

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level and GCE Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series

9694 THINKING SKILLS

9694/22

Paper 2 (Critical Thinking), 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 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 May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

| | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 2 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9694 | 22 |

1 (a) How significant is Mrs Tripp’s refusal to be interviewed by the Daily Record? [3]

It could be significant [1] if the refusal is either because Mrs Tripp is afraid of being ‘caught out’ [1] or because she is unwilling to support her husband to the extent of lying about her authorship [1]. It could also signify some sort of bullying or threats from her husband [1]. However, it might not be significant [1] as it could merely reflect a general refusal to have anything to do with the media / does not want to contribute to the Daily Record’s story [1].

(b) How relevant is Donald Tripp’s evidence, in Source C, that he won several prizes for writing when he was at school? [3]

It has some relevance because it suggests he did have some talent for writing in his youth [1]. However, winning school prizes does not necessarily mean one is going to be a successful author [1]. The prizes may have been trivial and awarded very generally [1]. Also, the issue is not whether he *could* have written the books but whether he actually *did* write them [2]. Therefore it has limited or no relevance [1].

(c) How reliable is Constance Lake’s denial, in Source E, that she ever received the letter from Donald Tripp? [3]

Unreliable / Not very reliable [1]. She may be saying this out of loyalty to her friend [1]. Also, if she had carelessly dropped it she might not want to admit she had received it [1], given the importance Tripp attached to her keeping it safely. [1]. Her reference to ‘no recollection’ may suggest she is not going as far as a full denial to avoid an outright lie [1].

However, reliability is increased as it is arguably unlikely she would have carelessly dropped such a letter had she received it [1].

(d) How likely is it that Mrs Tripp was the true author of Donald Tripp’s books? Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, with critical reference to the evidence provided and considering plausible alternative scenarios. [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 credit-worthy material. |

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 3 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9694 | 22 |

Case for it being likely

Mrs Tripp's refusal to be interviewed could indicate an unwillingness to actually deny authorship. This lack of an outright denial is damaging to her husband's position.

Tripp's point that he wrote 2 novels before he met his wife is not relevant to whether he went on writing them after he met his wife.

The evidence in Source D is significant. It points to a significant change of style and greater success after his early work which could be a reference to the 2 novels he wrote before he met his wife.

Case for it being unlikely

The letter is rather odd. Why should Tripp suddenly reveal this dark secret in writing even to a close friend? It could well be a forgery.

It seems unlikely that Mrs Lake would be so careless with the letter as to drop it as she was walking along.

Tripp's claim that he has enemies who would want to discredit him is supported by the literary critic in Source D.

This source also suggests writers' styles do change as they develop.

The reference to 'early work' does not necessarily exclude work written by Tripp after he met his wife.

On balance, it seems likely that the accusations are untrue and that Tripp is the victim of an attempt to discredit him.

| | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 4 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9694 | 22 |

- 2 (a) How reliably can we conclude that “the inhabitants of New York need not worry about the flood risk in the future” (Source B)? [3]

While the greater wealth of New York may mean they have better flood defences [1], ‘better’ does not mean foolproof / any place at sea level is threatened [1]. The conclusion relies on the assumption that a solution is just a question of money [1] when in fact the problem may lack a solution due to the scale of sea level rise etc. [1]. Also, New York may cease to be a wealthy city [1] meaning it could not afford flood defences [1].

- (b) Is the passage in Source E an argument? Explain your answer. [2]

It is an argument. The conclusion ‘*Many of the world’s major cities will become uninhabitable in the next 50 years due to flooding*’ is supported by reasoning in the rest of the passage such as ‘*The time scale involved in taking effective action means it is probably already too late for such action*’.

Award 1 mark if explanation generic. 0 marks if judgment without any explanation.

- (c) Suggest two explanations for the differences in the percentage increase in population at risk illustrated in Source F. [4]

Explanation 1

Population will have increased more in places like Kolkhata and Bangkok [1], due either to increased birth rate [1] or increased migration into these cities [1].

Explanation 2

The amount of flooding is predicted to be worse in places like Kolkhata and Bangkok [1]. This would mean more people would be affected [1]. The amount of flooding may be worse due to factors such as increased risk of tsunami, tropical storm etc. [1].

Up to 2 marks for each explanation. Max 2 marks if only one explanation.

| | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 5 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9694 | 22 |

(d) ‘Many of the world’s major cities will become uninhabitable in the next 50 years.’

How justified is this statement? Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, using and evaluating the information provided in Sources A–F. [6]

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 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 credit-worthy material. |

Indicative content

There is a great deal of evidence in the sources that flooding will be a major problem for world cities in the future. Cities in the situation described in Source C would seem to be uninhabitable as they would be permanently flooded. The optimism of Source D is certainly not justified on a number of grounds. No time scale is indicated, so we do not know if humans were actually around when this happened previously. Moreover, it is irrelevant to whether *major cities* will survive. The author’s reasoning seems to be a parallel to something like ‘We survived World War 2 so let’s not worry about having another world war’.

However, the conclusion is rather overdrawn. Flood defences and prompt action may prevent such flooding happening; the pessimism about political paralysis at a global level might not apply at a municipal level. Even if the flooding occurs on the scale envisaged, it is more likely that *areas* of cities will have to be abandoned rather than whole cities becoming uninhabitable. Also, this is a projection some way into the future – there could be changes that nobody can foresee at this stage.

| | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|----------|-------|
| Page 6 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9694 | 22 |

3 (a) Using the exact words in the passage as far as possible, identify the main conclusion. [2]

2 marks: Animal rights activists should not campaign against horse racing.

1 mark: Horse racing is not cruel.

1 mark: This [the claim that horse racing is cruel] shows a total misunderstanding of the sport.

(b) Using the exact words in the passage as far as possible, identify three reasons used to support the main conclusion. [3]

- This [the claim that horse racing is cruel] shows a total misunderstanding of the sport.
- (This/there is solid evidence that) horse racing is not cruel.
- These activists are continuing to fight a war that is already won.
- This [the disappearance of jobs] is clearly unacceptable.
- (Banning horse racing would not just deprive horses of an enjoyable activity) it would deny them the right to exist at all.

(c) Evaluate the strength of the reasoning in the argument. In your answer you should consider any flaws, unstated assumptions and other weaknesses. [5]

Marks for each evaluative point as follows, up to a maximum of 5 marks:

3 marks Key evaluative point, clearly expressed.

2 marks Key evaluative point, incompletely or vaguely expressed

or Valid evaluative point, clearly expressed but less significant than a key point.

1 mark Weak attempt at a valid evaluative point.

Candidates who fail to achieve any marks for evaluative points may be awarded up to 2 marks for partial performance, as follows, in respect of answers which have misinterpreted the nature of the task but have shown some understanding:

2 marks Relevant extended counter-argument/agreement **or** multiple specific counter-assertions/agreements

1 mark General counter/agreement **or** single specific counter/agreement.

*Partial performance marks must **not** be added to one another or to marks from the main part of the mark scheme.*

Paragraph 2

- Assumption: that there are no other explanations as to why horses carry on running.
- Assumption: that there are no other reasons for increased adrenalin.
- Staying with the other horses does not necessarily indicate enjoyment.
- What is true of humans might not be true of horses/animals.

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 7 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9694 | 22 |

Paragraph 3

- **[KEY]** Question-begging argument – states that it is not cruel when this is the crucial issue being focussed upon.
- Inconsistency in saying ‘war is already won’ while implying there are still countries with cruel sports by using the expression ‘many’ rather than ‘all’.
- **[KEY]** The point about welfare seems to be inconsistent with a broader picture of horses’ welfare. If one could show that gladiators in ancient Rome were given the best possible medical treatment, this wouldn’t mean that the question of whether there should have been gladiatorial contests at all is by-passed.

Paragraph 4

- Assumption: that the interests of humans take precedence over those of animals.
- The number of jobs created is irrelevant to the issue of cruelty.

Paragraph 5

- Assumption: that it is important that horses exist.
- Generalisation – extrapolates from horse-racing to using horses in general.

(d) ‘Animals should not be kept in zoos.’

Write your own short argument to support or challenge this claim. The conclusion of your argument must be stated. [5]

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 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 etc. 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 3 marks for wrong conclusion or if conclusion is implied but not stated. No credit for material merely reproduced from the passage.

Indicative content (specimen level 3 answers)

Support [108 words]

Some people argue that modern zoos do not put animals in cages but allow them to roam free. However, they are still captive and not in their native environment. Animals in zoos of any kind have a lower life expectancy than animals in the wild. This is because they are often more stressed and are unable to do various things that wild animals can do/learn to do in the wild. For example, elephants’ life expectancy is reduced by 30% if they are in a zoo. It follows that zoos have a bad effect on the health and welfare of animals. Therefore animals should not be kept in zoos.

| | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Page 8 | Mark Scheme | Syllabus | Paper |
| | GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2014 | 9694 | 22 |

Challenge [103 words]

Zoos do valuable work in preserving species that would become extinct in the wild. So, if we want such species to be preserved we need to keep animals in zoos. Zoos enable scientists to research into animal diseases in a way they could not if they only had access to animals in the wild. Contrary to popular opinion, it is not true that all zoo animals have a reduced life expectancy. Black-footed ferrets, for example, live longer in captivity than in the wild because they get a regular diet and medical attention when they need it. Therefore animals should be kept in zoos.