MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2006 question paper

8436 THINKING SKILLS

8436/02   Paper 2, 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 instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began.

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 grade thresholds for various grades are published in the report on the examination for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2006 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

1 (a) (i) The photograph. **[1]**

(ii) It is unlikely that the photograph is a fake/Magnolia does not deny that she and Sarah were both in the same photograph/it is significant in the sense that if they had not known each other the similarities between the songs could more plausibly have been dismissed as coincidence. For any one of these points. **[1]**

(b) Magnolia copied Sarah's song. Magnolia remembered Sarah's song subconsciously. The two songs had a common source. Sarah is manufacturing evidence to get money. 1 mark for each of these up to a maximum of **[2]**. **[Max 2]**

(c) (i) The lead guitarist has both vested interest (in the band) and would be expected to stand by M. **[1]** That makes him a fairly unreliable source. Also, the statements tells us very little: 'Being around' does not mean he saw her write it, and even if he had it would not mean she was not recalling it from memory. The claim that 'it came from her heart' is irrelevant as evidence of originality. The claim, if true, that people are always accusing stars of plagiarism does not mean that this allegation is any less true. **[1-2]** **[Max 2]**

(ii) Not very reliable source as the email was sent after the article had been published. **[1]** The writer could have been attention-seeking or just being mischievous, or supporting his ex-teacher. **[1]** Also he is recalling something from 8 years previously, and when he was only 9. **[1]** Also it contradicts Sarah's own evidence that she never gave the song another thought after it had been sung at college (though she may have forgotten using it for an assembly). **[1]** On the other hand it is a plausible story, and might not be one a person would make up, so it need not be completely dismissed from the reckoning. **[1]** **[Max 2]**

(d) Evidence:

- The article is relatively balanced in that it presents evidence from both sides of the dispute. Assuming that the author is a professional journalist there is no particular reason to suppose she would invent 'evidence', nor any reason to think that she gains anything from misreporting the story.

- There is hard evidence (photo) showing that the women had been in contact.

- There is much similarity between the songs.

- S's evidence is very believable and there is no evidence to back Paco's claim that she is trying to make money.

- Telling evidence from Rudenko. It makes it seem more than likely that the tune, as well as the chorus, were based on the song in the scrap book.

- By contrast M's 'refutation' is not very believable and she changes her story after the evidence is put in front of her. Instead of denying that any of the song was plagiarised, she switches her emphasis to the tune, since there is no hard evidence about that. Also it is implausible that she would remember nothing about Sarah, or the concert, or the song, as she claims, even when presented with the photograph etc.

- M has a 'damaged reputation' etc. but this is not strictly relevant, except in suggesting (if true) that M is exploitative. It doesn't mean she plagiarised the song.

- Most alternative scenarios, including coincidence, common source, etc., forged documents etc. are far-fetched. (I cannot think of any plausible ones!)

Conclusion

On balance the indications are in favour of a 'guilty' verdict. It is very probable, though not beyond reasonable doubt, that the song's original author was not Magnolia.

(generic)

- Acceptable conclusion. [1]

  and

- Some reference to the evidence, made in support of the conclusion. [1]

- Reference to the evidence and some evaluative points made in order to support the conclusion. [2]

- A reasoned argument developed on the basis of evaluation of points of evidence; possibly some alternative scenarios considered. [3]

- Sound and well developed argument involving the weighing of evidence and balancing of probabilities; plausible alternative scenario/s taken into consideration. [4]

- Add one mark for appropriate comments about the reliability of the article, subject to a maximum of 5 marks.

2 (a) (i) Summarise the argument for school uniform in paragraph two.

Reference to school's duty to protect students. [1]
Reference to uniforms allowing intruders to be detected. [1]

(ii) What reason is given for dismissing this argument?

"no serious criminal will be put off by such difficulties in evading detection" or equivalent. [1]

(b) Identify two unstated assumptions which the author makes in paragraph four.

Two from the following:

Distance from teachers is a bad thing.

People should not be taught to judge people by appearances.

Integration with the real world is a good thing.

Outlandish clothes are wrong.

Revolt against the symbols of authority is wrong.

A school that has uniforms is not the real world.

Uniforms are supposed to teach students to wear appropriate clothes. [2]

(c) Give two reasons of your own which might justify the uniforms of police, chefs and judges but not apply to school uniforms.

Two from the following:
Safety reasons; tradition; hygiene; in order to be identified by the public; as a privilege; to gain respect from others; wearers have a choice whether or not to take a uniformed job; professionalism. [2]

(d) In the last paragraph, the author claims that schools should aim to let students' minds develop. Suggest an alternative aim of education which is consistent with schools enforcing uniforms.

Alternative aims: to prepare them for the world of work; to instill in them a respect for authority; to guide students' minds towards social uniformity/identification with others. [1]

(e) Give a further argument which either supports or contradicts the conclusion. Your argument should contain two reasons (and a conclusion).

One mark for a clear conclusion.
Three marks for two supporting reasons which are not derivative of those in the text.
Two marks for one supporting reason which is not derivative of those in the text.
One mark for a reason which responds to an argument in the text. [4]

3 (a) Does this passage offer an argument, an explanation or neither? Give a brief reason to support your answer.

Zero **[0]**marks for:-
- The passage/the whole passage/it is an explanation.
- It offers an explanation [where no further comment is made].

One **[1]** mark for:-
- It offers an explanation as to how language developed/might have developed.
- It offers an explanation, but not an argument because no reasons are given for a conclusion.

Two **[2]** marks for:-
- Neither – it contains information and explanation.
- Neither – it contains information, but no reasons for a conclusion.

(b) Which of the following, if either, shows a way in which the computer model does not reflect how language develops? Give a brief reason to support your answer.

(i) Names for new gadgets are often decided by their manufacturers

This shows that the model does not reflect all aspects of the naming of objects, **[1]**
It is an example of naming by one decision maker, not of names emerging from the interaction of speakers and hearers **[1]**

(ii) People might not understand a language developed by computers.

This does not show that the model does not reflect how language develops [OR failure to comment on **(ii)** whilst getting the first mark for **(i)**]. **[1]**
The fact that someone outside a community of 'speakers' and 'hearers' (as human beings would be in relation to the computer's 'speakers' and 'hearers') would be unable to understand the language developed by that community does not show that human language could not have developed in accordance with the model. **[1]**

(c) Is spam a good example of the way in which the model works? Justify your answer. **[3]**

It is a clear example. It illustrates the point. However, we still understand the terms unwanted email, unsolicited email, junk email, and even require them to explain spam the first time we come across it. This seems to highlight limitations of the model.
Two points of evaluation (can be positive or negative) or a very thorough assessment – two marks
One assessment of how the evaluation affects the model – 1 mark.
Do not accept 'this shows the model is rubbish' – it does not. Do not accept 'this shows the model has got it just right' – it does not.
Accept any answer which indicates the model is quite good, or limited, or some bits work and some do not. To get the third mark, candidates should in some way restrict the application of the model.

(d) A student objects that, 'This model does not explain the role of grammar in language.'

(i) Is this a good objection to the model? Why?

Yes. This objection shows that the model does not cover all aspects of human language.
It is a model of vocabulary acquisition, not language use (or words to that effect).
This objection shows that the model assumes that words for things are the most important part of a language.
Accept but do not require: This objection points out a limitation in the model as it stands. There is no reason to suppose that the model cannot be adapted to include grammar.
Accept: no, the model is only supposed to show how we share names for things. But only 1 mark, because this model is explicitly related in the text to 'the emergence of human languages' and 'getting computers to evolve a common language'. **[2]**

(ii) Suggest one further objection to the model of language. **[1]**

Power relationships
Subcultures – cool etc.
Different languages (which interact)
Explanations (using sophisticated language)
Teaching
Emotional aspects of language
Words for abstract concepts.

4 (a) Analysis

The **main conclusion** is that metal detectorists should not be prevented from pursuing their hobby.

The **reasons** for this are:

- Most finds discovered by metal detectorists are not valuable and do not add significantly to archaeological knowledge.

- So **[intermediate conclusion]** it is of no consequence for finds to be kept by the metal detectorists.

- The artefacts that metal detectorists unearth are part of the nation's history.

- Land ownership does not extend down through the layers of earth.

- Thus **[intermediate conclusion]** landowners do not have property rights over artefacts discovered on their land.

- It is better that someone really takes pleasure from the artefact than it is hidden away from everyone in a vault of a museum.

- It is the decision of the private collector whether to exhibit the artefact publicly or not.

- Metal detectorists can inform archaeologists of a site that might be of interest for excavations.

- Without this information, many potential sites would go undiscovered and unrecorded.

(b) Evaluation

Assumptions:

- There is nothing wrong with the act of metal detecting.

- Because landowners have no property rights over the artefacts on their land, there is nothing wrong with detectorists keeping those that they find.

- It is important for archaeological finds to be publicly displayed.

- No purpose is served by storing archaeological finds in museums.

Strengths/weaknesses/flaws

- In Paragraph 2 a claim is made about the nature of the finds, but how could it be known that most of the finds are not valuable? Perhaps only the less valuable finds are reported, and the detectorists secretly sell the more valuable ones.

- Paragraph 3 is meant to support the assumption that there is nothing wrong with detectorists keeping the artifacts that they find, but it does not do so, since proving that x does not have ownership cannot imply that y can legitimately keep something.

- The analogy in Paragraph 5 is inadequate because the trade in art is not illegal, unless the art is stolen or counterfeit. As with Paragraph 4, once the artefact has been found by the detectorist, it is the decision of the finder to report or sell the find, and what happens to the artefact after this is up to the new owner or curator.

- The conclusion that metal detectorists should not be prevented from pursuing their hobby is not supported by the preceding reasons. The reasons mostly support the question of ownership of archaeological artefacts, rather than the hobbyist's liberty.

- The author appears to generalise from 'most finds' to 'all finds'.

- There is inconsistency in claiming that artefacts are part of a community's history, and yet that it is acceptable for individuals to keep them privately.

(c)   **Further arguments:**

In support of Metal Detectorists:

They can find contemporary lost items.
In the case of unexploded mines/bombs, it is a useful and worthwhile pursuit.
Beach combing: a healthy hobby and clears unwanted metal littering the beaches.
Metal detecting can increase public interest in archaeology.

Against Metal Detecting:

Trespassing on private land, which is breaking the law.
Disturbs farmers' crops and unsettles livestock.
In the case of unexploded bombs it can be dangerous.
Only the experts can determine the significance of finds.
Detectorists could damage valuable items when digging them up.

Mark Grid

	Descriptor Level 1	Level 2	Level 1	Level 0
Part (a) **Analysis** (max. 3)	L2 + evident understanding of **structure/techniques** 3 marks	Identifying the main conclusion, and ALL or MOST of the key **reasons.** 2 marks	Recognising the **general direction** of the argument, and some of the **reasons.** 1 mark	Summary of the text/parts of the text. 0 marks
Part (b) **Evaluation** (max. 6)	L2 + thorough evaluation of strength of argument referring to assumptions and weaknesses and/or flaws. 5-6 marks	L1 + Solid evaluation of strength of argument referring to assumptions, weaknesses and/or flaws 3 – 4 marks	General evaluation of strength of argument referring to an assumption, a weakness or flaw. 1-2 marks	No assumptions or weaknesses and flaws identified. 0 marks
Part (c) **Further Argument** (max. 4)	Relevant and well developed	Relevant		
For each point up to 2, or for 2 best points.	**Add 2**	**Add 1**		