



**General Certificate of Education (A-level)
January 2011**

Critical Thinking

CRIT1

(Specification 2770)

Unit 1: Foundation Unit

Final

Mark Scheme

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 events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process 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 standardisation each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2011 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.

Unit 1 Critical Thinking Foundation Unit

Section A

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
Questions 1 and 2 refer to the online discussion in Document A.					
1(a)	<p>In the third paragraph, Mike Letnic is said to have described the numbers of freshwater crocodiles dying as ‘worrying’.</p> <p>What support does he provide for this view?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> removing top predators like freshwater crocodiles can boost the number of their prey (doing this can) trigger a cascade of ecosystem changes that are difficult to predict <p>For each of the claims [1] (Accept suitable paraphrasing, e.g. candidates putting these together as a single claim: ‘removing top predators can boost their prey which will trigger ecosystem changes that are difficult to predict’ can merit the [2] marks)</p> <p>NB if candidates interpret this as an evaluative question, and provide answers along the lines of ‘Not much, because...’ then credit the critical comments accordingly up to a maximum of [2] for the question as a whole.</p>		2		
1(b)	<p>Identify <u>one</u> implicit assumption that Letnic’s argument makes</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> that (significant) changes to ecosystem = a bad thing / of concern / worrying; that not being able to predict how an ecosystem will behave is a bad thing / of concern / worrying; (if 2nd reason is seen as an inference from 1st) changing / increasing the numbers of certain groups of animals in an ecosystem can have a series of knock-on effects <p>For a clear articulation of an assumption that is required for the reasoning to work [2]</p> <p>For an imprecise / unclear expression of an assumption, e.g. overstatement [1]</p>		2		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
2	<p>Letnic claims that “If it had been whales or some species with big brown eyes everyone would have been up in arms”.</p> <p>What is Letnic implying about people’s attitudes to animals?</p> <p>Give two points.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(4 marks)</p> <p>Possible answers could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • people care more about...some species than others / about cuter looking ones • (in the context) crocodiles are not a species people care about / think are cute-looking • people were not up in arms about it <p>For a clear expression of each claim that is (clearly) implied [2]</p> <p>For an imprecise expression and / or for a claim that is less clearly implied [1]</p> <p>For no attempt / a non-claim / a non-sequitur [0]</p>		4		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
Question 3 refers to Documents A and B.					
3	<p>Look closely at the way the dialogue begins:</p> <p>Paul Let evolution take its course! Maybe the "freshies" will evolve.</p> <p>Zack Good point! This could be an excellent experiment in evolution. Let's wait and see what happens.</p> <p>Dilan Evolution happens to species within their natural environment. You can't release a creature elsewhere and hope it will evolve. It's like throwing yourself in the sea hoping you'll evolve into a fish and start swimming.</p> <p>Comment critically on what Dilan's response to what Paul and Zack say.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(4 marks)</p> <p>Dilan's post is intending to show that Paul's and Zack's views of evolution are mistaken / their comments are misguided / inappropriate / stupid [1]</p> <p>Candidates are likely to judge that it is <i>not</i> a (very) good response to what Paul and Zack say, on the grounds that:</p> <p>No one is saying that you can simply release a species somewhere and hope it will evolve. [1]</p> <p>Neither is anyone saying, or implying, that this would ever happen instantly (i.e. to the same generation that is introduced) – as Dilan's analogy suggests. This would be ridiculous [1–2]</p> <p>The analogy could similarly be seen as inappropriate / flawed / extreme / etc in that it involves a single individual, whereas the true situation here (or in any sensible 'experiment in evolution') will presumably involve populations [1–2]</p> <p>Therefore Dilan's claim and / or the analogy Dilan gives to support are at best irrelevant and at worst, a straw man (in that it presents and then demolishes a daft view of evolution, which is implicitly attributed to Paul and Zack). [1–2]</p> <p>Moreover, this is not what is happening here anyway: it is not the not the animal that is released that is threatened, but the animals that it's released amongst (a further failing of the claim / analogy on grounds of fairness / relevance) [1–2]</p>				
				4	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>There is evidence / grounds in Document A for believing that the crocodiles might / will evolve (last paragraph; what researchers say, and evidence of what happened to the blacksnakes) – therefore supporting what Paul and Zack say / undermining Dilan’s attempts to make their views appear foolish / ignorant / misguided [1–3]</p> <p>There are problems with (Dilan’s use of) the word ‘natural’: at what point is a species’ environment its ‘natural’ one? [1–2]</p> <p>It could be that Dilan / Dilan’s comment (through especially the analogy Dilan uses) is confusing evolving and surviving: species can be and often are ‘released elsewhere’, and do often survive (i.e. swim rather than sink, to pursue Dilan’s analogy!)</p> <p>On the positive side, candidates could receive a mark for judging that Dilan’s claims are largely true, and that the analogy does show that experiments in evolution are perhaps not as simple as some people <i>might</i> think – and / or that it supports a more general notion of the likely unfortunate (catastrophic?) consequences of clumsy action (in that a real natural biological system is always / necessarily more complicated than any model or theory) [1–3] candidates could receive a further mark for mentioning the evidence in Document A that the crocodiles may find it more difficult to adapt than e.g. the snakes</p> <p>Candidates however should not be credited for irrelevant attacks that miss the point of the analogy, i.e. saying that people <i>can</i> start swimming after having thrown themselves into the sea.</p> <p>Candidates can be credited with a ½ mark for recognising that an analogy is being used but this will be needed alongside a further point of analysis / evaluation to earn a mark.</p> <p>Candidates can be credited with a maximum of [1] mark for purely descriptive comments (e.g. recognising that an analogy is being used / that Dilan is arguing against / disagreeing with what Zack and Paul have said)</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
Questions 4 to 6 refer to Document B.					
4	<p>Consider the following contribution by Reena:</p> <p>It's not such a big worry that people have gone and introduced these toads. Similar things happen naturally. Species travel of their own accord, often by obscure methods such as clinging to a palm leaf in the ocean for a few weeks. It won't be the first time a species has had to adapt to the arrival of a new species.</p>				
4(a)	<p>What is Reena's conclusion?</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(1 mark)</i></p> <p>(That) It's not such a big worry that people have gone and introduced these toads [1] (Accept suitable paraphrasing e.g. 'It's OK / not such a big deal that the toads were introduced')</p>		1		
4(b)	<p>Identify an implicit assumption Reena is making.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(2 marks)</i></p> <p>That if something happens naturally, then it's not so bad / such a big worry to do it unnaturally.</p> <p>That if species have had to adapt to the arrival of other species in the past, that makes it OK / less bad / worrisome that it is happening here.</p> <p>That when species have had to adapt to the arrival of new species they have not necessarily failed to do so / have sometimes / often succeeded.</p> <p>For a clear articulation of an assumption that is required for the reasoning to work [2]</p> <p>For an imprecise / unclear expression of an assumption, e.g. overstatement [1]</p>		2		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
4 (c)	<p>Now consider the exchange between Zack and Mehmet that follows Renna’s argument.</p> <p>Mehmet That doesn’t mean that you can just go around introducing species wherever you want, Renna!</p> <p>Zack You’re not being fair to Reena’s argument, Mehmet. Reena wasn’t saying that.</p> <p>Mehmet But her argument implied it.</p> <p>With reference to Reena’s argument, who is right? Zack or Mehmet? Explain your answer.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(4 marks)</p> <p>Reena’s argument assumes / implies that, as a general rule, if something happens naturally then it is OK / not so bad to do it unnaturally. This shows that Mehmet is (partly / largely) right in what he says, since it is a clear consequence/ implication of Reena’s argument that it is not so bad to go around introducing species unnaturally, since it happens naturally. (If it’s ‘not such a big worry’ here, then why not anywhere else?). [1–3]</p> <p>Candidates could extend this to argue that Mehmet’s objection is therefore warranted in that it shows a legitimate danger inherent in Reena’s argument [1–2]</p> <p>However, saying something is not so bad is not the same as saying it’s totally OK [1]: therefore Mehmet has still perhaps exaggerated Reena’s argument (or its implications), making Zack’s accusation right / fair / better justified. [1–2]</p> <p>Candidates should be credited for applying the term ‘slippery slope’ effectively in their answer: either by saying that Mehmet is revealing a potential slippery slope in Reena’s argument; or by saying that, in its exaggeration of what Reena is saying / implying, Mehmet has resorted to slippery slope tactics himself. [1–2]</p> <p>For similar reasons, Mehmet could be accused of deploying a straw man [1–2]</p>		2	2	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
5	<p>Consider the following comment by Paul.</p> <p>I think you'll find it's not the first time a species has been introduced to a new environment by humans.</p> <p>In reply, Mehmet asks the following rhetorical question:</p> <p>'Oh, so that makes it OK on this occasion does it?'</p>				
5(a)	<p>Explain why Mehmet is right to think that it does not make it OK.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p> <p>To argue that, because something has been done before, it's OK to do it again, is to make an illegitimate <i>appeal to history</i>; or seen another way, to be guilty of a <i>tu quoque</i>: the fact that something has happened before is not a good enough justification in itself for doing it again (it could have been wrong in the first case and wrong again now) [1–2]</p> <p>For citing a well-chosen flaw [1]</p> <p>For explanation [1–2] up to maximum of [2]</p> <p>(NB Candidates do not need to specify the name of a flaw for full marks if their explanation is adequate)</p>			2	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
5(b)	<p>Comment critically on what Reena says after the question Mehmet asks:</p> <p>Whether or not it was man that introduced the pest is irrelevant: species invade and the existing ones must cope or die.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(4 marks)</p> <p>Candidates may point out that this is changing the point / refusing / ignoring to deal with the question or point Mehmet has raised (or even that it is missing the point of the debate as a whole) [1–2]; this could be seen as a form of <i>ad hoc</i> reasoning [1–2]; a case could even be made for her contradicting herself to a degree [1–2]</p> <p>Candidates can point out that the contribution is largely assertive: Reena asserts her position with little or no support [1]; this is especially so of the first claim ('Whether or not it was man that introduced the pest is irrelevant'), since this (unlike the second part, which is largely a truism) is wholly unwarranted [1]; since no real reason is given, and this is the issue at stake, Reena could be said to be <i>begging the question</i> [1–2]</p> <p>If it <i>is</i> to be taken as an argument (i.e. with the first claim as being supported by the second), then it is a very poor one: the fact that species <i>do</i> invade and the fact that other species have to 'cope or die' gives no support to the first claim ('Whether or not it was man that introduced the pest is irrelevant'). Candidates could illustrate the absurdity of this with an analogous argument, e.g. 'there are nasty things that happen to people and people have to survive etc; therefore whether or not it was a person that brought about the nasty thing is irrelevant'. (For recognising the non sequitur [1]; for suitable explanation with e.g. parallel argument [1–3])</p> <p>While the best responses need to tackle Reena's contribution as a whole (and in the context of the debate), candidates can approach the claims in isolation. Candidates could focus on the first claim and e.g. argue that it <i>is</i> relevant whether or not man introduced the species, since we have a responsibility for our actions. [1–2]</p> <p>Candidates could focus on the second part of Reena's comment ('species invade and the existing ones must cope or die'): in one sense it's a (fairly unhelpful) truism [1]; moreover what is meant by 'must'? Does this mean must be left alone to cope or die? [1–2] As formulated, it does not preclude the possibility that another species (i.e. us) could <i>assist</i> with their survival. (Candidates could see this as a case of <i>restricting / limiting the options</i>) [1–2]</p> <p>Candidates could perhaps take issue with the use of language ('pest', 'invade') and thereby earn [1] mark.</p>			4	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
6	<p>Consider Steffi’s final comment:</p> <p>We should just let nature take its course.</p> <p>How successfully does this resolve the debate? Explain your answer. (4 marks)</p> <p>Candidates could deem the advice to be merely asserted [1] / presented as a matter of principle. [1] But the principle(s) Steffi offers is / are highly contentious [1], and could (like Reena’s comment earlier) be said to <i>beg the question</i>. [1–2] (Candidates ought to be credited for explaining <i>why</i> the principle(s) is / are contentious, and could acquire full marks for this approach if suitably developed.)</p> <p>The advice is vague / unclear how it should be applied in this situation [1]: does it mean allowing the cane toad to wipe out the crocodiles? Or does it mean that the cane toad should not have been introduced in the first place? (If so, it’s too late for that, and the comment is useless) [1–3] (As above, suitable development of this point can earn a candidate full marks)</p> <p>Candidates should be awarded a mark for recognising that there is a problem of meaning, and suitable development will constitute a full mark response, for example:</p> <p>Presumably Steffi means by this <i>not</i> intervening. But why is this approach more natural? Perhaps nature has made us wise / intelligent enough to realise what is going on, therefore intervening would be part of nature’s course. Also, if the situation is of man’s doing, in what way is it letting <i>nature</i> take its course by leaving it to play out?</p> <p>Lesser development might be something like:</p> <p>Letting nature take its course <i>is</i> (effectively) deciding which species can and can’t survive (i.e. by deciding not to intervene to eliminate / cull an invasive species that is threatening the survival of another). This would add a further [1–2] to the mark for recognising there is a problem with meaning / interpretation.</p> <p>If candidates take on the assertion in isolation (i.e. not in context of the debate) they can earn [1] for plausible discussion, e.g. agreeing with the assertion on the grounds that nature <i>does</i> tend to do a good job / cope well at maintaining balanced ecosystems when left alone.</p>		4		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
Questions 7 to 9 refer to Document C.					
7	<p>Compare and contrast the situations in Document A and Document C with regard to invasive species.</p> <p>Suggest <u>three</u> significant ways in which the situations are and / or are not analogous (similar).</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(3 marks)</p> <p>Relevant similarities could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both are species which are newly arrived • Both are species whose arrival has been influenced by man’s activities • Both are endangering the survival of ‘native’ species • Both are endangering several / more than one species • Both involved a species being introduced deliberately by man to a new environment from which it then migrated with harmful consequences <p>Relevant differences could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plight of endangered species on Socotra seems more acute (smaller no’s / rarer) • Degree/ nature of human involvement: Toad was deliberately introduced; crows’ arrival was (largely) accidental / unintended (both observations merit a mark) • The crow was eating the indigenous species, the toad being eaten (one predator; one prey) • The crows’ situation has been dealt with; the other is ongoing 	3			

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
8	<p>Consider the argument by Lawrence Fisher titled ‘RESPONSE TO THE ARTICLE’.</p> <p>The argument is written in response to Simon Barnes’s article.</p>				
8(a)	<p>Explain the basic structure of the argument, identifying any conclusions that are drawn and the grounds provided.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(5 marks)</p> <p>Structure of the argument:</p> <p>The main conclusion of the argument is: If this is the case (i.e. if Simon Barnes is a bird lover), then he should not have written this article.</p> <p>This is based on three main reasons:</p> <p>Anyone who loves birds ought to celebrate the crow – not discriminate against it. + In going along with the popular image of the crow as baddie, he is demonising it. + In giving the native Socotran species rights that he is denying the crow, he is guilty of speciesism.</p> <p>[Depending on the formulation of the conclusion, the claim ‘Simon Barnes calls himself a bird lover’ can also be considered as a further reason.]</p> <p>The first of the three reasons is an intermediate conclusion / based on a further sub-argument, containing supporting reasons / evidence:</p> <p>Crows are highly intelligent, adaptive, resourceful (+ Evidence/ support: While other bird species struggle with a changing environment, crows are thriving in the modern world; crow populations in both cities and countryside are on the rise)</p> <p>The other two reasons could be seen as working together to support the (part implicit) view that Simon Barnes <i>is</i> discriminating against the crow; therefore the argument could be seen as having two main strands of reasoning:</p> <p>One, as a bird lover Simon Barnes ought to celebrate the crow, not discriminate against it.</p> <p>Two (part implicit), that the article is (not celebrating, but) discriminating against the crow.</p> <p>Candidates could also interpret ‘he is guilty of speciesism’ as a (intermediate) conclusion, but to do so they need to provide the ‘reason’ for this, i.e. that he has given the Socotran species rights that he is denying the crow).</p>	5			

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>GUIDE TO AWARDING MARKS</p> <p>For identifying any conclusion (regardless of how they label it, as i.e. main or intermediate or neither) [1]</p> <p>For correctly identifying the logical order of the conclusions (i.e. correctly labelling the main and / or intermediate conclusions) [1]</p> <p>For identifying each supporting reason / line of reasoning [1]</p> <p>For further relevant analytical comment about argument structure, e.g. recognising that the strands of reasoning for the main conclusion are working jointly [1]</p> <p>Award up to a maximum of [5] marks.</p> <p>FURTHER GUIDANCE:</p> <p>The following can be legitimately adjudged to be conclusions of the article and can automatically be credited with a mark (whether or not reasons are given/ correctly given):</p> <p>[If this is the case (i.e. if Simon Barnes is a bird lover), then] he should not have written this article / Simon Barnes should not have written this article.</p> <p>Anyone who loves birds ought to celebrate the crow – not discriminate against it.</p> <p>Can be credited as being a / the conclusion <i>only if</i> the grounds are provided (i.e. if the bit about him giving Socotran birds rights he is denying the crow):</p> <p>He/ Simon Barnes (in writing this article) is guilty of speciesism.</p> <p>Can also be credited with a mark for being labelled as a conclusion but NOT as <i>the</i> or the <i>main</i> conclusion (i.e. they must either say this or have provided another conclusion which is obviously of greater import), AND <i>only if</i> at least some of the grounds are provided (i.e. the stuff about how they are thriving in the modern world/ on the rise / comparisons with other birds):</p> <p>Crows are highly intelligent, adaptive, resourceful.</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>The following can be credited with a mark each for simply being labelled as a 'reason' <i>even if</i> they are not assigned to a conclusion / the correct conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Crows are highly intelligent, adaptive, resourceful• Other bird species are struggling with a changing environment, crows are thriving in the modern world• Crow populations in towns and cities are on the rise• In going along with the popular image of the crow as baddie he is demonising it• In giving the native species rights he is denying the crow he is guilty of speciesism				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
8(b)	<p>Identify two implicit assumptions that Lawrence Fisher makes.</p> <p>For each assumption, say whether or not you think it is warranted, explaining briefly why.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(6 marks)</p> <p>Examples of implicit assumptions candidates could identify are:</p> <p>that (an animal's / bird's / creature's) being intelligent (+ adaptive, resourceful) is good / worth celebrating</p> <p>A species' survival / thriving is a sign of its success</p> <p>(true up to a point, but over-successful can be self-destructive!)</p> <p>That we should celebrate them <i>because</i> they are successful / That a species' being successful / 'thriving' is a good thing</p> <p>That the crow's success is linked to their intelligence (and / or that other birds' failure linked to their relative <i>lack</i> of intelligence)</p> <p>That being specieist is bad / not good for a bird lover</p> <p>That a bird lover should love all birds (equally)</p> <p>By way of assessment, candidates need to do more than say 'this might not be the case' or 'he provides no evidence for this' – these are true of any assumptions. Instead candidates need to give (brief) reasons as to why their chosen assumptions may / may not be warranted.</p> <p>For example, candidates could question the assumption that the crow's relative success is linked to their intelligence by suggesting that it could be due instead to things like their aggressiveness to other birds.</p> <p>Or candidates could say of the assumption that a species' thriving is a sign of its success that this is largely true – by definition if life is seen as a struggle for survival.</p> <p>(Alternatively, candidates could question this assumption by questioning the idea that success is merely about surviving; or even point out that a species becoming too successful can be self-destructive)</p> <p>Any relevant line of assessment should be credited.</p> <p>For each implicit assumption [1–2] depending on clarity / precision of articulation</p> <p>For each assessment [1–2]</p> <p>Award up to a maximum of [6] marks.</p>			6	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
9	<p>With reference to the article itself, and also the definition of speciesism as given in Document C, do you agree with the Lawrence Fisher’s view that Simon Barnes’s in (writing) his article is ‘guilty of speciesism’?</p> <p>Justify your answer by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • considering what case, if any, there might be in support of the action which has been taken against the crows (and which Barnes is defending); • referring closely to the definition of speciesism provided in Document C; • deciding whether or not you think Fisher’s allegation is fair or unfair. <p style="text-align: right;">(7 marks)</p> <p>To get a high mark, candidates will need to consider what case there is/ might be for stoning the crows:</p> <p>They were killing ‘native’ species</p> <p>The crows were non-native / invasive</p> <p>Native species were (very) rare (unlike crows?)</p> <p>Not just one / several species were at risk (from the one predator)</p> <p>(And, presumably) They were brought there (at least indirectly) by human action</p> <p>In general, candidates ought to recognise that these reasons alone fall short of justifying the view that it is therefore OK / acceptable to eradicate the crows unless further significant assumptions are made; these assumptions are where the interesting area of the debate lies.</p> <p>Candidates could identify / question any assumptions e.g. the general principle that is implicitly assumed by the author: that we should protect rare species / that rare species deserve greater protection / are more important than less rare/ the more rare a species is, the more important its survival.</p> <p>Candidates could also structure their discussion around a consideration of:</p> <p>the significance of relative rights of native versus outsider / invasive species ditto rare rather than common ditto means of invasion (whether or not man-assisted)</p>				
			2	3	2

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>Candidates can ask: <i>Were they man assisted?</i> (They made their own way on the boats; surely this was their own initiative? And does this matter???)</p> <p>Candidates could ask whether or not the crows' ingenuity / initiative ('crows are clever') is a relevant factor in determining their relative rights compared to other species (they could draw comparisons with e.g. rights of great apes / monkeys (or even people) over less intelligent animals; they could raise points about our consistency, and whether or not this is a relevant / sufficient criterion for according rights).</p> <p>Put another way: should the fact that crows are smart give them any further rights (in the same way e.g. dogs have over insects – often seen as having greater sentience?) (+ does smartness equate to greater sentience?)</p> <p>Candidates could ask, given the author's argument / position, should we now stone the toads?</p> <p>Candidates' answers are to be banded as follows:</p> <p>6–7 marks: A clear case is made, where candidates: select and refer to the relevant facts, principles and / or important assumptions that are made; apply the definition effectively, accurately and consistently; and judge accordingly</p> <p>3–5 marks: A case is made, where candidates: refer to some relevant aspects of the situation and / or identify the main principles at stake and / or question the important assumptions that are made; apply the definition with some effectiveness, accuracy and / or consistency; and judge with some discretion</p> <p>1–2 marks: A slight case is made (or attempted), but where candidates: refer to few relevant aspects of the situation and / or identify few or none of the main principles at stake or fail to question some / any of the important assumptions that are made; apply the definition with some effectiveness, accuracy and / or consistency; and judge with little discretion</p>				

Section B (see Generic mark-grid, page 21)

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
10	<p>‘We as humans have to act like God’s gardeners. By this I mean we have a duty, a moral duty, to take steps to save endangered species from extinction’.</p> <p>To what extent do you agree with the above view?</p> <p>Write a reasoned argument in support of your position.</p> <p>In answering this question you should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • state your conclusion (or conclusions) clearly • offer effective reasoning to support your conclusion • use the information, and respond to issues or arguments, in Documents A – C. <p>(You may also if you wish refer to material in the Appendix, although this is optional).</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(20 marks)</p> <p>The question is very much an ethical one: about humans’ place in nature, their duties and responsibilities on the planet, and – more generally – about the place of morality in the natural world. Candidates’ answers will need to engage with the ethical level on some dimension. They do not need to go specifically into more abstract questions about ethical theories or dilemmas, but those that do so in a relevant way should be rewarded. Similarly, candidates are not expected to bring in sophisticated knowledge of biology, ecology, or evolutionary theory, but again relevant knowledge usefully applied should be rewarded. Links to other ‘green’ issues, where relevant, should also be credited, as should any relevant line of argumentation. Whatever line they take, in pursuing their arguments, candidates should make critical use of the evidence, examples and / or viewpoints presented in the source documents. However, they do not have to refer to every document, and information that is used, for example the case studies given in the Appendix, should be used critically.</p> <p>Some examples of possible relevant lines of argument are:</p> <p>Candidates could argue that the threat to many animals’ survival is down to <i>our</i> behaviour / actions; therefore we have a moral duty to act / intervene. Strictly speaking, this line of argument would only support the view that we have a moral duty to act to save species endangered by our actions, not generalised across all endangered species as in the view presented for discussion. Candidates should be rewarded for recognising this, and for adopting an appropriate position: E.g. we have a moral duty to intervene if and only if the species is endangered as a (direct) result of our actions). Useful reference could be made to the red kites and / or rabbits in the Appendix, as well as other examples across the source documents.</p>				20

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>Candidates could question this / pursue an opposite argument by asking: what makes human actions different from those of any other species? All species act in a way that suits them, and if that is detrimental to another species, then so be it – that is the way of nature. Why should we do differently? (Candidates who argue like this ought really to consider the implications of their stance: are they exempting themselves from morality per se – adopting a total moral nihilism? – or just in relation to the natural world? Can you consistently avoid treating animals morally without avoiding to be moral to humans?)</p> <p>Candidates could use the ‘fact’ of our higher / superior intelligence (which could usefully be briefly supported through setting / agreeing terms regarding how this is measured) to argue that with this comes a further moral duty for our actions. (This could be developed by analogy with e.g. babies or the mentally retarded versus ‘normal’ adults and relative responsibility for ones actions)</p> <p>Candidates could develop this to say that we, unlike other species on the planet, are aware of what is going on; therefore for us to <i>not</i> act could be seen as morally wrong in a way that does not apply to other species</p> <p>Candidates could consider the <i>significance</i> of a species’ survival against other considerations e.g. economic growth and human wealth / poverty. On the one hand, the death of a species is <i>ultimate</i> / irreparable; on the other hand, extinction is a natural part of evolution (useful reference could be made to the oft-quoted 99% of species that have ever lived having died), and prolonging suffering existence of a dying species (at the expense of e.g. stopping source of income for poor people) is not necessarily morally preferable.</p> <p>Candidates could take a hardline naturalist / evolutionary line and argue that extinction is a necessary part of evolution, and in keeping with nature for species to die out if they are no longer suited to their environment; that the environment will always change and that we should let those that can live in it / adapt / survive (reference could be made to the discussion in Document B).</p> <p>Candidates may wish to make analogies with halting / combating climate change (and in so doing perhaps question the extent the analogy holds, e.g. are these different because predominantly in our interests?), or with economics / business / free market philosophies, e.g. the question of whether to step in to save small businesses from the march of supermarkets / larger organisations.</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>Candidates could even pick at the God’s gardeners image / metaphor: the gardener doesn’t typically look after ALL species – just the ones that are seen as beautiful! Candidates could draw on the example situations in the source documents. (Similarly candidates could comment critically on the rhetorical devices used in the metaphor or its wider persuasive connotations – however such discussion must not get sidetracked into missing the core of the question, and avoid taking an appropriate / relevant stance on the matter.)</p> <p>(Note: The above are sample responses and do not constitute an exhaustive list.)</p>				

Generic mark-grid for Section B

Descriptor	Award Level		
	Good response Criteria thoroughly met and communication is clear and appropriate.	Reasonable response Criteria partially met and communication is mostly clear and appropriate.	Limited response Criteria barely met and communication errors may impede understanding.
<p>Conclusion</p> <p>A conclusion is drawn which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> is clearly stated (or unmistakably implied) is consistent with the reasoning as a whole responds directly to the question 	3	2	1
<p>Reasoning's</p> <p>The conclusion is appropriately supported by relevant reasons. For higher levels of credit these should be developed by such means as :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> examples explanations analogy clarification of terms; definitions acknowledgement (and response to) opposing positions, and counter-arguments recognisable structure avoidance of bare or simplistic assertion/presumption/over-generalisation 	9 – 11	5 – 8	1 – 4
<p>Use of source documents</p> <p>The reasoning is supported by appropriate reference to the source documents. For higher levels of credit this should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> relevant to the point being made accompanied by critical/evaluative comment expanded or explained (if necessary) 	5 – 6	3 – 4	1 – 2

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

AO Balance	AO1	AO2	AO3
Total Section A	23	25	02
Total Section B	–	–	20
Paper Total: [70] Marks	23	25	22
Paper Total: [70] Percentage	33%	36%	31%