

**CAMBRIDGE**  
INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

[www.PapaCambridge.com](http://www.PapaCambridge.com)

**June 2003**

GCE AS LEVEL

MARK SCHEME

MAXIMUM MARK: 50

SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 8436/01

THINKING SKILLS  
Paper 1 (Multiple Choice)

<i>Question Number</i>	<i>Key</i>	<i>Question Number</i>	<i>Key</i>
1	<b>B</b>	26	<b>D</b>
2	<b>C</b>	27	<b>D</b>
3	<b>D</b>	28	<b>B</b>
4	<b>C</b>	29	<b>B</b>
5	<b>E</b>	30	<b>A</b>
6	<b>C</b>	31	<b>D</b>
7	<b>D</b>	32	<b>A</b>
8	<b>C</b>	33	<b>B</b>
9	<b>C</b>	34	<b>B</b>
10	<b>E</b>	35	<b>B</b>
11	<b>B</b>	36	<b>D</b>
12	<b>E</b>	37	<b>E</b>
13	<b>C</b>	38	<b>E</b>
14	<b>E</b>	39	<b>C</b>
15	<b>B</b>	40	<b>C</b>
16	<b>A</b>	41	<b>D</b>
17	<b>B</b>	42	<b>B</b>
18	<b>E</b>	43	<b>C</b>
19	<b>C</b>	44	<b>C</b>
20	<b>E</b>	45	<b>C</b>
21	<b>D</b>	46	<b>D</b>
22	<b>A</b>	47	<b>C</b>
23	<b>C</b>	48	<b>E</b>
24	<b>E</b>	49	<b>C</b>
25	<b>B</b>	50	<b>A</b>

**TOTAL 50**

**CAMBRIDGE**  
INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS



**June 2003**

**GCE AS LEVEL**

**MARK SCHEME**

**MAXIMUM MARK: 50**

**SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 8436/02**

**THINKING SKILLS  
Paper 2 (Critical Thinking)**

Page 1	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003	8436

### Question 1: Marking Guide

The issue here is whether Crowe deliberately caused the crash. The alternative conclusions are that Crowe 'held his line' and that *either* the crash was accidental with no one to blame *or* that it was Farr's own fault for trying to overtake where he did.

All or most of the following points should be addressed, with the accompanying (or similar) commentary:

1. (MOT) Crowe has a **motive**: a crash would leave him as champion. He does not have to win the race, only stop Farr from finishing ahead of him.
2. (C/F) Crowe **claims** he held his line and it was Farr's fault. Farr **disputes** this and says that he had room to get through, and Crowe drove into him as they came level. This is not evidence; it is simply claim and counter claim, and therefore cancels out.
3. (LOC) The location of the crash and the conditions: the Slide was 'notorious' – implying 'dangerous'. And it was raining. This could be seen as supporting Crowe's claim that it was a bad place to overtake.
4. (PH) The hard evidence of the **photographed positions** of the car is *not really conclusive*, and that is the correct evaluation. As they approach the bend Crowe is in the lead and therefore has a right to 'hold his line'. The two main questions to ask are: **(A)** Does C hold his line or move towards Farr as he tries to overtake on the inside? **(B)** Does F really have enough room to get past? A related question could be: Does F himself drive over towards C? He could have just lost control or been too quick to head into the next bend. It would not be wrong to question whether F is holding *his* line.
5. (MAN) **Farr's manager** says he swerved deliberately, but her claim is not supported by any hard evidence. It is an assumption on the basis of the motive alone, which is insufficient. Obviously, too, she is not impartial/has interest. If C is disqualified it could mean her driver wins the championship after all. She was also angry.
6. (TV) The footage shows C smiling. But this does not mean he acted deliberately. It could be asked why C chose to deny blame so quickly. Is that a sign of guilt?
7. (RO) The **race official**, though unsure, says it looked like an accident. S/he was in a good position, (ref. to picture) though it was raining and the spray may have made visibility poor.
8. (A) **Akram** would also have had difficulty seeing the cars in the spray, and he could not really see C's car at the time of the crash because it is blocked by the spectators stand (ref to picture). He implies that it was deliberate, though he denies C swerved as such. His statement is based on assumptions about C's motives and past record, rather than on observation, and (he claims) the general expectation. We don't know whether he is impartial or not.
9. (B) **Brecht's** report is mainly hearsay and gossip and cannot be taken as conclusive. We don't know whether she is impartial or not, though the fact that she reports as she does suggests she does not particularly like C. 'Knowing him well' means that she may have biased views, and cannot be treated as very reliable.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003	8436

10. (REC) C has been involved in **similar incidents** in the past, but not found to be at fault. This adds to suspicion, but is not conclusive by any means.

**Conclusion:** despite much room for suspicion, there is insufficient evidence to conclude that C was guilty of causing the crash intentionally. 'Quite believable', 'likely', etc. are acceptable conclusions provided there is reasoning to support them.

### Question 1: Mark Scheme

#### Component A: Evaluation

For each point addressed (up to a maximum of 8) award:

**1 mark** for raising the point **and** commenting, but not necessarily with a valid inference, e.g. "The manager said Crowe did it on purpose because that meant he won the championship. She said it was no surprise, so she was probably right."

**2 marks** for a sound but basic evaluation – e.g. "The manager said that it was no surprise that Crowe had swerved deliberately. But she was biased and so she may have been making it up."

**3 marks** for a thorough and sound evaluation – e.g. "The manager blamed Crowe for deliberately causing the accident. She claimed it was obvious that he had done it deliberately because that was all he needed to do to win the championship. However, she has a strong reason for wishing to see Crowe disqualified, as this might give her man the championship after all. Her opinion is likely to be influenced by this."

**Note:** If a candidate raises more than 8 identifiable points, credit is given to **the best 8**. This gives a possible total of 24. The score is therefore halved to give the mark for evaluation out of 12.

#### Component B: Conclusion and overall reasoning

Marks are awarded as follows:

**1 mark** for a **credited conclusion**, OR a **consistent** one.

**2 marks** for a credited conclusion if it is also **consistent** with the evaluation.

**3 marks** for a credited and consistent conclusion which is further supported by **sound reasoning**. This would normally be in a separate summing up or opening paragraph of the essay, but sometimes it may be found running through the essay. It need not be elaborate, but there must be reasoning *from* the evidence (as evaluated) *to* an acceptable overall conclusion for the full 3 marks to be awarded for component B.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003	8436

### Question 2: Marking Guide

- (a) (i) Identify the conclusion reached in paragraph 1, and two of the claims which are used to support it. [3]

ANSWER: It would seem good business sense to be tolerant of personal computer use [1]. Reasons [2 from]:

- Figures suggest workers are happier etc., if they have some recreational time
- Most of those who take breaks claim that they are better motivated because of this
- Some firms that have forbidden personal use of computers during office hours, have felt the effects of increased worker apathy and resentment

- (ii) What is the conclusion of the *main* argument (paragraphs 2-5)? [1]

ANSWER: The only sensible policy for any responsible organisation to adopt is to ban personal Internet access in the workplace [1].

- (b) Assess the strength of the reasoning given in paragraph 2. How effectively does it challenge the claims made in paragraph 1? [2]

Par. 2 does to some extent challenge the conclusion of par.1 by suggesting that the benefits of tolerating time-wasting are not worth the large and rising financial costs [1]. However, it is not a particularly effective challenge because the costs are not quantified/uncertain/just an estimate; and/or because it is only 'probable' that they outweigh the benefits. [2]

[NOTE: Observing that the challenge is not particularly strong, with appropriate reasons, can qualify for 2 marks. For observing strength/s only, 1 mark is given.]

- (c) Is the comparison in paragraph 4 between online news addiction and gambling a fair one, for the purposes of the argument? (Give supporting reasons for your answer.) [3]

ANSWER: Gambling on the face of it seems a more serious problem than looking at news bulletins; therefore it could be said that the analogy is an exaggeration and hence unfair [1]. It could also be said that looking at news is not a real 'addiction', or that it is only referred to as an addiction metaphorically, hence the inverted commas [1]. Also, news-watching doesn't cost money, unlike gambling [1]. However, there are similarities: people can feel *compelled* to follow news stories [1] and there are possibly repercussions for the individual and for their families [1]. [1 mark for each point of similarity or difference (or 2 for a well-developed one) up to 3 marks.]

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003	8436

- (d) **‘Companies that run websites deliberately use attention-grabbing news headlines which encourages users to revisit their sites regularly.’ If true, does this statement support the main argument or weaken it, or neither? (Give supporting reasons for your answer.) [2]**

ANSWER: The claim would clearly strengthen the argument [1]. Reasons: it helps to show that visiting news sites is compulsive/addictive and/or that this is intentional on the part of the companies that run them [1].

- (e) **‘It is not the right or the responsibility of any organisation to interfere with the way individual employees choose to live their lives.’ Which claim in the passage does this objection challenge most directly? How serious a challenge is it for the argument as a whole? [3]**

ANSWER: The claim most directly challenged is that if action can be taken to combat the growing addiction to online news, then it should be ... for the personal welfare of those concerned [1]. In an obvious way, this challenges the argument by attacking that one premise and thus implying that if people want to become addicted to news bulletins it is no concern of the employer/s. However, the challenge can easily be met: the argument is about the misuse of the organisation’s time, not the employee’s personal time; or the company is paying the employee to work and has a right/responsibility to ensure the work is done; or there is a financial reason for reducing time wasting, not just a personal one, etc. [1 mark for explaining the challenge; 2 marks for explaining and meeting the challenge in one of the ways above – or similar.]

- (f) **Present two further objections which could be made against the main argument and its conclusion. [4]**

ANSWER: There are various alternatives: e.g. developing the line taken in paragraph 1 about workers being better motivated if they are given some free time; or challenging the conclusion that the *only* sensible policy is a ban, by suggesting other policies or compromises such as restricted use; or a comparison between computer use and other accepted uses of free time such as stretching, exercising, coffee breaks, etc., and suggesting there is no significant difference. [1 mark for each of two relevant points; or 2 each if the point is well-developed/expanded – a maximum of 4 marks.]

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003	8436

### Question 3: Marking Guide

#### Analysis

The argument is contained in the second half of the passage. The first two and a half paragraphs supply the context, i.e. the target for the argument.

The overall conclusion is that restaurant owners who value their business would be wise to ignore the court ruling. It follows from the intermediate conclusion – or more correctly, conclusions – that the ruling is (A) unjust and (B) foolish/harmful to the industry. These claims are supported respectively by two lines of reasoning: (A) that the service charge is the waiter's by rights, because s/he serves the customer and boosts the profits, etc.; and (B) that waiters are poorly paid and that without tips service standards will fall and customers will stay at home (implying that profits will fall as a result).

A full analysis would be:

#### CONTEXT:

Restaurant tips have traditionally been for waiters.

Restaurant owners object to the tipping system as unfair and costly (for reasons given).

The EU court has ruled in the owners' favour.

*[A: paragraph 4]*

R1 It is the waiter, not the owner, who serves the customer.

R2 Customers who receive excellent service will return to a restaurant time and time again, boosting its profits and its reputation.

R3 Any money charged or given for *service* is earned.

*therefore*

**Intermediate Conclusion (1) (from R1-R3) Tips belong to the service staff by rights.**

*[B: paragraph 5]*

R4 Restaurant employees are very poorly paid.

R5 Waiters' organisations say that it is only the tips that give their members the incentive to provide good service.

R6 Tips encourage waiters to put up with the long, unsociable hours and the incessant demands of ill-mannered customers.

R7 As the standards of service inevitably fall, eating out will cease to be a special occasion. People will stay at home, save their money and cook for themselves.

(IMPLICATION (of R4-R7): profits may fall).

**Intermediate Conclusion (2) (from IC (1) + the implication of R4-R7). The court ruling is unjust *and* foolish.**

---

**Main Conclusion**     **Restaurant owners who value their businesses would therefore be wise to ignore it (the ruling).**



Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003	8436

www.PapaCambridge.com

## Levels of analysis (re. grid)

### Candidate...

#### Level 1:

recognised the **general gist** or **direction** of the passage and alluded to some (two or more) of the supporting reasons.

#### Level 2:

identified the **main conclusion** AND noted all or most of the **important reasons**.

#### Level 3:

achieved L2 and showed some understanding of the **form/structure/techniques** of the reasoning:

[e.g. the two strands of reasoning; the main argument as distinct from the context material; the two conjoined claims in the IC; the implied conclusion of par. 5; the use of a rhetorical question (R6) to support the reasoning in strand B].

## Evaluation

### Strengths:

The reasons do support the conclusions in that they challenge both the fairness and the wisdom of the court ruling on a number of counts. It is a fair point that if waiters give good service which boosts profits they should be rewarded for it, and that if the incentive to give good service goes, business may suffer.

In this sense the argument is *valid*.

### Flaws/weaknesses/assumptions

There are, however, a number of claims and/or steps in the argument which could be challenged, e.g.

'Service' is assumed to be given only by waiters; as observed in paragraph 2, chefs and other staff do not get tips, yet arguably they 'serve' customers too, and boost profits etc., and therefore 'earn' rewards in the same way.

The claim about 'poor pay' is unsupported and vague; also, 'often' needs qualifying.

The claim by the waiters' organisation that *only* tips give waiters incentive is too strong. As evidence it is also suspect, as the source has a vested interest.

The rhetorical question (R6) does not establish that hours *are* long or customers ill-mannered, etc. These have to be assumed.

The claim that standards will 'inevitably' fall is too strong for the supporting reasons; and the consequences of such a fall are speculative, and possibly exaggerated. (Slippery slope fallacy could be alleged here.) People may still choose to eat out and put up with poorer service.

The IC that the ruling is 'foolish' is not really established by paragraph 5, less still that it will 'harm the whole industry'.

The move from IC to C could be challenged on the grounds that some restaurant owners could abide by the ruling regarding tipping, but reward or motivate waiters in

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	AS LEVEL EXAMINATIONS – JUNE 2003	8436

some other way. There is an assumption that tipping is the *only* way to achieve this which, if refuted, weakens the argument.

### Typical further argument

Against the argument, the line taken in paragraph 2 could be developed: waiters are not the only employees in a restaurant who the owner has to pay; and there is no reason for them to have tips exclusively.

In support of the argument it could be claimed that, on the contrary, waiters are a special case: they have the personal contact with the customer and it is their extra care and attention that decides whether a large or small tip (or no tip) is given. Therefore, the tip should go personally to the waiter, not be shared with others who may not have been as caring or attentive.

Taking neither side directly, it could be argued that tipping a waiter is outdated and demeaning; also that it encourages employers to pay bad wages and should be abandoned altogether. Moreover, it is *inconsistent* to tip some people (e.g. waiters, taxi-drivers, hair-dressers) but not others (e.g. teachers, fire-fighters).

Question 3: Mark grid

<i>Evaluation</i> ⇒	<b>Level 3:</b> thorough critical evaluation of the argument, in terms of soundness, strengths, weaknesses, status of claims, assumptions, flaws. <i>At least 3</i> of these must be included in the critique	<b>Level 2:</b> critical evaluation of <b>some</b> key points in the argument	<b>Level 1:</b> some evaluation or relevant discussion of the <b>argument</b>	<b>Level 0:</b> some relevant discussion of the <b>passage</b>
<b>Component A:</b>  <b>Analysis</b> ↓				
<b>Level 3:</b> L2 + evident understanding of <b>form/structure/techniques</b>	12-13	10-11	8-9	6-7
<b>Level 2:</b> identifying the <b>main conclusion</b> , and ALL or MOST of the key <b>reasons</b>	10-11	8-9	6-7	4-5
<b>Level 1:</b> recognising the <b>general direction</b> of the argument, and some of the reasons	8-9	6-7	4-5	2-3
<b>Level 0:</b> summary of the text/parts of text	<b>N/A</b>	4-5	2-3	1
<b>Component B:</b> <b>Further argument</b> (max 4)	relevant and well developed	relevant		
for <b>each point</b> up to 2 (or for 2 best points):	add 2	add 1		