

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2012 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- Cambridge will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2012 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2012	9694

- 1 (a) How reliable is Tyrell's evidence (Source B) in discovering whether the princes in the Tower were murdered?

(Rather) unreliable [1]. Although he had excellent ability to know what happened [1], under torture he would probably have admitted whatever his tormentors wanted him to admit [1]. A report from officials loyal to Henry VII is presumably the only source for this information, and they would have reported whatever the King wanted them to report, whether Tyrell had said it or not [1].

Maximum 2 if only one side considered.
Award mark for judgement only if the judgement is supported.

- (b) How useful are the views of the Richard III Society in Source D in discovering whether Richard ordered the murder of the princes in the Tower? [3]

Neither very useful, nor entirely useless [1]. The Society's bias to interpret evidence in favour of their beliefs reduces their credibility [1]; however, this bias may not extend very far because of their academic aims; so their belief may well be plausible [1]. Although the Society is a modern one, and the events took place long ago (poor ability to see) [1], they may be able to study relevant documents in a scholarly way [1], or their amateur status may prevent them from doing so [1]. The views are useful because they offer an alternative perspective [1].

Maximum 2 if only one side considered.
Award mark for judgement only if the judgement is supported.

- (c) In 1674, builders repairing the Tower of London discovered the skeletons of two children under a staircase; on the orders of King Charles II, they were re-buried in Westminster Abbey.

How significant is this discovery in deciding whether the princes were murdered? [3]

Not very significant. [No mark for judgement.] The discovery is consistent with the princes' having been murdered [1] but far from decisive [1]. Charles II appears to have believed the skeletons were those of the princes [1], but they could have been of other children [1] (less likely if there is no record of any other two children being imprisoned in the Tower [1]). Even if the skeletons were of the two princes, they may have died of natural causes [1], although the fact that the skeletons were found under a staircase suggests foul play [1].

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2012	9694

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

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 possible alternative scenario.
Level 2 3–4 marks	A reasonable answer, which uses and/or evaluates the evidence, draws an acceptable conclusion in terms of probability and may mention at least one possible alternative scenario.
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.

Indicative content

Candidates may legitimately argue in favour of any of four possibilities: they were killed on the orders of Richard III; they were killed on the orders of Henry VII; they died of natural causes; or they survived to a later date. Particularly perceptive candidates may recognise that the most damning evidence against Richard is his failure to produce the children in order to prove that he had not murdered them (this can be inferred from Source A).

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2012	9694

- 2 (a) To what extent does the evidence in Source C support the claim in Source D that 'attractive people are less likely than average to commit crimes, whereas unattractive people are more likely to do so'?

The evidence does support the claim [1], because in nearly all the categories the probability for unattractive people is +, whereas the probability for very attractive people is – [1]. However, it may only support it quite weakly, because the numbers may be seen to be quite small [1]. Some results do not fit a clear pattern [1], and it is not possible to evaluate the differentials reliably in the absence of any indication of what the average is [1]. The judgements of attractiveness are subjective and therefore not wholly reliable [1]. Strictly, the evidence can support only claims about people **admitting** to having committed crimes, not to actually committing them [1].

Award mark for judgement only if the judgement is supported.

- (b) A blogger commented, 'Unattractive and poor often go hand in hand. Probably most of the crimes listed in the study were committed by the poor who happened to be unattractive as well.'

To what extent does this comment undermine the usefulness of this study? [3]

It does not undermine it much, if at all [1], because according to Sources B and C the data were adjusted to take account of factors which might indicate poverty [1]. However, poverty itself was not included in the adjustment; so this confounding factor may not have been totally eliminated [1]. This comment is consistent with the hypotheses in Source D [1]. Alternatively, if poverty causes unattractiveness, then the research is seriously undermined [1].

Award mark for judgement only if the judgement is supported.

- (c) The research study described in Source B also discovered that very attractive females who commit crimes are less likely to be arrested, and less likely to be convicted if charged.

To what extent do these findings offer an alternative to the explanations suggested in Source D? [3]

Very little if at all [1], because the data refer to self-reporting, not arrests, prosecutions or convictions [1]. However, there may be a slight effect, since it is possible that people are psychologically less likely to admit to criminal activity if they have avoided detection or conviction [1], or that they are unlikely to risk incriminating themselves [1]. It is possible that attractive people commit as many crimes but are less likely to be 'labelled' as criminals [1]. These findings reinforce the claim in Source D that people in authority favour attractive people [1]. Unless very attractive men are equally likely to avoid arrest or conviction, these findings do not explain why men self-report less crime [1].

Award mark for judgement only if the judgement is supported.

(d) 'You can identify people who have criminal tendencies just by looking at their faces.'

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 – D.

[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

The support for this claim offered by the four sources is very weak. Despite the enduring appeal of physiognomy, Source A suggests that it has no rational or scientific basis. The availability of information on the internet is of nearly negligible value as support. The research described in Sources B, C and D suggests that unattractive people may be a little more likely to engage in criminal activity, which is a much narrower claim than the one being discussed.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2012	9694

3 (a) Using the exact words from the passage as far as possible, identify conclusion.

2 marks: We need urgently to develop ways of punishing criminals apart from sending them to prison.

1 mark: Incomplete version of 2-mark answer (e.g. We need urgently to develop new ways of punishing criminals.)

Paraphrase of 2-mark answer.

2-mark answer + additional material

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

- This (that it costs us even more to punish law-breakers) is ridiculous and unfair.
- In today's economic climate we cannot afford to continue with it/with prison as a means of punishing criminals.
- Prison did not originate as a punishment.
- Criminals should be made to repay society for the harm they have done.
- A high proportion of prisoners in the UK need to be treated instead of punished.
- The harm inflicted by prison is long-term and counter-productive.
- Prison punishes the wrong people.

- (c) Evaluate the reasoning in the argument. In your answer you should comment on the strengths, weaknesses, flaws and unstated assumptions.

Level 3 4–5 marks	Evaluation of strength of argument with critical reference to strength/weakness, including some of: flaws, support given by reasons to intermediate conclusions, use of evidence, inconsistency, analogies, assumptions.
Level 2 2–3 marks	Relevant extended counter-argument (3 marks). Specific counter-assertions/agreements (2 marks). Single point of evaluation only (2 or 3 marks).
Level 1 1 mark	Discussion of the topic without specific reference to the passage or general counter-assertion/agreement. or weak attempt at evaluation
Level 0 0 marks	No relevant comments. Summary/paraphrase of passage.

Indicative content

The argument in para 2 depends on the questionable assumption that the original use or purpose of an institution is a reliable guide to current policy.

In para 3, the author shifts from “victims or society” to “society”.

The extended example in para 3 supports the argument well by showing how an alternative policy might work in practice, although the picture is rather idealised.

In para 3, the author begs the question in referring to “work which no one can afford to pay for”.

Para 3 may be based on a false dichotomy, since there may be ways of making people in prison do work which will repay either their victims or society in general.

Although the reference to evidential basis in para 4 is vague, it does strengthen the argument. This section of the argument depends on the reasonable assumption that people who are mentally ill should not be held responsible for their behaviour and/or that punishment and treatment are mutually exclusive. It is not possible to draw conclusions about how to treat all criminals on the basis of evidence about many.

Because the evidence in para 4 refers only to the UK, it provides only weak support to the main conclusion.

The argument in para 5 draws a conclusion about prison in general from evidence about the consequences of “lengthy” terms of imprisonment; the author ignores the possibility that short prison terms might be effective and might avoid the detrimental effects.

The argument in para 5 depends on the assumption that criminals should be motivated and equipped to become productive and responsible members of society.

(d) 'The punishment for crime should be so severe that people will not risk it.'

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

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 & c 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.

Indicative content (5-mark answers)

Support (87 words)

Those who contemplate breaking the law weigh up the possible benefits against what will happen to them if they are caught. There is not much a government can do to reduce the possible gains: so the obvious way of modifying the equation in order to reduce the amount of crime is to make the punishments harsher. Since so many people currently live in fear of crime, reducing it is an urgent task. Therefore the punishment for crime should be so severe that people will not risk it.

Challenge (87 words)

Excessively severe punishments offend against the principle of justice, but it might be possible to justify them if they effectively deterred potential criminals from breaking the law. However, it seems clear that harsher penalties would not actually make much difference to the amount of crime in a country, because people will continue to commit crimes if the motivation is strong enough and if they believe they are unlikely to be caught. Therefore the punishment for crime should not be so severe that people will not risk it.