

**THINKING SKILLS**

**9694/23**

Paper 2 Critical Thinking

**October/November 2019**

**MARK SCHEME**

Maximum Mark: 45

---

**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 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **9** 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.

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
1(a)	<p><i>Two answers required.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because the victim was presumably tortured into making his confessions [1], he would have had a vested interest to sign whatever his torturers wanted him to sign [1].</li> <li>• Because the alleged traitor was executed immediately [1], he had no opportunity to repudiate the confession [1].</li> <li>• Because the report was published in a newspaper controlled by the government [1], the reporter had a vested interest to report the official version of events, which may not have been true [1].</li> <li>• Because Southland has a reputation for being a repressive society [1], the newspaper had a vested interest to avoid saying anything which would get them into trouble [1].</li> <li>• Because the Chief of Staff wanted to incriminate and remove the First Lady/to secure a male heir to the Presidency etc. [1], he had a vested interest to lie about Boro's confession [1].</li> </ul>	4
1(b)	The Chief of Staff (or possibly the President himself) may have arranged for her to be killed [1] in order to avoid the embarrassment of a trial [1] or in order to avoid the possibility of a not guilty verdict [1] or in order to create an opportunity for the Chief of Staff's daughter to become First Lady [1] or in order to clear the way for a further marriage which could produce a male heir to the presidency [1].	2
1(c)	<p><i>1 mark for each of the following:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To encourage the President to make this declaration.</li> <li>• To facilitate a peaceful succession of power in due course.</li> <li>• To consolidate the power and influence of his own family.</li> <li>• To consolidate his own power and influence as father of the First Lady/grandfather of the next President.</li> <li>• To enable a member of his own family to become the next President.</li> <li>• To embed the notion of a hereditary presidency among the population.</li> <li>• To mollify/distract the population following the recent troubles and death of the First Lady.</li> </ul>	3

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>		<b>Marks</b>											
1(d)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>Level 3</b> 5–6 marks</td><td>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.</td><td style="text-align: center;"><b>6</b></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Level 2</b> 3–4 marks</td><td>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.</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Level 1</b> 1–2 marks</td><td>A weak answer, which refers to some of the evidence, possibly including a simple evaluative comment. The conclusion may be unstated or over-stated.</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td><b>Level 0</b> 0 marks</td><td>No credit-worthy material.</td><td></td></tr> </table>	<b>Level 3</b> 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.	<b>6</b>	<b>Level 2</b> 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.		<b>Level 1</b> 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.		<b>Level 0</b> 0 marks	No credit-worthy material.		
<b>Level 3</b> 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.	<b>6</b>												
<b>Level 2</b> 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.													
<b>Level 1</b> 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.													
<b>Level 0</b> 0 marks	No credit-worthy material.													

***Indicative content***

The possible conclusions are:

- Anna Jaja was guilty of adultery and/or treason.
- The President arranged for his wife and her friend to be falsely accused in order to free himself to marry again, in the hope of producing an heir.
- The President's Chief of Staff framed Anna Jaja and her friend, without the knowledge of the President, in order to remove her and free the President to marry again, in the interests of national stability.

The third of these may be the most likely.

***Notes for the guidance of markers***

Simple supported conclusion 1 (if no conclusion cap at Level 2)

+ simple consideration of alternative +1  
AND reasoned rejection of alternative +1

+ explicit use of some (3 or fewer) sources of evidence +1  
OR explicit use of all or most (4 or more) sources of evidence +2

+ critical evaluation of evidence +1 or (more than one case) +2  
+ good inferential reasoning +1 or (more than one case) +2

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p><i>Up to 2 marks each for up to two answers:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because there is a wide range of traits in each category, respondents are likely to find something with which they agree.</li> <li>• Each trait is open to broad interpretation, so is highly likely to be perceived as a good fit.</li> <li>• Because some traits feature in more than one row, the results may not be significant.</li> <li>• Respondents were shown only one list of traits each – they might have felt another list described them better if they had seen one.</li> <li>• Because people have a psychological need to belong to a group, they are likely to agree with any list of traits.</li> <li>• Some respondents may be reluctant to agree that negative traits apply to them, so the data are unreliable.</li> <li>• Responses may be affected by current mood/imagined context/scenario in which these labels are being applied.</li> <li>• Different people will have different understandings of the meaning of the labels (especially whether positive/negative).</li> <li>• The circumstances under which responses were given could be significant – results could differ depending on whether they responded verbally to the student, filled in a form, whether their data was anonymous etc.</li> </ul>	4
2(b)	While it suggests that there are circumstances in which the strict birth order does not correlate with the theory [1], in these cases the mechanism of Adler's theory is still correct [1], i.e. that it is the child's role in the family structure that develops the observed personality traits [1]. So Source B suggests that the theory might need modifying/expanding [1], by distinguishing between actual and psychological birth orders [1], but it does not contradict the theory [1].	3
2(c)	Pregnant women can ensure that they live in such a way as to give their unborn child the best chances in life [1] and parents and other adult members of the family can ensure that they give maximum stimulation and encouragement to all the children equally [1].	2

Question	Answer		Marks							
2(d)	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%; padding: 5px;"><b>Level 3</b> 5–6 marks</td><td style="padding: 5px;">A reasoned argument, which uses and evaluates all or most of the evidence provided.</td></tr> <tr> <td style="width: 20%; padding: 5px;"><b>Level 2</b> 3–4 marks</td><td style="padding: 5px;">A simple argument, which uses and/or evaluates evidence.</td></tr> <tr> <td style="width: 20%; padding: 5px;"><b>Level 1</b> 1–2 marks</td><td style="padding: 5px;">A weak answer, which makes some correct reference to evidence but consists of opinion and/or assertion rather than argument <i>or</i> a weak argument which makes no reference to evidence.</td></tr> <tr> <td style="width: 20%; padding: 5px;"><b>Level 0</b> 0 marks</td><td style="padding: 5px;">No credit-worthy material.</td></tr> </table>	<b>Level 3</b> 5–6 marks	A reasoned argument, which uses and evaluates all or most of the evidence provided.	<b>Level 2</b> 3–4 marks	A simple argument, which uses and/or evaluates evidence.	<b>Level 1</b> 1–2 marks	A weak answer, which makes some correct reference to evidence but consists of opinion and/or assertion rather than argument <i>or</i> a weak argument which makes no reference to evidence.	<b>Level 0</b> 0 marks	No credit-worthy material.	6
<b>Level 3</b> 5–6 marks	A reasoned argument, which uses and evaluates all or most of the evidence provided.									
<b>Level 2</b> 3–4 marks	A simple argument, which uses and/or evaluates evidence.									
<b>Level 1</b> 1–2 marks	A weak answer, which makes some correct reference to evidence but consists of opinion and/or assertion rather than argument <i>or</i> a weak argument which makes no reference to evidence.									
<b>Level 0</b> 0 marks	No credit-worthy material.									

***Indicative content***

- Source A describes Adler's theory that personality traits are influenced by birth order, which supports the claim,
- and says that the theory is popular, which may suggest it produces plausible results,
- but also admits it has little research support.
- Some of the traits listed in the table seem mutually incompatible,
- while others are attributed to more than one position in the family.
- Source B broadly supports the theory, but explains that it needs modifying to some extent.
- Source C suggests that birth order does not affect personality traits,
- but does have a small effect on intelligence.
- Source D claims a more significant effect on intelligence
- and mentions well-established effects of birth order on education, employment and income, which does support the claim.
- However, if the explanations in Source D are correct any disadvantages for later-born children can be overcome.

***Notes for the guidance of markers***

Simple supported conclusion 1  
*or* nuanced conclusion 2

+ use of 1 or 2 sources +1  
*or* use of all or most (3 or more) sources of evidence +2  
*not just mentioning or summarizing or comprehension*

+ critical evaluation of evidence +1 or (more than one case) +2

+ good inferential reasoning +1 or (more than one case) +2  
*not speculation*

+ personal thinking +1

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Marks</b>
3(a)	2 marks: Logically violence is the unavoidable final step in all disputes. 1 mark: No reasonable or humane person approves of violence, but logically violence is the unavoidable final step in all disputes.	2
3(b)	<p>1 mark for each of the following, to a maximum of 3 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (therefore) under the right circumstances everyone will behave violently.</li> <li>• Children are more aware of the inevitability of violence than anyone.</li> <li>• they [people who believe violence in society can be reduced by imposing severe punishments on those convicted of violent offences] are contradicting themselves</li> <li>• a policy of non-retaliation actually encourages violence.</li> <li>• (So) the threat of violence is the only reason why World War III has been avoided over the last 70 years.</li> </ul> <p><i>Allow one additional element or one significant omission in each case. If more than three answers are offered, mark the first four only.</i></p>	3

Question	Answer	Marks
3(c)	<p><i>Marks for each evaluative point as follows, up to a maximum of 5 marks:</i></p> <p><i>2 marks: Valid evaluative point, clearly expressed.</i></p> <p><i>1 mark: Weak attempt at a valid evaluative point.</i></p> <p><i>Paragraph 1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Appeal to authority/begging the question:</i> The reference to ‘the most reliable psychologists’.</li> <li>• <i>Assumption:</i> that inherent drives in human nature cannot be controlled/suppressed.</li> </ul> <p><i>Paragraph 2</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Weak support for the IC: children’s awareness of the inevitability of violence is established, but not the comparison with ‘anyone’ (else).</li> <li>• The description of advice as ‘realistic’ begs the question.</li> <li>• <i>Inconsistency:</i> The hint that the abolition of physical punishment is inevitable and the word ‘irony’ imply a negative attitude towards physical punishment, which is inconsistent with the IC.</li> </ul> <p><i>Paragraph 3</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Stipulative definition:</i> The claim in the final sentence relies on a broad implicit definition of violence.</li> </ul> <p><i>Paragraph 4</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Ad hominem:</i> The description of proponents of non-retaliation as ‘idealistic’ and knowing ‘nothing about real life’ is a personal attack [1], but it is not much of a weakness, since it is supported by reasoning [1].</li> <li>• <i>Conflation</i> of ‘not resisting’ with ‘non-retaliation’.</li> </ul> <p><i>Paragraph 5</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Restriction of options:</i> Either you have nuclear weapons or you are unable to defend yourself (<i>can be expressed as conflation</i>).</li> <li>• <i>Conflation:</i> This paragraph supports the MC only if ‘violence’ includes ‘the threat of violence’.</li> <li>• <i>Overdrawn IC:</i> The reasoning supports the claim that the threat of violence is a reason why WW III has been avoided, but not that it is the <b>only</b> reason. <i>(Can be expressed as restriction of options or assumption.)</i></li> </ul>	5

Question	Answer		Marks
3(d)	<p><b>Level 3</b> 4–5 marks</p> <p>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.</p>		<b>5</b>
	<p><b>Level 2</b> 2–3 marks</p> <p>A simple argument. One reason + conclusion – 2 marks. Two or more separate reasons + conclusion – 3 marks.</p>		
	<p><b>Level 1</b> 1 mark</p> <p>Some relevant comment.</p>		
	<p><b>Level 0</b> 0 marks</p> <p>No relevant comment.</p>		
	<p><i>Maximum 3 marks for wrong conclusion or if conclusion is implied but not stated.</i> <i>No credit for material merely reproduced from the passage.</i></p> <p><b>Specimen level 3 answers</b></p> <p><b>Support (106 words)</b> Living at enmity with relatives, colleagues or neighbours is more stressful than any other experience. In addition to creating unhappiness for all concerned, it wastes a lot of mental energy. So everyone needs to develop the skills required to maintain peaceful relationships.</p> <p>The purpose of education is to develop the skills required for success in adult life. The skills required to form and maintain healthy relationships should have a high priority, because they not only are relevant to the future, but also affect the quality of life in school itself.</p> <p>Therefore teaching people to live at peace with one another is an important part of education.</p> <p><b>Challenge (117 words)</b> Life is a competition, and its prizes, such as money, luxury and power, go to those who have the courage and the determination to seize them. Peaceable people are the natural losers in this competition. So learning to be ruthless is better than learning to live at peace.</p> <p>The kind of peace which is desirable is peace between nations. But the methods and skills required to build that kind of peace are totally different from those needed to live at peace with other people. So learning to be a peaceable person in one's private life will not promote world peace.</p> <p>Therefore teaching people to live at peace with one another is not an important part of education.</p>		