

---

**THINKING SKILLS**

**9694/22**

Paper 2 Critical Thinking

**October/November 2017**

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 2017 series for most Cambridge IGCSE<sup>®</sup>, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

Question	Answer	Marks
1(a)	<p>Limited significance [1]. Although the money referred to by Bland could well be the proceeds from selling his shares in Alpha Holdings [1], and the plausibility of this is strengthened by the date of the email [1], it offers no evidence that this sale is due to insider trading [1]. Also, we cannot be sure that the money referred to is from the sale of these shares [1].</p>	3
1(b)	<p>Not useful [1] (in Bland's defence).</p> <p>It is unreliable as Bland's lawyers will have a vested interest to lie or distort the truth [1]</p> <p>We do not know what proportion of these sales was due to Bland selling his shares [1]. It is possible that all or the vast bulk of these shares were Bland's, given the amount of money he gained as evidenced in Source A [1].</p> <p>The fact that many shares were sold on the day in question might indicate that the insider information was widely leaked i.e. that Bland was not the only offender but this does not show him to be innocent [1]</p> <p><i>Alternatively</i> Quite useful [1]. The fact that Bland waited for two days after the newspaper article before selling his shares might indicate Bland's innocence [1] (if one supposes that their value was likely to go down in that time).</p>	3
1(c)	<p>It could be relevant [1]. Bland's amoral attitude and willingness to take risks could mean he is willing to do inside trading [1] but we cannot assume this [1]. However, even if he had no inner moral restraints about insider trading he might still be deterred by the threat of going to prison [1] – which is mentioned as the penalty for insider trading in Source A. Also, his reference to risk-taking may apply purely in the sense of gambling with money rather than risk in a broader sense [1].</p>	3

Question	Answer		Marks
1(d)	<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.	
	<p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Possible answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bland is not guilty and was simply securing his gains possibly prompted by the rumours.</li> <li>• Bland is guilty and knew the talks were going to collapse the next day.</li> <li>• Bland actually started the rumours to provide a cover for his insider trading</li> <li>• Bland started the rumours and scuppered the deal to secure his gains.</li> </ul> <p>The main problem for Bland is explaining the timing of his sale the day before the collapse. It seems fortuitous if this was just a normal sale of shares. On the other hand, because it looks so suspicious to sell the shares the day before, if it had been a case of insider trading by Bland he might have done this a few days before to allay suspicion. This would also have the advantage of selling before people acted on the rumours. The fact that he delays acting until the 11th hour suggests he wasn't the source of the rumours. The source of the rumours is a crucial question and Bland could have a motive to spread such rumours to cover his tracks. Also, we need to know more about why the deal collapsed and whether Bland had a hand in this. If it collapsed unexpectedly at the last minute it is difficult to see how Bland could have foreseen this. The idea that Bland deliberately scuppered the deal seems implausible if it is true that shares were expected to go on rising once the deal had gone through.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks
1(d)	<p><b>Notes for the guidance of markers</b></p> <p>Simple supported conclusion 1 (if no conclusion cap at Level 2)</p> <p>+ simple consideration of alternative +1 AND reasoned rejection of alternative +1</p> <p>+ 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</p> <p>+ critical evaluation of evidence +1 or (more than one case) +2 + good inferential reasoning +1 or (more than one case) +2</p> <p><i>Max 6</i></p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
2(a)	<p><i>1 mark for each plausible reason, for example:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not possible to compare specific ‘laser eye treatment’ with unspecific dental procedures.</li> <li>• It is not possible to compare widespread routine dental procedures with a minority non-routine procedure like laser eye surgery.</li> <li>• We don’t know if the chance of something going wrong is at all similar for eye surgery and dentistry.</li> <li>• We don’t have enough information to judge the relative necessity of these procedures.</li> <li>• The severity of the consequences of something going wrong is probably greater in eye surgery than in dentistry.</li> <li>• Teeth can be replaced but eyes cannot.</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>
2(b)	<p>Not good at all <b>[1]</b>. It fails to have any impact on the point about needing reading glasses in later life <b>[1]</b>. It also fails to have any impact on the point about the risk of contact sports <b>[1]</b>.</p>	<b>3</b>
2(c)	<p><i>1 mark for each explanation identified (max 2):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The statistics are a result of the procedure being carried out incompetently by their cheaper rivals.</li> <li>• The statistics are a result of the procedure being carried out on inappropriate people.</li> <li>• The after-effects are self-reported, so the numbers are likely to over-represent the occurrence of such problems.</li> <li>• No timeframe is given; these after-effects could be only temporary (and so arguably not serious).</li> <li>• There may be effective treatment for the problems identified</li> <li>• These eye problems may be being wrongly attributed to the eye surgery.</li> </ul> <p><i>1 mark for a clear outline (see below) of why they might be used:</i></p> <p>All these explanations would suggest that there is little or nothing wrong with the actual procedure. Any problems are temporary/treatable.</p>	<b>3</b>

Question	Answer		Marks
2(d)	<b>Level 3</b> 5–6 marks	A reasoned argument, which uses and evaluates all or most of the evidence provided.	<b>6</b>
	<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 <b>or</b> a weak argument which makes no reference to evidence.	
	<b>Level 0</b> 0 marks	No credit-worthy material.	
	<p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Source A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly popular procedure</li> <li>• Comparable in risk to other medical procedures</li> <li>• However from a biased source</li> </ul> <p>Source B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reading glasses will still be needed in later life</li> <li>• Not suitable for people involved in contact sports</li> <li>• Above points undermine claims in last sentence of Source A</li> <li>• However, reading glasses might not be needed at all times</li> <li>• The degree of risk re contact sports is unknown</li> </ul> <p>Source C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence for a number of problems after laser eye treatment</li> <li>• Treatment is irreversible</li> <li>• Treatment is unnecessary</li> </ul> <p>Source D</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 99% report they can see perfectly well</li> <li>• If true, suggests those who have problems are either unsuitable for treatment or have suffered incompetent treatment. The procedure is OK.</li> <li>• However this point fails to address the issues raised in Source B</li> <li>• The above statistic also fails to challenge the fact that the procedure is irreversible</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer	Marks
2(d)	<p><b><i>Notes for the guidance of markers</i></b></p> <p>Simple supported conclusion 1 OR nuanced conclusion 2</p> <p>+ <u>use</u> of 1 or 2 sources +1 OR <u>use</u> of all or most (3 or more) sources of evidence +2 <i>not just mentioning or summarising or comprehension</i></p> <p>+ critical evaluation of evidence +1 or (more than one case) +2</p> <p>+ good inferential reasoning +1 or (more than one case) +2 <i>not speculation</i></p> <p>+ personal thinking +1</p> <p><b><i>Max 6</i></b></p>	

Question	Answer	Marks
3(a)	<p><i>2 marks:</i> We should encourage people to participate in sports in order to improve their health</p> <p><i>1 mark:</i> We should encourage people to participate in sports.</p>	<b>2</b>
3(b)	<p><i>1 mark for each of the following, to a maximum of 3 marks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A society in which the vast majority of people participated in sport would put less strain on hospital accident and emergency units.</li> <li>• Spending on health would be kept under control.</li> <li>• (So) sport brings economic benefits.</li> <li>• Sports injuries are a price worth paying.</li> <li>• (We must conclude that) there is no substitute for sport as a means of keeping fit.</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>	<b>3</b>

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>• Assumption – all sports involve physical activity.</li> <li>• Assumption – participation in sport would not encourage over-eating.</li> <li>• Assumption – heart disease and diabetes can be relieved through losing weight.</li> </ul> <p><i>Paragraph 2</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption – people with long term health conditions are frequent users of accident and emergency units.</li> <li>• Assumption –reduction in use of A and E by people with obesity etc will be greater than the increase in sports related injuries.</li> <li>• Flaw – a healthier population is not a sufficient condition for keeping health spending under control.</li> </ul> <p><i>Paragraph 3</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistency: it is possible that a competitive mindset might be bad for health / undermine health benefits of sport.</li> <li>• The support given to the MC by this IC is vague and inaccurate.</li> <li>• Equivocation in use of the word ‘competing’</li> </ul> <p><i>Paragraph 4</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistency – points here undermine reasoning in paragraph 2.</li> <li>• Ambiguity – ‘price worth paying’ could be true in a figurative sense for the individual but not true for economics of health care.</li> <li>• Incoherence: it is not clear how getting injured would not undermine the physical benefits of participation in sports.</li> </ul> <p><i>Paragraph 5</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assumption – non-sporting activities do not build character in other ways.</li> <li>• Flaw – generalisation; ‘team spirit’ only applies to team sports.</li> <li>• Flaw – post hoc. Assumed causal relationship between participation in sport and successful careers.</li> <li>• Flaw – the intermediate conclusion about keeping fit does not follow from the reasoning used.</li> </ul> <p><i>General evaluative point: Much of the reasoning only supports the first part of the conclusion rather than the specific conclusion ‘in order to improve health’. (Do not credit in addition to the same point made specifically about the IC of paragraph 3.)</i></p>	<b>5</b>



Question	Answer	Marks								
3(d)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>Level 3</b> 4–5 marks</td> <td>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.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Level 2</b> 2–3 marks</td> <td>A simple argument. One reason + conclusion – 2 marks. Two or more separate reasons + conclusion – 3 marks.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Level 1</b> 1 mark</td> <td>Some relevant comment.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Level 0</b> 0 marks</td> <td>No relevant comment.</td> </tr> </table> <p><i>Maximum 3 marks for wrong conclusion or if conclusion is implied but not stated.</i></p> <p><i>No credit for material merely reproduced from the passage.</i></p> <p><b>Specimen level 3 answers</b></p> <p><i>Support (118 words)</i></p> <p>Selling rights to screen sporting events has been a key contributor to the over-commercialisation of sport. Ticket prices have increased massively as ownership of sporting clubs has passed to businessmen who see them mainly as a way of making money. Many ordinary fans cannot afford these ticket prices so are deprived of the right to see live sport. Sportsmen and women are also drawn into this world where making money becomes the key focus. They are involved in lucrative sponsorship deals with leading sports goods manufacturers. Firms are only willing to pay these huge sums because they know the player will be seen by millions of people on television. So television has had a negative impact on sport.</p> <p><i>Challenge (115 words)</i></p> <p>Whilst some sports, like football, have become increasingly commercialised due to lucrative television deals, sport is played at a local level by ordinary people much as it has always been. Only at the very top professional level has televising sport had an impact on its nature. So it would be a massive generalisation to say television has had a negative impact on sport. It is also possible that watching sport on television has made a significant number of people interested in participating in a sport in the first place. So, in this case, television has actually had a positive impact on sport. So it is not true that television has had a negative impact on sport.</p>	<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.	<b>5</b>
<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.									