

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9694 THINKING SKILLS

9694/21

Paper 21 (Critical Reasoning), 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 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 May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9694

1 (a) How reliable are Caldicott's responses in source D? Justify your answer.

3 marks: Strong answer focussed on the reliability of Caldicott's responses.

2 marks: Reasonable answer referring to the reliability of Caldicott's responses.

1 mark: Inconclusive point or points which could be used to assess the reliability of Caldicott's responses. [Max 3]

Indicative content

Caldicott's responses are not very reliable as he has a strong vested interest to claim that Leopard is lying to protect his reputation and regain a chance at the job. He appears to have issues with women (bias against women) which would affect his objectivity when commenting on Leopard's competence. The claim that, 'I am a better poet than Leopard,' is subjective. He avoids answering the question about sexual harassment, which, together with evidence from source E, implies that he is avoiding telling the truth.

Guidelines

Give 1 mark for each valid point made (e.g. judgment, reason, explanation).

(b) How useful is Source B in helping to decide what happened in this situation? Justify your answer. [3]

3 marks: **Strong support** given to candidate's conclusion focused on usefulness in helping to decide what happened.

2 marks: **Reasonable support** given to candidate's conclusion.

1 mark: **Weak support** given to candidate's conclusion or inconclusive point or points which might be used to show how useful Source B is. [Max 3]

Indicative content

The email in Source B is useful in deciding that Caldicott has been accused of harassing students, especially as it gives details which can be checked and it is corroborated by Source E, but it doesn't show that he was 'convicted' of harassment. Source A claims that Leopard accused Caldicott of being convicted of harassment. So the email helps us to see that Source A claims too much.

The email in Source B comes from 'female-poet@hotmail.com.' This is not clearly from Leopard, and might even be the sort of address used by someone trying to get Leopard into trouble. So we can't be sure that Leopard sent this email.

So the email is useful to a certain extent, because it helps to establish some of the claims being made and allow them to be checked, but it is not useful in helping to decide whether Leopard has made any claims, because we can't tell whether it is from her or not.

Guidelines

Give 1 mark for each valid point made (e.g. judgment, reason, explanation).

Maximum 2 marks if only one side is considered.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9694

(c) 'I am a better poet than Leopard.' (Source D). How relevant is this claim in deciding what happened in this situation? Briefly support your answer.

- 3 marks: Strong explanation of the relevance of this claim with a focus on the dispute.
- 2 marks: Reasonable explanation of the relevance of this claim.
- 1 mark: Weak explanation of the relevance of this claim.

Indicative content

- It is not relevant to the sexual harassment claims against Caldicott.
- It is not direct evidence of what happened.
- It suggests a certain arrogance on the part of Caldicott, which might extend to his approaches to women.
- It assumes that poetic skill is the only criterion for selection.
- If true, this claim might have given Leopard a motive to start a smear campaign to get rid of a rival.

Guidelines

Give 1 mark for each valid point made (e.g. judgment, reason, explanation). [Max 3]

(d) How likely is it that Rebecca Leopard deliberately spread untrue claims about James Caldicott? Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, using the evidence provided and considering plausible alternative scenarios. [6]

Deliberately. We can't be sure that Leopard was at the root of the campaign against Caldicott, as we do not know that the email came from her. She admits to mentioning that Caldicott might not be a suitable person to work with students to a journalist. Depending on her relationship with the journalist, and how naïve she is, this might have been 'unwise' or it might have been a way of deliberately making sure that someone started to research Caldicott's background. It is possible that she intended to ensure that damaging, true information was remembered in time to help her become poetry professor.

Untrue claims. It is unlikely that Leopard intended to spread untrue claims. The claim that he 'might not be a suitable person to work with students' does seem to be substantiated by details of sexual harassment claims. Neither Leopard nor the email claims – as is reported by Source A – that Caldicott had been convicted of sexual harassment. [Max 6]

Level 3 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 different possible course of events.
Level 2 3–4 marks	A reasonable answer, which evaluates the evidence, draws an acceptable conclusion in terms of probability and may mention the plausibility of at least one different course of events.
Level 1 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.
Level 0 0 marks	No creditworthy material.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9694

2 (a) **How reasonable is it to use evidence about chimps and ancient hunter-gatherers to help understand human behaviour today? Justify your answer.**

3 marks: Strong, fully relevant explanation of how reasonable it is to use evidence about chimps and ancient hunter-gatherers to help understand human behaviour today.

2 marks: Reasonable explanation of how reasonable it is to use evidence about chimps and ancient hunter-gatherers to help understand human behaviour today.

1 mark: Attempted explanation or inconclusive comment which might be used to explain how reasonable it is to use evidence about chimps and ancient hunter-gatherers to help understand human behaviour today. [Max 3]

Indicative content

Generally speaking, our close relationship with chimps and primitive humans means that it is quite reasonable to use them as a guide. We share many characteristics with them. However, the similarities shouldn't be over-emphasised or treated as too certain.

Guidelines

Give 1 mark for each valid point made (e.g. judgment, reason, explanation).

Maximum 2 marks if only one side is considered.

1 mark only for stating that violent behaviour is similar.

(b) **Source A suggests that food surpluses can lead to conflict, whereas Source B suggests that food shortages can lead to conflict. Is this a contradiction? Briefly explain your answer.** [2]

It isn't a contradiction (1 mark). We need the right amount of food – it is quite possible that too much or too little can lead to problems (1 mark).

Credit reasonable variations. [Max 2]

(c) **'Abolishing poverty.' (Source D). Suggest one way in which we might abolish poverty. Explain your answer.** [4]

Reasonable suggestion – 1 mark

Explanation

3 marks: Strong, considered explanation of how the suggestion would abolish poverty.

2 marks: Reasonable explanation of how the suggestion would abolish poverty.

1 mark: Attempted explanation or inconclusive comment which might explain how the suggestion would abolish poverty. [Max 4]

Indicative content

We might abolish poverty by increasing economic activity. This would make sure that there is enough wealth for everyone to have a fair share, so no one would be short of money.

We might abolish poverty by taxing the rich and giving to the poor. This would redistribute money so that poor people have enough money to feed and educate their children and give them the best chance for the future.

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9694

(d) Can human conflict be avoided? Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, using and evaluating the information provided in Sources A–D.

It seems unlikely that human conflict can be entirely avoided, because it seems to have a root very deep in our make up, as we can see from evidence about chimps (which are closely related to humans) and hunter gather societies (Source A). We cannot avoid things like drought, which cause conflict according to boxes A and B. Nor can we avoid some people/states becoming more powerful than others and therefore more likely to attack – humans are likely to strive to be the more powerful to avoid being the less powerful party which is attacked.

However, it does seem that we can act to minimize conflict, by controlling population growth, increasing links between states and supporting failing states. This is unlikely to be fully successful, as the measures needed, such as 'abolishing poverty', are huge and difficult to achieve.

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

NOTE: Evaluation might include consideration of the credibility of the source, the support given by evidence to conclusions drawn, implications of the evidence and/or the likeliness of particular consequences. [Max 6]

3 (a) Identify the main conclusion of the argument. [1]

We should stop talking about a natural life and simply enjoy the benefits of our unnatural life. [Max 1]

(b) Identify three reasons used to support the main conclusion. [3]

- Our lives are better for being unnatural.
- Our diets are better now than they would be if we lived a truly natural life.
- A natural life would be much more uncomfortable than our modern lives.
- We would therefore be less healthy and die much younger.
- There are snakes, poisonous plants, large animals that would like to eat people – and there are bad people.
- We have morality in our modern world precisely because a natural world is not very nice.
- Our unnatural moral rules prevent us from killing each other, stealing from each other and fighting over mates.
- By nature we would stick to our own small tribe, and fight outsiders.
- Fortunately, we have unnatural governments which impose unnatural laws so that people who do behave naturally can be punished. [3 × 1 mark] [Max 3]

Note: Because the structure of paragraph 4 is ambiguous, any of the sentences which could be reasons must be credited.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9694

- (c) Evaluate the reasoning in the argument. In your answer you could comment on the strengths, weaknesses, flaws and unstated assumptions.

Use the grid below. Refer to indicative content below.

[Max

Note that candidates who quote 'assumptions' from the text have misunderstood the nature of an assumption, which must be an unstated gap in the argument. However, candidates may be credited for evaluative comments which are made about reasoning misidentified as assumptions.

Level 3 5–6 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.
Level 2 3–4 marks	Some evaluative comments referring to strength/weakness including one or more of: flaws; support given by reasons to intermediate conclusions; use of evidence; inconsistency; analogies; assumptions. Maximum 3 marks for relevant counter-argument only.
Level 1 1–2 marks	Discussion of or disagreement with the argument/reasons/evidence.
Level 0 0 marks	No relevant comments.

Indicative content

Some contradiction – the argument concedes that there may be benefits in becoming more natural, but then says that we should simply enjoy being unnatural.

The argument shows that some degree of unnaturalness improves life, but does not show that our current degree of unnaturalness is either necessary or beneficial.

There are a great many points to be made about the use and abuse of 'natural', and the definition of a number of things as natural or not. Credit straw person if the candidate thinks that an unusual view of natural has been attributed to others.

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9694

(d) 'Medicine is natural.' Write your own short argument to support this claim.

Use the grid below. Refer to indicative content below.

Indicative content

Although some people argue that medicine is unnatural, these people are mistaken. Medicine is natural, because it comes from an instinct in humans to cure themselves of disease and injury. People also use natural materials, mostly taken from plants to cure injury and disease. Other animals have a similar instinct and similarly use plants in a medicinal way. A dog licks its wounds to keep infection out, for example. Grazing animals have been shown to select specific plants with medicinal properties when they are unwell.

Level 3 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 5 marks.
Level 2 2–3 marks	A simple argument. One reason + conclusion 2 marks. Two or more separate reasons + conclusion 3 marks.
Level 1 1 mark	Some relevant comment.
Level 0 0 marks	No relevant comment.

Maximum level 2 if conclusion is clearly implied but not stated.

Maximum 2 marks if a candidate challenges the statement instead of supporting it.