

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2007 question paper

9694 THINKING SKILLS

9694/02

Paper 2 (Critical Reasoning), maximum raw mark 50

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.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

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

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2007 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	9694

1 (a) How credible is the evidence of Ms Nuñez? Support your view.

Ms N is the person most likely to be blamed for leaving the girls behind, whether deliberately or negligently. Therefore she has a VI to be less than truthful about the events and her part in them to cover herself. [1]

Her story is in conflict with that of Mr E, who claims that he told Ms N there were two students short. She may be trying to shift the blame on to Mr E. [1]

Her claim that the girls were talking to some boys is corroborated by the girls and she does not try to hide the fact that she was annoyed with them. Nor does she deny saying they would be left behind if they didn't hurry. However, this does not mean she deliberately left them behind, and her explanation that this is just something that teachers say to hurry students up is plausible. [1–2]

Conclusion: As a denial that the girls were deliberately left, Ms N's evidence is credible / But there is room for doubt that she took proper care to see that no students were left behind. [1]

Credit 2 good credibility points and one for a conclusion supported by those points. Max 3

(b) Which teacher is more to blame for leaving the two girls behind? Support your view. [2]

Mr E admits it was his job to count, but he also says that he told Ms N there were two students missing. He also says that she said the girls had arrived and told the driver to go. If all of this is true, then Mr E is not as much to blame, if at all, especially as we are told Ms N is the more senior teacher and the organiser of the trip / OR Mr Eales is to blame because it was his job to count and he should have recounted, even if Ms Nunez believed all the students were there. [1–2]

Mr E's statement is plausible: it is how a teacher in his position would be expected to behave. However, his claims are contradicted by Ms N, and he does of course have a reason to say that he had done his job and informed Ms N that there were students missing. A fair conclusion would be that on balance Ms N bears more responsibility for the error – if it was an error. If it was not an error, then she is almost certainly the one to blame. [1–2]

(c) Comment on the reliability and usefulness of the evidence given by Anil's father. [2]

The father's statement is almost entirely hearsay. [1]

There is no reason to think he is lying, but there is every reason to think that he is gullible: he seems to have swallowed everything his daughter has told him - uncritically. So although his evidence may be, to the best of his knowledge, true, that does not make it very useful/ OR Anil's father has a vested interest to protect his daughter / family's reputation / is biased in favour of his daughter, whom he clearly loves. [1]

Anil's father's evidence is useful to a certain extent, because it allows us to see certain inconsistencies with Greta's evidence or implausible parts of the story – for example, his evidence about the mobile phones points to a lie, because it is unlikely to the point of being implausible that neither girl had a working mobile phone. [1]

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	9694

(d) How credible is the explanation given by Greta and Anil for their late arrival? Evaluate the evidence in order to support your answer and consider alternative explanations.

It seems more than likely, on the strength of their evidence, that the girls were not being truthful.

Credit candidates who consider which bits of their evidence are more credible than others.

Evaluative points (e.g.):

- There are a number of inconsistencies and implausibilities in the evidence given by the two girls. There are also things they don't know or can't remember that are not convincing. Examples: Was it a man or woman who directed them? Why would they not remember where the bar was if they walked home from it?
- If they had been really worried about getting home they would have phoned their parents on a mobile: it is possible, but unusual, for two to be out of action at once. And in an emergency they could have borrowed a phone or used a public one.
- It is also a little implausible that they could not get together enough money for a bus fare, especially given the claim by Simon that Greta at least 'always has lots of money'.
- It is puzzling that they should say the boys were from another school unless they were hiding something, though that may have just been a guess rather than a lie.
- It is plausible that, after bunking off to go shopping, the two girls did get into some kind of trouble.
- More plausible—or at least as plausible—is the suggestion made by the ex-boyfriend Simon that they had gone into town; or gone somewhere with the lads they met at the centre.

(d) generic

Acceptable conclusion [1]

and:

- Some reference to the evidence, made in support of the conclusion [1]
- Two or more points of evidence examined and some evaluative comment made [2]
- Thorough evaluation of the evidence in terms of consistency, credibility/reliability, corroboration, etc. [3]

and

One or more plausible alternative explanations suggested [1] and argued for [1] [2]

[Max 6]

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	9694

2 (a) Identify two reasons the author gives to support the claim that ID cards will identify terrorists.

- people will not announce that they are terrorists on their ID cards.
- someone who is stopped by the police will escape if they do not show up on police records.
- forgery of ID cards will be inevitable.

(b) Identify one unstated assumption in the second paragraph. [2]

The author assumes that people will not change their ways if ID cards become compulsory. The author assumes that a system that does not work (perfectly) should not be attempted. The author assumes that a person caught without an ID card will not be given a chance to go and get it.

Statement of the assumption phrased as a counter-assumption (e.g. “people might change their habits with the new laws”) or unclearly stated. [1]
Correctly identified assumption. [2]

(c) ‘The police keep a list of people who are suspected of planning terrorist acts’.

Would this statement, if true, weaken or strengthen the argument or neither? Support your answer. [2]

An explanation linked to the appropriate conclusion (strengthen/weaken/neither). [2]

(d) Identify and briefly explain one flaw in the author’s reasoning in the last paragraph. [2]

The author uses a “slippery slope” argument in moving from ID cards to the threat of the widespread abuse of human rights. There is a contradiction in the author’s argument that ID cards will be useless and yet be “too powerful” to be trusted.

Name of flaw, unrelated to the reasoning/explanation which hints at the flaw. [1]
Clear statement of flaw and why it is problematic. [2]

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	9694

(e) Construct a brief argument to either support or counter the claim that a country should require its citizens to carry ID cards. State your conclusion.

- A reason which would support or challenge the claim / derivative reasoning to support the conclusion. [1]
- A reason and a clear conclusion (which it supports). [2]
- More than 1 reason clearly supporting conclusion. [3]
- Coherent + developed. [4]

Possible reasons in favour include:

1. Countries in a “state of emergency” may require ID cards even allowing for the criticisms above.
2. ID cards may make a country safer once the populace have become accustomed to them.
3. ID cards can be used to identify lost or missing persons or dead bodies.
4. ID cards are useful to identify those over 18.
5. ID cards are useful to keep track of legal and illegal inhabitants of a country.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	9694

3 (a) Can either of the following be reliably concluded from the evidence above? Explain your answers.

One mark for answer. One for explanation in each case.

(i) Patients taking 300mg of Drug X experience a 20% greater improvement than those taking 75mg. [2]

No (1 mark) because the graph shows percentages of patients experiencing a >50% improvement/we have no other information about the differences in improvement between patients on different doses (1 mark). (This ought to be an easy couple of marks)

(ii) Placebos work better for pain than for illnesses such as asthma. [2]

No (1 mark) we do not have enough / relevant evidence (1 mark). Candidates might look at 14% of asthma sufferers responding to a placebo and compare this with all the men in Experiment A or with Hanna in the magazine article. However, this is not enough relevant evidence.

(b) How might Experiment A be used to counter the idea in the cartoon, that a placebo has no real effect? [2]

Experiment A shows that the placebo is linked to the production of endorphins (1), a real, physical effect (1), so it is not just an imaginary feeling unrelated to what is happening in the body (1). So experiment A counters the idea by showing that the line on the graph, which is purely imaginary to improve feeling, is not analogous to what happens in the body/words to that effect (1).

Any two relevant, accurate points.

(c) '14 healthy male volunteers are not a representative sample of the whole population.' How effective is this objection to Experiment A? [3]

This is not an effective objection (1) because the experiment is not generalising from the sample to the whole population (2)/because you only need a small sample to negate the claim that the placebo effect is only psychological (2)

It is quite effective (1) because these people volunteered (1) and may therefore be predisposed to be convinced by a placebo (1).

Or it is effective (1) because only male, only, healthy, only volunteers, only young (any two of these) (1).

(d) How well does the evidence support Meera's claim that low-level light therapy is 'definitely working for Hanna'? [4]

Very weakly (1) because: it assumes a causal link between the treatment and Hanna's lack of headache (1) whereas there may be no link, or the lack of headache may be the result of the placebo effect (1). The other evidence, such as feeling relaxed and being in a good mood, is irrelevant (1). 45 minute session and few seconds treatment (1) so it may have been the talking or other part of therapy that lead to the effect (1).

OR Very strongly + identification of evidence [1]

4 Mark Grid

Descriptor	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Level 0
Component A Analysis (max. 4)	Evident understanding of structure, techniques, etc Eg Ex→R R→IC – C or Reasons joint. 4 marks	Identifying the main conclusion , and 2 of the key reasons . Or wrong MC but all KR 2-3 marks	Recognising the general direction of the argument, and some of the reasons . 1 mark	Summary of the text/parts of the text. 0 marks
Component B Evaluation (max. 5)	Thorough evaluation of strength of argument + critical reference to assumptions, weaknesses, and flaws 5 marks	Some evaluation of the argument, with reference to assumptions, weaknesses and/or flaws. Pertinent counter argument 3-4 marks	General discussion of strength of the argument / disagreement with the reason / weak counter argument. 1-2 mark	No evaluative comments. 0 marks
Component C Further Argument (max. 3)	Relevant and well developed point. 3 marks	One or more relevant points 2 marks	Some response to the argument. 1 mark	No further argument. 0 marks

Elements in bold are key.

Analysis

CA Blame the parents for the bad and anti-social behaviour of young people.

Ex: 'Yob culture!' 'Teenage gun crime!' 'Nine-years old – hooked on heroin!'

R1 (CA) They are always out at work.

R2 (CA) They do not go to work.

R3 (CA) They do not discipline their children.

R4 (CA) They beat their children.

R5 (CA) They let their children watch TV all day.

R6 (CA) They put their children under too much pressure to achieve.

Rhetorical dismissal: Contradictory rubbish!

R1 Some children from deprived homes or neglectful parents become determined to succeed and strive to do well in life.

R2 Others choose crime or antisocial behaviour despite coming from supportive backgrounds.

Ex Zakia Ahmed, for example, comes from a good home in Islamabad – her father is a judge, and her mother a modest housewife. Yet Zakia was caught stealing in Harrods on a family trip to London. We cannot blame Zakia's parents for her actions.

IC1 Each and every one of us is an independent human being who can make their own choices, and this includes children.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	9694

R3 Children are also influenced by their peers, by their teachers and by the media.

R4 These influences contribute to the choices that children make.

(these two reasons jointly support IC below).

Dev This means that they have to assume responsibility for their actions at a younger age than the previous generations. (Not an IC because it totally does not follow).

R5 To start with, our genes dictate our behaviour to a great extent.

Ex For example, children with a short version of MAOA gene are more likely to become criminal than other children, especially if they grow up in an abusive environment.

R6 Furthermore, we cannot go against our fate. We must follow our destiny.

IC2 Our behaviour is determined by factors beyond our control.

Ex There are too few jobs, too much pressure to make money and too many big problems to feel guilty about, with no hope of finding a solution. And too many exams.

R7 Government policies mean that young people do not see a future for themselves in the world their parents' generation have made.

IC3 So we can see that there are many reasons why children behave in an anti-social manner.

C Parents are not completely responsible for their children's poor behaviour.

Evaluation

The passage does offer some support for the claim that parents are not completely responsible for their children's bad behaviour. However, this support is weakened by contradiction and poor use of example.

Paragraph One

Fairly weak version of counter argument, showing contrasting extremes – straw person. Also extreme instances of anti-social youth behaviour implicitly generalised to all.

Paragraph Two

Parents can foster bad behaviour in their offspring both by over disciplining and under disciplining them. So the extremes of the counter argument are not contradictory, so the author has not adequately dismissed it. (Straw person continued from para one).

Everyone makes their own choices is a good reason why parents are not completely responsible for their offspring's behaviour. The author assumes that children are mature enough to make independent choices. However, children are not completely independent, and their behaviour and choices depend to a fairly large extent on the examples set by their parents. It is true that children can make choices which seem not to be determined by their parents or environment, but this does not mean that they are not influenced by their parents / environment.

Paragraph Three

Zakia Ahmed is not a good example. The author assumes that seeming respectable makes them good parents. However, just because her parents appear respectable does not mean that they are good parents – they may be too busy, or abusive, or not supportive. There is nothing in this example to suggest that Zakia made her own choices with no influence from her parents, or that this can be extended to other children.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2007	9694

Paragraph Four

The idea that children are exposed to other influences which affect their choices does give support to the claim that there are many reasons why children behave in an anti-social manner. However, it undermines the reasoning that children make their own choices independent of what their parents do. The author assumes that these are largely bad influences, and this may not be the case. The concluding sentence of this paragraph does not follow and is irrelevant.

Paragraph Five

The idea that our behaviour is determined by factors beyond our control would support the idea that our parents are not responsible for our actions. However, it is inconsistent with the ideas that we make our own choices and that there are many influences on our behaviour, or that government policies influence behaviour.

Genes determining our behaviour to a great extent does not mean that there is no environmental influence, such as from parents. The example is a poor one, because it focuses on criminal rather than badly behaved, and this example requires an abusive background as well as a particular gene. Abusive background would tend to mean parents. Genes also come from our parents.

Paragraph Six

Somewhat extreme, but actually a real contributory reason to the anti-social behaviour of children. Does not mean that parents have no responsibility, though. If their parents' generation have made the world which causes the behaviour, the parents' generation does have some responsibility for the behaviour – but this does not mean that individual parents do.

The examples are problems that have been faced by every generation so it cannot be these example which lead to our children being worse behaved than others. Perhaps our attitude to these problems?