

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

GCE Advanced Level

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 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 2013 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 2013	9694	42

1 (a) Make three criticisms of the data presented by *The Mistletoe Rag*. [3]

- Arbitrary selection of years.
- After adjusting for the 4% inflation, fees have gone up in real terms but hardly skyrocketed. (If there had been no real increase, inflation adjusted fees for 1997 would be \$24 940, and for 2012 \$44 916.)
- The 4% inflation is not tailored to the particular relevant costs.
- Tuition and accommodation fees presented together may hide significant variations in the costs of the constituent parts. e.g. have tuition fees for some intensive courses increased?
- Average (mean) fees over the period increasing may result from a number of new, more luxurious student properties, and no change to the 'standard provision'.
- Presentation of the graph: unequal gaps between the years given (1992 – 1997 – 2012) accentuates the apparent acceleration.
- y-axis beginning at \$15 000 accentuates the apparent acceleration.
- The set of 'services' being paid for may have changed between 1992 and 2012.
- Does not take into account the University's overheads e.g. more costly high-tech facilities, increase in salaries of teaching staff, less government subsidy, etc. These things may have gone up faster than inflation.

(b) Explain how the data presented and the claims made by *The Mistletoe Rag* could be consistent with those made by the University. [2]

- Data for 10 years ago is not given: the (real) increases that did take place may have all occurred between 1992 and 2002.
- The average 4% inflation (over 20 years) could have occurred mainly in the second decade.
- "Most students": mode could remain the same, while the mean and median increased.
- The "cost of studying" is not necessarily the same as the fees for "tuition and accommodation".
- The standard provision of "high quality service and good value for money" would have been maintained after adjusting for inflation

2 Briefly analyse Happy Bee's argument in Document 1: *To Be Happy*, by identifying its main conclusion and main reasons, as well as any intermediate conclusions and counter-arguments. [6]

MR* – It is important that people feel they are growing in their circumstances, if they are to be truly happy.

CA – It is widely believed that happiness can be achieved through selfless acts for the benefit of others.

IC – they (self-righteous acts) can lead to a sense of less growth.

MR* – Real or true happiness comes only when you get a feeling that you are better off than you were.

MC – Individuals should prioritise their own happiness before all else by doing all they do for themselves.

IC – happiness is all about what you do for yourself that makes you feel happy.

MR – If people do things to make themselves, not others, feel better, then they achieve true happiness.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9694	42

MR – By sacrificing yourself for others, you may not actually be leaving them with a sense of growth, but rather the opposite.

CA – It has been argued that individuals feel happy or unhappy because of their genetic programming.

IC – No-one is predetermined by their DNA to stay unhappy.

IC* – So, if you are feeling unhappy, that is a sign of feeling less growth and of being worse off.

Marks

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

* Credit only one of these three.

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

Para 1

Conflation: self-righteousness, which has negative value connotations, is conflated with selflessness, which has positive value connotations.

Begging the question: “Real or true happiness...”

Para 2

Other possible explanations as to why people chose either of the two options, eg. they are extrapolating to future years (in which it is more profitable option, given a year or two more).

Generalisation from “These people understood...” (a particular example) to “Ultimately this means that...” (a general principle).

Conflation of experiencing growth with doing things for yourself.

(Therefore) the IC, “happiness is all about what you do for yourself that makes you feel happy” is unsupported.

Para 3

Assumption that one would feel resentful about leaving one’s office tidy for the benefit of a successor.

The reasoning in the paragraph is unconvincing, and is insufficient to demonstrate that “true happiness” will be obtained in this way. Both examples involve acts that benefit others, whereas the intention is to suggest that we should focus on acts that benefit ourselves.

Para 4

Assumption that all parents have more than one child.

Assumption that parents who amass fortunes have made sacrifices to do so.

The example shows that parents leaving money to their children does not guarantee happiness, but fails to show that it is unlikely to produce happiness.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9694	42

Para 5

The CA “individuals feel happy or unhappy because of their genetic programming” has only very limited relevance to the issue of whether individuals should prioritise their own happiness.

Straw man: “individuals feel happy or unhappy because of their genetic programming” overstates the CA and thereby makes it easier to oppose.

Para 6

Contradiction: the ways to make yourself feel better are not about growth and the suggestion of signing up to be an organ donor is couched in terms of virtuous (= altruistic) motives rather than selfish ones.

Overall evaluation

The argument is, overall, very weak. The reasons given support the notion that it might be good to do things for oneself, but fail to demonstrate that one should prioritise one’s own happiness before all else. In particular, the concepts of personal growth and happiness upon which the argument depends are extremely vague and ill-defined. Because of the shifting meaning of these terms the whole argument is circular and many of the claims made are non-falsifiable.

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	42

4 'We should give up the pursuit of happiness.'

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

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9694	42

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. The claim in Document 1 that people can be happy by making right choices and that genes do not control our free will should not overlook the stated findings in Document 5 that our genes are to an extent responsible for feelings of happiness. The claim in Document 4 that happiness comes through a process of natural selection has to take stock of the dilemma that circumstances beyond our control can arise and thwart family planning and family joys or affect our ability to sustain our dependents, as implied by Document 3. It may be observed that the statistics in Document 2 go against the claim in Document 5 that genetic programming has more influence on how people feel than better living conditions. It could be inferred from Document 5 that the unhappiest countries are those where living conditions for the majority are much worse off than for their fellow beings in countries high up the list for happiness and life satisfaction, hence the evidence from Document 3 that human migration tends to flow from less 'happy' to 'happier' countries.

The higher order activity of applied reasoning is to construct *critical reasoning* by critically evaluating and integrating the material in the documents with their own ideas and arguments to produce a coherent case. For example, after critically commenting on the claims or information in Documents 1, 4 and 5 that people tend to turn to technologies to artificially manufacture feelings of happiness, rather than by making good choices and working towards their own happiness, as advocated by Document 4, it may be inferred that happiness is an illusion as much as unhappiness. This can help support a further argument such as that humans, being genetically programmed (Document 5) and subjected to the unpredictability of life (Document 3) should give up working for their happiness and find short cuts to feeling happy. Candidates may also, in constructing a reasoned case, look at definitions of happiness. This could lead to inferences which impact on the question of whether bio-happiness is indeed authentic or even ethical happiness, and whether it is worthwhile or right to take such routes to happiness e.g. people may become addicted to drugs through the craving for the happy feel. The question of whether our ability to be unhappy or happy in human situations that arise is due to our genes or whether we are responsible overall for being happy or unhappy is a key issue in the debate as to whether the pursuit of happiness is worthwhile. Consequentialist or utilitarian views may be used relevantly. However, no marks are reserved for the candidates' knowledge about ethical theories, only the relevant application for critical thinking will be credited. Good answers should be able to nuance the evident complexities in arguing either way.

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 one ought to do all one can to become happy should consider that chance and circumstances can

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A LEVEL – May/June 2013	9694	42

overtake, or that other people's happiness does matter in the equation. On the other hand, a conclusion that human beings are born to be happy or unhappy and it is right to turn to intervention of technology to become happy people may have to answer to counter-arguments that this eliminates individual responsibility with resulting consequences. Anecdotes from personal experience should not dominate the discussion to the exclusion of other considerations raised by the stimulus sources: they should be weighed in the balance relevantly and appropriately.

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