GCE

Critical Thinking

Mark Scheme for June 2011

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Section A – The Language of reasoning			
Question	**Expected Answer**	**Mark**	**Guidance**
	For answers 1(a), 1(b), 1(c) and 1(d), credit answers as follows: **3 marks** For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author. You must only credit the words written; ellipsis (…) should not be credited. The words in brackets are not required, but candidates should not be penalised if these words are included. **2 marks** For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author, but **missing out** information, **or** for a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrasing. **1 mark** For a less accurate statement of the argument element which has the gist but lacks precision **and/or** contains **additional i**nformation. **0 marks** For a statement of an incorrect part of the text.		

Section A – The Language of reasoning				
Question		Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)	**State the <u>conclusion</u> of the Archbishop's argument in paragraph 1 of Document 1.** food transported by air should be replaced gradually by home-grown produce from thousands of new allotments.	**[3]**	*** Credit** if there is an introduction that the Archbishop's conclusion is that, "……". *** Popular addition** "The Archbishop of Canterbury has suggested that". Credit 1 mark. *** Popular omission** Leaving out "from thousands of new allotments." Credit 2 marks.
1	(b)	**State the <u>reason</u> given to support the Archbishop's conclusion in paragraph 1 of Document 1.** the carbon footprint of air-freighted food is too high. *He claims that* "the carbon footprint of air-freighted food is too high." (This is correct because the quotation is distinct from *He claims that*.)	**[3]**	*** Popular additions** "like peas from Kenya". Credit 1 mark. If *He claims that* is **not** distinct from the accurate quotation, eg no quotation marks used. Credit 1 mark.

Section A – The Language of reasoning				
Question			**Expected Answer**	**Mark**	**Guidance**
1	**(c)**		**State the <u>evidence</u> given to support the Archbishop's argument in paragraph 1 of Document 1.** **3 marks** (According to the Soil Association,) 1% of food imported into the UK is air-freighted, but it contributes 11% of the CO2 emissions from UK food distribution. **2 marks** It contributes 11% of the CO2 emissions from UK food distribution. **1 mark** A paraphrase of the evidence without the actual figures. **0 marks** 1% of food imported into the UK is air-freighted. (On its own, this does not support the Archbishop's argument.)	**[3]**	
1	**(d)**	**(i)** **(ii)**	**State two <u>counter-assertions</u> given in Document 1.** **eg** • The Archbishop's suggestion would (however) threaten the livelihoods of a million farming families in Africa. • Flying food (in) from Kenya may (also) be greener than we think.	**[2x3]**	For Q1(d) enter a mark out of 6 [2 x 3]. Indicate with ticks (✓) at the end of (i) and (ii) to show how many marks allocated to each sub-question. *** Do not credit** the counter-***arguments*** about "allotment-produced food may not be a practical solution" or "to suggest that this shouldn't happen …". *** Popular omission** Leaving out "in Africa". Credit 2 marks.

Section A – The Language of reasoning

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
2	(a)		**Consider the claim in <u>paragraph 4</u> of Document 1 "In Hackney, east London, the wait is four to five years."** **Name the argument element used.** **2 marks** Example/counter-example **1 mark** Accept 'example' if it is embedded in unclear reasoning. **0 marks** For no credit-worthy material.	[2]	For Q2, enter a mark out of 4 ((a) out of 2, (b) out of 2). Indicate with ticks (✓) at the end of (a) and (b) to show how many marks allocated to each sub-question. *** Do not credit** the answer "evidence", or "example/evidence" (ie scattergun approach where both are included).
2	(b)		**Explain your answer to 2(a).** **2 marks** It *illustrates* the evidence/reason or gives an *instance* (or a synonym of *illustrates/instance*). (Accept 'shows' and 'demonstrates' as synonyms for 'instance'.) **1 mark** It *supports* the evidence/reason. (Accept synonyms for 'support', eg 'backs up', 'strengthens'.) **0 marks** For no credit-worthy material.	[2]	*** 2(a) and (b) should be marked independently** ie if 2(a) is incorrect, marks can be awarded for 2(b).

Section A – The Language of reasoning					
Question			**Expected Answer**	**Mark**	**Guidance**
3	**(a)**		**Explain <u>one</u> way in which the evidence given in the survey in <u>Document 2</u> may be representative of food wasted.** **2 marks** For a correct assessment which is **explained** eg - At 2,715 the sample size may be large enough for those interviewed to represent the differences in food wastage across households in the rest of England and Wales. - Although the survey was only conducted in England and Wales, habits are likely to be similar in Scotland and Northern Ireland/other countries, so the figure could be representative of the whole of the UK. **1 mark** For a correct assessment that **states** rather than explains eg - The sample size may have been large enough. - It is a large sample/number. - England and Wales are a large part of the UK. - England and Wales are the same as Scotland and Northern Ireland. **0 marks** For no credit-worthy material.	**[2]**	*** Explanation** would normally include a brief development beyond merely restating the question (that it may be representative of food wasted). **NB** Reliability of the data is different from representativeness and cannot be credited, eg 'the people surveyed are likely to have been honest about their food wastage' is about reliability of the data, not representativeness of food wasted.

Section A – The Language of reasoning				
Question			**Expected Answer**	**Mark**	**Guidance**

| **3** | **(b)** | | **Explain <u>one</u> way in which this evidence may not be representative of food wasted.**

2 marks
For a correct assessment which is **explained** eg
• If those included in the sample were largely from cities, where waste may be more likely to include shop-bought food, this might mean that the evidence may not be representative of the differences in food wastage across England and Wales.
• By only conducting the survey in England and Wales, it cannot be representative of the whole of the UK as it does not include Scotland and Northern Ireland/other countries/other places.
• The evidence may not be representative of total food wasted because the survey only analysed household food wastage **(statement)**, not hotel/restaurant/hospital etc wastage **(explanation).**

1 mark
For a correct assessment that **states** rather than explains eg
• The evidence might be taken just from cities.
• The evidence is taken just from cities.
• It is a small sample/number.
• The survey was only conducted in England and Wales.

0 marks
For no credit-worthy material. | **[2]** | *** Explanation**
• Would normally include a brief development beyond merely restating the question (that it may not be representative of food wasted). Developed answers should identify a limitation in the survey and explain its impact on representativeness.
• Candidates can also be credited two marks by making a relevant statement and explaining it.

NB Reliability of the data is different from representativeness and cannot be credited, eg 'the people surveyed may not be honest about their food wastage' is about reliability of the data, not representativeness of food wasted. |

Section A – The Language of reasoning				
Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
4			**State an <u>assumption</u> that is needed to support the reasoning in the photograph caption:** **"Allotments will help people move away from consumerism, because they can reconnect with nature by adjusting their diets to the seasons."** **3 marks** For an accurate statement of an assumption which is reasonable to make. Valid assumptions will either address: **That consumerism is a problem which it is necessary/desirable to address eg** • We live in a consumer society/people practise consumerism. • People will take up the opportunity to reconnect with nature. • People want to move away from consumerism/reconnect with nature. • It is desirable to move away from consumerism/reconnect with nature. **That allotments are a practical way of moving away from consumerism/reconnecting with nature eg** • People who have allotments may buy less food from the supermarkets. • People do not already adjust their diets to the seasons. • People eat the food they grow on their allotments and don't sell it. • People grow fruit and vegetables on their allotments rather than flowers. • Allotments can provide food all year round. **2 marks** For a less precise statement of the assumption (too general, too strong) eg • *Everyone* will take up the opportunity to reconnect with nature. • People will *only* consume the food they grow and not buy *any* food from supermarkets. • Allotments can provide a *wide* range of food all year round.	**[3]**	Ideally candidates will focus on **either** the gap between the strength of the "will" of helping people move away and the "can" of reconnecting, which is only a possibility **or** the balance between allotment-grown and supermarket-bought food. *** Do not credit** "Allotments are the **only** way to move away from consumerism" etc (ie there may be other ways).

Section A – The Language of reasoning				
Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
			1 mark For the essence of an assumption expressed as a challenge eg • Just because people are given allotments, it doesn't mean that they won't still buy unseasonable foods from a supermarket. **0 marks** For rephrasing or repeating the photograph caption or for no credit-worthy material.		

Section A – The Language of reasoning				
Question		**Expected Answer**	**Mark**	**Guidance**
5		**Suggest <u>one</u> reason of your own to support a possible claim that it is more difficult to grow your own food on an allotment than in your own garden. You must give <u>only</u> a reason and not add other argument elements.** **3 marks** For a reason that relates specifically to a **difficulty on an allotment/ease of a garden** eg • You may have to travel to an allotment. • You may have to travel further to an allotment (than to your garden). • You may have to carry your tools a long way to the allotment. • It is easier for thieves to steal from an allotment. • The scale of the commitment to allotment growing is more demanding. **2 marks** For a reason that focuses upon **growing your own food in general** eg • Growing your own food requires a lot of knowledge about plants. **1 mark** For an answer that goes beyond a reason eg an argument, or includes extra argument elements (eg an example) eg • Growing your own food requires a lot of knowledge about plants such as potatoes. • You may have to travel a long way to your allotment, whereas your garden is next to your house. (ie joint reasoning) **0 marks** For no credit-worthy material. For a reason that is derived from the passage: • You may have to wait a long time to get an allotment.	**[3]**	"Growing your own food on an allotment is not an easy task because….." or "because" can lead into a reason worth 3 marks and should not be penalised. *** Full reason** The reason must be written in full and not in note form, eg 'You have to travel further to an allotment' (correct), NOT 'travel further to allotment' (in note form) *** A comparative element** is **not** necessary, eg longer, easier, more, further. *** Incorrect knowledge** Credit incorrect knowledge or assumptions about allotments, eg that they are smaller than gardens. *** Linked words** Expressions which link together two single words, such as "time *and* care", should not be treated as two separate reasons.

Section A – The Language of reasoning				
Question		**Expected Answer**	**Mark**	**Guidance**
6	**(a)** **(b)**	**Consider the argument presented in <u>paragraph 6</u> of <u>Document 1</u>. Assess how strongly the reasoning gives support to the conclusion that "allotment-grown food is the best way to eat locally." You should make <u>two</u> developed points that refer directly to the links between the reasoning and the conclusion**. Credit as follows for up to two points made: **3 marks** For a correct point of assessment that focuses directly upon a link between the reasoning and the conclusion, either **best** and/or **locally**, eg • Just because there are advantages to allotment-grown food, doesn't mean that it is the *best* way to eat *locally.* The allotment growers haven't explained how it compares to other locally-grown produce, such as food grown in your own garden or food from local markets. • The reason that you save the fossil fuels means it is the *best* way to eat because there is less CO2 emitted which helps the environment. • It assumes that the *chemical input* in allotments is less than that in conventional agriculture, to make the claim that allotment-grown food is the *best* way to eat locally. • It assumes *growing your own* is the same as *allotment-grown food,* to make the claim that allotment-grown food specifically is the *best* way to eat *locally.* These delicate fruits could be grown in your own garden. **2 marks** For a correct point which assesses the reasoning, without any reference to the link between it and the conclusion about allotment-grown food being the best way to eat locally. Or for a weak assessment of how the reasoning links with the conclusion where the assessment is not clear • The author conflates home-grown produce with allotment-grown food. • Saving fossil fuels is a good thing because it produces less CO2.	**[2x3]**	For Q6, enter a mark out of 6, (a) out of 3, (b) out of 3. Indicate with ticks (✓) at the end of (a) and (b) to show how many marks allocated to each sub-question. *** Circling 'Strong link'/'Weak link'** Do not credit marks for the circling itself. This simply indicates whether the answer is intended to indicate strength or weakness. 3 mark answer: clear and needs no interpretation. 2 mark answer: gaps in the answer need to be filled by examiner.

Section A – The Language of reasoning					
Question			**Expected Answer**	**Mark**	**Guidance**
			1 mark For correctly identifying relevant reasoning without assessing it or assessing it wrongly. • Because you are saving the fossil fuels (means that eating locally is the best thing to do). (paraphrase which identifies relevant reasoning) • It is picked at the peak of ripeness. **0 marks** For no credit-worthy material.		
			Section A Total	**[35]**	

Section B – Credibility				
Question		**Expected Answer**	**Mark**	**Guidance**
7	**(a)** **(b)**	**Assess the credibility of <u>Document 3</u> from www.kent.gov.uk. You should make <u>two</u> points. Each point should identify and use a relevant credibility criterion to assess the credibility of the document and support this with reference to the text.** **Award up to 3 marks for each correct answer:** **1 mark** **For correct understanding of the** credibility criterion **selected, even if the assessment is either incorrect <u>or</u> inadequately justified eg** 　*www.kent.gov.uk* should have the necessary **expertise** *(credibility criterion ✓)* to be able to identify what needs to be tackled and what can be tackled *(weak attempt to justify relevance).* **1 mark** Additional mark for a **correct assessment with adequate justification.** 　*www.kent.gov.uk* should have the necessary expertise *(credibility criterion ✓)* to be able to identify what needs to be tackled and what can be tackled **because of their expertise of handling the problem in their area** *(justified assessment ✓).* **1 mark** Additional mark where a relevant assessment (even if inadequately justified) is supported by a **relevant reference to the text.** 　***www.kent.gov.uk** (relevant reference ✓)* should have the necessary expertise *(credibility criterion ✓)* to be able to identify what needs to be tackled and what can be tackled because of their expertise of handling the problem in their area *(justified assessment ✓).* NB This reference mark may still be awarded even if the assessment is too weak to be given the second mark. **0 marks** For an irrelevant or inaccurate point/no credit-worthy material.	**[2x3]**	For Q7, enter a mark out of 6, (a) out of 3, (b) out of 3. Indicate with ticks (✓) where single marks have been allocated. *** Reference to text** ● Credit any reference to Kent/government/ council as a reference to the whole document and not as a source within the document. ● This need not be in quotation marks. ● It does not need to be a sentence - a relevant phrase or term may be adequate to support an assessment. ● This needs to be relevant to the assessment made. *** An assessment of a source within the document** can only gain 1 mark for a correct criterion identified. However if the individual source is used as an example to assess the credibility of the whole document, it can access all three marks eg "The credibility of Document 3 is increased by its use of the expertise of WRAP because ………." *** Credibility criteria** Credit only RAVEN criteria, **not corroboration**. (N – neutrality, includes its opposite, bias.) *** Repetition of a credibility criterion** can only be credited if a different

Section B – Credibility					
Question			**Expected Answer**	**Mark**	**Guidance**
			Examples of answers that would each gain **3 marks**: **Ability to perceive** *Kent district councils* should have first-hand ability to perceive what causes the problems that need to be tackled because of their involvement with local food wastage. **Reputation** *www.kent.gov.uk* has a self-acclaimed worldwide reputation as the *Garden of England* so it might make accurate claims in order to maintain this positive reputation. **Vested interest** *www.kent.gov.uk* might have a vested interest to give support to any campaign that would bring additional support to its website and area.		assessment is made in relation to the criterion, eg vested interest that weakens and a different assessment of VI that strengthens credibility, eg to protect their public image. *** Use of bias and vested interest** If candidates choose both, they can only be credited once if the same material is used twice. *** The name of www.kent.gov.uk** can only be credited as a reference to the text if it directly relates to the assessment. See example given for Expertise.
8	(a)	(i) (ii)	**Consider the different figures given about food waste in <u>Documents 2 and 3</u>. Identify the <u>two</u> pieces of data that are inconsistent with each other.** **2 marks** Both pieces of data correctly identified. **1 mark** One piece of data correctly identified. • the average UK household needlessly throws away 18% of all food purchased and families with children throw away 27%. (Candidates may quote **all** or **either half** of this piece of data.) • around a third of all the food bought in the UK ends up being thrown away.	**[2x1]**	For Q8(a), enter a mark out of 2, (i) out of 1, (ii) out of 1. Indicate with ticks (✓) at the end of (i) and (ii) to show how many marks allocated to each sub-question. *** Paraphrase** which does not distort the author's meaning can be credited. *** Source** No source is required for this answer. There are no other possible answers (do not accept 6.7 million tonnes as a substitute for a third).

Section B – Credibility				
Question		**Expected Answer**	**Mark**	**Guidance**
8	(b)	**Explain why the figures might be different in the two documents.** **2 marks** For a correct assessment that is explained eg • *www.kent.gov.uk* might have had a vested interest to round up the higher figure from 27% to a third, in order to draw public attention to the severity of the situation about food wastage. • It is plausible that both claims might be true, because the higher figure might include wastage of food at the supermarket which becomes unsuitable for sale before it reaches the shelf. • The survey in Document 3 could have included Scotland and Northern Ireland, where habits about food wastage may be different. • The survey in Document 3 could have counted food that had gone rotten in addition to food thrown away that was still edible, and the survey in Document 2 only counted food "needlessly" thrown away, which would increase the percentage in Document 3. **1 mark** For a correct assessment that is stated eg • *www.kent.gov.uk* might have exaggerated the figures. • It could be two different surveys. • Figures in Document 3 might include Scotland and Northern Ireland. • Figures in Document 3 might include supermarket food waste. • The sample size could be different. **0 marks** For no credit-worthy material.	[2]	There is no other data that are inconsistent with each other apart from those given in the answer to 8(a). There is therefore no need to credit explanations why other figures might be different.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance

9	(a)	(i)
		(ii)
		(iii)
		
		(b) (i)
		(ii)
		(iii)
			Assess the credibility of one claim made by the <u>Africa Research Institute</u> in paragraph 3 and one claim made by <u>Rosie Boycott</u> in paragraph 5 of Document 1.
			
			Apply <u>two</u> credibility criteria to explain how these may strengthen or weaken the credibility of the selected claim.
			
			• **Claim:**
			1 mark
			For a reasonably accurate statement of the claim.
			eg: "We also have a host of enthusiastic gardeners who are well equipped to turn these spaces into thriving allotments growing healthy food."
			
			0 marks
			For an incorrect statement of the claim.
			
			• **Assessment of each point:** (two points for each source)
			2 marks
			For an accurate point that **assesses the person in relation to an aspect of their claim**
			by applying a relevant credibility criterion.
			eg: "As a newly appointed Chair and a former newspaper editor she may have a vested interest to make positive claims about such a scheme to make it sound as if **the new initiative that she has launched will work**."
			
			Or 1 mark
			For an accurate point that **assesses the person** without reference to an aspect of their claim
			by applying a relevant credibility criterion.
			eg: "As a newly appointed Chair and a former newspaper editor she may **have a vested interest to make truthful claims in order to protect her position**."
			
			An additional 1 mark
			For a correct point of assessment (whether weak or strong) that **explicitly**
				[2x7]	For Q9(a) and Q9(b), enter a mark out of 7; (i) out of 1, (ii) out of 3, (iii) out of 3. Indicate with ticks (✓) where individual marks have been allocated.
					
					* Claim
					• Following an **incorrect** claim, credit a maximum of 1 mark, if a correct understanding of the credibility criterion has been demonstrated.
					• Following a **missing** claim
					  Either credit a maximum of 1 mark, if a correct understanding of the credibility criterion has been demonstrated
					  Or credit according to the 3 marks available, if the candidate refers to the correct claim in a correct answer.
					• **For the second mark in the assessment**, there must be an explicit reference to the claim (this may be brief, eg 'the scheme/ project')/or what is implied by the claim.
					
					* Credibility Criteria
					• Credit only RAVEN criteria, **not corroboration**. (N – neutrality, includes its opposite, bias.)
					• No mark can be credited in this question for the **understanding** of the credibility criterion if it is incorrectly applied.
					• **Repetition** of a credibility criterion can only be credited if a different

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
	(a)	(i)	**indicates** whether this **strengthens or weakens** the claim. *eg:* "As a newly appointed Chair and a former newspaper editor she may have a vested interest to make positive claims about such a scheme to make it sound as if the new initiative that she has launched will work. **This would weaken the credibility of her claim**." (Total: 3 marks) *eg:* "As a newly appointed Chair and a former newspaper editor she may have a vested interest to make truthful claims in order to protect her position. **This would weaken the credibility of her claim.**" (Total: 2 marks) **0 marks** For an irrelevant or inaccurate assessment/no credit-worthy material. • **Africa Research Institute** Claim: eg "To suggest that this shouldn't happen is to penalise a globally competitive African industry for the carbon footprint of European holidaymakers." Accept "has published a report praising Kenya's fruit and vegetable industry for its environment-friendly carbon footprint" or a version of this. Do not accept "Flying food in from Kenya may also be greener than we think" as this is the author's comment.		assessment is made in relation to the criterion, eg vested interest that weakens, and an alternate assessment of VI that strengthens credibility. • If candidates choose **both bias and vested interest**, they can only be credited if the same material is not used twice. For correct use see below in adjacent column. * **Synonyms** of strengthen or weaken should be credited, eg *"increases credibility".* Accept *"positive/negative credibility", "strong/weak", "credible/not credible".*
		(ii) (iii)	Example of assessments that would each gain **3** marks: **Reputation/Vested Interest** As an institute with professionalism to maintain, it might have a vested interest to make an accurate assessment of the African industry as globally competitive. This would strengthen the credibility of its claim. **Neutrality** As a London-based institute, it might have nothing to gain from exaggerating the merits of the African industry. This would strengthen the credibility of its claim of a globally competitive African industry.		

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
			Vested Interest As an organisation interested in Africa, it may have a vested interest to blame tourists for the damage and promote the economic industry of Kenya. This would weaken their claim of a globally competitive African industry. **Expertise/Experience/Ability to Perceive** As an institute it should have expertise to understand how Africa performs within the global market. This would strengthen the credibility of its claim.		
(b)	**(i)**		• **Rosie Boycott** Claim: eg "We also have a host of enthusiastic gardeners who are well equipped to turn these spaces into thriving allotments growing healthy food." Accept other claims made by Rosie Boycott.		
	(ii) **(iii)**		Example of assessments that would each gain **3** marks: **Reputation/Vested Interest** As an advisor to the mayor of London she might have a vested interest to preserve her professionalism by making an accurate claim about those who could make good use of the scheme. This would strengthen the credibility of her claim. **Expertise/Experience/Ability to Perceive** As a newly appointed Chair and a former newspaper editor she may not have the experience required to accurately assess the extent of ability of those who could make good use of the scheme. This would weaken the credibility of her claim.		

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance

10	**Write a reasoned case coming to a judgement as to whether replacing air-freighted food by home-grown produce from allotments is likely to be a practical way of reducing the UK's carbon footprint. You should assess:**
	
	• **the relative credibility of both sides giving their views in <u>Document 1</u> about air-freighted food and the extended use of allotments to reduce the UK's carbon footprint;**
	
	• **the relative plausibility (likelihood) that reducing food wastage will have a more immediate impact than extending the use of allotments.**
	
	Your answer should include sustained comparisons within each of these tasks and must refer to the material within the documents.
	
	In this question there are four areas:
	    Two issues of credibility;
	    and two issues of plausibility.
	
	For each of the four areas, the assessment could be strong, weak or not covered.
	
	See the grid below:
		[16]	Credit marks relating to the precise credibility/plausibility issues specified in the grid.

Credibility Allotments	**Credibility Air freight**
Strong | Weak | Not covered	Strong | Weak | Not covered
Plausibility Allotments	**Plausibility Reduce food wastage**
Strong | Weak | Not covered	Strong | Weak | Not covered

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
	Level 3 11-16 marks **Strong, relative, sustained assessment** All **4** areas are covered and at least **3** are strong. **12 marks** **3** areas are covered and all **3** are strong. **11 marks** Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following: • Direct points of comparison are made. • Clear and explicit judgement is drawn from an assessment of **both** credibility and plausibility. • **Effective** reference is made to the material in the documents in all areas covered. • **Effective** use is made of specialist terms and argument indicator words. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are accurate. **Level 2 6-10 marks** **Partial or weak assessment** **3 or more** areas are covered and **2** are strong. **7 marks** **2** areas are covered and **2** are strong. **6 marks** Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following: • Explicit judgement that relates to a partial assessment. • Limited use is made of the material in the documents. • Grammar, spelling and punctuation are adequate with correct use of specialist terms. **Level 1 1-5 marks** **Basic assessment** **1** or more areas are covered but only **1** is strong. **1 mark** **1** or more areas are covered but **none** are strong. **0 marks** Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following: • The points are connected. • A judgement is implied. • Reference to the names of the sources is made. • Grammar, spelling and punctuation do not impede understanding. **NB** Where candidates do not cover **any** of the four areas, they cannot access any of the four bullet points.		*** Credibility** **Strong credibility** eg *"The side that claims that allotments are the way to reduce the UK's carbon footprint includes claims from the Archbishop of Canterbury and Rosie Boycott, both of whom have a vested interest to represent the effectiveness of allotments accurately in order to protect their professionalism and public standing."* Characteristics of 'strong': Source**s** within the issue are identified **AND** Credibility is explained for at least one source and there is at least reference to a second source. **Weak credibility** eg *"The side that claims that allotments are the way to reduce the UK's carbon footprint includes claims from Rosie Boycott, who has a vested interest".* Characteristics of 'weak': One source is identified instead of sources on a side **AND** credibility is identified but not explained. **OR** A number of sources are identified with no assessment of the credibility criteria identified. **BONUS:** **Credit a bonus of 2 marks** where a candidate assesses the credibility of only

Question	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
	0 marks For no credit-worthy material. Answers might include **some** of the following comparisons: **The relative credibility of both sides giving their views about the extended use of allotments to reduce the carbon footprint.** eg Vested interest The side that claims that extending allotments will be an effective solution has both neutrality and a vested interest to exaggerate the support for it. The Archbishop probably has no vested interest to misrepresent the use of allotments other than to combat climate change, **as** he will gain little from the recommendation and will face possible criticism. **However**, the Chair of London Food may have a vested interest to present the extended use of allotments positively, **as** it is an initiative that she has introduced, *'launched the Capital Growth project'* and **so** will need to present it in its best light. Additionally, the allotment growers might have a vested interest to promote the merits of allotments, in order to make what they do look effective in the eyes of the public. **However** the other side **also** appears to have vested interest, this time to discredit the recommendation. The director of the aviation lobby group will have a vested interest to protect the financial interests of that industry. Also, although the Africa Research Institute is *'London-based'*, standing outside the needs of the economy of Africa, it is likely that the Institute will want to protect this where it can. It **thus** appears that there is a <u>higher degree</u> of possible vested interest that might be influencing the claims expressed by those against the recommendation.		one person on one side **AND** includes a correct answer that applies more than one credibility criterion with developed assessments. The bonus may be added to both sides of credibility where the above type of assessment is made. The bonus needs to be added after the level and bullet points have been added. This may take the mark beyond the initial level given. *** Plausibility** **Strong Plausibility** Reference to the text with developed original thought, ie: Completely new thoughts **or** a development of thoughts prompted by the text **or** a synthesis of different parts of the text, using these to make a reasoned argument. **Weak Plausibility** Merely restating parts of the text. **Partial Performance Mark** If candidates mistakenly discuss the plausibility of air freight instead of the plausibility of reducing food wastage, this can credited as weak coverage.

Question			Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
			The relative plausibility (likelihood) that reducing food wastage will have a more immediate impact than extending the use of allotments. **If** the government can put in measures to reduce overbuying and food wastage, (**like** changing the multi-pack offers, banning Buy One Get One Free offers and offering smaller portions on sale for couples or those catering just for themselves), **then** they might stand a greater chance of success at *'removing one-fifth of the traffic from the UK's roads' 'to protect the environment'*, **because** it is not left so much to the will of the people to change their lifestyles. **Whereas** relying on people to grow their own food will depend on many having the will to take up a change in lifestyle to adjust *'their diets to the seasons'*. **However** reducing food wastage may be <u>equally</u> difficult to achieve **if** busy lifestyles prevent people planning their meals ahead and sticking to the menus for the week. In which case allotments might be the better option, **as** people would be growing food locally and have flexibility for the week's meals **and** be reducing *'lorries transporting goods to supermarkets'* at the same time. **Thus** the success of the extended allotment scheme seems more credible than it is plausible, **as** its success would depend on the will of many people to radically change their lifestyles.		
			Section B Total	**[40]**	
			Paper Total	**[75]**	

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance
programme your call may be recorded or monitored