

**CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS**

**GCE Advanced Level**

## **MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series**

### **9694 THINKING SKILLS**

**9694/42**

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 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 A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9694	42

**1 (a) Make three criticisms of the statistics used in the diagram. [3]**

Award 1 mark for any of the following:

- 3-D representation of pie chart exaggerates the “never” category.
- Too few/broad categories.
- Two categories overlap: 1–3 and 3–5 both contain ‘3’.
- No categories exist for ‘between 0 and 1’ or ‘over 5’.
- It is not at all clear what the terms “fast food”, “dining” or “family” refer to.
- Without some idea of the number who responded, it is very difficult to gauge the significance of the results.

**(b) Do you think that the evidence provided is sufficient for this inference to be drawn? Justify your answer briefly. [2]**

Award up to 2 marks for a developed answer along the lines of any of the following:

The claim is not supported, because:

- the question is about how often families dine on fast food and many Americans might not dine as a family;
- it is possible that many respondents whose families dine on fast food less regularly than once a week responded ‘never’;
- readers of this newspaper may not be representative of the US population as a whole;
- respondents may not be representative of the readership – those proud of their eating habits more likely to respond;
- it may be that not only Americans read this newspaper – an unknown number of respondents may have been citizens of other countries;
- the scope of the survey question is very poorly defined and so the data is likely to be unreliable.

**2 Briefly analyse Iaman's argument in Document 1: *The Better Half*, by identifying its main conclusion and main reasons, as well as any intermediate conclusions and counter-arguments. [6]**

**MC** – I would urge people not to vote for a woman prime minister to lead our nation.

**CA** – (Even though) some countries in the world, looking to demonstrate an attitude of equal opportunity, have opted for female leaders.

**IC/MR** – The number of female politicians in a country has always been much lower than their male counterparts.

**CA** – (The problem is that there is a widespread notion out there that) women can be seen as equal to men if they enter the political arena, (and that) if they choose being home-makers as their priority they are seen as second-class citizens.

**IC** – By compelling women into politics you effectively deny them individual freedom.

**IC** – (It is clear that) women are not tough enough for the rough and tumble of politics.

**IC** – (So) women in politics would find it more difficult to discharge their duties.

**IC** – Men are better than women in policy matters

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>42</b>

**IC** – (Because of this,) men don't have to fight to be taken seriously

**IC** – (So, it's quite obvious that) women do not make better politicians than men.

**Marks**

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

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9694	42

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

**Paragraph 1**

**Straw man** – “looking to demonstrate an attitude of equal opportunity”

**Appeal to popularity** – “these are exceptions rather than the norm.”

**Paragraph 2**

**Irrelevance** – The number of politicians of particular gender is not relevant to a judgement about their quality.

**Inappropriate appeal to tradition** – “One has only to look at the track record...”

**Straw man** – “One cannot accuse millions of people the world over of sexism”

**Paragraph 3**

**Appeal to popularity** – that popularly held beliefs are right; so women should stay away from politics.

**Appeal to nature** – engaging in politics goes against women’s ‘natural bent’ / ‘natural inclinations’.

**Contradiction** – the ‘widespread notion’ contradicts earlier assertion of ‘popular belief’ which held an opposite view.

**Assumption** that women would not choose to go into politics.

**Paragraph 4**

**Flawed analogy** – there are significant dissimilarities between combat in a war and politics.

**Conflation** of “practical and logical” with “practical”, and being “obsessed about theoretical knowledge” with being “theoretical”.

**Paragraph 5**

**Assumption** that women have more “responsibilities towards their families” than men.

In order to support the IC “women do not make better politicians than men”, it is necessary to **assume** that people who “find it more difficult to discharge their duties” will discharge them less well.

**Paragraph 6**

**Assumption** that being “influenced by others” / depending on “family and friends” leads to poorer decision making.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>42</b>

### **Paragraph 7**

**Assumption** that people “who constantly have to prove themselves” will make worse politicians.

The crucial IC of this paragraph does not support the MC, as ‘not better’ does not necessarily mean ‘worse’.

### **Marks**

Award 1 mark for each correct point and 2 marks for a point that is well-expressed.  
(Maximum 9 marks.)

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A LEVEL – May/June 2014	9694	42

4 ‘Any country that has not yet had a female national leader should appoint one next.’

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]

Level	Structure	Max 8	Quality of argument	Max 8	Use of documents	Max 8	Treatment of counter positions	Max 6
4	<p>Precise conclusion and accomplished argument structure with consistent use of intermediate conclusions. Likely to include at least two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• strands of reasoning</li> <li>• suppositional reasoning</li> <li>• analogy</li> <li>• evidence</li> <li>• examples</li> </ul> <p>Argument is structured so the thought process is made clear. Uses vocabulary of reasoning appropriately and effectively to support argument.</p>	7–8	<p>Cogent and convincing reasoning which answers the question which was asked. Subtle thinking about the issue. Use of relevant own ideas and ideas from documents. Very few significant gaps or flaws.</p>	7–8	<p>Perceptive, relevant and accurate use of documents to support reasoning.</p> <p>Sustained and confident evaluation of documents to support reasoning. (More than 2 evaluative references to documents or nuanced evaluation). Able to combine information from two or more documents and draw a precise inference.</p>	7–8	<p>Anticipation of key counter arguments not mentioned in documents and effective response to these. Use of valid critical tools to respond to counter arguments. Frequent effective use of appropriate terminology.</p>	5–6
3	<p>Clear conclusion that is more than “I agree”. Clear argument structure, which may be simple and precise or attempt complexity with some success. Appropriate use of intermediate conclusions. Use of other argument elements to support reasoning. Generally makes thinking clear. Appropriate use of vocabulary of reasoning.</p>	5–6	<p>Effective and persuasive reasoning which answers the question which was asked. (Although there may be some irrelevance or reliance on dubious assumptions.) Use of own ideas and ideas from documents. Few significant gaps or flaws.</p>	5–6	<p>Relevant and accurate use of documents which supports reasoning. (Likely to reference at least 3 documents.)</p> <p>Some evaluation of documents to support reasoning. Inference drawn from <math>\geq 1</math> document.</p>	5–6	<p>Consideration of relevant counter arguments and effective response to these. Attempt to use critical tools to respond to counter arguments. Some use of appropriate terminology.</p>	3–4

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A LEVEL – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9694</b>	<b>42</b>

<b>Level</b>	<b>Structure</b>	<b>Max 8</b>	<b>Quality of argument</b>	<b>Max 8</b>	<b>Use of documents</b>	<b>Max 8</b>	<b>Treatment of counter positions</b>	<b>Max 6</b>
2	Clear, straightforward argument or a discourse at length with a focus on the ideas and content but only a basic structure. Conclusion stated or clearly implied. Conclusion may be “I agree”. Uses reasons. Sufficient clarity for meaning to be clear. Some appropriate use of vocabulary of reasoning.	3–4	A reasoned stance which answers the general thrust of the question which was asked. Some support for the conclusion. (Although there may be considerable irrelevance or reliance on dubious assumptions.) Some thinking/own ideas about the issue. Use of rhetorical questions and emotive language. Some significant gaps or flaws.	3–4	Some relevant and accurate use of documents, but some documents used indiscriminately.  Some (perhaps implicit) comparison of documents or some critical evaluation of or inferences drawn from, documents.	3–4	Inclusion of counter argument or counter assertion but response to this is ineffective.	2
1	Attempt to construct and argument. Unclear or no conclusion. Disjointed, incoherent reasoning. Use of examples in place of reasoning. Possibly a discourse or a rant. Reasons presented with no logical connection. Substantial irrelevant material.	1–2	Attempt to answer the general thrust of the question. Attempt to support their view. Excessive use of rhetorical questions and emotive language. Ideas which are contradictory.	1–2	Some, perhaps implicit, use of documents. No attempt at critical evaluation. No comparison of documents.	1–2	Inclusion of counter argument or counter assertion with no response.	1
0	No creditworthy material	0	No creditworthy material	0	No creditworthy material	0	No creditworthy material	0