

**MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2009 question paper
for the guidance of teachers**

9694 THINKING SKILLS

9694/22

Paper 22 (Critical Reasoning), maximum raw mark 45

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 must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

- CIE will not enter into discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2009 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9694	22

1 (a) How reliable are the reports published in the North Star? [4]

The reports are not very reliable/the reports are reliable insofar as they report facts but not the speculation. They have a Vested Interest to sensationalise and sell papers. They jump from slight evidence to strong conclusions. They make assertions, questions, insinuations, but give almost no reliable evidence. The only possible 'fact' in the first report is that Migi could have been meeting Dal Sam. This comes from an unnamed 'reliable' source but telling us it is reliable doesn't make it so. As it is unnamed and in the context of this report, the source may well not be reliable. But the paper is unlikely to publish as fact something which cannot be substantiated, and other evidence confirms this meeting. But it is not reliable to infer from this meeting that Migi is joining the terrorist activities. In the second report the only 'facts' are that there was an explosion and three people were injured (we do not know to what extent). These facts are likely to be reliable, the explosion is corroborated by the police statement. However, the cause of the explosion is open to question. The paper has jumped to conclusions again.

4 marks: Strong support given to candidate's conclusion, grounded in solid understanding and evaluation of credibility issues. The focus should be on these reports rather than on the paper as a whole (although this does not exclude some comments about the paper as a whole).

3 marks: Reasonable support given to candidate's conclusion, based on acceptable understanding/evaluation of credibility issues. Some mention of the reports as well as the paper should be made.

2 marks: Some support given to the candidate's conclusion based on some understanding/evaluation of credibility issues.

1 mark: Inconclusive point or points which might be used to show that the North Star is (un)reliable with some connection to credibility.

[Max 4]

(b) How reasonable is it to believe that Migi did not know about Peter Long's possible identity as Dal Sam? Justify your answer. [3]

It depends on how strong the link was between his everyday 'Pete' identity and his identity as 'Dal Sam'. The first police report says that this is an 'alleged' identity, which indicates that Dal Sam might be almost a creation and not strongly linked to a particular person. Even if Pete is Dal Sam, it might be possible for a naïve girl who remembers a childhood friend to be misled. It is also possible for people not to know everything about each other. So it is plausible that, even if Pete is Dal Sam, this is a surprise to Migi. On the other hand, if it is very well known that Pete is Dal Sam, and if he is more or less openly engaged in terrorist activities, it would be harder to hide this from Migi. She also has a clear vested interest to pretend that she does not know about any connection to preserve her public image or repudiate any allegations about her own links to the terrorist group. So, although it is plausible that she didn't know, it is also quite possible that she did.

3 marks: Candidate's conclusion strongly justified by reasoning with some subtlety of 'how reasonable' – so consideration of extent.

2 marks: Reasonable support for candidate's conclusion (perhaps less subtle).

1 mark: Candidate provides some comments which might support conclusion.

[Max 3]

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9694	22

(c) Explain the significance of the two televised Police Statements in judging this case. [3]

The Police Statements are useful in bringing the issue back to what is known rather than unfounded implications. From the Police Statements, we know that the connection between Pete Long and Dal Sam is not as certain as the North Star suggested. We also know that the police are investigating allegations about Pete Long and Migi. It is uncertain however whether these are allegations brought by the North Star or other allegations, so the weight of this information is uncertain. If the police are investigating other allegations about the activities of Migi, it gives more weight to the North Star's reports that Migi might be involved in terrorist activities. The other report tells us that there was an explosion, but makes it clear that the cause is unknown, which puts the North Star's wild assertions into a calmer context.

3 marks: Strong explanation of the significance with specific reference to each report.

2 marks: Some explanation of the significance, possibly talking about the reports generally.

1 mark: Some comments about the significance.

[Max 3]

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9694	22

(d) How likely is it that Migi is involved in Southern Separatist Terrorist activities? Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, using the evidence provided and considering plausible alternatives. [5]

Accept conclusions based on likelihood. Do not accept over-statements such as 'Migi was definitely a terrorist.'

Generic:

Acceptable conclusion in terms of probability [1]

And:

3 marks: Reasoned argument involving thorough evaluation of the evidence to support the conclusion.

2 marks: Evaluative reference to the evidence in support of the conclusion.

1 mark: Some reference to the evidence in support of the conclusion.

And:

Consideration of the plausibility of the alternative scenarios. [1]

[Max 5]

Indicative content:

On the balance of probability it is not likely that Migi is involved in SST activities. Firstly the reports that began the rumour from the North Star, themselves are not reliable. As it is from the north, their reports shows their inability for them to accept that a Southerner could rise to stardom. This rumour could also be a campaign to shot down Migi's career as her songs depict provocative lyrics describing the injustice of the South's poverty. Furthermore, the North Star claim that their resources were reliable, when in truth they may be biased. Moreover, they branded themselves as warriors for the truth with the label, 'our brave campaign' further showing that this is merely a business tactic to earn more sales and profits. However, the press release by Migi's team is also unreliable as they had vested interest in protecting Migi's reputation by denying any links to terrorist activities. Nevertheless, she shows her innocence by being honest in the interview about knowing Peter Long not Dal Sam, and this is corroborated by the televised news reports. In addition, the interview shows of Peter's innocence as Migi described him as one who would protect people not harm them. However, her anger against the North for their oppression on the South may give substantial thought to her guilt. Nevertheless, the second police report, shows the possibility of North Star stretching the truth of Migi's guilt as police claimed that there were other causes of the explosion, including a backlash from Migi's fans. Finally, Migi would not want to destroy her own career as a singer by getting involved in such activities.

(1+ 3 +1 = 5. This is an outstanding answer.)

It is likely that Migi is involved in the SST activities as in the newspaper article of the North Star, it states that Migi has repeatedly been seen in the company of Dal Sam, who is thought to be a senior commander of SST. And according to the statement of a police in 5th of October, it says that there is a photograph show that Peter Long was talking intently with Migi. In addition, in television interview, Migi refused knowing that Peter was Dal Sam and impliedly saying that Peter was not a terrorist. As stated by Migi, Peter was a good friend of her and always used to protect her and the little kids from being bullied and Peter was like an older brother to her. Therefore it is plausible that Migi acts out of loyalty to protect Peter Long.

(1 + 1 + 1 = 3)

[Total: 15]

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9694	22

- 2 (a) **Consider Box A. Is making rats forget a strong feeling of disgust a good example of erasing a specific memory? Explain your answer.** [3]

3 marks: Strong explanation, focussed on 'specific memory.'

2 marks: Reasonable explanation, referring to the differences between rats and humans.

1 mark: Comment which might explain whether this is a good example.

Indicative content

It depends on whether a feeling of disgust counts as a memory. It's not the same as forgetting that you had an accident. But it might be more like turning down the emotional part of a memory. Do the rats forget that they ate a food and were sick? Or do they just forget the feeling of disgust? Will this work in people?

[Max 3]

- (b) **Consider Box B. Some people who would never take memory altering drugs themselves believe that these drugs should be available for others. Can this reliably be concluded? Explain your answer.** [3]

3 marks: Strong explanation of how the conclusion can be drawn.

2 marks: Reasonable explanation of why people might feel this way.

1 mark: Comment which might explain.

[Max 3]

Indicative content

Yes. 2000 people were asked 2 questions, so it was the same 2000 people. 52% of them would never take memory altering drugs themselves, but 75% of the total thought that these drugs should be available, either regulated or not. So some of these people must be the same as the people who said they would never take the drugs.

- (c) **'Some people manage to injure themselves on their trousers.' To what extent does this reason oppose the development of memory-altering drugs?** [3]

3 marks: Strong explanation focussed on the quality of support given, perhaps considering the differences between making mistakes with everyday objects and the care/attention/regulation involved with potentially dangerous medication.

2 marks: Reasonable explanation, perhaps with candidate's own opinion as the focus rather than the link of support between reason and conclusion.

1 mark: Comment which might explain.

[Max 3]

Indicative content

On the one hand, it does show how irresponsible or daft people can be. If we can harm ourselves so easily on harmless, everyday objects, there might be a case for protecting us from harmful substances. On the other hand, if even trousers can harm some people, there might be a case for saying, fine, some people are lost causes, let's concentrate on the majority, and on those who can benefit from this. It would be irrational to deprive some people of a benefit just because some extreme cases would abuse it. In order to justify that kind of protectionism, you'd have to show that there was a reasonable danger rather than just a few idiots.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9694	22

- (d) **Should Governments fund further research into memory-altering drugs? Write a short, reasoned argument to support your conclusion, using and evaluating the information provided.** [6]

Level 3: Strong answer 5–6 marks

Reasoned argument which evaluates and uses the evidence in support of own thinking.

Level 2: Reasonable answer 3–4 marks

Simple argument with uses and/or evaluates the evidence.

Level 1: Weak answer 1–2 marks

Opinion/assertion with reference to the evidence OR a simple argument which makes no reference to the evidence at all.

Note: Evaluation may include a consideration of the implications of the resource material as well as the reliability and use of the evidence.

[Max 6]

Indicative content

Governments should fund research into memory-altering drugs. However, there should be very strict regulations in regulating and monitoring the research. It represents a new development of technology which is vital in modern era. Besides, according to source A, patients could remember the details of an event, but did not feel upset remembering it. This may help in crime investigations, where the memory of the victim is significant. According source B, 36% of the 2000 people would take the drugs if they had been through a traumatic experience. This is good for traumatised victims, it may help them to live with dignity and lead a normal life as they lead before the traumatic experience happened to them. According to Source C, it is a benefit to war veterans, accident victims and drug addicts. It could help in the rehabilitation of drug addicts and also remove painful memories of the war veterans and accident victims. This may contribute to their future well-being. According to source D, the bloggers basically are objecting to mind-altering drugs. They claimed that bad memories remind us of our mistakes and memories make us what we are today. They fail to see that bad memories may reduce a strong person into a depressed or disturbed weakling. Besides that, traumatic experience is not healthy.

(6 marks)

Yes, the Governments should fund further research into memory-altering drugs. This can be shown by the research in New York that a chemical called ZIP had successfully erased specific memories which can at the same time be able to work on human beings. Moreover, the memory altering drug could be a useful tool to help people forget painful memories. And it should be made available to the public and be strictly regulated and sold only to those who need it. Besides the memory-altering drugs could lead certain people to healthier lives by erasing those traumatic experience. As a conclusion it is a useful tool that should be kept on researching to help the community who need it.

(3 marks)

[Total: 15]

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9694	22

3 (a) Identify the main conclusion of the argument. [1]
 People should revise their expectations of Obama, though.

(b) Identify three reasons given to support the main conclusion. [3]

Changing the whole world will take effort from all of us.
 One man, no matter how powerful, cannot improve the world without us.
 It is also important worldwide that citizens move away from the attitude that the Government should solve all our problems.
 This means that those people in Europe and Africa and Asia who have welcomed this new President as their saviour are being misled by false hopes.
 He may not be able to solve problems that others have caused.
 People around the world will suffer greater deprivation in a few years' time when a lesser leader takes his place.
 Obama is only the president of one part of the world.

Any three, one mark each.

(c) Evaluate the reasoning in paragraphs 1–6. In your answer you could consider any strengths, weaknesses, flaws and any unstated assumptions. [6]

Use grid below and see comments overleaf.

(d) 'We need to accept responsibility for our own lives.' Write your own short argument to support or challenge this claim. [5]

Use grid below and see comments on page 9.

Descriptor	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Level 0
(c) 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. Relevant counter argument 3–4 marks	Discussion of or disagreement with the argument. Weak counter argument. 1–2 marks	No relevant comments. 0 marks
(d) further argument max 5	Relevant, developed argument. 5 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

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9694	22

Evaluation

There are persistent assumptions about what people around the world expect from Obama, some are more realistic than others. The assumptions are not generally based on an understanding that people's hopes and expectations vary.

Assumption: people around the world hope that Obama will affect people outside the US – quite reasonable given the tangled web of the world.

Assumption: people hope that Obama will solve global warming etc. Probably people don't really hope that he will solve these problems even if they do hope that he will help to make some or all of them less problematic. Certainly anyone who did hope that Obama will provide a complete solution should revise their hopes.

There is reasonable strength in the argument that one man cannot make decisions for everyone.

If you accept the premises, there is support for the claim that citizens move away from the attitude that the government should solve all our problems, but there is room to challenge some of the premises. There is a slight issue here about whether US citizens or world citizens are being talked about and this makes a difference to the strength of the reasoning.

Obama being president in only one part of the world does not mean that he has no power to affect those outside the US, so people outside the US are not necessarily being misled by false hopes on this basis – although if they think of him as a saviour they may find they are hoping for too much! Contradiction with the last paragraph in which a failure to re-elect Obama will cause disaster for those around the world.

Slippery slope in the last paragraph with some links that might be ok, and some that are clearly extreme.

Overall, if we accept that people have unduly high expectations of Obama, there is reason to accept that people should revise their expectations of him.

Indicative content

The following are candidate's part answers indicating level of performance:

The author says that Obama has no power to affect people outside the US but the author failed to consider that Obama had been sending diplomats around the world to help improve or solve the country's problem. This has indirectly affect people outside the US. (Level 3)

The author ignored that the powerful president could change and affect the decision of the whole world. (Level 2)

The decision we make in our daily lives (shopping etc.) may not affect the world. Politics does not involve the public other than the elections. (Level 1)

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A/AS LEVEL – October/November 2009	9694	22

Further arguments

'We need to accept responsibility for our own lives.'

Support:

It is bad for us to depend on others (support with examples). If we depend on others we do not direct our own futures. If we accept responsibility for our own lives we are happier and more balanced (support with examples). So we need to accept responsibility for our own lives.

Challenge:

So many of the things that happen to us in our lives are the result of things we cannot affect, such as financial crises, or the country we were born in. This means that our lives simply are dependent on others, so we cannot be responsible for things that are out of our control.

[Total: 15]