



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
General Certificate of Education Advanced Subsidiary Level and Advanced Level

---

**THINKING SKILLS**

**9694/02**

Paper 2 Critical Reasoning

**For Examination from 2009**

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

**1 hour and 30 minutes**

---

**MAXIMUM MARK: 45**

---

This document consists of **7** printed pages and **1** blank page.



**1 (a) How believable is Karen van Dyke's version of events? Are there any strong reasons for doubting her account?**

- The story is believable enough: passengers do get angry with staff on planes. But there are some quite strong reasons for suspecting that she exaggerates.
- Karen (KV) has a motive to exaggerate. She may be in trouble with the airline if Linda Hong (LH) complains of excessive force or over-reaction on her part.
- There is little corroboration for her claims about shouting, violently pushing, objects falling. Sharma says he couldn't hear LH was saying. Only Marion Deane (MD) really supports her claims.
- The passenger in 16A, who would have seen if someone had 'lashed out' gave a much less dramatic account: he just called it a 'struggle' and said she 'muttered'. [3]

**(b) How does Linda Hong's account differ from Karen van Dyke's, and to what extent is Linda's version supported by other evidence?**

- She denies it was her fault the coffee spilled.
- She (LH) just tried to push past to go to the toilet, not out of violence.
- Some things on the trolley rattled but didn't fall on anyone.
- She called the stewardess clumsy, but did not necessarily shout, (though she admits she was told to calm down.)
- The passengers in the next seat and behind imply that there was no shouting or violence.
- No one else reported things falling on them. [3]

**(c) Comment on the reliability of Marian Deane's statement.**

- MD is old and may be confused, forgetful, etc.
- She clearly exaggerates and dramatises – 'very brave', 'could have been armed', etc., – which cast doubt on her reliability.
- She clearly felt well-disposed to KV, and so may have been biased.
- Best evaluation; not very reliable. [3]

**(d) Construct a reasoned case for concluding either that Linda Hong should be charged with causing a violent disturbance, or that she should not.**

- Weighing the above evidence should lead to a verdict of insufficient evidence to charge LH with violence.
- Doubts about KV's story, patchy corroboration, and unreliability of a key witness (MD) all point to the probability that the staff were hurrying and did over-react. LH's clean record also weighs in here favour. [4]

2 (a) Can either or both of the following statements be concluded on the strength of the claims made in the passage? Give a brief reason for each of your answers.

- **Fast-food is addictive.**

No. There is some evidence that it may be, not proof that it is. [2]

- **The lawyers will probably win their case against the fast-food companies.**

No. They may win if they can prove that food triggers changes that are similar to addiction. There are no grounds for saying how probable or improbable this is. [2]

(b) Summarise the two reasons, in paragraph two, for claiming that the case against the fast-food companies is not as absurd as it may seem.

- Eating a lot of fast food may cause changes in the brain which make it hard to resist eating it [1]
- Fast food may trigger changes which resemble addiction [1]

(c) Explain the significance of the example of the hormone leptin in the argument that fast-food encourages people to overeat.

- Leptin indicates the levels of fat reserves in the body. But gaining weight can weaken its effectiveness. Even a few fatty meals can upset the leptin system, leading to over-eating habits. [3]

(d) ‘Nobody has to smoke, but everyone has to eat?’ How far, if at all, does this comment weaken the lawyers’ case against the fast-food companies?

To some extent it weakens the argument because it challenges the analogy between smoking and eating. However, no one has to eat sweet, fatty foods. So by encouraging us to do so, as fast-food allegedly does, we are arguably being encouraged to do something we don’t have to do and something that is harmful – as with smoking. Therefore, the lawyers’ case is **not** severely damaged by this comment. [3]

**3 (a) Identify two reasons given in paragraph 1 to oppose the use of drugs in sport.**

- It is felt to be cheating.
- Drugs can also do long term damage to an athlete's health.
- It is also only a small step from accepting that elite athletes use drugs to regular illegal drug use in society (and all the ills that accompany drug addiction).

Any two, one mark each.

[2]

**(b) Identify and briefly explain one flaw in the reasoning in paragraph 1.**

- Slippery slope, making extreme, illogical jumps from athletes using drugs to regular drug use, to reach an unlikely conclusion about the ills of addiction.
- Conflation of performance enhancing drugs and other illegal drugs. The argument treats these as the same, even though there are important differences between them.
- Straw person which misrepresents and distorts the argument of holders of the opposing. It is unlikely that many opponents of drugs in sport are really concerned about effects on recreational drug use.

Any one flaw. One mark for the name, one for a brief explanation. Alternatively, two marks for a really good explanation of the flaw. [2]

**(c) – (e) Use grid.**

Descriptor	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Level 0
analysis max 4	Identifying the main conclusion, all or most of the key reasons, and demonstrating understanding of structure.  4 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 marks	Recognising the general direction of the argument and some 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
evaluation max 6	Evaluation of strength of argument with critical reference to assumptions, weaknesses and flaws.  5–6 marks	Some evaluative comments referring to assumptions, weaknesses and/or flaws.  2–4 marks	Discussion of or disagreement with the argument.  1 mark	No relevant comments.  0 marks
further argument max 6	Relevant, developed argument.  5–6 marks	One or more relevant points given in support of candidate's conclusion.  3–4 marks	Relevant comments.  1–2 marks	No argument. Statement of disagreement or irrelevant comment.  0 marks

### Analysis

- R At the top level in sport, the divide between excellence and a gold medal is tiny, and
- R The drive to succeed is strong,
- IC Athletes will take any measures necessary to cross that divide and ensure themselves a gold medal.
- R At present this can lead to ill health.
- R Regulations could focus on testing for unhealthy levels of drugs.
- IC If regulations were changed, athletes would benefit in terms of their long term health.**
- CA People are concerned about fairness, and the 'spirit' of sport.
- R (or RCA) However, if everyone is using performance enhancing drugs, it seems unfair to penalise only those who get caught.
- R It is unfair that some people have natural, genetic advantages which make them unbeatable, however much their opponents train.
- Ex East African distance runners have thinner lower legs, which means that they use less energy compared with European athletes.
- Ex 1 in 5 Europeans has a genetic mutation which makes them unlikely to succeed as sprinters.
- IC Using performance related drugs could actually make sport fairer by minimising these genetic differences.**

R We train and practise in order to improve, in order to do that bit better next time.

**IC The spirit of sport is surely all about enhancing performance.**

R Sport makes us not only healthier but happier.

R Drugs generally make us unhealthier and unhappier,

IC so they defeat the point of sport for most of us.

R Fame, fortune and fans are at stake (in elite sports).

IC Elite sport is completely different from normal, fun sport.

**IC So elite sport should have different rules.**

**C We should accept the use of performance enhancing drugs in elite sport.**

## Evaluation

### Paragraph 2

The reasoning gives some support to the claim that a change in regulations **could** benefit athletes' health in the long term. However, it overstates the likelihood that athletes will take drugs currently. The claim that this will 'ensure' them a gold medal is unfounded. It offers no reason why all athletes taking regulated doses of drugs **would**, overall, be better in terms of athletes' health than the current situation of many athletes taking unregulated doses of drugs. We would have to assume that athletes did not take unhealthy doses in between testing sessions.

### Paragraph 3

The author has provided only weak support (in para 2) for the supposition that everyone is using performance enhancing drugs. It is reasonable to suppose that if everyone were indeed using such drugs, that more people would get caught. So the unfairness of penalising only those who get caught is very weakly supported.

We have to assume that the answer is to allow the use of performance related drugs rather than to penalise everyone or stop holding such high profile competitive events. There is a flaw in the reasoning here; just because a wrong thing is happening and leading to another wrong thing, does not mean that we should accept the first wrong thing. (Variant on reasoning from wrong actions.)

The author conflates natural unfairness with cheating unfairness. Sport is intended to establish who has greater natural prowess (i.e. who has the genetic advantage), and this is why measures such as performance enhancing drugs are opposed so strongly. Conditions external to the individual should be as equal, or as fair, as possible, in order that such natural differences can be seen. This conflation seriously weakens support for the claim that, 'using performance enhancing drugs could actually make sport fairer.'

The examples do not really add support to the author's claims. The East African runners are an example of natural difference giving individuals the competitive edge. However, it has to be assumed that this is a genetic difference, rather than one caused by the environment (e.g. nutrition). This is a reasonable assumption, but would need to be checked. The example of the Europeans is an example of genetic disadvantage. So, although it might contribute to the general notion of unfairness, and to the claim that using performance enhancing drugs could make sport fairer, it is a weak example of natural advantage.

The passage also assumes that taking drugs could rectify these differences. It may be that drugs work in a different way, or that, if everyone were allowed to take a 'safe' dose, then those with the natural advantage would retain their advantage.

The passage leaves itself open to the counter argument that these people should simply find an area that they do excel in rather than taking drugs to compensate.

#### **Paragraph 4**

The reasoning here does support the claim that sport is about enhancing performance, but through natural means. So it undermines its claims about accepting performance enhancing drugs.

Fame, fortune and fans do not seem to be sufficient incentive to make oneself unhealthier and unhappier with drugs. Furthermore, the claim that drugs generally make us unhealthier and unhappier is inconsistent with the claim in paragraph 2 that accepting drugs would have health benefits for athletes.

Although the author has shown that the rewards of elite sport are greater than of 'normal, fun sport,' they have not shown that elite sport is completely different. It remains sport, and the participants remain physical human beings. So there is insufficient support for the claim that, 'elite sport should have different rules.' If drugs are bad/wrong for most of us, they are probably bad/wrong for elite athletes.

#### **Further Argument**

'Sport makes us not only healthier but happier.'

#### **Support**

Human beings need to move around. If we do not move around, our muscles become underdeveloped, our hearts do not work properly and we become unhealthy. Because modern life involves a lot of sitting, one of the main ways of moving around is to engage in sport. By running around we keep healthy. If we are healthy we are normally happy. So sport makes us not only healthier but happier.

Sport keeps us fit and healthy because it makes us move around. It also introduces us to people who share our interests. Friends are important in keeping us happy. Furthermore, sport has been shown to reduce depression by releasing chemicals in the brain. So it makes us not only healthier but happier.

#### **Challenge**

Although exercise may make us healthier and happier, sport has the opposite effect. Sport leads to injuries, which mean that we are immobile for weeks, and may even have long lasting effects. It is also intensely competitive, and someone always has to lose, which will make them unhappy. So sport can actually make us unhealthier and unhappier.

Young people may find sport healthy. However, older people, who tend to retain their competitive urge but not their fitness, are more likely to give themselves a heart attack by trying too hard at sport. It also makes them unhappy that they are no longer as successful as they were in their youth. So sport may make people both unhealthier and unhappier.

