



**General Certificate of Education (A-level)  
June 2013**

**Critical Thinking**

**CRIT2**

**(Specification 2770)**

**Unit 2: Information, Inference and Explanation**

**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](http://aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2013 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.**

## Marking methods

In fairness to students, all examiners **must** use the same marking methods. The following advice may seem obvious, but all examiners **must** follow it as closely as possible.

1. If you have any doubt about which mark to award, consult your Team Leader.
2. Refer constantly to the mark scheme throughout marking.
3. **Always** credit **accurate, relevant and appropriate** answers which are not given in the mark scheme.
4. Do **not** credit material irrelevant to the question / stated target, however impressive it might be.
5. If a one word answer is required yet a list is given, take the first answer (unless it is crossed out).
6. If you are considering whether or not to award a mark, ask yourself 'Is this student nearer those who have given a correct answer or those who have little idea?'
7. Read the information on the following page about levels of response mark schemes.
8. Use the full range of marks. Don't hesitate to give full marks when the answer merits them or give no marks where there is nothing creditable.
9. No half marks or bonus marks can be given under any circumstances.
10. The key to good and fair marking is **consistency**. Once approved, do **not** change your standard of marking.

## Marking using CMI+

All GCE Critical Thinking papers are marked electronically using a software application called CMI+ (Computer Marking from Image). Instead of paper being posted to examiners, student responses are scanned and sent electronically. The software is easy to use, but demands a different approach.

1. Instead of marking paper-by-paper you will mark item-by-item. An item is a part-question. Each time you log on you will need to choose an item to mark.
2. Before you start marking your own items you will need to mark some pre-marked items known as seeds. These ensure you are still applying the same standard set during standardising. If you are not, you will need to speak to your Team Leader before you can continue marking in order to clarify the correct interpretation and application of the mark scheme.
3. Seeds will also appear at random intervals during your marking to ensure you are maintaining the correct standard. If your marking is out of tolerance for a seed you will be prevented from marking that item until your Team Leader discusses this with you and clears you. You will, however, be able to mark other items.
4. Some higher mark questions are Double Marked. This means that a certain number of answers that you mark will be marked by another person. If the marks are within tolerance of one another, the higher mark awarded is the mark the student will be awarded.
5. You can annotate items in various ways: underlining, highlighting and adding icons from a drop-down menu. Your Team Leader will tell you which types of annotation to use. Examiners must not add extra annotation as this can be confusing for teachers and students if they request Access to Scripts.
6. As you mark each response, enter the mark you are going to award in the box at the bottom of the screen. If you realise you have made a mistake you can go back one paper to change the mark.

7. Your assessments will be monitored throughout the marking period. This ensures you are marking to the same standard, regardless of how many clips you have marked or what time of day you are marking. This approach allows senior examiners to ensure your marking remains consistent. Your Team Leader can bring you back to the right standard should you start to drift.
8. If your marking of a particular item is out of line, your Team Leader will contact you as soon as possible to explain where differences are occurring and how this can be addressed.

### Levels of Response marking

Levels of response marking requires a different approach than traditional 'point for point' marking. It is essential the **whole response is read** and allocated the level it **best fits**.

Marking should be positive, rewarding achievement rather than penalising for failure or omissions. The award of marks must be directly related to the marking criteria.

Use your professional judgement to select the level that **best** describes a student's work. Levels of response mark schemes enable examiners to fully reward valid, high ability responses which do not conform exactly to the requirements of a particular level.

If a student demonstrates knowledge, understanding and/or evaluation at a certain level, he/she must be credited at that level. **Length** of response or **literary ability** should **not be confused with critical thinking skills themselves**. A short answer which shows a high level of conceptual ability, for example, must be credited at that level.

Levels are tied to specific skills. Examiners should **refer to the stated assessment target** of a question (see the mark scheme) when there is any doubt as to the relevance of a student's response.

Levels of response mark schemes include either **examples** of possible students' responses or **material** which students might use. These are intended as a **guide** only as students will produce a wide range of responses to each question.

### Assessment of Quality of Written Communication (QWC)

Where students are required to produce extended written material in English, they will be assessed on the quality of written communication.

Students will have to:

- ensure text is legible; spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate and meaning is clear
- select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter
- organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in all units in this specification via Assessment Objective 3.

---

## Unit 2 Information, Inference and Explanation

### Section A

Questions 1 and 2 refer to Document A

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
1	<p>Paragraph 1 implies that it is surprising that the world is not more peaceful, given our scientific progress.</p> <p>Give <u>one</u> reason to explain why advances in scientific understanding do not necessarily lead to peace.</p>	(2 marks)	1	1	

[2 marks] for an explanation as to why the kind of progress that comes through science and technology does not necessarily have peaceful / non-violent consequences. For example:

“Weapon technology can get into the hands of terrorists / make violence (or violent crime) easier to commit.”

“Progress in improving society / controlling aggression / etc. has not kept pace with scientific progress / is not part of science.”

“Science does not deal with ethical questions.”

[1 mark] for unexplained examples or reference – for example “Weapon technology.”

NB 0 marks for merely restating the question.

NB2 Some scripts take the line that science can offend or upset people (e.g. on religious grounds) [1 mark] and hence cause tension, even violent protest. [2 marks]

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
2	<p>At the end of paragraph 1, the writer claims that ‘we face an unprecedented crisis of crime, terrorism and war’.</p> <p>How well does the information in paragraphs 2 and 3 support this claim?</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(4 marks)</b></p>				
			1	3	

Q2	How well does the information / evidence in (the text) support the claim that ...?		
Level	Mark	Descriptor	Q-specific
Good	3-4	<p>The relevant information is identified and assessed, and an appropriate judgement made (or clearly implied) on the level of support it provides for the claim.</p> <p>If the judgement is positive, the relevant supporting information or evidence from the text is identified and the support it gives is explained. If negative, the inadequacy of the evidence support is identified and explained.</p> <p>Pros and cons may be weighed / balanced if appropriate.</p>	<p>The overall judgement must be that at best there is weak support for the claim because the claim is a comparison with the past, not just about present troubles.</p>
Intermediate	2	<p>Some relevant information is identified, and a judgement made on strength / weakness it gives to the claim. Explanation, if any, is minimal.</p>	
Basic	1	<p>Some evaluative comment on the information is attempted, in connection with the claim.</p>	

The correct response is broadly that the claim, that the crisis is ‘unprecedented’, is a comparative one, but no evidence from past times is given for comparison. Hence the text does not support it / gives it limited support.

NB Candidates who cite examples of problems listed in paragraphs 2 and 3 as *support* for the claim may be credited up to the middle band, 2 marks.

**Questions 3 to 5 refer to Document B**

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
3	<p><b>At the end of paragraph 2, Pinker writes ‘So experts should be recognising the improvements in the world’s fortunes...’</b></p> <p><b>Does what he writes in paragraphs 1 and 2 justify his inference?</b> <b>(4 marks)</b></p>				
			2	2	

Level	Mark	Descriptor	Q-specific
Q3 Does (the text) justify the inference that ..... ?			
Good	3-4	<p>The relevant information is identified and assessed, and an appropriate judgement made (or clearly implied) on the level of justification it gives to the inference</p> <p>If the evaluation is positive the grounds should be identified and explained; if negative, their inadequacy should be explained.</p> <p>Pros and cons may be weighed / balanced if appropriate.</p>	<p>Candidates should EITHER recognise that there is a lack of evidence of <i>improvement</i> (as opposed to non-disasters).</p> <p>OR (if they choose to support the claim) they should argue that averting disasters is a <i>form</i> of improvement – e.g. compared with the disasters that were not averted in the past.</p>
Intermediate	2	Some relevant information is identified, and a judgement made on strength / weakness / lack of justification it gives to the inference.	This band if candidates merely list what has <i>not</i> happened.
Basic	1	Some evaluative comment on the information is attempted, in connection with the claim.	

There are two possible ways to answer: One is that the justification is not strong. The evidence consists of what has not happened, predictions which have not been borne out, which is not the same as identifying improvements in the world’s fortunes. The fact that there has not been a world war of the sort some predicted does not mean that there are no tensions, threats of other kinds. So Pinker could be accused of selectivity. Candidates may add counter examples such as the conflict in former Yugoslavia, growing crime (using own knowledge or drawing from other documents).

The other line that could be taken is that several decades ago there were grave threats that have in fact been averted and turned into a long and continuing peace. Also that the gravest threat of all – another world war like the last two – has not occurred, so that compared with the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century things have got better.



No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
4	With reference to paragraph 6, is Pinker right not to count deaths in war zones of Iraq and Afghanistan when calculating deaths from terrorism? Briefly explain your answer.  <p style="text-align: right;">(4 marks)</p>		1	3	

Level	Mark	Descriptor	Q-specific
Good	3-4	The reason is supported with an argument or explanation (however brief) that provides a plausible justification for the answer given.  This may be qualified with a balancing comment / possible objection.	See below for examples of a bare reason and a suitably developed justification.  Note that there are two routes to a justified 'No' answer.
Intermediate	2	There is an appropriate reason given for answering Yes or No, but it is not a <i>justifying</i> reason: There is no argument or explanation to support it.	See the examples below awarded [2].
Basic	1	An answer is given and a reason <i>attempted</i> , which may be inadequate	e.g. Deaths are deaths (without specifying terrorist deaths or war zone.)

There are grounds for both Yes and No answers.

- 1) Yes, Pinker is right to exclude war-zone deaths *because* war-deaths are not / not necessarily 'deaths from terrorism'; or because only peacetime deaths should count.  
[2]

For a top band answer this would need to be supplemented with: EITHER a brief argument / assertion / explanation as to why (some or all) war-deaths do not count as terrorism, or by offering some definition of 'terrorism' that rules out war-death – e.g. they are on military not civilian targets; AND/OR by explaining that it would distort the figures that otherwise show the (peacetime) terrorist threat to be declining – e.g. "Pinker is trying to show that terrorism outside war-zones is declining."

- 2) No, Pinker is not right to exclude war-zone deaths because terrorist deaths in warzones are still terrorist deaths. [2]

For top band this would need to be supplemented by – e.g.

- Pinker is cherry-picking / using selective / ad hoc reasoning etc. to support his conclusion.
- Deaths are deaths wherever they occur

- Terrorists operate in war-zones as well as in countries not at war.
- 3) No, because terrorism can lead to war; and/or war to terrorism [2]. Therefore war deaths are (arguably) 'deaths from terrorism' / deaths cause by terrorism [3-4]

(NOTE: an answer may be qualified, but merely 'giving both sides' does not count as justifying or explaining either answer.)

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
5	<p>In <u>paragraph 7</u>, Pinker argues that ‘...there is a moral imperative in getting the facts [about war and violence] right’.</p> <p>What role does his phrase ‘The effort to quantify the misery can seem heartless’ play in his argument?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p>		2		

The role of the phrase is to **acknowledge** / **anticipate** a **possible objection**; OR to excuse the author from treating deaths as numbers; OR to offset the seeming *heartlessness* needed for ‘getting the facts right’.

For 2 marks the candidate **must** – but need only - recognise that the phrase has one of the above roles, or similar..

Examples:

- “It (the phrase) is there to show Pinker is not being heartless (by quantifying, etc.);
- “It shows that he understands other points of view / sensitivities, etc.”.
- “He says this because some people may object to treating deaths / misery as numbers.”
- “...because he doesn’t want to appear heartless / or insensitive to the real misery.” etc.
- “It is a possible counter-argument to his counting up deaths that he needs to answer.”

NOTE: The following line of response is wrong or imprecise:

“The phrase is used to say that it is imperative to get the facts right.” (This is Pinker’s argument, not the role of *this phrase*.) [0 marks]

“The phrase is saying that *despite* seeming heartless it is imperative to get the facts right.” [1 mark]

Some candidates refer to the phrase as *an appeal to emotion* / e.g. pity, etc. or as a *counter-argument*; even a *contradiction*. If this is **all** they say – mark 0, as none of these is the right term here. But if they use such a term in an otherwise correct interpretation, mark positively and award as above.

E.g. “This is a counter argument that could be made against Pinker’s arguments, and it shows he is sympathetic to others’ feelings.” [2 marks]

**Questions 6 to 9 refer to Document C**

**6 Question 6 refers to Graph 1**

To what extent can each of the following statements safely be inferred from the information in Graph 1 alone?

(You should assume that the data are accurate).

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
6(a)	In the 1990s, for the first time since the 1950s, there were more civil wars than interstate wars.  <i>(3 marks)</i>		1	2	

Level	Generic	Q-specific Q6(a)
<b>Good: 3</b>	Correct assessment + precise and clearly communicated reason	e.g. as explained below
<b>Intermediate: 2</b>	Correct assessment with an imprecise or incomplete reason	e.g. it's not safe because it just gives average.
<b>Basic: 1</b>	Correct assessment.	It's not safe :

(For wrong answer, or answer but no reason: 0)

Award marks for the justification of the judgement.

This inference is not safe because the graph does not show number of conflicts at all, just average battlefield deaths per conflict (or per conflict per year).

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
6(b)	<b>No war of any kind since 2000 has killed more than 10 000 people.</b> <b>(3 marks)</b>		1	2	

Level	Generic	Q-specific Q6(b)
<b>Good: 3</b>	Correct assessment + precise and clearly communicated reason	e.g. as explained below
<b>Intermediate: 2</b>	Correct assessment with a broadly correct but imprecise or incomplete reason	e.g. it's not safe because it just gives average deaths not conflicts.
<b>Basic: 1</b>	Correct assessment	It's not safe.

For wrong answer: 0

This inference is unsafe because...

- (a) EITHER battle deaths per conflict is an average, so a single conflict could have seen more than 10,000 deaths, but the average remain lower; OR a war may last more than one year;

OR

- (b) there may have been wars since 2010 / the 2000s with a greater number of casualties;

OR

- (c) there may have been death that were not 'battle deaths' (e.g. civilian casualties);

OR

- (d) there may be other kinds of war than the two in the graph – e.g. the war on terror / drugs – with higher casualties.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
6(c)	Between 1950 and 1979, the deadliness of interstate war was, on average, more than 4 times greater than in the 30 years from 1980-2009.  <b>(5 marks)</b>		1	4	

Yes, the inference is safe:

Calculations (in thousands, with a margin of +/- 1 on reading of each bar):

$$(67+48+47) = 162 \text{ (+/- 3)} > ((24+ 4+3) = 31 \text{ (+/- 3)}) \times 4 = 124 \text{ (+/- 12)}$$

OR

$$\text{Avg of } (67+48+47) = 54 \text{ (+/- 1)} > \text{ avg of } ((24+ 4+3) = 10 \text{ (+/-1)}) \times 4 = 40 \text{ (+/- 4)}$$

Marks

Correct answer with evidence of correct calculation within the margin of error: [5 marks]

...with a very minor error (i.e. 'slip of pen' / missing zero): [4 marks]

...with correct method but some calculations outside the margin of error: [3 marks]

...with serious error/s or faulty method (very unlikely!): [2 marks]

Correct answer only – e.g. Yes: [1 mark]

Incorrect answer [0]

NB: *Evidence* of correct calculation does not require all working to be *shown*. For example: "Yes, 162 > 40" would get 5 marks.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
7	<p><b>Look at <u>Graph 2</u>.</b></p> <p><b>The total number of countries included in Graph 2 has increased from 36 in 1946 to 118 in 2008.</b></p> <p><b>Give three plausible explanations as to why this has occurred.</b> <b>(3 marks)</b></p>		3		

E.g. Increased population has taken many countries over 500,000 pop. [1] (NOTE: Impact of rising birth rate / improved longevity can be rewarded as separate answers.)

E.g. Small countries unite with others to form country with >500,000 pop.

E.g. Immigration raises pop. above 500,000.

E.g. New countries formed by independence, 'end of empire' etc.

E.g. Some countries which were neither autocracies nor democracies became one or the other, so qualified for inclusion on the graph.

E.g. Countries divides as a result of civil war. (e.g. Vietnam, Korea, Yugoslavia).

E.g. Some new countries resulted from inter-state conflict.

Do not credit "New countries (with 500k pop.) discovered." (Too implausible.)

Mark the explanation positively even if there is some factual inaccuracy in any examples offered. Examples are not necessary any way, for the mark.

Answers based on lack of available data are not explanations: award 0.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
8	<p><b>Consider Graph 2 and Graph 3.</b></p> <p><b>To what extent does the information in the graphs support the view that there is a link between types of government and the number of civil wars?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(8 marks)</b></p>				
			2	3	3

Q 8		<i>To what extent does the evidence / data support the alleged <b>link</b> ...?</i>	
Level	Mark	Descriptor	Q-specific
Good	6-8	<p>Relevant details in the data are identified, and correctly analysed, and evaluated for the support – or lack of support – they give to the suggested link.</p> <p>Correlations, patterns, causal connections, (if any), are correctly assessed where they are found.</p> <p>A general conclusion is drawn consistent with above interpretations of the data.</p>	<p>Some of the points below, and/or the critical comments, should be included in the response – or similar.</p> <p>Any positive correlations noted should be balanced by points of difference, as there are both.</p> <p>General conclusion should be that if there is any correlation it is limited / weak / inconsistent; no obvious causal / explanatory links.</p>
Intermediate	4-5	<p>The relevant data is referred to, and some assessment of the extent to which it does or does not give grounds for the suggested link is offered.</p>	
Basic	1-3	<p>An assessment of the support for the link is attempted with some reference to the data but with little or no critical analysis or evaluation (of the data).</p>	

**Some observations:** [Civil wars (CW); Autocracies (A); Democracies (D)]

1. CW rose with growing number of countries between 1946 and 1975.... then fell as number of countries levelled at 100 - 120
2. CW rose with A until 1975...but continued to rise after A fell.
3. CW rose also rose with D until 1991, then fell after D overtook A.
4. CW rose after 2001 as above trends continued – but similar spikes have occurred before.



1 could explain 2 and 3

2, 3, and 4 reveal little anyway.

**Relevant data:**

- The number of democracies has risen continually, if unevenly, with a sharp rise after the early nineties.
- Numbers of autocracies rose rapidly (until the mid 70s) then fell back to 1946 levels.
- Civil war incidence rose and fell unevenly, over same period but peaked about 15 years after the peak in autocracies – weak support for a link.
- However, civil wars peaked and then fell from the time when democracies overtook autocracies (giving some support for a link) ...
- ... but have (inexplicably) risen again since c 2002, whilst democracies have continued to rise and autocracies fall, (weakening the support for a link)

**Conclusion:**

There is a weak or partial correlation, but little or no support for a causal link *from* changes in government type *to* incidence of civil wars. It is just as plausible that a decline in civil wars between 1990 and 2002 allowed democracies to develop; or that some other factor – e.g. wealth, ending of cold war, etc. – accounted for both trends. And there is no obvious explanation (in the data) for the resurgence of civil wars since 2002.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
9	<p><b>Look at Graph 4. Evaluate the following argument:</b></p> <p><b>‘The only fair measure of violence is how many people are killed in total, but as we can see in the graph, Pinker always gives relative figures, never totals. Ask yourself: Is it preferable for ten people in a group of 1000 to die violent deaths or ten million to die in a group of one billion? Morally, the extinction of more individual lives, one after another, is worse. But for Pinker, the two scenarios are exactly the same, in both cases it is a 99% chance of dying peacefully. So, measuring deaths relative to population is mistaken.’</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(6 marks)</b></p>		1	4	1

Level	Generic (evaluate short argument)	Q-specific Q9
<b>Good: 5–6</b>	<p>The response shows a clear understanding of the structure of the argument.</p> <p>It makes an appropriate evaluative assessment of the strength of the premises as support for the conclusion, and/or notes unwarranted assumptions and/or other flaws, if any.</p>	
<b>Intermediate: 3–4</b>	<p>The response shows some understanding of the direction of the argument, including recognition of the conclusion.</p> <p>Some evaluative comments are made and a plausible evaluative conclusion stated, noting one or more strengths or weaknesses in the reasoning.</p>	
<b>Basic: 1–2</b>	<p>Some relevant evaluative comment and a supporting explanation offered.</p>	

For reference, the argument structure is:

- P1 The only fair measure is total deaths.  
 P2 The deaths of 10/10,000 is morally preferable to 10 million / 10 billion  
 P3 Pinker gives relative deaths (proportionate to populations); and claims they are the same they are the same

C Relative measurement is mistaken

But candidates are not required to reproduce this, only to demonstrate (explicitly or implicitly) a broad understanding of the reasons and conclusion

**Sample evaluation points:**

**Negative criticism:**

1. The argument is poor It misrepresents Pinker and could therefore be called a straw man. Pinker does not claim that 10 in a thousand is preferable to ten million in a billion, but that a low relative figure is better than a high relative figure.
2. The conclusion does not follow from the premises: even if Pinker does not cite total deaths, that does not mean relative measurement 'is mistaken'. It works by allowing us to calculate total deaths.
3. The argument is circular because P1 is effectively saying the same as the conclusion: namely that relative measurement is unfair and therefore mistaken.
4. P1 is an unsupported (explicit) assumption.
5. P3 is suspect: there is nothing morally preferable about two expressions of the same proportion. Their moral preference is identical.

**Positive criticism:**

Very little can be said in favour of the argument as it stands. A possible defence is that it correctly identifies a coldness in Pinker's argument in trying to quantify misery in terms of proportion of deaths/pop.

**Section B (See Generic mark-grid Page 15)**

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
10	<p><b>‘The world is a more dangerous place than ever.’</b></p> <p><b>Write a reasoned argument for or against the statement above.</b></p> <p><b>In presenting your case you should:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>produce a structured argument with a clearly stated conclusion or conclusions</b></li> <li>• <b>draw on relevant information and evidence found in the source documents; you may also draw on your own knowledge and experience if relevant</b></li> <li>• <b>consider any general principles that may apply</b></li> <li>• <b>consider and respond to possible counter-arguments.</b></li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(26 marks)</b></p>				<b>26</b>

Candidates may:

- consider the meaning of ‘dangerous’

**Against**

- argue that wars in the past resulted in many more deaths than the new threats of terrorism and crime cause;
- argue that wars killed many more soldiers in the past than modern wars; e.g. 1914–18 war, thousands died in a day on many occasions: now it is big news when one soldier is killed;
- medicine and technology save many more lives than in the past;
- crime detection has improved hugely.

**For**

- crime is internationalised and much more sophisticated;
- police now have to be armed – not in the past so much;
- weapons of mass destruction could kill millions in a moment at any time;
- terrorism is a bigger threat to civilians than traditional wars were.

**Principles**

E.g. Because the world is more dangerous we should all make greater effort to promote peace.

It is time to end discrimination and hate-crimes which fuel conflicts.

Life should be valued above all else.

Any other valid points should be credited.

**Generic mark-grid for Section B:**

Criteria	Award level		
	Level 3: Good response	Level 2: Reasonable response	Level 1: Basic response
<b>Conclusion</b>	3 A conclusion is clearly stated that is supported by all the reasoning, and directly responds to the question.	2 A conclusion is clearly stated that is supported by most of the reasoning, and responds to the question.	1 A conclusion is stated that is supported by some reasoning, and responds to the question in part.
<b>Reasoning</b>	8 – 10 The conclusion is strongly supported with reasons, contributory arguments, examples, clarification of terms, etc. which are precise and detailed.	5 – 7 The conclusion is supported with reasons, contributory arguments, examples, clarification of terms, etc.	1 – 4 The conclusion is weakly supported with reasons, contributory arguments, examples, clarification of terms, etc. which may be imprecise.
<b>Use of information</b> From Source Documents and/or to other relevant information or experience.*	5 Information ( <i>must</i> include Source Documents) supports reasoning strongly. Information is interpreted carefully and inferences drawn from it are evaluated in detail.	3 – 4 Information supports reasoning. Information is interpreted and inferences drawn may not be evaluated.	1 – 2 Information supports reasoning weakly. Information is not interpreted. Inferences drawn may be implicit and are not evaluated.
<b>Reference to principle</b>	4 One or more general principles are introduced and play a significant role in the argument. Justification of the principle may be given.	2 – 3 One or more general principles are introduced and play a role in the argument.	1 One general principle is introduced and plays a minor or unclear role in the argument.
<b>Counter-argument</b>	4 One or more challenges and objections are anticipated and answered effectively.	2 – 3 One or more challenges and objections are anticipated and answered.	1 One or more challenges and objections is anticipated and partially answered.

	<b>Good response</b>	<b>Reasonable response</b>	<b>Basic response</b>
<b>QWC</b> <b>Quality of Written Communication</b>	Consistently communicates clearly and appropriately	Generally communicates clearly and appropriately	Communication may impede understanding.

\* NB Candidates are not rewarded for exhibiting additional knowledge per se, but for the use they put it to in their reasoning if they choose to introduce it. Conversely, there is no penalty for not exhibiting additional knowledge: use of the documents alone is sufficient for awarding Level 3 'Good response' (5 marks).

**Distribution of marks across the questions and assessment objectives for Unit 2**

<b>AO Balance</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>	<b>Totals</b>
Qu 1	1	1		2
Qu 2	1	3		4
Qu 3	2	2		4
Qu 4	1	3		4
Qu 5	2			2
Qu 6(a)	1	2		3
Qu 6(b)	1	2		3
Qu 6(c)	1	4		5
Qu 7	3			3
Qu 8	2	3	3	8
Qu 9	1	4	1	6
<b>Total Section A</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>44</b>
Qu 10			26	26
<b>Total Section B</b>			<b>26</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Paper Total: [70] Marks</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Paper Total: [70] Percentage</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>100%</b>