



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **Critical Thinking**

**CRIT 1**

**Unit 1      Critical Thinking Foundation Unit**

## **Mark Scheme**

*2009 examination - June series*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2009 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

# Critical Thinking Mark Scheme

## INTRODUCTION

The nationally agreed assessment objectives in the QCA Subject Criteria for Critical Thinking are:

- AO1** Analyse critically the use of different kinds of reasoning in a wide range of contexts.
- AO2** Evaluate critically the use of different kinds of reasoning in a wide range of contexts.
- AO3** Develop and communicate relevant and coherent arguments clearly and accurately in a concise and logical manner.

- Marks are allocated to the assessment objectives according to the nature of each question and what it is intended to test.
- For Section A, Examiners need only provide a total mark for each of the candidates' answers. They do not need to provide a breakdown by Assessment Objective.
- For Section B, marks should be awarded according to the generic marking grid.
- Candidates should be able to achieve the highest marks with a selection of relevant points, not necessarily the complete range.
- **Indicative content is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and other valid points must be credited.**

# Unit 1 Foundation

## Section A

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
<p><b>Questions 1 to 2 refer to Document A</b></p> <p><b>Look first at the news article ‘Child use of antidepressants up four-fold’.</b></p>					
1	<p><b>In paragraph 4 the author implies that the increase in prescribing children antidepressants is not necessarily a good thing.</b></p> <p><b>(a) What information in paragraph 4 does he base this view on? (1 mark)</b></p> <p>(Publication of) research showing that children given antidepressants run a higher risk of self-harm and are more likely to attempt suicide. [1]</p> <p><b>(b) What further assumption does he need to make about the relationship between children taking antidepressants and self-harming and / or attempting suicide in order for this information to support his judgement? (1 mark)</b></p> <p>That the taking of antidepressants is responsible (at least in part) for the higher risk of self-harm or suicide/ there is a causal link between taking the drugs and the higher risks cited [1]</p> <p>Also that the research is accurate / representative of real trends [1]</p>		1		
2	<p><b>(a) What is Lucy’s main conclusion? (1 mark)</b></p> <p>That the decision to prescribe antidepressants to children (to this extent) is unjustified. [1] (Accept ‘It’s not justified’ [1] or also any other reasonable interpretation of her main point of view [1])</p> <p><b>(b) Lucy contrasts two approaches to combating depression. In what way are the two approaches similar? (1 mark)</b></p> <p>They both involve the belief / assumption that depression has a physical / chemical cause [1] similarly that they both are internally caused rather than e.g. environmentally / sociologically etc [1]</p> <p><b>(c) Comment critically on Lucy’s use of the phrase ‘push and peddle’ by:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• identifying the implied analogy</li> <li>• judging whether the analogy is fair or unfair. (5 marks)</li> </ul> <p>The implied analogy is between drug companies supplying (legal / prescription) drugs to children / people, and (illegal) drug dealers supplying illegal drugs to children/ people [2] (NB for incomplete answer, e.g. analogy is between legal and illegal drugs, [1] mark)</p>		1		3

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>For evaluation, accept any well-argued response.</p> <p>Examples of (negative) critical comments might include: analogy is unfair because one sort of drug is designed to improve (mental) health, the other does not have this purpose (and is usually harmful); one is (more) addictive; drugs need to be obtained through a doctor/ are prescribed by a trained expert.</p> <p>(Candidates might want to argue that it hinges on the use of the word ‘unnecessary’ – that the analogy breaks down if the prescription drugs, unlike illegal drugs, are in fact <i>necessary</i>.)</p> <p>Examples of (favourable) critical comments might include: in both cases the creators / suppliers of the drug are motivated by profit (the pharmaceutical companies are big business / an industry); in both cases the drugs affect people’s moods / minds/ personalities; in both cases people can become dependent.</p> <p>[1] for each relevant contrast / comparison; 1 mark for convincing argumentation.</p>				
	<p><b>(d) Identify a general principle which Lucy needs to assume in order for her main conclusion to follow from the reasoning.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>The main conclusion is that ‘This (i.e. prescribing antidepressants in such quantities) is not justified’. This is based on the reasoning that the problem ‘can be treated naturally’.</p> <p>The principle needed therefore is that: people ought to choose a ‘natural’ approach over a non-natural one if this is available OR: non-natural approaches should not be used / adopted / encouraged. [1]</p>		1		
	<p><b>(e) Identify and explain a Straw Man in Lucy’s argument.</b> <b>(3 marks)</b></p> <p>Lucy has argued that the decision to prescribe antidepressants is ‘not justified’. To do this, she has tried to counter the argument for prescribing them with the claim that ‘People don’t get depressed because of a lack of prozac in their bodies, people get depressed due to deficiencies in amino acids and other fundamental nutritional building blocks’. However, a doctor would be very unlikely to put the argument in this form: that someone needs to be prescribed prozac because of a lack of prozac in their bodies! Put this way, the argument for prescribing them seems ridiculous, and is therefore an example of a Straw Man.</p> <p>For showing knowledge and understanding of what is meant by a Straw Man [1]</p> <p>For identifying the Straw Man ‘People don’t get depressed because of a lack of prozac in their bodies’ [1] (NB if correctly identified, assume and award the mark for knowledge and understanding also)</p> <p>Explaining why / asserting that this is unfair / a distortion [1]</p>		1	2	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
<p><b>Questions 3 to 6 refer to Document B</b></p> <p><b>Read the dialogue between Jenny and Nick.</b></p>					
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Look at the way the dialogue begins.</b></p> <p><b>(a) What assumption has Jenny made about the causes of childhood depression? (1 mark)</b></p> <p>That it is influenced / affected by external / environmental / sociological factors i.e. not due purely to internal / biological factors [1]</p> <p><b>(b) What assumption does Nick make in return? (1 mark)</b></p> <p>Either explicitly: That (surely) the quality of individual people’s lives has got better [1]</p> <p>Or implicitly: That global issues have no bearing on / little affect on / do not affect individual’s quality of life [1]</p> <p>Or implicitly: That the quality of individual people’s lives makes people happier / makes the level of childhood depression surprising [1].</p>	<p><b>1</b></p> <p><b>1</b></p>			
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>Nick suggests some ways in which science and technology have improved things for people:</b></p> <p><b>NICK And all the rest of scientific progress. Think of the way technology’s improved your life. Televisions. Computers. Mobile phones</b></p> <p><b>Jenny then responds with a counter-argument:</b></p> <p><b>JENNY Nuclear bombs! Anyway. All this so-called ‘progress’ – it just pollutes the world. It’s also made us greedier. The more you have, the more you want!</b></p> <p><b>What conclusion is implied by Jenny’s response by Jenny’s response? Explain and evaluate the support she provides. (8 marks)</b></p> <p>Jenny’s conclusion, which is partly implied, is that what we think of / refer to as scientific or as technological progress is not in fact progress. [1] Also accept: Technology has not improved our lives; or, Nick’s view that technology has improved our / her / your life is wrong. [1] for suitable formulation.</p> <p>In support she gives the example of nuclear bombs. This is intended to be a counter-example to Nick’s claim, and his supporting list, of how technology has improved things. [1]. For it to be relevant, we must assume that the</p>	<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p>		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>existence of nuclear bombs has made our lives qualitatively worse; this is debatable, since it is at least possible that the existence of nuclear bombs – in particular for the countries that possess them – has actually prevented conflict. However, it is also arguable that they have led to conflict (e.g. through attempts to stop proliferation), and also increased anxiety / cause for fear / depression. [1–2] for assessment of relevance and effectiveness of the counter-example.</p> <p>Her other reasons are that (i) it just pollutes the world [1]; (ii) it makes us greedier, <i>because</i> the more you have the more you want. [1]</p> <p>(Describing the second reason as an intermediate conclusion based on the principle / general ‘truth’: ‘The more you have, the more you want’ is a creditable interpretation [1])</p> <p>The first reason is debatable / false – certainly doesn’t ‘just’ pollute the world! Could argue that through science we are aware of damage doing, and possibly are finding / will find ways to reduce this [1–2]. However, candidates could earn [1–2] for acknowledging that pollution <u>is</u> a concern and that it is not unreasonable to link it to growth in science / technology (e.g. industrial revolution)</p> <p>The second reason depends on a feature of human nature; could argue that there is some truth in this, and that increasing wealth creates increasing demands. Candidates could question the causal link here, for example its direction (the greed could create the progress). Could also argue that this is not a problem with technological / scientific progress per se, and that we could / should learn to control this tendency (esp in light of the positive things it brings) [1–2]</p> <p>The basis for the second reason (or intermediate conclusion) is also debatable. The claim ‘The more you have, the more you want’ is far from being certain / always / generally accepted. The opposite could be just as confidently, and justifiably, asserted [1–2]</p> <p>NB ‘So-called’ is not a reason; it is leading language, implying a negative view/ that it is foolish / mistaken / untrue (it is helping to imply / assert the conclusion without offering a reason) [1] for identifying / commenting on this.</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
5	<p><b>Consider the following section of the dialogue:</b></p> <p><b>JENNY</b> ...We've become too materialistic, too selfish – we don't even care about our own children, let alone society. We're driven by getting richer, owning more things, but none of that is making us any happier.</p> <p><b>NICK</b> Well if you want to give everything up and go and live in a cave, that's fine. But leave me your iPod before you go.</p> <p><b>Comment critically on Nick's response to what Jenny has said here.</b> <b>(4 marks)</b></p> <p>Nick's first comment clearly involves an exaggeration of her view, making it look ridiculous (Straw Man) [1–2] / it could also be deemed to be restricting the options in that there is clearly a middle ground between being less materialistic and living in a cave! [1–2]</p> <p>His second comment aims to expose her hypocrisy, and to some extent does point to a potential inconsistency between how she feels people ought to be and how they in fact are / suggests that it is easier said than done [1–2]</p> <p>Candidates might wish to argue that the use of humour is effective here in making this point more persuasively / powerfully / strikingly [1]; Or they may prefer to argue it as a 'cheap shot' (for reasons described elsewhere e.g. points below) [1]</p> <p>However this is only a potential inconsistency; the fact that you are guilty of something too does not mean you cannot criticise this. [1] (In a sense, Nick could be accused here of a <i>tu quoque</i>: Jenny's point that we / people are 'too materialistic' / 'driven by... owning more things' is not weakened by his pointing out that she herself is perhaps guilty of this tendency – her 'wrong' does not make it 'right' [1–2])</p> <p>Also owning an iPod is not necessarily indicative of being highly materialistic – this might be an exception / not representative of her general attitude / approach to life [1–2]</p>	4			



No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
6	<p><b>Look closely at the last section of the dialogue:</b></p> <p><b>JENNY</b>      <b>So for you quality of life is all about getting richer and living longer.</b></p> <p><b>NICK</b>          <b>At least these are things you can actually measure! Look, my main point is this. Have you ever had an operation? Ever taken antibiotics for a serious infection? If so, you probably wouldn't even be alive if this was a hundred years ago. In fact, you probably wouldn't even have been born – almost certainly one of your parents or grandparents would have died for the same reason, or from some other disease that they can now cure, or vaccinate against. So you've got no right to argue that things are worse than they used to be. The fact that you're alive to have this argument proves that's not the case.</b></p> <p><b>JENNY</b>      <b>You've just proved my point!</b></p> <p><b>(a) Look at Nick's contribution to the dialogue.</b></p> <p><b>(i) How might the word 'right' in the penultimate sentence be ambiguous?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p>One meaning: (rational) justification/ grounds [1]; another: moral justification – i.e. she <i>ought</i> not to argue as she does / ought to be more appreciative etc [1]</p> <p>[NB do not allow 'correct' or 'true' or 'accurate' (or other synonymous expression) as one of the meanings; in the context of the argument it is the sense of 'grounds' / 'basis' / or 'justification']</p> <p><b>(ii) What effect does Nick's last sentence have on how we should interpret the word 'right'?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>Since his last sentence is about it proving that 'that's not the case' implies that the meaning is more one of rational justification / empirical grounds, rather than that she is breaking some sort of moral principle; i.e. the first of the two meanings identified above (candidate just needs to get over the idea that it is in a non-moral sense / that it is <i>just</i> in the sense of justified, rather than <i>morally</i> justified – they do not need to explain why) [1]</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>(iii) Identify <u>one</u> major assumption Nick needs to make in order to conclude that things are <u>not</u> getting worse. (2 marks)</p>		2		
	<p>That whether or not you (personally) are alive is relevant to whether or not things (generally) are getting better [2]</p>				
	<p>Or that: whether or not you are alive trumps all other factors in judging whether or not things are getting better or worse / If you are alive then things <i>must</i> be better (or rather, <i>cannot</i> be worse) than if you were dead [2]</p>				
	<p>For candidates who have glimpsed, or are reaching towards the assumption, but there is some inaccuracy [1]</p>				
	<p>For clearly encapsulating the required assumption [2]</p>				
	<p>(b) Jenny seems to believe that all Nick's arguments for an improving quality of life can be reduced down to the claims that:</p>				
	<p>– we are getting richer – we are living longer.</p>				
	<p>Does Nick's final argument help to show – as Jenny thinks it does (by saying 'you've just proved my point') – that she is right in her analysis? Give reasons for your answer.</p>				
		(5 marks)	2	2	1
	<p>In a sense Jenny is right (and Nick's last contribution <i>does</i> 'prove' her point) – since his last argument can be interpreted to be merely an extension of, or support for, the 'living longer' claim. (It is certainly very closely related to his earlier points about life expectancy / infant mortality / death in childbirth etc) [1–2]</p>				
	<p>However candidates need to decide whether or not his last argument goes 'deeper' than merely the aspect of living longer. In particular they might want to consider the (perhaps unwarranted) assumption that he needs to make in order to draw his main conclusion (i.e. candidates could refer to their answer to (c) (ii), by commenting critically on whether or not they think it a warranted assumption to make.) There is a case that Nick is 'begging the question', or at least a part of it, as he needs to assume that things <i>must</i> be better if you are alive now when you might not have been to show that therefore they are better, when the assumption is itself something that needs establishing. Jenny is entitled to argue, for example, that the world would have been better if less people (including herself) had been born! [1– 4]</p>				
	<p>[NB This is an open question, and candidates need to be rewarded for showing relevant critical thinking in response to the question – whether at AO1, AO2, or AO3]</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
<b>Questions 7 and 8 refer to Document C, 'Clear-Eyed Optimists'</b>					
7	<p data-bbox="280 405 1265 472"><b>(a) What is the author implying in paragraph 6 about the Media's attitude to the reporting of good and bad news? (1 mark)</b></p> <p data-bbox="280 506 1222 539">That it has a tendency towards / favours reporting 'bad' news to good [1]</p> <p data-bbox="280 577 1273 678"><b>(b) A reader has commented that this paragraph (paragraph 6) makes an unjustified generalisation. Do you agree with this assessment? Give reasons for your answer. (3 marks)</b></p> <p data-bbox="280 719 1270 846">Candidates can either refer to the implied view identified in part (a) or the author's claim that 'This is typical of the Media's attitude to the reporting of good and bad news.' In either case a general claim is made on the basis of one or two (or limited) examples.</p> <p data-bbox="280 891 1222 958">Showing understanding of what is meant by an unjustified generalisation (e.g. by identifying the possible generalisation here) [1]</p> <p data-bbox="280 992 1074 1025">For their assessment, useful lines of argument might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="280 1059 1262 1234">– the e.g. about the reporting of the weather is just one example, which suggests the reader's criticism is justified [1]; however, if true, it is a very effective/ convincing example [1] (candidates could develop this to argue that in some circumstances a single example can be indicative of a general rule, if the rule is e.g. an attitude rather than a trend [1])</li> <li data-bbox="280 1267 1270 1507">– candidates could argue / contend that the Media's treatment of the reports themselves constitute another example (and therefore the author's generalisation is less hasty) [1–2]; however, to do so we need to assume that the reason the reports were given the space they were was to do with the good / bad news contents (and not due to the fact that the reports were more credible / that there was not something else 'swamping' the news at the time) [1–2]</li> <li data-bbox="280 1541 1257 1641">– two examples are still insufficient / support the reader's criticism [1]; even if the examples are effective, the author's judgements (either his explicit claim or that implied) is / are still a little too confidently expressed [1]</li> </ul>	1		3	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
8	<p><b>The article contains references to three separate reports. (The recent UN report; and two older reports – ‘Limits to Growth’ from the 1960s and ‘Global 2000 Report’ from the 1980s.)</b></p>				
	<p><b>(a) Compare and contrast the way that the reports have been presented, suggesting <u>three</u> ways in which the way the author’s presentation or treatment of the recent UN report differs from his presentation or treatment of the two older reports. (3 marks)</b></p> <p>Possible answers might include:</p> <p>The UN report has been presented in a more favourable light [1]</p> <p>The UN report has been presented as being more accurate / reliable / representative [1]</p> <p>The UN report has been referred to in greater depth or detail / has been allocated greater space (direct quotes rather than the others just summaries) [1]</p> <p>The author appears to take the UN report more seriously [1]</p> <p>The writer has used more positive persuasive language to describe / refer to the UN report / more negative language for the others [1]</p> <p>The writer has treated the UN report as if it is accurate / factual – whereas the other reports he has treated as judgements / far more sceptically [1]</p> <p><b>(b) Decide whether or not you think the writer’s treatment of the different reports is fair or unfair. Marks will be awarded for the support you provide:</b></p> <p><b>You might like to consider the language he has used, any important assumptions he has made and / or any possible flaws in the reasoning (6 marks)</b></p> <p>Candidates are likely to judge the treatment unfair.</p> <p>Use of language:</p> <p>Candidates could develop the idea that the superiority of the UN report to the previous ones has been achieved through <i>impression</i> / persuasive / ‘leading’ language rather than through reasoned argument, e.g. the use of ‘officially’ (suggesting authority / expertise) and ‘learn’ (suggesting fact)</p> <p>However, candidates might wish to interpret this as an effective way of illustrating a view which was in fact extreme / distorted / overly pessimistic (through reference to later in the same paragraph, ‘getting worse in every</p>	3		4	2

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>measurable way' / 'running out' of 'everything') – and therefore argue that the use of persuasive language is not entirely unfair</p> <p>Candidates might also pick up on the 'calling themselves' – which implies a slight belittling of their status / an implicit 'put-down'; implication is that they were not recognized by others, akin to calling someone a 'self-styled' expert or authority; they could also comment on his reference to 'a group of scientists', rather than e.g. giving their names / backgrounds / areas of expertise – makes them sound less prestigious (when who else would be behind such a report / what more could you expect); 'calling themselves the Club of Rome' could carry an implied air of irony / ridicule at the pompous-sounding name! (– especially when juxtaposed with 'group of scientists'!)</p> <p>[1] for explaining why each given use of language is / isn't unfairly persuasive</p> <p>Assumptions:</p> <p>Candidates could point out that the author has made an implicit assumption that the UN report is more accurate / reliable – and that no grounds have been given for this.</p> <p>If there is some truth in the connoted unreliability of the previous reports then he is likely assuming that the UN report is more substantial / more accurate as a result of this.</p> <p>Or they could suggest that the author has implicitly assumed that the more recent report is the more accurate / the fact that it is the most up-to-date means it is the most accurate; candidates could argue that in a changing world this is a fair assumption to make (however the fact that all three make predictions about the future serves to undermine this assumption to some extent)</p> <p>The author may have assumed that the UN report is likely to be more credible in being either a bigger enterprise / with greater weight of research / evidence gone into it (in comparison especially with the Club of Rome); or being more neutral (in comparison especially with the US backed report which might be more partisan).</p> <p>In terms of the UN report's <i>significance</i>, the main implicit assumption is that the negative things mentioned (global warming / income inequality) are less important / significant than the positive things; otherwise conclusion that step forward for humanity doesn't follow</p> <p>[1] for identification of an important assumption; [1] for showing / explaining / suggesting why the assumption is / isn't warranted</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>Possible flaws:</p> <p>Candidates could question the assumption that the UN report is more accurate than the older reports, asking whether the author has relied on an <i>appeal to authority</i> in that it is a 'UN' report</p> <p>There is a case for arguing that phrasings such as 'speeding down a congested highway to extinction' are distortions / exaggerations, aimed to make the opposing point of view seem naïve / unbalanced / extreme (accept reference to Straw Man / Ad hominem)</p> <p>[1] for identifying and [1] for explaining a suitably chosen flaw.</p>				

**Section B** (see Generic Mark Scheme, page 14)

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
9	<p><b>Write a reasoned argument for or against the view that, generally speaking, the quality of life is getting better.</b></p> <p><b>In answering this question you should:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>state your conclusion (or conclusions) clearly</b></li> <li>• <b>offer effective reasoning to support your conclusion(s)</b></li> <li>• <b>use the information, and respond to issues or arguments, in Documents A – C (you may also refer to information in the Appendix)</b></li> <li>• <b>make it clear what criterion (or criteria) you consider important when judging/ determining quality of life</b></li> <li>• <b>make it clear why you are using this/these criteria; and why they enable you to draw the conclusion you have.</b></li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(20 marks)</b></p> <p>SAMPLE RESPONSES</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>There is no right conclusion, but candidates should state either that, generally speaking, the quality of life <i>is</i> getting better; or that, generally speaking it <i>is not</i>; or alternatively that it is too difficult, too wide, or too complex (or too <i>qualitative</i>) an issue to decide (or that the available evidence is insufficient.) In order to take a non-committal stance, however, candidates' answers will need to have addressed the material in the source Documents, explaining / arguing clearly why, for example, the figures in Document C do <i>not</i> constitute evidence for an improving quality of life. Candidates may also argue that the quality of life is getting <i>worse</i>, although again they will need to deal with / 'explain away' the counter 'evidence'.</p> <p>Whatever position candidates take, they will need to judge the relative <i>significance</i> of the views and evidence across the source documents, providing clear reasons why the material is / isn't relevant to their criteria for determining quality of life. Their position should also be recognisable as a conclusion, and be consistent with the reasons / arguments which accompany it. Simply stating a view is not sufficient.</p> <p><b>Reasoning &amp; Use of documents</b></p> <p>Lines of argument / evaluation could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A development of Jenny's argument about the importance of 'happiness' as a criterion – that having what you want does not make you happy (as evidenced by Document A in combination with the Appendix)</li> </ul>				20

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A development of the view asserted / implied by Nick – that we can only (safely) judge improvements which are <i>quantitative / measurable</i> – and therefore presumably follow the position taken in the Wall Street Journal (explaining why / admitting why they share the central assumptions of the author, and explaining away the apparent significance of Document A as a ‘red herring’)</li> <li>• Candidates could argue that happiness <i>is</i> quantifiable, and that the evidence of numbers diagnosed with / treated with e.g. depression (Document A) is just that! (However, some caution is necessary here; candidates ought to at least show awareness of the assumptions they are making, and explain why this evidence is reliable / representative of real levels of depression/ mental illness / disease)</li> <li>• A cautious candidate might argue as above, but withhold from drawing an affirmative conclusion due to their questions / suspicions / doubts regarding the evidence of Document A and the assumptions made in Document C, while downplaying the evidence in the Appendix</li> <li>• Candidates might want to develop some of the other themes raised in the Dialogue – about materialism / lack of care for others / social cohesiveness / the decline of the family unit, or about advances (or otherwise) in science and technology, or about the global issues that Nick dismisses as being irrelevant</li> <li>• Candidates may prefer to use a line of argument outside the source documents (such as the sense of alienation / angst that has come with a decline in spiritual values), but those that do this must still deal with the material in the documents by showing understanding and awareness of how their line of argument fits with the material (i.e. where it is corroborated by arguments and material presented in the Documents, or, where it is in conflict, why it is more significant than the conflicting evidence / material)</li> <li>• As stated above, ‘on the fence’ candidates <i>must</i> still present a <i>conclusion to an argument</i> (through an evaluation of the relative strength and significance of arguments, evidence and views on either ‘side’)</li> </ul> <p>(<b>Note:</b> The above are sample responses and do not constitute an exhaustive list.)</p> <p><b>Criteria</b></p> <p>Candidates need to make it clear how they are going to determine / measure quality of life; for instance they need to explain whether to use the more objective / quantitative ‘data’ such as longevity / wealth, or the more</p>				



No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>Intangible / qualitative / 'spiritual' criteria of happiness / inner contentment – or a combination of both. As justification they will need to explain / argue why e.g. their criteria is most relevant / the most measurable / most accurate. 'On the fence' candidates could use a combination of arguments here to good effect – such as that the most <i>relevant</i> ('happiness') is also the least measurable, and therefore no affirmative conclusion (or the negation of it) can be drawn.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Candidates do <i>not</i> need to make explicit use of terms such as 'quantitative' or 'qualitative' (although such terms used well ought to be credited), but they do need to show an understanding of e.g. some of the problems with measuring a variable such as happiness.</p>				

**GENERIC MARKING GUIDE, Question 9**

Descriptor	Award Level		
	Good response Communication is clear and appropriate	Reasonable response Communication is mostly clear and appropriate	Limited response Communication errors may impede understanding
<b>Conclusion</b> A conclusion is clearly stated that is consistent with the reasoning, and directly responds to the question	4	3–2	1
<b>Reasons/Lines of Reasoning</b> The above conclusion is well supported with reasons, contributory arguments, examples, clarification of terms, etc.	5–7	3–4	1–2
<b>Use of source documents</b> Candidate has engaged critically with source material	5–6	3–4	1–2
<b>Reference to criteria</b> One or more relevant criteria are deployed	3	2	1

	AO Balance	AO1	AO2	AO3
<b>Total Section B</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>
(Document A Questions)		8	5	0
(Document B Questions)		13	10	1
(Document C Questions)		4	7	2
<b>Total Section A</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Total Paper 1: [70]</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>

**Distribution of marks across the questions and assessment objectives for Unit 1**

	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total marks
<b>Section A: Document A (Questions 1 &amp; 2)</b>	8	5	0	13
<b>Section A: Document B (Questions 3 to 6)</b>	13	10	1	24
<b>Section A: Document C (Questions 7 &amp; 8)</b>	4	7	2	13
<b>Section B: (Question 9)</b>	0	0	20	20
<b>Total marks per AO</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>70</b>