

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

GCE Advanced Subsidiary Level

MARK SCHEME for the November 2005 question paper

8436 THINKING SKILLS

8436/02

Paper 2 (Critical Thinking), maximum raw mark 50

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began. Any substantial changes to the mark scheme that arose from these discussions will be recorded in the published *Report on the Examination*.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the *Report on the Examination*.

The minimum marks in these components needed for various grades were previously published with these mark schemes, but are now instead included in the *Report on the Examination* for this session.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the November 2005 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 1	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS LEVEL – NOVEMBER 2005	8436

www.PapaCambridge.com

1 Guidelines:

(a) 1 mark each for the following observations, up to a total of 10:

- 1 AB's age and possible reason for resentment because a younger man was promoted over her. (Corroborated by VB)
- 2 AB's absence with stress. Obviously she had been badly affected by something at work.
- 3 Clinical condition corroborated by Dr M, but not evidence of sexual harassment, only of illness. Note doctor's *expertise*. Note too that *if* the harassment was real, then it *would* be support for the claim that AB had been forced to leave the job.
- 4 Lawyer: hearsay evidence only, so cannot be taken as corroboration. Also AB is the lawyer's client so vested interest to believe it. Only first-hand evidence is to the fact that AB was 'agitated and distressed'.
- 5 JT: first hand witness, but not good memory. Can only say Watson was probably joking. And AB a little over-sensitive. May have played down the incident so as not to antagonise his boss. Note later promotion. On the other hand, he does not blatantly deny the incident: he seems reasonably even-handed in his account.
- 6 KS: could not remember, suggesting either that she did not want to or that it was not a very serious/memorable incident at all. Seems to like TW, so they may be on friendly terms.
- 7 VB: first hand evidence that AB is upset, but only hearsay evidence of what was said to her by Watson. VB jumps to conclusions on strength of history and AB's distress. Not evidence of harassment.
- 8 TW denies the charges, as he would. However, he does let it slip that he finds fault with AB's work and attitude; therefore it is not implausible that at times he has let it show.
- 9 Teale's promotion could be taken as a sign that he sided with TW.
- 10 APPENDIX 1 - Personnel list: shows that one of the other TL's was a woman. Therefore unless she had similar complaints, there is no reason to think that TW treats all women abusively.
- 11 APPENDIX 2 - Law: Establishes that this would be sexual harassment if the facts are all true as AB reports.

(b) What can be said is that if AB is telling the truth and not exaggerating, she does have a case for claiming sexual discrimination. The remarks he allegedly makes are both insulting: the July remark is clearly based on her gender - 'cow' - and even the March incident could be said to imply that women gossip instead of working. Between them the two remarks do match the definition given in the notes: treatment which causes offence and which would not have been used against a similarly placed member of the opposite sex. Also there is clear evidence in that she was off with stress and that she was probably very upset by conditions at work.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus
	GCE AS LEVEL – NOVEMBER 2005	8436

However, the evidence to support AB's specific claim that the discriminatory remarks were made is weak. It is largely based on her word alone. Against AB is also the possibility that she may have harboured resentment because TW has been promoted over her. This would give her a motive to get back at him. It may also be a reason for her to have been obstructive and awkward in which case TW would have had some justification for reprimanding her, to which she in turn over-reacted. Certainly there is evidence from two witnesses that AB is rather sensitive etc. There is no real corroboration for her claim: on the contrary others seem generally to find TW a satisfactory boss.

On AB's side is the suggestion by JT that TW can be sarcastic at times, so maybe he went too far and was insensitive. Given what he says about AB's work, he clearly does feel some annoyance towards her. Also there is a reason to suppose that he too may have carried ill-feeling over from the time when they competed for promotion – she apparently has made it known she thought he should not have got it – and he may have been too ready to put her down when he got the chance.

On the balance of the evidence, it cannot be concluded that harassment took place. The most that can be said with confidence is that there was ill feeling between the two employees that resulted in AB leaving her job.

2 Suggested answers

- (a) (i) **Either:** the view that modern art is valueless/rubbish/has little merit **or:** the view that art requires special skills/is not art without special skills. [1]
- (ii) Because it showed that no great skill or care was needed to make the exhibit [1] and that therefore it could not have very much merit. [1]
- (b) (i) It showed that the cleaner had recognised the exhibit as rubbish literally. [1] It showed that the artist had got his message across (about art not being permanent etc.) [1] (N.B. Some candidates may say 'because the cleaner was in on it'. This should not be credited as it is not the author's claim, nor one the author is offering in explanation.)
- (ii) That it did not mean the exhibit was rubbish as a work of art [1]. That it added to the point the artist was trying to make [1] (i.e. that art does not have to be permanent or precious [1])
- (c) That (merely) showing something to be impermanent or not precious is of some artistic value; OR (merely) succeeding in what is intended gives a thing some artistic value. [1]
- (d) It would be a weak challenge in the sense there is no skill required to fill a bag of rubbish or leave litter around. Or it could be said that it is not a challenge at all because the argument is not about skill. [1] The author would probably reply by arguing that it is the idea and imagination alone that makes something artistically valuable.
- (e)
- The claim about the dreary brown portraits is a blatant contradiction of the earlier claim (conclusion) that no work of art can be called rubbish. If they are rubbish then the conclusion cannot be true.
 - There is an *ad hominem* (attack on the person rather than his/her argument) made twice in the last paragraph: critics showing themselves to be elitists/dull, narrow minded critics. The slur is added to by the irrelevant allegation that the critics are also elitist about music.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	
	GCE AS LEVEL – NOVEMBER 2005	8436	

- There is an unwarranted assumption that conceptual art such as Hirshhorn's Metzger's *does* provoke a response and/or that it demonstrates ideas and imagination.
- In the last paragraph there is an assumption that the dreary brown portraits do not provoke a response in anyone. Without this assumption the contrast the author is making between classical and conceptual art, breaks down, since we have already been told that anything which provokes ideas etc. is art (i.e. a sufficient condition). Yet clearly the assumption is unwarranted, and thus reliance on it constitutes a flaw.
- The author restricts the options in paragraph 6 by implying that artists either have skill or imagination and ideas. Obviously many classical artists had both, just as some modern ones do. This could alternatively be described as a straw man, in that it represents the contrary view so poorly.
- There is some question begging in paragraph 5 (conclusion) because the author helps him/herself to the assumption that the object being considered is already accepted as art. This could be described as circular: of course if something is art it is not rubbish, but that does not mean anything that is *claimed* to be art is not rubbish, or that it is art.

Up to two of the flaws: 1 mark each if located and 1 if described or explained. [max. 4]

- (f) Several lines possible here. It could be argued that if the cleaner was 'in on it' then he would not have genuinely recognised the work as rubbish, but only pretended to, and therefore its intention to show impermanence etc. had failed [1 or 2]. However, this could be seen as a work of art *qua event*, including the cleaner's part in it, as the author implies. [1 or 2] The candidate who gives one of these answers only would have to say that the impact of such a revelation on the argument would be weak [+1]. Best answer is a balanced one giving both sides.

3 Marking Guide Analysis

The main conclusion (MC) is that the terrible scenes of kidnapping victims should be broadcast in full. The most direct reason for this is the intermediate conclusion (IC) that the whole truth must be told.

These two claims counter the views that broadcasting in full should be suppressed to deny publicity, spare audiences, preserve morale. Two lines of reasoning are used: the first is an argument from principle that people have a right to know everything. The other is a more pragmatic argument that if people know the worst consequences of war (e.g. kidnapping) they will be less inclined to support military action in future. (There is an underlying assumption therefore that in general people should not support military action - see below.)

Context/issue:

Kidnapping is a terrible act. Should it be broadcast? (Whole of paragraph 1)

Argument:

- R1 People have right to know what is happening.
- R2 No politician has right to withhold truth.
- R3 We are intelligent adults and able to judge.
- R4 Denying information infringes human rights.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	
	GCE AS LEVEL – NOVEMBER 2005	8436	

Therefore:

- IC1 (from R1-R4) (Suppressing information) is wrong.
- R5 If people know worst consequences they will oppose war.
- R6 If they think war has no bad consequences, they will go on being persuaded to support it.

Therefore:

- IC2 The whole truth must be told.
- MC The right choice has to be to broadcast (the dreadful scenes) in full.

Counter arguments considered:

- Suppressing broadcasting denies publicity and spares victims' families etc. (par 1)
- It also preserves morale and saves people living in fear. (par 3)

Evaluation → Component A: Analysis ↓	Level 3: Thorough critical evaluation of the argument, in terms of e.g. soundness, strengths, weaknesses, status of claims, assumptions, flaws. <i>At least 3 of these must be included in the critique.</i>	Level 2: Critical evaluation of some key points in the argument.	Level 1: Some evaluation or relevant discussion of the argument .	Level 0: Some discussion of the passage .
Level 3: L2 + evident understanding of form/structure/techniques .	12-13	10-11	8-9	6-7
Level 2: Identifying the main conclusion , and ALL or MOST of the key reasons .	10-11	8-9	6-7	4-5
Level 1: Recognising the general direction of the argument, and some of the reasons.	8-9	6-7	4-5	2-3
Level 0: Summary of the text/parts of text.	N/A	4-5	2-3	1
Component B: Further argument (max 4)	Relevant and well developed.	Relevant.		
For each point up to 2, (or for 2 best points);	Add 2	Add 1		