

## **MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2008 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 2008 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>02</b>

**1 (a) Comment on any vested interest that Mr Tlali might have.**

- If he did finally snap and hit Vaidhya, Mr Tlali would have a vested interest to lie about it and blame Vaidhya for the trouble in order to avoid being arrested and punished.
- If Vaidhya was causing trouble, Mr Tlali would have a vested interest to exaggerate this to increase Vaidhya's punishment.
- If Vaidhya was not causing trouble, but Mr Tlali thought he was, Mr Tlali would have a vested interest to demonstrate that there was some trouble to avoid looking like a silly, confused old man.
- If Vaidhya and his brothers really make Mr Tlali's life a misery, Mr Tlali would have a vested interest to get some revenge (perhaps by exaggerating the crime?)
- If Mr Tlali really is jealous of the boys' youth and energy, he may have a vested interest to exaggerate their naughtiness to make himself feel better?

One point well developed 2 marks.

OR less well developed 1 mark (two such points = 2 marks)

E.g. Mr Tlali has a vested interest to get revenge and keep out of trouble = 2 less well developed points and therefore 2 marks.

Mr Tlali has a vested interest to blame Vaidhya = 1 less developed point and therefore 1 mark.

[Max 2]

**(b) How relevant is the statement provided by Hua-Ann Driggers?**

- Hua-Ann Driggers gives character reference, which is relevant, although the reference to Vaidhya is limited to, 'I quite like Vaidhya.'
- H-A D refers mostly to Vaidhya's oldest brother, which is irrelevant.
- H-A D refers to her mother's prejudice, 'would prefer me not to talk to...' which is relevant because it affects how we consider her mother's character reference of the boys.
- H-A D comments on the way Mr Tlali looks at her, which is relevant to the extent that it casts him in poor light/provides some sort of character reference (even though this may be unreliable).

Any two points simply made 1 mark each.

One well developed point 2 marks.

Do not credit credibility points such as, 'HA was not there at the time so she couldn't see what happened.' The question is about relevance not reliability. Also, HA did not need to be there to see in order to give a character reference.

[Max 2]

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>02</b>

**(c) How reliable are the statements provided by Mrs Kapoor and her son, Vaidhya?**

- Mrs Kapoor is clearly biased in favour of her sons and is therefore likely to protect Vaidhya.
- Mrs Kapoor has a vested interest to portray Mr Tlali as a jealous, complaining old man partly to maintain her own view of her sons and partly to blame Mr Tlali for the trouble rather than Vaidhya.
- Mrs Kapoor believes Vaidhya without question (hearsay), and accuses Mr Tlali without question.
- Vaidhya has a vested interest to lie if he was causing trouble, to protect himself from the consequences, and to get Mr Tlali into more trouble.
- Vaidhya has a reputation for playing jokes on Mr Tlali which makes his claims of innocence less plausible/reliable.
- However, this does not mean that he was actually causing trouble on this occasion.
- Vaidhya's story conflicts with his mother's story. She says that Vaidhya claimed that Mr Tlali, 'slapped' him, whereas Vaidhya says that, 'he took his walking stick and hit me.' This makes his story sound less reliable.
- Vaidhya's bruise is more consistent with being slapped than being hit by a stick (unless an old man who needs to lean on his stick could reasonably be thought to have raised his stick to face height and swung it hard enough to have caused a bruise).
- Vaidhya's claim that, 'he makes things up. He doesn't know what day it is most of the time,' is corroborated by Mrs Driggers' comment that, 'he may get confused,' so this claim is more reliable, and might mean that Mr Tlali thought Vaidhya was causing trouble or being threatening when he wasn't. However, it might not.

Simply made point or reference to the key parts of the evidence with very weak use of this: 1 mark.

Developed or clearly evaluative points can gain two marks each.

E.g. 'Mrs K says Mr Tlali slapped V but V says Mr Tlali hit V with his walking stick.' 1 mark

'Mrs Kapoor's story about Mr Tlali slapping Vaidhya conflicts with Vaidhya's account that Mr Tlali hit him with his walking stick, making them seem unreliable.' 2 marks.

To get full 4 marks must comment on both Mrs Kapoor and Vaidhya.

[Max 4]

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>02</b>

**(d) Conclusion:**

Mr Tlali's story is more likely to be true, although there is room for doubt/It is plausible that each perceived the other to be threatening although neither was intending to be so. Accept Vaidhya's story is more likely to be true.

Do not accept overly definite statements such as 'Vaidhya is definitely telling the truth.'

**Evidence:**

Vaidhya did have a bruise on his cheek, but there is nothing to link it to being hit by Mr T. It seems unlikely, although not impossible, that a man of 83 who leans on a stick could hit an active child that hard. It might be that V bruised his cheek as he careered against the stairway door, or that he had the bruise anyway.

Mr T claims that V had graffiti paint in his hand; a spray can was found, but not with V's fingerprints on it. It is possible that he was using his handkerchief to prevent prints from being left. It is also possible that V dropped the paint can in the stairway as he crashed into the door. However, there is no mention of graffiti actually appearing on Mr T's door. This may be because Mr T opened the door, or it may be because V was not producing graffiti and Mr T, who cannot see very well, was wrong about the spray can.

V was found to have a knife in his pocket, which may be linked to the scratch on Mr T's door, although Mr T was vague about the scratch. It may not even be new. The cigarette lighter in his pocket is not an unlikely thing for a twelve year old boy to have in his pocket alongside sweets and elastic bands, just because he can. So we cannot conclude too much (if anything) from this, but along with the stink bombs, it may perhaps mean that Vaidhya tends to misbehave.

Vaidhya has a reputation for bad behaviour which would not preclude scratching Mr Tlali's door or even pushing him and abusing him. Although Mrs Driggers may simply be prejudiced, her claims are contradicted only by her daughter, who appears to be infatuated with V's older brother and to dislike Mr T. Even Mrs Kapoor admits that her sons are, 'lively boys,' which is fond mother-speak for badly-behaved louts.

There is a history of annoyance and complaint between the neighbours which means that any incident is likely to be exaggerated. The main parties have a strong vested interest in blaming the other for any incident. The complaints about the boys seem largely related to noise rather than vandalism and violence, so it is possible that Mr T feels threatened and has exaggerated the threat coming from Vaidhya. The change in V's story, the implausibility of a twelve year old boy genuinely being hit and bawling to his mother, and the relative mobility of a twelve year old boy and an 83 year old man make it unlikely that Mr T really did hit V, although he probably wanted to.

**Generic:**

Acceptable conclusion in terms of probability. [1]

And:

Some reference to the evidence in support of the conclusion. [1]

Evaluative reference to the evidence in support of the conclusion. [2]

Reasoned argument to support the conclusion, possibly considering plausible alternatives. [3]

Sound argument to support the conclusion, weighing probabilities and considering plausible alternatives. [4]

[Max 5]

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>02</b>

- 2 (a) **‘A world run by women would be more peaceful than our present world.’ Identify two reasons the author gives in paragraphs one and two to support this claim. [2]**

Women are essentially more social than men.  
 Women tend to negotiate.  
 International negotiation would be better than war.

Any two, 1 mark each.

[Max 2]

- (b) **‘Some female leaders, for example Indira Gandhi and Margaret Thatcher, have male personality characteristics.’**

**Does this additional comment, if true, strengthen, weaken or have no effect on the argument? Justify your answer. [3]**

Weaken: This would weaken the argument because it shows that women leaders are not necessarily more social or more likely to negotiate than men/that the world would not be more peaceful if it was run by women so we do not need more women leaders.

This would weaken the argument because it shows that the argument is generalizing about women.

It would neither strengthen nor weaken the argument because these women became leaders in a male dominated world in which it may have been necessary to have male personality characteristics in order to become a leader. So we can't generalize from them to the sort of women who could be leaders.

Strengthen: If some women have male characteristics as well as the beneficial female characteristics, it would strengthen the argument that we need more female leaders, as then we would have the best of both worlds.

3 marks: developed, thoughtful evaluative reasoning which supports conclusion.

2 marks: evaluative comment which offers some support to conclusion.

1 mark: comment which could be used to support conclusion (which is better than writing nothing but not very strong).

0 marks: candidate shows no understanding or total misunderstanding.

[Max 3]

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2008	9694	02

**(c) ‘We need more women leaders.’ How far is it reasonable to use evidence about the business world to support this claim? [3]**

Assuming we understand ‘leaders’ to include the business world, it is completely reasonable. We might also understand, ‘a world run by women’ as including running business, and not just politics. In this case it is entirely reasonable to use evidence from business.

The passage conflates business and political leadership, which is problematic. There may be significant differences between managing a team by negotiating, and taking a stance in international politics/between the boardroom and warfare (or avoiding it). So the success of women in negotiating in a business environment cannot necessarily be extended to the political arena.

This evidence does not show that we need ‘more women leaders.’ The skills exhibited by women might be those of a ‘second in command’ – oiling the wheels so that the decisions of the leader are accepted and carried out.

On the other hand, the point of the passage is that women’s skills would usefully be extended from the community, from business to leadership. To this extent, it is reasonable to show that women have skills in business which would make them good leaders.

3 marks: developed, evaluative reasoning which supports conclusion.

2 marks: evaluative comment which offers some support to conclusion.

1 mark: comment which could be used to support conclusion (better than writing nothing but not strong).

0 marks: candidate shows no understanding or total misunderstanding. [Max 3]

**(d) Write one further argument to support or challenge the claim that, ‘we need more women leaders.’ [4]**

1 mark for reason which does/would support or challenge claim.

2 marks for simple argument (e.g. one reason + conclusion).

3 marks for more developed argument e.g. second reason/development of first reason/intermediate conclusion + conclusion.

4 marks for coherent, developed argument.

E.g.

We do not need more women leaders because (R) women tend to make emotional judgements and (R) leadership requires rational judgement.

We need more women leaders because this would help to raise the aspirations of women which would make them more productive in the community.

We need more women leaders as well as male leaders in order to represent the whole community. Male leaders tend to overlook women’s concerns if they do not affect them so women are needed to redress the balance.

We need more women leaders to create a more equal world, in which issues such as childcare are seen as parental issues not women’s issues.

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>02</b>

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

**(i) People in Hampshire UK are 62% more likely to be injured in a car than on a bicycle. [2]**

No this cannot be concluded, (1 mark) as we do not know what proportion cyclists are of all vehicles or trips/you do not find how much more likely one thing is than another by subtracting one percentage from another/we do not know how many injuries there are as a proportion of casualties. [max 2]

Allow explanations which interpret casualty as accident if the candidate's answer is otherwise sound and well-thought through.

**(ii) People's concerns about the disadvantages of cycling decrease when they cycle more. [3]**

No, this cannot be reliably concluded. Although some concerns (e.g. about fitness and distance) decrease, other concerns (e.g. about pollution and injury) increase. Five areas of concern increase, whereas only four decrease. We do not know how important each of these concerns is, so we cannot be sure whether the overall concerns increase or decrease.

3 marks: developed, evaluative reasoning supporting conclusion.

2 marks: evaluative comment supporting conclusion.

1 mark: comment which could be used to support conclusion (better than writing nothing but not strong).

0 marks: candidate shows no understanding or total misunderstanding.

**(b) Identify two reasons given in Box C to show that it is difficult to compare the safety of driving and cycling. [2]**

The population that cycles differs from that which drives.

An entire generation of riders believes that the only safety responsibility of a cyclist is to wear a helmet. [2 x 1]

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>02</b>

- (c) **Would cycling or driving be the best way for most people to travel short distances? Write a short reasoned case to support your conclusion, using and evaluating the information provided in Boxes A – D.** [5]

Conclusion: Overall, it would probably be better to cycle short distances than to drive.

Evidence:

In terms of fitness and health, it is unquestionable that cycling would be a healthier means of transport for short distances. However, in terms of safety, it is unclear whether cycling is better than driving.

Doc A – shows that 9% of casualties in one part of England are cyclists. To be sure what this meant in terms of relative safety, we would need to know what proportion of trips were made by cyclists. We certainly could not generalize from this information in any case.

Candidates may add from their own general knowledge that if people generally cycled, there would be fewer cars, so cycling would become safer.

Doc B – shows reasons why people do not want to cycle. Not wanting to cycle is not necessarily a good reason not to cycle. Becoming hot and sweaty, for example, might be a good reason not to cycle for some journeys (to weddings or job interviews), but this does not apply to all journeys. The practical difficulties of cycling may be no greater than the practical difficulties of driving (parking, congestion). Pollution and fear of injury may well reduce if people generally cycled rather than drove. This document seems to indicate that people would become fitter if they cycled, which would be beneficial. Credit reasonable evaluation of any points made about these reasons for not cycling.

Doc C – argues that it is hard to tell which is safer; gives little evidence but plenty of reasons why cycling is safe for the experienced and careful and not safe for the daft. So we could conclude from this that cycling may be the best way for some people to travel, but not for others. It's implied that if cycling were regulated as driving is, then it would be safer and therefore better.

Doc D – clearly demonstrates that cycling is beneficial in health/long life terms.

**Generic:**

1 mark: Some reference to the evidence but no conclusion/unsupported but appropriate conclusion.

2 – 3 marks: argument with reference to the evidence to support C.

4 – 5 marks: reasoned argument with critical evaluation of the evidence to support C.

[Max 5]



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>02</b>

Sample candidate answer worth 5 marks:

From Box A we can see that there are much less casualties with bicycles than with cars. However, this might be because much more people use the car than the bicycle and so when the number of cyclists increases, maybe the percentage increases. 18% of cyclists are afraid of injury. Also it depends where one uses the bicycle. Because Hampshire is a county with a high proportion of farms and 3 small cities, so the information in Box A might change if it was in a big city.

Box B states that people are worried about theft, which cannot change, as there will always be theft regardless to the number of bicycles. However, for small distances people shouldn't be worried about the 'hot and sweaty' factor, as well as the 'unfit' and 'too far' factors because the distances will be short.

Concerning 'pollution' factor, it might decrease if more people use the bicycle and so that factor would not be an issue. However, both fear of injury and weather factors would be an important issue as the more a person uses the bicycle, the more concerned they are about this.

The luggage to carry factor is not a big issue as the more people use the bicycle the less they care about that. Therefore this issue should not be taken into consideration.

With regards to practical difficulties, riders will gain more experience the more they use the bicycle, so this issue will be lowered down.

Finally, the study in Box D says that it decreases in 40% the risk of mortality. However, we must take into account where the study has been done.

In conclusion, for short distances bicycles should be used as many factors that worry the population would be decreased with use, time and experience. [Question Max 12]

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>02</b>

4

Descriptor	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Level 0
a) analysis max 5	Identifying the main conclusion, most of the key reasons, and demonstrating understanding of structure.  5 marks	Identifying the main conclusion and one or more of the key reasons.  Identifying all the key reasons and some of the structure but confusing main and intermediate conclusions.  3 – 4 marks	Recognising the general direction of the argument and one or more of the key reasons.  Identifying the conclusion but none of the reasons.  1 – 2 marks	Summary of the text/parts of the text.  Not recognising the general direction of the argument.  0 marks
b) evaluation max 5	Evaluation of strength of argument with critical reference to assumptions, weaknesses and flaws.  5 marks	Some evaluative comments referring to assumptions, weaknesses and/or flaws. Reasonable counter argument.  3 – 4 marks	Discussion of or disagreement with the argument.  Weak counter argument.  1 – 2 marks	No relevant comments.  0 marks
c) further argument max 3	Relevant, developed argument.  3 marks.	One or more relevant, further points.  2 marks	Some further response to the argument.  1 mark	No argument. Statement of disagreement or irrelevant comment.  0 marks

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2008	9694	02

## Analysis

Key reasons are in bold.

Ev This is demonstrated by evidence from the British Royal National Institute for Deaf People, which claims that 90% of young people suffer damage to their hearing after going to a live concert.

Ev The World Health Organisation says that excessive noise is the main avoidable cause of permanent hearing loss.

**R1 An addiction to loud music is leading vast numbers of young people around the world damaging their hearing by turning their music up too loud.**

R2 They could turn their iPods down, or wear earplugs to concerts.

R3 However, anyone who uses public transport will know that young people have the volume on their iPods so high that it is painfully loud for everyone in the bus or train.

Ev Only 3% of young people wear earplugs to prevent damage to their hearing.

Explanation: They (young people) are afraid of seeming uncool.

**IC1 Young people are not taking simple measures to prevent damage to their hearing (allow because they are afraid of seeming uncool).**

CA Some young people may argue that techno at very low volumes sounds like a child hitting a saucepan with a tent peg, but

Response to CA

R4 actually, all techno sounds like this,

IC2 so turning the volume up does not improve the quality of the music that young people listen to.

**IC3 So we can see that young people are unable to appreciate music.**

R5 Music is an important part of life which can be enjoyed from infancy until old age,

**IC4 so it does not make sense to allow immature, irresponsible youth to throw away their ability to hear music.**

**IC5 Consequently we must take action to prevent young people from damaging their hearing.**

**C There should therefore be internationally agreed limits to sound volumes which must apply to the volume of music from all speakers and sound systems as well as to the volume of music at live concerts.**

<b>Page 12</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>02</b>

## **Evaluation**

### **Paragraph 1**

We cannot generalise from evidence from the UK to young people around the world unless we assume that young people in the UK are typical of young people around the world. They may not be, as there may be more opportunities to go to live concerts in the UK than in some countries. This evidence also does not support the strand of reasoning referring to iPods.

The evidence from the WHO is not precisely relevant as it refers to 'excessive noise' not specifically to loud music, unless we assume that loud music is a significant part of excessive noise.

Clarification of key terms, such as addiction, which is rather loosely used to refer to a liking rather than a chemical change in the body.

### **Paragraph 2**

The claim that young people are not taking simple measures to prevent damage to their hearing is partly but not totally supported by the evidence that only 3% of young people wear earplugs to concerts. We do not know where this statistic comes from, so we do not know if this is 3% of British young people, or 3% of people worldwide.

The explanation of young people not taking measures to prevent damage to their hearing being because of fear of seeming uncool is plausible but not supported at all. It may be that many young people are not aware of the risk to their hearing from loud music, or that they do not believe that hearing loss will happen to them. You have to assume that not listening to loud music is perceived as uncool.

Turning iPods down or wearing earplugs seem to be reasonable and manageable measures. However, it seems reasonable to counter argue that the point of going to a concert is to hear the music so earplugs might be counter productive.

Generalisation about young people and iPod volume. Although some young people have their iPods so loud that other people find it too loud, this does not mean that all young people do.

### **Paragraph 3**

Contradiction/inconsistency between claim that music can be enjoyed from infancy until old age and claim in para 4 that young people do not appreciate music.

Ad hominem attack on young people – some justification?

IC that we should take some action is reasonable if we assume that young people should not have the free choice to do damaging things.

Conclusion doesn't follow. It is one of many options and it may be too extreme, especially given the fairly weak reasoning.

### **Paragraph 4**

Counter argument – straw person, misrepresenting the argument of those who would oppose internationally agreed limits to volume.

Response is amusing but unsupported.

Generalisation from techno to all music that young people listen to.

Unsupported leap to young people being unable to appreciate music (accept slippery slope if candidates write it, although it is not quite).

<b>Page 13</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>02</b>

Further Arguments

Suggested answers:

Challenge:

Imposing limits on sound volumes would infringe our freedom to choose how to behave. So long as we are only harming our own health, we have the right to behave as we like. So there should not be internationally agreed limits to sound volumes.

(add another one after co-ordination meeting).

Support:

Other people's noise is a nuisance which affects our health. People exposed to other people's noise are far more likely to experience depression and heart problems. As other people's music is a significant source of nuisance noise, there should be internationally agreed limits to sound volumes.

Most of the people who damage their hearing with loud music are under eighteen. They are therefore not mature enough to make decisions about their own health, and society has a duty to protect them. So there should be internationally agreed limits to sound volumes.