

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

**GCE Advanced Level**

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series**

### **9694 THINKING SKILLS**

**9694/43**

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 May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A LEVEL – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>43</b>

**1 (a) Make three criticisms of the data presented in the passage. [3]**

For example:-

- It is not clear whether the \$170 from the Government is a one-off or an annual payment.
- Average insulation cost is unlikely to include houses that are already insulated or partly insulated.
- “E4U will pay half the cost” – but the Government is paying half the cost or if E4U or their contractors are carrying out the insulation work, this half includes their profit; so not really half the ‘cost’.
- Many households may already have some degree of insulation so the figures for cost or savings might not be applicable.
- It is not clear that the geographical /demographical distribution of E4U customers is the same as the presumably nationwide distribution that has been used to produce the average figure of \$700. e.g. if E4U’s customer base consists disproportionately of apartments or new buildings, the cost of insulating them could be much lower than the nationwide average (since new buildings and apartments are better insulated than older buildings).
- It is not certain whether E4U select their customers avoiding costly insulations.
- It is not clear whether the standard of insulation offered by E4U is the same as that costed at an average \$700 by the Government.
- “as much as \$500” could be any figure from \$0 to \$500 / the \$500 maximum is likely to be an extreme case, far from the average.
- For households who already buy (or own) energy-saving light bulbs the annual saving would be \$0 / for households who never buy energy-saving light bulbs the \$10 cost is irrelevant.
- \$30 annual saving ignores the cost of replacing bulbs.

**(b) A government spokesman commented, “The E4U strategy could save \$890 in one year alone and shows that the REUS represents great value for money to the taxpayer.”**

**Is this claim supported by the evidence presented? Justify your answer. [2]**

Award up to 2 marks for a developed overall assessment of the credibility along the lines of

- Taxpayers who do not stand to benefit (e.g. already insulated, using low-energy bulbs) will be out of pocket by subsidising others. So not great value for them.
- E4U will be appropriating some of the \$170, and probably some of the \$350 and the \$10; so taxpayer is in fact boosting profit for E4U, which is not great value for money.
- The strategy of one supplier cannot be generalised to the whole REUS, so the general statement is not supported by the one example only.
- The figure of \$890 includes initial installation costs and so would not be repeated annually therefore the claim is misleading (in other words because it implies that it might be for more than 1 year).
- “save \$890” – taxpayer (≈ homeowner) has paid \$170 in tax, so claim is inflated.
- No cost listed about the raise in taxes due to spending under this program in order to make assessment about 'great value for money to the taxpayer'.

Award 1 mark for

A relevant point that is undeveloped or poorly-expressed.

**or**

A further point that weakens the credibility of the statistics that has not already been credited in part (a).

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9694	43

- 2 Briefly analyse Buddy2u’s argument in Document 1: *Watch your Waste*, by identifying its main conclusion and main reasons, as well as any intermediate conclusions and counter-arguments. [6]

**CA** – food waste is an inevitable by-product in an age of mass production and busy lifestyles

**MC** – It is time to establish (once and for all) that modern food waste culture is inexcusable.

**MR** – Buying food simply to throw it out is a waste of all those precious resources.

**IC** – Overbuying by the rich has led to food shortages for others.

**IC** – Corporations and marketing have to take the blame for creating the culture of huge wasteful portions.

**MR** – It is a disgrace that obese people consume food to excess without a thought for the malnourished and starving elsewhere.

**IC** – Suppliers and manufacturers have some responsibility in the problem of society wasting food.

**MR** – food wastage is environmentally harmful.

**Marks**

1 mark for each element (maximum 4 marks if MC not identified).

- 3 Give a critical evaluation of the strength of Buddy2u’s argument in Document 1: *Watch Your Waste*, by identifying and explaining any flaws, implicit assumptions and other weaknesses. [9]

**Para 2**

Author does not make the distinction between misjudgement and deliberate waste. People do not buy food with intention (simply to) to throw out – but people overbuy because they misjudge how much they need.

**Assumption** that there are viable alternatives to throwing out excess food.

**Para 3**

**Assumption** that there is an open global market for food.

**Alternative explanations:** There may be other reasons why rich countries waste grain / There may be other reasons for food shortages e.g. crop failures.

**Strength:** This paragraph succeeds in demonstrating that overbuying by the rich is a cause of food shortages for others.

**Para 4**

**Contradiction:** Suggests that corporations have to take *all* the blame, but goes on to ascribe blame to other parties, e.g. parents.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A LEVEL – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>43</b>

**Generalisation:** From the author not being fond of starters to restaurant portions being “beyond one’s eating capacity”.

**Contradiction:** “huge portions beyond one’s eating capacity” is inconsistent with the author’s companion’s ability to work “his way through a three-course meal”.

The author displays some confusion over whether over-ordering or restaurants serving huge portions is responsible for the waste.

**Slippery slope** from children being allowed to waste food to the creation of a throw-away society.

#### **Para 5**

This paragraph goes against the grain of the argument so far in that the food is consumed by the obese and not thrown away; but this could still be viewed as ‘waste’.

Use of emotive language in place of reasoning.

Credit candidates if they point out that the obese are technically “malnourished” and this therefore seems to be a contradiction.

#### **Para 6**

Invalid appeal to tradition: there was no quality control in those days.

**Assumption:** that people do not consume the food before the use by date.

#### **Para 7**

It is unclear how the elements of the paragraph are related to one another (environmentally harmful – methane – global warming – worsening poverty).

#### **Overall evaluation**

The author has established a number of reasons why a food waste culture might be bad, but neither that it is “inexcusable” nor that “it is time”.

#### **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.)

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9694	43

4 'Those who waste food should be held morally accountable for the hunger of others.'

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 either to claims within sources or identifying conflict / contradiction between 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.	Clear reasoned stance. Some independent reasoning / implicit critical comments. Clear statement of 3 or 4 reasons in support.	12–16
		Weakly reasoned stance. 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 attempt to construct reasoning.	2–6
		Stream of consciousness. Wholly irrelevant/deviant/incoherent material. No attempt.	0–1

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A LEVEL – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>43</b>

This question assesses the candidate's ability to apply critical thinking in a holistic way, i.e. *applied reasoning*. They have to produce a cogent, relevant and well-reasoned argument in response to the source materials and the question. This entails working efficiently to produce a sound case within the time constraints of the exam. Candidates would do well to plan their answers at the start by being very clear about the argument they have in mind and the conclusion they propose and gearing their materials in the chosen direction. Such planning should:

- select evidence and arguments judiciously from the given stimulus documents;
- combine evidence, opinion, argument etc., from given sources through comparison, critical evaluation and critical reasoning;
- introduce strong supporting examples and arguments in addition to the supplied sources;
- propose a clear conclusion or recommendation which is supported by, and consistent with, selected evidence and reasoning used;
- consider some consequences of their conclusion – anticipate counter-arguments/ challenges to their own position and how they would respond.

#### *Indicative content*

Candidates should be able to skim-read, not be distracted by every detail, but judiciously select and identify material that has clear relevance and significance for the debate. Selecting claims from Document 1 and or 2 that those who waste food are morally accountable for the hunger of others should not ignore the wider context, i.e. that there are other reasons for world food shortage and world hunger that are not just due to individuals wasting food. Singer's Greater Moral Evil principle can be used to support Document 1's claims that people should not waste food, but should not overlook the difficulties with his proposition that people also have a moral obligation to give to the poor until they become materially level with those they give to. A claim in Document 3 that hunger in America is increasing astronomically, in support of the view that the US cannot be expected to contribute to relieving hunger elsewhere in the world, should not ignore the data in Document 5 that the US are still relatively very much better off than vast numbers of people in developing countries. It could be observed that the data in Document 5 does not state other major reasons for world hunger – such as drought and famine.

The higher order activity of applied reasoning is to construct *critical reasoning* by critically evaluating and integrating the material in the documents with own ideas and arguments to produce a coherent case. For example, through critically commenting on the arguments and information in Document 1, 2, 3 and 4, it may be argued that those who waste food show contempt for the hunger of millions (given the data in Document 5), but not that those who waste food are morally responsible for the hunger of others. This inference may be drawn through further reasoning that wasting food and not giving to the poor cannot be described as moral evil. Some candidates may draw a distinction between the concept of moral responsibility as referring to an abstract principle, and actual responsibility which refers to cause and effect, which cannot be made. On the other hand it may be argued that wasting food is callous and irresponsible and what was wasted could have alleviated the suffering of the hungry and starving though how realistically this could be done should also be considered.

To obtain higher bands, candidates should consider or anticipate counter-arguments and objections to their own position, and indicate how they would respond, e.g. a conclusion that those who waste food should be held morally accountable for the hunger of others may have considered that the hunger of masses are sometimes caused by their own governments, and that no amount of cutting back or giving to ensure the needy in such countries can be supplied with food can fully succeed. On the other hand, a conclusion that those who waste food should not be held morally responsible for the hunger of others should have looked at objections, for example, that it is very hard-hearted and inhumane to look away from the media pictures of malnourished children, or that every little helps in a suffering world and that moral tokens show empathy with the suffering.

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A LEVEL – May/June 2013</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>43</b>

No marks are reserved for the quality of written English or specialist knowledge of philosophy or ethical theories. It is the quality of *critical thinking* and reasoning alone which is under assessment.