to a counter)</i> <i>Maximum 3 marks</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Argument elements</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">1 mark for each use of other argument elements that strengthens the reasoning: counter with response, example, evidence, analogy, hypothetical reasoning <i>Credit each type only once per strand of reasoning</i> <i>Maximum 3 marks</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Structure</td> <td style="padding: 5px;">1 mark for two or more distinct strands of reasoning</td> </tr> </table>		Reasons	2 marks for three or more reasons supporting conclusions 1 mark for one or two reasons supporting conclusions	Inferential reasoning	1 mark for each use of an intermediate conclusion or chain of intermediate conclusions <i>(including if used in a response to a counter)</i> <i>Maximum 3 marks</i>	Argument elements	1 mark for each use of other argument elements that strengthens the reasoning: counter with response, example, evidence, analogy, hypothetical reasoning <i>Credit each type only once per strand of reasoning</i> <i>Maximum 3 marks</i>	Structure	1 mark for two or more distinct strands of reasoning	8
Reasons	2 marks for three or more reasons supporting conclusions 1 mark for one or two reasons supporting conclusions										
Inferential reasoning	1 mark for each use of an intermediate conclusion or chain of intermediate conclusions <i>(including if used in a response to a counter)</i> <i>Maximum 3 marks</i>										
Argument elements	1 mark for each use of other argument elements that strengthens the reasoning: counter with response, example, evidence, analogy, hypothetical reasoning <i>Credit each type only once per strand of reasoning</i> <i>Maximum 3 marks</i>										
Structure	1 mark for two or more distinct strands of reasoning										
<p><i>Each component of a candidate response may score only once. Where there is more than one possibility, use the classification which leads to the higher total mark.</i></p> <p><i>Maximum 6 marks for no conclusion or wrong conclusion, or a conclusion that does not follow from the reasoning, or if both sides are argued without a resolution.</i></p> <p><i>No credit for material unrelated to the claim given on the question paper. No credit for material merely reproduced from the passage.</i></p> <p>Annotate answers as follows:</p> <p>CON To indicate main conclusion.</p> <p>R To indicate creditworthy reason used to support a conclusion.</p> <p>I To indicate creditworthy intermediate conclusion.</p> <p>AE To indicate creditworthy other argument element.</p> <p>S To indicate distinct strand of reasoning.</p> <p>E To indicate that mark has been capped.</p> <p>SEEN When a type of argument element has already been credited in the same strand of reasoning.</p> <p>X To indicate material that is judged not to have a structural function the argument.</p> <p>Use highlighter to indicate material which is not relevant to the stated claim or is reproduced from the passage.</p>											

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p>Example 8-mark answers</p> <p><i>Support (178 words)</i></p> <p>When people are young, they are often attracted to risky sports such as bull riding or motor racing. Due to immaturity, they are not sufficiently aware of the dangers they face or of their vulnerability to them, so they need to be protected from themselves. Governments are best placed to maximise the welfare of their citizens, therefore such protection should be given by law.</p> <p>While it may be argued that people should be free to risk their lives if they wish to do so, serious injuries do not just affect the lives of participants; they have a negative impact on loved ones and on healthcare services. So, it is not just a matter of individual freedom, there are wider interests to be considered.</p> <p>Some safer sports give people an adrenalin boost comparable to what they could expect from more dangerous ones. If people can attain the same hormonal outcome with less risk, then it follows that it would be irrational to choose riskier activities. However, people do not always make rational choices.</p> <p>Therefore, dangerous sports should be banned.</p> <p><i>Challenge (171 words)</i></p> <p>It is impossible to define accurately what constitutes a 'dangerous' sport. For instance, both gymnastics and soccer – normally viewed as 'safe' sports – sometimes involve serious injuries to participants. If all sports where risk of injury is a factor were to be banned, then, given that many popular sports fall into this category, it follows that the effect would be widespread.</p> <p>People should be free to take whatever risks they please with their lives, as long as they don't risk the health and safety of others; hence, as long as nobody else is put at risk of harm, there is no justification for paternalistic limits on how people choose to take private recreation.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p>S AE</p> <p>While it is true that many young lives are lost each year through hazardous sporting activities, life is inherently R dangerous. Learning to manage risk is an important part of growing up; so, it would be better to teach people how to do this rather than to encourage them to avoid risk completely.</p> <p>I</p> <p>CON</p> <p>Therefore, dangerous sports should not be banned.</p> <p><i>Acceptable 'challenge' conclusions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dangerous sports should not be banned. • We should not ban dangerous sports. 	