MARK SCHEME
MAXIMUM MARK: 50
SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 9694/02 Thinking Skills SPECIMEN PAPER

UNIVERSITY *of* CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

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)** **Summarise in your own words:**

(i) **the main conclusion of the argument?**

- It is time that the crime coverage is restricted, or programmes taken off the air altogether
  [1]

(ii) **the main reason for drawing this conclusion**

- They are doing more harm than good **[1]**

(b) **The author says that it 'cannot be a coincidence' that there has also been a rise in the number of crime programmes. What is the author assuming here?**

- That the programmes have caused the disproportionate anxiety **[1]**

(c) **Explain why the case of the elderly is particularly important to the argument?**

- The elderly are the least affected by crime but the most alarmed
- They are the most likely to be isolated as a result of their fears
- They are the most reliant on television for information about the outside world (and therefore the most likely to be made anxious by it. **[2]**

(d) **If further evidence were produced to show that people who do not watch the programmes have the same perception of crime levels as those who do, would this severely weaken the argument, or not – and why?**

Superficially it would weaken the argument, in that it would challenge the claim that television was the direct cause of anxiety. However, those who do not actually watch the programmes may hear all about them from neighbours or relatives who do, with the same effect in the long run. Therefore 'severely' may be too strong a term. **[3]**

(e) **Construct a brief argument that could be used by a television company to justify continuing to broadcast crime documentaries and re-enactments.**

E.g.:
- It is important to be aware of crime, even it the public perception is distorted. It is better to be over anxious than complacent
- Fear of crime makes people more vigilant, improvs security in their homes, etc.
- Crime is popular entertainment and providing that it the job of television companies
- The programmes help to catch criminals / deter criminals, etc.
- The programmes involve the public and make for good relations with the police.
  [4]

3 (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]**

4 *Critically evaluate the following argument. In your evaluation you should:*

(a) show that you have a clear understanding of the argument by identifying its main conclusion and the reasoning used to support it.

- The main conclusion is that there is no moral obligation to tell the truth at all times: what matters is the motive.
- The main reasons given are (1) that telling the truth is not always done for good reasons, (2) that the truth can actually do harm; (3) that lying is not always done for bad reasons; and (4) that telling the truth can be disadvantageous. Examples are given to back up each of these four lines of argument. **[2]**

(b) point out any assumptions that the argument makes, and/or points that need to be clarified.

Assumptions – e.g.:
- that if you do something out of duty it is morally justifiable
- that journalists generally know what the consequences of their exposes will be, and that they (journalists) are typically uncaring
- that survival in a competitive world is some justification for lying
- that 'others doing the same' in some way excuses antisocial acts.

Points possibly needing clarification – e.g.:
- how 'truth' should be understood
- the meaning of 'an honest person' as distinct from someone who just tells the truth

[3]

(c) decide whether or not it is a good argument, and identify any flaws or contradictions.
- The strength of the argument is that it provides several exceptions to the general rule that truth telling is good, lying bad; and this does support the conclusion that that there is a moral obligation to tell the truth *at all times*.
- The main weakness is that it contradicts itself. The first three examples it gives justify some lying on the grounds that it is sometimes done for unselfish reasons; but in the last paragraph selfish motives are also seen as being a justification.
- It would be a fair evaluation to say the argument was good up to the point where the contradiction comes in. **[4]**

(d) offer two further reasons, or short further arguments, which could be used for or against the conclusion.

For – e.g.:
- other examples where lying is arguably kinder or safer or more desirable
- other examples where truth telling is harmful

Against – e.g.:
- that lying is wrong 'on principle', not just socially undesirable.
- that here may be times when we do something wrong for good reasons, but it is still wrong.
- that lying causes a loss of trust, whatever reason there may be for it.
- that people may prefer to be told a painful truth than lied to. It is not for us to decide what is best to tell others: we should just be truthful

[3]

	Level Descriptor			
	Level 3	**Level 2**	**Level 1**	**Level 0**
1 Analysis (3-4 marks)	Level 2 + evident understanding of structure, techniques, etc., and clarifying of text where necessary.	Identifying the **main conclusion** and ALL or MOST of the key **reasons.**	Recognising the **general direction** of the argument, and some of the **reasons**	Summary of text or part of text
2 Evaluation (5-6 marks)	Level 2 + thorough evaluation of strength of argument + critical reference to assumptions, weaknesses, and flaws	Level 1 + some evaluation of the strength of the argument, with some reference to assumptions, weaknesses and/or flaws.	General evaluation of strength of the argument.	No evaluative comments
3 Further argument (3-4 marks)	Relevant and well developed points	One or more relevant points	Some response to the argument	No further argument

Notes:
The exact mark-allocations in each individual paper will vary slightly depending on the nature of the text and the precise questions asked.

Typically there will be three or four parts to Question 4, (a), (b), (c)… This is to help candidates structure their responses to take full advantage of available marks.

The question parts [(a) (b) etc] will not necessarily correspond exactly to the categories [analysis, evaluation, etc], but they will always be closely related. In this sample paper, for instance, the allocation is as follows:

Question 4:	**Analysis**	**Evaluation**	**Further argument**
(a)	2	-	-
(b)	1	2	-
(c)	-	4	-
(d)	-	-	3
TOTAL	3	6	3

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE