



Private & Confidential

FACULTY OF LIBERAL ARTS

FINAL EXAMINATION

Student ID (in Figures) :

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Student ID (in Words) : _____

Subject Code & Name : **MPU2232 Thinking Skills**
Semester & Year : January – April 2017
Lecturer/Examiner : Ahmadiliman Ibrahim, Shazan Khan Omar
Duration : 2 hours

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

1. This question paper consists of 2 parts:

PART A (60 marks) : READING COMPREHENSION

There are **TWO (2)** sections in this part. Read the passages and answer all questions in the space provided.

PART B (40 marks) : PROBLEM SOLVING

There is only **ONE (1)** section in this part. Write your answers in the space provided.

2. Candidates are not allowed to bring any unauthorized materials except writing equipment into the Examination Hall. Electronic dictionaries are strictly prohibited.

3. This question paper must be submitted along with all used and/or unused rough papers and/or graph paper (if any). Candidates are NOT allowed to take any examination materials out of the examination hall.

4. Only ballpoint pens are allowed to be used in answering the questions, with the exception of multiple choice questions, where 2B pencils are to be used.

WARNING: The University Examination Board (UEB) of BERJAYA University College of Hospitality regards cheating as a most serious offence and will not hesitate to mete out the appropriate punitive actions according to the severity of the offence committed, and in accordance with the clauses stipulated in the Students' Handbook, up to and including expulsion from BERJAYA University College of Hospitality.

Total Number of pages = 11 (including the cover page)

PART A : READING COMPREHENSION (60 marks)

INSTRUCTION(S) : There are **TWO (2)** sections in this part. Read the passages and answer **ALL** questions in the space provided.

SECTION 1: Questions 1 – 10 (30 marks)

Read the passage carefully and answer the questions that follow in the space provided.

Tilikum, SeaWorld’s Killer Orca

I have been anticipating and dreading this announcement for years. SeaWorld warned that Tilikum, SeaWorld’s largest and best-known killer whale, is dying. His health is deteriorating due to a drug-resistant bacterial lung infection. “He has a disease which is chronic and progressive,” an emotional SeaWorld vet explains in a video. “We have not found a cure.” The statement appears to be an effort to prepare the public for Tilikum’s death. “Historically, we never put out that kind of stuff unless we were pretty sure they are going to die,” says John Hargrove, who trained killer whales for 12 years at SeaWorld before leaving in 2012.

Tilikum is a special and transformative killer whale. He was netted off Iceland in 1983, at the age of two, and has lived in captivity for almost 33 years now, for the past 24 years at SeaWorld’s Orlando, Florida park. His life has changed how we view SeaWorld and the marine park industry, and changed our moral calculus regarding the confinement and display of intelligent, free-ranging species.

Like most of the world, I had never heard of Tilikum until February, 24, 2010 when he pulled SeaWorld trainer Dawn Brancheau into his pool and brutally killed her. When I learned that he had been involved in two previous deaths it seemed clear he had a story worth telling. So I set out to try and explain how Tilikum’s life led to the death of Dawn Brancheau. I published “The Killer In The Pool” in Outside magazine in the summer of 2010. That led to a call from filmmaker and director Gabriela Cowperthwaite, and a chance to help turn Tilikum’s story into the documentary Blackfish, which premiered in 2013. In between, journalist David Kirby published Death At SeaWorld, also an in-depth examination of killer whale captivity.

To tell Tilikum’s story, it was necessary to tell the story of SeaWorld and killer whale entertainment. He was responsible for three human deaths: a trainer at Sealand Of The Pacific in 1991, a late-night trespasser at SeaWorld in 1999, and Dawn Brancheau in 2010. The last death, because of its savagery and because Brancheau was a high-profile SeaWorld trainer, forced us to ask, collectively, sincerely, and for the first time: “Who Is Shamu?” Instead of the iconic, happy killer whale celebrated by SeaWorld and its fans for five decades, Tilikum demanded the world confront his reality, Shamu’s reality, which involved separation from family, confinement, boredom, chronic disease, aggression among marine park killer whales, and aggression against trainers.

“Tilikum’s life was the subject of Blackfish, but when I began the film, I was terrified of him. I had nightmares about him,” says Cowperthwaite. “It was only when I learned about his capture, his life in captivity, that I began to understand the depth of this tragedy on so many levels.”

Tilikum made for a sympathetic and compelling character. At 22 feet and 12,000 pounds, he was a would-be ocean king reduced to a court jester with a floppy dorsal fin, splashing delirious SeaWorld audiences at the end of circus-style shows. (SeaWorld recently announced that it would phase out its Shamu shows.) His other, more important role, seemed equally unsettling: to be a prolific supplier of sperm for SeaWorld's killer whale breeding program. John Jett, a SeaWorld trainer who helped care for Tilikum after his arrival at SeaWorld in 1992, found himself saddened by Tilikum's existence: bullied by the female killer whales, too big to elude their attacks in a small pool, and always subject to the needs of the marine park business. "For somewhat selfish reasons I enjoyed working with Tilikum, and I have no doubt that his current trainers have sincerely tried to provide him a decent life," says Jett, who left SeaWorld in 1995 and is now a research professor at Stetson University, near Orlando. "But Tilikum is a tragic figure, and I have often thought about the terror, confusion and stress that Tili has been forced to endure."

Tilikum so touched our empathy that few in the public, and few on the staff at SeaWorld, could not direct anger and blame at him for the death of Brancheau, a gloriously charismatic and well-liked trainer. It was as if everyone understood deep down that it was Tilikum's circumstances, not Tilikum himself, that killed Brancheau. John Hargrove, who was a senior trainer at SeaWorld Texas when Brancheau died, says that most trainers, including some of Brancheau's closest friends, did everything they could to care for Tilikum after the incident: "We did feel sorry for Tilikum, because we knew his life would be drastically changed forever. That he would become more isolated, with less contact and connection. We wanted him to be treated with dignity and respect on a daily basis, and not as a monster."

It is without question a deep tragedy that it took the death of Dawn Brancheau for the world to stir itself to take a hard look at the lives of the killer whales she trained and loved. But Tilikum never set out to become the symbol of an industry, a relationship between man and nature, gone wrong. He was just a wild killer whale calf in an ocean world whose life was suddenly interrupted and derailed by the human world. And the thing that most saddens me about Tilikum's plight, and his eventual death, is the life he never lived. I have been never able to see a wild killer whale without thinking of Tilikum, languishing mostly alone in his tank in Orlando. I frequently wonder whether he has any memory of the Icelandic seas, or his mother. I wonder what he would have looked like as a full-grown bull killer whale cruising the open ocean with a regal and knife-straight dorsal fin. I wonder how far he would have travelled, how deep he would have dived, and how magnificent he might have been as a totally wild killer whale.

But he was never given the chance, and we can mourn that. Still, when Tilikum dies he will leave us with something extremely precious, something to redeem his impoverished life in captivity: a desire to give greater moral consideration to other species on our planet, and to re-think the casual ease with which we seek to use nature and all things wild for human purposes. We desperately needed that. For me, that will be Tilikum's truest and most meaningful legacy.

Adapted from: <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/2016/03/160310-tilikum-killer-whale-orca-death-seaworld-sick-dying/>

1. Which of the following is **NOT** true about Tilikum? (1 mark)
- A. Tilikum is a killer whale
 - B. Tilikum kills 3 of his trainer
 - C. Tilikum was raised in captivity
 - D. All of the above

2. What did Gabriela Cowperthwaite do about the incident surrounding Tilikum? (1 mark)
- A. She wrote “the killer in the pool” article
 - B. She published the article “Death at SeaWorld”
 - C. She became the new SeaWorld trainer
 - D. She directed the documentary “Blackfish”

3. What is the overall tone of the article? (1 mark)
- A. Serious
 - B. Casual
 - C. Academic
 - D. Humorous

4. Based on the article, Tilikum seemed to have a tragic life. Why is it so? (3 marks)

5. As mentioned in the article, what are the two purposes of Tilikum in SeaWorld? (4 marks)

6. What did few of the SeaWorld Trainers do to Tilikum regarding the death of Dawn Brancheau? (2 marks)

7. How are the relationship between Tilikum and the other orcas? (2 marks)

8. What are the writer's opinions about Tilikum. Provide **THREE (3)** reasons based on the article. (6 marks)

9. Provide **TWO (2)** reasons that are directly related to Tilikum's aggressive behaviour. (4 marks)

10. In your opinion, should animals be kept in captivity? Support your opinion with **ONE (1)** fact from the article. (6 marks)

SECTION 2: Questions 11 – 18 (30 marks)

Read the passage carefully and answer the questions that follow in the space provided.

Dinner at Edwins

It's believed that Edwins, a French restaurant in Cleveland, Ohio that opened in 2013, is the only high-end restaurant in the United States where ex-offenders make up the majority of the staff. And in addition to serving up delicious examples of French cuisine, these former criminals are learning valuable skills to help them get a second chance in life. What makes this story even sweeter is that of the 200 plus students that have gone through their six-month rotation at Edwins over the past few years, not one has re-offended, and over 90% of them have gained permanent employment – an amazing result and one that will hopefully inspire other restaurateurs to follow suit.

10 The restaurant opened in 2013 and was inspired by the passion of owner Brandon Chrostowski. He wanted to give former criminals a chance that they otherwise might not have, and he did it because he'd also had a run in with the law in his younger days.

15 As Chrostowski said in an interview back when the restaurant was opened: "I was a reckless teenager, and one night, I was arrested and thrown in jail. Fortunately, I had a judge who gave me a break instead of 10 years in prison. While I was on probation, I met a chef who mentored me –and once I was in that kitchen, I knew that's where I belonged for the rest of my life."

20 During the day, the former offenders at Edwins are given culinary training and lectures involving wine education and food prep. During the evening dinner service, the employees use these lessons, cooking for actual paying customers. Edwins provides 40-50 hours of training each week for six months. Students receive a weekly payment for their services, as well as a portion of the donations left by diners in lieu of tips. A full-time caseworker helps them with housing, counselling or getting a driver's license.

25 As Chrostowski told journalists: "Edwins is a family. There's a spirit in here where we're in this together. To have a second chance is to have a new life. And if you're ready to work hard, you can change the stars." It's impossible to overstate the effect that the program – which is now entering its fourth year – has had on the former criminals who have taken part.

30 The statistics speak for themselves: over 200 have completed their six month rotation since Edwins opened in 2013, and there's been no record of any re-offending. "The first thing I did when I moved into the restaurant was ripping out the old security cameras." said Chrostowski; "I've had less problems here than any other place I've ever worked"

35 Going even further to make a positive difference, Chrostowski launched a dormitory for his employees. "Seeing how hard we're pushing, and how little they had, I was sick," he said. "I said, 'We're going to fix it.'" He raised over \$1 million to purchase and renovate three dilapidated buildings to house employees. Chrostowski was recently honored as a recipient of the 2016 CNN Heroes Award. It's a fitting tribute to the man who has given back so much to the community, and particularly to those who he has given a very rare second chance to.

40 "The long-term goal of Edwins is to build the best culinary center in the world based on people just coming out of prison," Chrostowski told journalists. With the results already achieved, it would appear that the goal is well on the way to being achieved.

Adapted from: <http://www.pressunion.org/dinner-edwins-fine-dining-french-restaurant>

11. Based on your opinion, why do you think it is hard for ex-offenders to find a job? (2 marks)

12. According to Chrostowski, why does he consider hiring ex-offenders to work in Edwins? (3 marks)

13. What is Chrostowski trying to convey when he said *“Seeing how hard we’re pushing, and how little they had, I was sick,” (line 37)?* (3 marks)

14. Give **TWO (2)** examples of the employee’s daily duties at Edwins. (6 marks)

15. Why do you think Chrostowski remove the old security cameras when he first moved into the restaurant? (3 marks)

16. What are **THREE (3)** suggestions that you can give to make sure that Edwins long-term goal is achieved? (3 marks)

17. What improvement do you think that you can implement if you are the manager of Edwins? (4 marks)

18. What **SIX (6)** evidence shows that Chrostowski really wants to help the ex-offenders? (6 marks)

END OF PART A

PART B : PROBLEM SOLVING (40 marks)

INSTRUCTION(S) : There is only **ONE (1)** section in this part. Write your answer in the space provided.

SECTION 1: (40 marks)

*Write a 300 word essay to discuss the situation given below. In your essay, you must **identify the main problem, analyse the possible causes of the problem, and propose at least TWO (2) solutions that can help solve the problem. You must write in detail with explanations and examples taken from the given situation.***

Dave had recently been invited to join a group of kids from his college on Facebook. Since he was somewhat shy around other people and had only recently begun to hang out with these guys, Dave felt good about being asked to join the group. And, to be sure, it was a lot of fun at first. Until one day when Dave logged onto Facebook and was disgusted by what he saw.

Somebody had posted a photo of a girl in their class and altered it with Photoshop. The image made it look like she was the only girl at a party of boys, scantily dressed, holding a beer, and laughing. The caption under the picture was filled with four-letter words and mentioned her name. Dave hardly knew the girl, but he did know that she had a reputation as a straight edge and that she was often teased about it. He also knew that this would be very hurtful to her if she ever found out.

Dave knew it was a private online group and anything posted there was supposedly for the members' eyes only. But what if someone in a group you belong to posts something offensive—like this photo? Won't anyone who sees it think it's from the whole group? Dave also wondered who else might be able to see what is posted. Can people who aren't members look at the postings without the group knowing? Dave knew the other members would think he was overreacting if he made an issue about it. But he also knew that the photo made him feel guilty, a sure sign that his moral compass was tugging at him.

Now should he say something to the other guys and risk looking like a weirdo? He was sure they would just tell him to lighten up. Should he drop out of the group? That would mean the photo stayed out there and he would just be ignoring the problem. He had a lecturer he really respected who he could talk to, but what if the whole thing snowballed into a discipline issue at college? What would happen then? And if he talked to his parents, they might take away his internet access.

Dave felt stuck. All he did was agree to join a group. Why was this such a problem? What, if anything, should he do?

Adapted from www.goodcharacter.com/dilemma/archive.html

