



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS  
General Certificate of Education Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

---

**THINKING SKILLS**

**9694/02**

Paper 2 Critical Thinking

**May/June 2008**

**2 hours**

Additional Materials: Answer Booklet/Paper

---

**READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST**

If you have been given an Answer Booklet, follow the instructions on the front cover of the booklet.

Write your Centre number, candidate number and name on all the work you hand in.

Write in dark blue or black pen.

Do not use staples, paper clips, highlighters, glue and correction fluid.

**DO NOT WRITE IN ANY BARCODES.**

Answer **all** the questions.

Start each question on a new answer sheet.

At the end of the examination, fasten all your work securely together.

The number of marks is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question.

---

This document consists of **7** printed pages and **1** blank page.



- 1 Study the following evidence and answer the questions that follow.

### Fall fells firm favourite!

Controversy dominated the Women's 1500m, a race where the women were competing not only for medals but for three places in the National Squad. Angelica (A), widely expected to claim the gold medal, fell on the first corner of the last lap.


Suffering from a broken elbow and struggling along on crutches with tendon injuries, Angelica blames Britanni (B). "She pushed me, because she knew that was the only way she could get my place in the National Squad," claims Angelica, of the North-Eastern District Runners Club.

"There was a flash and bang from the crowd which startled me and I tripped," counters Britanni. "I'm sorry it affected Angelica. She's a good runner, she'll get another chance next year."

The provisional result:

1st – Emily (E), West Central Running Club;  
 2nd – Britanni, Southern Running Club;  
 3rd – Cassandra (C), Southern Running Club.

There will be an official enquiry into the incident. If Britanni is found guilty of pushing Angelica she is likely to lose her medal and perhaps her place in the National Squad.



**Extracts from evidence given at the enquiry:**

Angelica (A): I had just moved out of the pack of runners, ready to sprint the last lap. I was feeling good. I felt Britanni's hand in my back and she shoved. I lost my balance and fell, and Daniele fell over me. I was so determined to run for my country, and now I'm injured, so I don't even know when I can train again.

Britanni (B): I was getting tired and tripped. Unfortunately I fell into Angelica, who didn't have enough balance to keep running. I wouldn't deliberately push anyone. It wouldn't be in my interests. I was in a good position to come forward and win the race.

Cassandra (C): Britanni seemed to twist her ankle and accidentally knocked Angelica so that she fell. It serves her right, really. Angelica is always gloating about being the best, and on the starting line she was taunting Britanni. They've always been competitive.

Daniele (D): It's all a bit of a blur. I was looking ahead on the track, focussed on my next move. And I had sweat in my eyes, it was a very hot day. I did notice Britanni sort of diving, then I fell over them and ended up coming last in the race. I expect Britanni did do it on purpose. She's always been jealous of the fact that Angelica's a better runner.

Evidence from the two cameras (see positions on diagram) was examined frame by frame. The moving camera was focused on Emily, who was in the lead at the time, and only showed Angelica falling into the picture. The fixed camera showed a wide view of all the runners coming round the corner, but Angelica's body blocked the view of Britanni.

- (a) Look at the diagram. Who was in the best position to see whether Angelica was deliberately pushed? Support your answer. [2]
- (b) Evaluate the reliability of Britanni's evidence. [3]
- (c) Whose evidence is more reliable, Cassandra's or Daniele's? Support your decision with reference to the credibility of both Cassandra and Daniele. [4]
- (d) How likely is it that Britanni deliberately pushed Angelica? Write a short, reasoned argument making reference to the evidence to support your conclusion. [4]

2 Read the following passage and answer the questions that follow.

- 1 Banning smoking in public places is dreadful social engineering. Public smoking has been banned in California for several years, and European countries are now introducing similar bans. Politicians think that banning smoking will lead to healthier people and a cleaner atmosphere. They are control freaks who think that they can change people. But they can't. People will stay at home and smoke instead. Alternatively, when the weather is good, smokers will step outside to smoke.
- 2 The amount of drugs advertised on television tells me what has replaced tobacco (although 20% still smoke): painkillers, Prozac and anti-depressants. These adverts always come with a list of side effects including diarrhoea, panic attacks and headaches.
- 3 People say that smoking has dreadful side effects, and on some people it does, but not on all. Dennis Thatcher\* smoked all his life and died at 88; Kurt Vonnegut\*\* smoked for 70 years and died at 84. What is the explanation? Nobody seems to ask and no one gives any explanation.
- 4 When Deng Xiaoping, the Chinese leader, died in the late 1990's at the age of 92, the New York Times printed a foolish letter which said that Mr Deng was a very bad example to the young because he always had a cigarette in his mouth. I replied that Mr Deng had lived a very long life and the logic of this argument would be that Adolf Hitler was a good example for the young as he didn't smoke. The New York Times did not print my letter and I realised that it was no longer a serious newspaper. After that I was sceptical about everything I read in the newspapers.

\* Husband of former British Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher.

\*\* American science fiction writer and graphic artist.

- (a) Identify **two** reasons in paragraph 1 why politicians cannot change people. [2]
- (b) What has to be assumed if paragraph 2 is to oppose politicians' claim that "banning smoking will lead to healthier people"? [2]
- (c) Explain why the author's reasoning does not work well in paragraphs 3 and 4. [4]
- (d) Write your own short argument to support a smoking ban in public places. [4]



- 3 Study the following evidence and then answer the questions that follow.

**Box A**

For many endangered plants and animals, trade can mean extinction. Markets for their hides, shells, roots or other body parts are a great a threat to their lives. Illegal species trade is a multi-billion dollar business. Legal trade, too, can endanger species.

**Box B: Risks of importing non-native species into the USA**

Number of animal species legally imported into the USA, 2000 - 2004

	Total imported non-native species	Non-native species with known risk	Known invasive* species	Species with known disease risk to humans	Species with known disease risk to livestock	Species with known disease risk to other animals
Amphibians	172	13	7	0	0	8
Birds	559	129	107	28	0	28
Fish	121	36	36	0	0	0
Mammals	263	61	40	22	4	24
Reptiles	710	52	45	4	3	3
Invertebrates	416	11	11	0	0	0
Total	2241	302	246	54	7	63

Note: A species can pose a risk for more than one reason.

\*An invasive species breeds so well in its new home that native species lose out and become endangered.

**Box C**

Exotic animals captured in the wild – such as kangaroos, kinkajous, iguanas and tropical fish – are streaming into the USA by the millions with little or no screening for disease, leaving Americans vulnerable to a serious sickness outbreak.

More than 770 people have been sickened since 2000 with tularemia, a disease that can be contracted from rabbits, hamsters and other rodents which are commonly kept pets in the USA. At least three people have died.

One of the first times the deadly Asian bird flu reached the West was in eagles smuggled aboard a plane to Europe. SARS is believed to have jumped to people from caged civet cats in a Chinese market.

**Box D**

Trade bans may seem an obvious way to protect species, but there is the danger that a ban may make the species more valuable and appealing to poachers. A grim cycle can ensue: the more endangered an animal or plant becomes, the higher its black market price, and the more poaching and illegal trade occurs.

**(a)** Can either of the following be reliably concluded from the evidence above? Briefly explain your answers with reference to boxes B and C.

**(i)** Most legally imported species have no risk to native species, humans, livestock or other animals. [2]

**(ii)** There is 0.05% chance that a bird imported to the USA will have deadly Asian bird flu. [2]

**(b)** 'The American population is a little over 300 million.'

Does this additional evidence strengthen, weaken or have no effect on the support given in box C to the claim that importing animals leaves 'Americans vulnerable to a serious sickness outbreak'? Justify your answer. [3]

**(c)** 'The USA should ban the import of exotic pets.'

How far does the evidence provided in boxes A - D support this claim? [5]

4 Critically evaluate the following argument. In your evaluation you should:

- (a) show that you have a clear understanding of the argument by identifying its main conclusion and the reasoning used to support it. [5]
- (b) evaluate the argument by identifying any unstated assumptions and discussing weaknesses and flaws. [5]
- (c) offer **one** further argument which could be used to support or challenge the conclusion. [3]

Cities around the world are increasingly full of dogs. This creates a number of problems. Dog owners seem to think that their joy in their pets is shared by everyone, and fail to prevent their hairy, smelly beasts from bounding up to passers by and licking them. Worse, they happily let them chase joggers and steal children's balls. Every dog owner in every country should have to have a licence – like an international driving licence – to show that they are competent dog owners who will treat their pets properly, control them and clean up after them.

Animals are independent beings with feelings. As such, they should be treated with proper respect for their dignity and their rights. It is therefore wrong to say that we 'own' another being and it is cruel to deprive it of its freedom to act as it chooses. So, keeping dogs in city apartments, alone for much of the day and with only streets for short evening walks, is a breach of their animal rights.

Dogs can transmit unpleasant diseases so they have a negative effect on human health. Puppies, for example, may pass the bacterium *Campylobacter* in their faeces, and this can give humans diarrhoea. Dogs also carry rabies, which is often fatal to humans.

Furthermore, animals are essentially wild. They are not suited to domestic living and close company with humans. This is illustrated by the increasing numbers of pet dogs now being given anti-depressants. We wouldn't even think of keeping a wolf as a pet, so it seems strange to keep their close cousins, dogs, in our homes. Thus we can see that it is wrong to keep dogs as pets and so we should support measures to significantly reduce the numbers of dogs kept as pets around the world.

---

*Copyright Acknowledgements:*

Question 2

© David Hockney; *The Guardian*, 15 May 2007 <http://arts.guardian.co.uk/art/visualart/story/0,,2079735,00.html>

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.