CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge International Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2014 series

9694 THINKING SKILLS

9694/41 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 October/November 2014 series for most Cambridge IGCSE®, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

CAMBRIDGE
International Examinations

1 Make five criticisms of the information provided by the food manufacturer and/or the inference that the snack is healthier than those of their competitors. [5]

Award 1 mark for any of the following:

- No information given about the proportion of fat in the snacks that is saturated.
- No information is given about the size of the snack so we do not know:
  - how many would you eat at a time?
  - the percentage of the snack's mass that is fat.
- There is no indication of how much of a recommended daily intake of fat 1 g represents.
- Absence of comparison with fat content of other snack foods.
- The inference that they are "healthier" rests upon an assumption that the consumer would otherwise be consuming a product that had a higher fat content.
- Without knowing what other ingredients there are in the product, we cannot make inferences about it being healthier.

2 Briefly analyse Globe-trotter's argument in Document 1: *Respect for Other Cultures*, by identifying its main conclusion and main reasons, as well as any intermediate conclusions and counter-arguments. [6]

MR/IC – those who feel prejudice against others are likely to commit hate crimes.
IC – all long-surviving cultures are good cultures.
IC – Attempting to modify other people's cultures carelessly means destabilising stable structures that you don't understand and may not be able to replace with anything near equal.

IC – As a host country we should not expect people who come here from other countries to change their cultures and assimilate.

IC – This calls for a great deal of broadmindedness in societies that have been traditionally more or less mono-cultural.
CA – It is only natural that people of host countries view the incoming cultures as intrusions. **and/or** when a mono-cultural society is bombarded with immigrants, various prejudices, misunderstandings and xenophobic attitudes come to the fore, contributing to tensions.

IC – The way forward is to replace this ignorance with understanding of others.

CA – We cannot be expected to understand all cultures completely – nor is there any rule stating that we should.
IC – A multicultural society can exist peacefully only when there is acceptance and tolerance of all those cultural practices that defy understanding.
MC – So we need to tolerate culturally different neighbours and their oddities.

Marks
1 mark for each element (maximum 3 if MC not identified).

3 Give a critical evaluation of Globe-trotter's argument in Document 1: *Respect for Other Cultures,* by identifying and explaining any flaws, implicit assumptions and other weaknesses. [9]

Para 1

Stipulative definition – "Prejudice is really hatred of humanity"

Slippery slope from feeling prejudice to being likely to commit hate crimes

Contradiction – stating that cultures are stable contradicts previous statement that cultures are constantly evolving.

The second half of the paragraph includes much vague and circular reasoning.

Para 2

Conflation of those who "abandon their cultures" with those who "change their cultures".

Assumption that people are only able to 'fit in' with those from their native culture.

Slippery slope from adopting a different culture to becoming an aimless individual.

Para 4

Conflation of "ignorance" with "prejudice"/feeling "scared" or "undermined".

The meaning of the terms used in the paragraph is rather confused and shifting; in particular, lacking prejudice seems to be equated with being civilised.

For the last statement to be true, it would have to be ***assumed*** that "understanding of others" entails the elimination of all feelings of being scared or undermined.

Para 5

Contradiction – paragraph 4 states that one should understand another culture, whereas here this is described as an impossible task.

Overall Evaluation
Overall, the argument is mediocre. Although most of the intermediate conclusions do support the main conclusion, there are flaws in the reasoning supporting these and the MC is not at all persuasive for someone who does not agree with many of the propositions – particularly because of the contradiction between paragraphs 4 and 5. The counter position has not been represented sufficiently or refuted convincingly.

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)

4 'We should fight prejudice by making it a crime.'
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	Precise conclusion and accomplished argument structure with consistent use of intermediate conclusions. Likely to include at least two of the following: • strands of reasoning • suppositional reasoning • analogy • evidence • examples Argument is structured so the thought process is made clear. Uses vocabulary of reasoning appropriately and effectively to support argument.	7–8	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.	7–8	Perceptive, relevant and accurate use of documents to support reasoning. Sustained and confident evaluation of documents to support reasoning. (Two or more valid **evaluative** references to documents). Able to combine information from two or more documents and draw a precise inference.	7–8	Consideration of key counter arguments and effective response to these. Use of own ideas in response to counter arguments. Use of valid critical tools to respond to counter arguments. Effective use of appropriate terminology.	5–6
3	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.	5–6	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.	5–6	Relevant and accurate use of documents which supports reasoning. (Must reference 3+ documents.) Some evaluation **and** comparison of documents to support reasoning. Inference drawn from ≥ 1 document.	5–6	Consideration of key counter arguments and effective response to these. Some use of appropriate terminology.	3–4

2	Conclusion stated but may be "I agree". Sufficient clarity for meaning to be clear throughout. Structure may be easy to follow but brief or a longer argument which has a less clear structure. Uses reasons. Some appropriate use of vocabulary of reasoning.	3–4	A reasoned stance which attempts to answer 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 use of documents to support reasoning, but some documents used indiscriminately. Some (perhaps implicit) comparison of documents or some critical evaluation of documents.	3–4	Inclusion of counter argument or counter assertion but response to this is ineffective.	2
1	Attempt to construct an argument. Unclear conclusion, multiple conclusions 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. Documents considered sequentially. 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 use, 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