

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

**GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level**

## **MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2012 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 2012 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>23</b>

- 1 (a) **Source B contains information about allegations of official corruption. How significant is this information in relation to the reasons for the arrest of Anton Aschenbach?** [3]

Very significant [1]. The three strands of information which all allege that corruption is endemic in Ruritania strongly suggest that Mr Aschenbach has bribed public officials [1], but that this is not unusual [1] and is therefore not the true reason for his arrest [1]. This therefore gives added plausibility to the claims made in Sources C and D [1]. Another possible reason for the arrest is that Mr Aschenbach has failed to pay sufficiently high enough bribes to officials/the police [1].

- (b) **How reliable is the information in Source C in relation to the reasons for the arrest of Anton Aschenbach?** [3]

Somewhat reliable (neither very reliable nor entirely unreliable) [1]. The credibility is reduced by the vested interest of the opposition party to portray the government in a bad light [1], although the fact that they are in exile suggests that the regime is oppressive and thereby adds a little weight to the accusations of corruption [1]. The fact that the opposition party is in exile reduces their ability to see [1], but they claim that their statement is based on reports from within the country, which would have better ability to see [1].

*Maximum 2 if only one side considered.*

- (c) **How useful is the information in Source D in relation to the reasons for the arrest of Anton Aschenbach?** [3]

Of some use (neither very useful nor useless) [1]. Because the special correspondent is in Ruritania, he/she has at least fairly good ability to see/know what is happening [1], but he/she may have a vested interest to misrepresent the truth [1]. Because the reports are described as “rumours”, they are not very reliable [1], but they are consistent with the reports of Bernard Bruges’ political ambitions [1] and in combination with those reports offer a plausible motive for the arrest of Anton Aschenbach [1].

*Maximum 2 if only one side considered.*

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012	9694	23

- (d) Why do you think Anton Aschenbach has been arrested? Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, with critical reference to the evidence provided and with consideration of any plausible alternative scenarios. [6]

<b>Level 3</b> 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.
<b>Level 2</b> 3–4 marks	A reasonable answer, which evaluates the evidence, draws an acceptable conclusion in terms of probability and may mention at least one possible alternative scenario.
<b>Level 1</b> 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.
<b>Level 0</b> 0 marks	No credit-worthy material.

*Indicative content*

There are strong reasons for rejecting the official explanation for the arrest (as explained in answer (a)) and for accepting either of the explanations offered in Sources C and D, but there is very little basis for choosing between the two. Both the explanations in Sources C and D are plausible, but both are rather speculative and they are probably mutually exclusive.

- 2 (a) One newspaper entitled its report of the research described in Source A, “Clean your teeth twice a day to prevent heart attacks”. How well does the research support this title? [3]

The title overstates the implications of the research [1] and implies causation when the research has not established this [1]. Although it does suggest that people who brush their teeth regularly are less likely (other things being equal [1]) to experience a heart attack [1], the headline assumes that a change in behaviour can affect the risk of heart disease [1] and ignores other predisposing factors [1].

*Maximum 2 if only one side considered.*

- (b) Suggest and briefly explain two reasons why the connection between tooth-brushing and heart disease may be stronger than suggested by the research described in Sources A, B and C. [3]

- The researchers followed up the subjects for only eight years. Some of them may have developed heart disease after the end of the research period.
- Some of the factors for which the statistics were adjusted (such as high blood pressure) may possibly be caused or encouraged by poor tooth-cleaning habits.
- Too great an adjustment may have been made to compensate for the other important factors.
- According to Source D, some people who brush their teeth regularly do not do it efficiently; perhaps those who brush efficiently may experience even less heart disease than shown in the research.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>23</b>

- People who brush less may not bother with routine medical checks either; so minor heart disease may not be diagnosed.
- People may have over-estimated how often they brushed; so some of those who were recorded as brushing twice a day may actually have brushed once or even not at all.

*Guidelines*

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

2 marks for one developed explanation or for two undeveloped explanations.

1 mark for one undeveloped explanation.

- (c) Does the information in Source D support or challenge the conclusion in Source C? Justify your answer. [3]**

It supports the conclusion [1], by offering a further link between the lack of tooth-brushing and heart disease via gum and tooth disease [1]. On the other hand, it challenges the conclusion [1] by suggesting that the quality of brushing is more important than the mere fact of brushing twice a day [1].

- (d) ‘Brushing your teeth twice a day is one of the simplest and most effective ways to improve your health.’  
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]**

<b>Level 3</b> 5-6 marks	A strong, reasoned argument, which uses and evaluates all or most of the evidence provided.
<b>Level 2</b> 3-4 marks	A reasonable, simple argument, which uses and/or evaluates evidence.
<b>Level 1</b> 1-2 marks	A weak answer, which makes some reference to evidence but consists of opinion and/or assertion rather than argument <b>or</b> an argument, which makes no reference to evidence.
<b>Level 0</b> 0 marks	No credit-worthy material.

*Indicative content*

The claim goes further than the research justifies. Regular tooth-cleaning does improve health, but it is not clear to what extent and also these sources give no basis for denying that other strategies might be equally or more effective. Source D may to some extent undermine the findings of the research, since it implies that many of those listed as cleaning their teeth twice a day may do so inefficiently.

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

2 marks: If that opinion is wrong, or if they hold it for no good reason, then they are not entitled to it.

1 mark: No one is entitled to hold an opinion which is evidently wrong.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>23</b>

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

- The claim to be entitled to one's opinion is a poor excuse for intellectual laziness.
- If we voice an opinion without having thought about the issue, weighed the issue and considered alternative views, we are being less than human.
- Anyone who thinks that all opinions are equally acceptable is a fool.
- No one is entitled to hold an opinion which is evidently wrong.

**(c) Evaluate the reasoning in the argument. In your answer you should consider any strengths, weaknesses, flaws and unstated assumptions. [5]**

<b>Level 3</b> 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.
<b>Level 2</b> 2–3 marks	Relevant extended counter-argument (3 marks). Specific counter-assertions/agreements (2 marks). Single point of evaluation <b>only</b> (2 or 3 marks).
<b>Level 1</b> 1 mark	Discussion of the topic without specific reference to the passage <b>or</b> general or single counter-assertion/agreement <b>or</b> weak attempt at evaluation.
<b>Level 0</b> 0 marks	No relevant comments. Summary/paraphrase of the passage.

*Indicative content*

Para 2 consists of simple assertion, unsupported by reasoning.

The use of a stipulative definition of humans in para 3 begs the question.

The requirements in the last sentence of para 3 are rather unrealistic for everyday life.

The argument in para 4 is based on a straw person.

The examples in para 5 support the counter-argument well.

The strength of the counter-argument in para 5 reduces the effectiveness of the overall argument.

The first example in para 6 demonstrates persuasively that at least some moral judgments are not matters of opinion, but it leaves open the possibility that very few issues are so clear-cut.

The second example in para 6 is not supported by reasoning.

The final reason relates to the conclusion in a circular way – it is almost a statement of the conclusion.

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE AS/A LEVEL – October/November 2012</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>23</b>

- (d) ‘No one should ever tell anyone else that their opinion is wrong.’  
**Write your own argument to support or challenge this claim. The conclusion of your argument must be stated.** [5]

<b>Level 3</b> 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.
<b>Level 2</b> 2–3 marks	A simple argument. One reason + conclusion 2 marks. Two or more separate reasons + conclusion 3 marks.
<b>Level 1</b> 1 mark	Some relevant comment.
<b>Level 0</b> 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 5-mark answer*

Some people hold opinions which could put them in danger, and it is therefore in their own interests that someone should show them that their opinion is wrong. The belief that if you want something badly enough you will get it, for example, is a dangerous delusion and anyone who holds that opinion needs to be told it is wrong.

In most discussions between equals, telling someone that their opinion is wrong means something different, but it is none the less permissible. It is the equivalent of saying “I disagree with you.” That is not the end of a discussion, but the beginning.

In both these situations, telling someone that their opinion is wrong is likely to have good consequences. So it is not correct that no one should ever tell anyone else that their opinion is wrong.