

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2012 series

9694 THINKING SKILLS

9694/42

Paper 4 (Applied 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, 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.

| | | |
|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Page 2 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus |
| | GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2012 | 9694 |

1 (a) Make three criticisms of the study as reported by research Group A.

Examples include:

- Small sample size.
- Non-representative group (age, health, profession).
- Volunteers in group B already had low or healthy cholesterol levels
- No reference to the number of trials / only one trial done.
- No figures given about relevant reduction in cholesterol.
- No details provided about the dose of bran.
- No comparative trial done with wheat bran

(b) Based on the information from both research studies, draw one precise, credible inference about the effects of oat bran on cholesterol levels that would be consistent with both studies. [2]

For example:

- Oat bran reduces cholesterol in middle-aged people (more than in young people).
- Oat bran reduces borderline to high cholesterol (more than low cholesterol).
- Oat bran does not lower cholesterol levels in those with already low or healthy cholesterol.

Candidates who link the reduction of cholesterol to age or initial cholesterol level but are not so precise – 1 mark.

2 Briefly analyse Dada's argument in Document 1: *Miserable failure*, by identifying its main conclusion and main reasons, as well as any intermediate conclusions and counter-arguments. [6]

IC – capitalism has failed to provide the people of this planet with a good life.

R – half of them live on two dollars a day or less.

R – While people die from diseases related to overeating in the so-called developed countries, children die of malnutrition elsewhere on this small planet.

CA – Apologists for capitalism have always said that it was just a question of the developing countries acquiring democracy, free-market economic systems, and some old-fashioned hard work, and then they too would enjoy the good life like the citizens of Europe and North America.

R – the long awaited take-off for the economies of the poorest countries seems nowhere in sight.

IC – In these countries capitalism is a clear failure.

CA – A few years ago one could have argued that capitalism has succeeded in the industrialised countries of the northern hemisphere.

MR – even in these countries with high per capita income there were and still are tremendous disparities.

MR – The recent global financial crisis underscores the inequality, fragility and unpredictable future of the capitalist economic system.

MC – It's time to take a stark look at capitalism and shout down the politicians who continue to shamelessly chant that the fundamentals of this economic system are sound.

MR – The fundamental premise of this system is a clear lie.

IC – the sooner that we face up to this, the better off we will be.

(NB if these two written in one sentence only credit 1)

| | | |
|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Page 3 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus |
| | GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2012 | 9694 |

www.PapaCambridge.com

MARKS

1 mark for each emboldened element (maximum 4 if MC not identified).
Max 2 available for identification of CAs.

- 3 Give a critical evaluation of CAP's argument in Document 2: *The solution to poverty*, by identifying and explaining strengths, weaknesses, implicit assumptions and flaws. [9]

Strength: The rationale that somebody has to create capital to initiate capital flow is a strong line of reasoning.

Weaknesses

Para 2

Argues from the particular (*laissez-faire* capitalism) to the general (capitalism).

Assumption that helping the poor requires wealth (rather than e.g. education).

Assumption that the rich have a genuine care / concern for the poor

Weak analogy: The rich need the poor... just as the poor need the rich.

Equivocation of the term freedom: the 'freedom from' that is necessary to the rich is different from the 'freedom to' that is necessary to the poor.

Assumption that the only way the government helps the poor is issuing hand-outs and obstructing entrepreneurs.

Para 3

Straw man representation of the humanitarian's position.

ad hominem (c.f. para 1): Implies that the humanitarian is *irrational* i.e. attacking the arguer rather than the argument.

Para 4

Assumption that the properties of Mother Theresa and Bill Gates could not co-exist under the same economic system.

Irrelevance: The motive of neither Mother Theresa (alleviate suffering) nor Bill Gates (unclear) is to lift the masses out of poverty.

| | | |
|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Page 4 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus |
| | GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2012 | 9694 |

Para 5

Conflation of being 'poor' (i.e. not having wealth) and 'in poverty' (i.e. in an inescapable state of deprivation).

Para 6

Assumption that the concept of justice or being 'just' is not a correlate of equality and/or compassion.

Assumption that the majority of people are against capitalism.

Contradiction with paragraph 1: whereas in paragraph 1 capitalism is presented as the saviour of the poor, here capitalism is presented as a cold uncaring system or as a hated system in need of protection from the poor or the less well-off majority.

This paragraph appears to **contradict** the overall gist of the argument that capitalism is the best way to benefit the many.

Para 7

Assumption that those who are incapable of taking care of themselves are a fixed, small group (e.g. effects of natural disasters can create mass deprivation and human misery).

Assumption that the mentally ill, crippled and orphans are all poor or without means to afford their own care.

Contradiction: Given that the author has stated in paragraph 6 that capitalism is not compassionate, it is unlikely that capitalists would be inclined to help those incapable of taking care of themselves or indeed the poor in general.

Use of **rhetoric/persuasive language** (Maximum 1 mark, example required – e.g. "bowls of slop").

Overall Evaluation

The main conclusion is that there is no alternative to capitalism for lifting the masses out of poverty. The argument is overall quite weak, with a vastly overdrawn/unsound conclusion. Firstly, the author argues categorically that capitalism can alleviate poverty but fails to demonstrate that it is the only one.

Secondly, much of his argument centres around the capacity of capitalism to amass capital, but fails specifically to show that thereby poverty would be alleviated.

(Explaining either of these points can access the two marks for overall evaluation.)

Marks

For each sound evaluative point 1 mark and 2 marks for a developed point, to a maximum of 8 marks.

Up to 2 marks for an overall judgment on the argument. (Maximum 9 marks.)

4 'Capitalism is the best economic system.'

To what extent do you agree with this statement? Construct a well-reasoned argument in support of your view, commenting critically on some or all of Documents 1 to 5, and introducing ideas of your own. [30]

| Band | Overall | Within | Score |
|----------|--|--|-------|
| Band IV | Considers counter-positions to own argument and reflects on implications in arriving at conclusion. | Developed consideration of counter-positions. Knows precisely what complexities face own argument. | 27–30 |
| | | Limited development of 1 or 2 counter-positions to own argument. | |
| Band III | Well-reasoned, coherent argument, which should include evaluation of sources, integration of viewpoints, further argument and simple consideration of counter-arguments (or conflicting sources). Must reference 3+ documents. | Introduces further relevant lines of argument building their own position, with supporting examples. Outlines some complexities. Combines different viewpoints, or synthesizes arguments from different documents, using own ideas or critical comments or fresh perspectives. | 22–26 |
| | | Forges a chain of reasoning through examining multiple sources. Compares and contrasts documents relevantly. Good interpretation of sources. Applies precise critical comments/evaluation to a source. | 17–21 |
| Band II | A reasoned stance: a clear conclusion, supported by reasons clearly expressed but uncritically selected from the sources. Implicit or explicit reference to document/s. | Some independent reasoning / implicit critical comments. Clear statement of 3 or 4 reasons in support. | 12–16 |
| | | Reasons indiscriminately selected. Little clear independent or no independent reasoning. Some irrelevance / deviation from the question. May be multiple conclusions with little support for each one. Too brief a response, even if accurate. | 7–11 |
| Band I | 'Pub rhetoric': unclear or no conclusion; reasoning that goes off question target at a tangent; substantial irrelevant material. Completely misunderstands or no understanding of question. | Reproduced reasoning from Q2 and Q3. Disorganised. Unconvincing attempts to construct reasoning. | 2–6 |
| | | Stream of consciousness. Wholly irrelevant/deviant/incoherent material. No attempt. | 0–1 |

| | | |
|--------|-------------------------------------|----------|
| Page 6 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus |
| | GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2012 | 9694 |

Indicative Content

Credit will be given for the judicious use of resources in the documents and careful referencing material relevantly.

Candidates need to judiciously select and use material within stimulus documents, commenting, comparing and contrasting relevant material to support or challenge their case; e.g. supporting or challenging the claim in document 1 against capitalism as, say non-productive, with the 'for' arguments of document 2. Candidates should have the ability to skim-read, while not glossing, having a perceptive eye to locating relevant material, while not being distracted by other content of the sources, which may appear interesting but are not relevant to the debate.

Credit will be given for critical evaluation of stimulus sources, critical interpretation of evidence and inferences, and forging critical reasoning.

e.g. Documents 3 and 4 present different angles on economic models embraced by different nations, are largely neutral and offer fresh insights, highlighting dilemmas and proposing resolutions. Document 5 appears quite unrelated and yet the facts presented there have ramifications for claims made in documents 3 and 4 (and 1). Candidates may discuss the question of whether communism or capitalism had been most helpful in China's rise to economic prosperity. Candidates should evaluate the significance, relevance and typicality of the evidence they have been presented with. They should be able to construct critical reasoning based on their findings.

Credit will be given for the synthesis of arguments from different sources, awareness of complexities, proposing further arguments, and consideration of counter-arguments to own position.

Candidates should be able, by the synthesis of arguments, to draw inferences which become good reasoning for constructing further arguments. Good responses will have inferred the complexities of positions on either side of the debate. Candidates could supplement their further arguments with other reasons drawn from own ideas and knowledge to build a coherent reasoned case which may embrace wider but relevant context/s.

To obtain higher bands, candidates should consider counter-arguments and objections to their own position, and some response to these. Anecdotes from personal experience should not dominate the discussion to the exclusion of other considerations raised by the stimulus sources; they should be weighed in the balance properly.

No marks are reserved for the quality of written English or specialist knowledge of the subject matter/s in the stimulus material. It is the quality of critical thinking and reasoning alone which is under assessment.