



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **Critical Thinking 1771**

## **CRIT 2**

## **Unit 2 Information, Inference, Explanation**

# **Mark Scheme**

*2010 examination - January series*

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

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

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

Copyright © 2010 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 2 Information, Inference, Explanation

### Section A

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
<b>Questions 1 to 4 refer to Document A</b>					
1 (a)	<p><b>What does the author infer from his claim, in paragraph 2, that London is <i>not</i> the ‘safest city on the planet’?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(1 mark)</b></p>		1		
	That CCTV cameras are not very effective; OR that conventional wisdom is wrong (in predicting otherwise)				
1 (b)	<p><b>Identify the two explanations he uses to support the inference.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(2 marks)</b></p>		2		
	Cameras have technological limitations: they can only look in one direction etc. [1] Criminals know this / are adaptive and can move elsewhere [1]				
2	<p><b>In paragraph 4 the author concedes, without explanation, that cameras are effective in reducing car-crime in car-parks.</b></p> <p><b>What might explain this apparent exception to the alleged ineffectiveness of cameras?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(2 marks)</b></p>		2		
	e.g. Car-parks are defined areas which the cameras can cover effectively / completely. Each camera can be allocated a group of cars [1–2]. Car-thieves are likely to avoid a well-lit car park with lots of cameras and go elsewhere, reducing crime in the car-park itself. [1–2].				
3	<p><b>In paragraphs 3 and 4 it is alleged that cameras do little more than move crime from one place to another.</b></p> <p><b>If this is a fact, how could it weaken the claims that cameras are ineffective and ‘a waste of money to the community’?</b></p> <p><b>Give one or more supporting reasons.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(3 marks)</b></p>			3	
	If the cameras move crime on to the store next door then <i>prima facie</i> they must be effective. [1–2] It could be argued that if all the stores had cameras criminals would eventually have nowhere to rob, and / or that it is therefore the lack of enough cameras that is the real problem, not the existence of some. [1–2]				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	NB Some candidates say (instead or as well) that since the stores are paying for the cameras it is not a waste of money <i>to the community</i> . This is partially relevant, as it is arguably a weakness in the reasoning. (If instead) [1]				
4	<b>Identify two examples of an appeal to fear or emotion in the article, and assess their relevance and effectiveness for the argument as a whole. (3 marks)</b>		2	1	
	<p>Paragraphs 5 and 6 make the reference to ‘abuse and Orwellian effects on privacy and civil liberty’, and ‘police-state surveillance technologies ... for China.’ Some candidates may add that the prediction that cameras will be too small to notice is an appeal to fear. Another example that could be given is ‘cameras are everywhere’. Another is the photograph and its caption. [2]</p> <p>It could be said that factors add to an overall opposition to cameras, and alert the reader to their ‘costs’ But given that the author’s main argument has been targeted at the ineffectiveness of cameras, the appeals are arguably irrelevant / mere rhetoric; OR that they are about the abuse of cameras rather than their effectiveness or otherwise. [+1]</p> <p>+ Waste of money eg taxpayers could be an appeal to emotion (just)</p> <p>+ there will always be such places – for criminals to move on to</p>				
<b>Questions 5 to 7 refer to Documents B and C and the data in the accompanying table and graphs (Figure 1 to Figure 3). Assume that the data is reliable.</b>					
5	<b>Assess the adequacy of the available evidence for each of the following assertions.</b>				
5(a)	<b>If the head of Viido at New Scotland Yard is correct (Document B), fewer than 6000 crimes were solved using CCTV in 2007. (2 marks)</b>		1	1	
	<p>There is strong support: the total number of cleared-up crimes is 193,467, 3% of which is 5804. OR (by approximation), 3% of 200,000, is 6000, (and 193,467 is less than 200,000). [1–2]</p> <p>The figures are for London only and not national. [1]</p>				

Question		AO:	1	2	3
5(b)	<b>Having fewer cameras leads to more vigilant policing.</b>  (2 marks)		1	1	
	This cannot be reliably inferred. There is evidence that some boroughs solve crime successfully without large numbers of cameras, and one explanation for this could be that the police in these boroughs are more vigilant, but there is no evidence for a causal connection between the two correlates; or in other words that more vigilant policing is <i>the</i> (causal) explanation.				
5(c)	<b>“There is no link between a high number of CCTV cameras and a better crime clear-up rate.” (Liberal Democratic policing spokeswoman, quoted in Document C)</b>  (2 marks)		1	1	
	A line of best fit on Figure (3) would be almost flat, indicating that there is no appreciable correlation between numbers of cameras and clear-up rate, i.e. the percentage of crimes solved. Therefore there is good evidence for the spokeswoman’s assertion. [1–2]  + Document B states that four out of five boroughs with most cameras have records of solving crime that are below average				
5(d)	<b>In general, the boroughs with fewer than the median average number of cameras are at least as successful at solving cases as those with more than the median average number of cameras.</b>  (3 marks)		2	1	
	The assertion is fully supported. The median falls between boroughs 16 and 17 in the list. Boroughs 1–16 include 6 with above-average clear-up rates, the best being 24% Boroughs 17–32 have 8 with above-average or average rates, including one with more than 25%. [1–3] Must get correct figures for 3 marks.  Alternatively the average of the lower and higher halves of the table could be compared – 21.6% and 20.1% respectively – with the same conclusion.				
6	<b>On the strength of the information and data available, especially Figure 2, is it safe to say that CCTV has played no part in the reduction of crime?</b>  (4 marks)		1	3	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>Figure (ii) suggests that crime levels actually increase with the number of cameras, which would superficially support the claim. [1]</p> <p>However, there is no data to indicate whether the crime levels in the boroughs would have been even higher without the cameras. It is possible, too, that cameras have been installed in larger numbers <i>in response</i> to higher than usual crime figures, which would account for the correlation without supporting the claim. Arguably the claim (that CCTV has played no part whatsoever...) is too strong for the evidence available. [1–3]</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
7	<p><b>Which side of the debate are the photograph of the pickpocket and its caption meant to support, and how successful are they in giving support?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(3 marks)</b></p>		1	2	
	<p>Given the context, the photo and caption are almost certainly supporting the view that cameras are ineffective / unhelpful. [1]</p> <p>Seen from one perspective, this is not a successful device since it clearly shows a crime being committed. If anything it demonstrates that cameras <i>can</i> be effective. The fact that not all / most images are not as helpful does not detract from the usefulness of this and others like it. [1–2]</p> <p>On the other hand, whilst the image shows a crime being committed, it does not show the face of the pick-pocket clearly enough for identification. Interpreted more charitably the caption could be understood to say: ‘If most images are not <i>even</i> as helpful as this one, then they are not very effective.’</p> <p>On this reading the photo and caption are more successful. [1–2]</p>				
<p><b>Question 8 relates to Document D and the extract in the footnote.</b></p>					
8(a)	<p><b>Explain two of the rhetorical or journalistic devices that the author uses in the text and accompanying street map.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(4 marks)</b></p>		2	2	
	<p>E.g. Making a comparison between a frightening, fictional world and the real world now and in the foreseeable future. It is ‘making a point’ by choosing cameras close to Orwell’s former home. OR pointing out the irony of finding that the former home of the inventor of 1984, of Big Brother, the telescreen, ‘thought police’ etc. is now surrounded by so many surveillance cameras. OR repeated use of ‘spy camera’ suggesting a sinister agenda. [2 each]</p>				
8(b)	<p><b>What conclusion does the author of the <i>Evening Standard</i> article seek to support?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(2 marks)</b></p>		2		
	<p>That the nightmare world of ‘1984’ has become a reality, or is mirrored by present reality.</p>				
9	<p><b>‘I’m sick of listening to all you doom-mongers! You’re trying to tell me, because of a few cameras on lamp-posts in your street, that the whole Big Brother nightmare is just around the corner, with every citizen’s movements watched and controlled by invisible agents of the state.</b></p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p><b>Well, I can assure you, it's not. It's the classic slippery-slope argument. Anyway, it would take half the people in the world to watch the other half. And then who would watch the watchers? It's an impossible scenario. Surveillance cameras aren't a menace, they're valuable hi-tech tools in the fight against an ever-growing crime-wave which is the real enemy. If you've nothing to hide, you've nothing to fear.'</b></p> <p><b>Comment critically on the above argument by:</b></p>				
<p><b>9(a)</b></p>	<p><b>Identifying the main conclusion.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>The Big Brother nightmare (with everyone watched etc.) is not just around the corner / not imminent.</p> <p>[1] (with or without the phrase in parenthesis)</p>		1		
<p><b>9(b)</b></p>	<p><b>Giving a brief assessment of the strength of the reasoning.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(6 marks)</b></p>			6	
	<p>Reasons and assessment: (sample answers)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'It's the classic slippery slope argument.' This is a fair point: there is no necessary progression from cameras on lampposts to the 'whole ... nightmare'.</li> <li>• However, it could be said that the author exaggerates or ridicules the (imagined) opponent's claims, e.g. by using language like: '...every citizen's movements watched and controlled by invisible agents of the state'.</li> <li>• In the other direction the author minimises / is unduly dismissive of the threat as 'a few cameras on lamp-posts' and the opponents as 'doom-mongers'.</li> </ul> <p>(NB: Simply saying that the author uses persuasive language / rhetoric is not sufficient for credit here: it must be understood that this in some way distorts the argument.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'It's an impossible scenario.' Arguably a fair point, though again exaggerated. It is not obvious that watching would have to be one-on-one, as suggested, but clearly there would have to be a lot of watchers who in turn would need watching. It is certainly improbable that everyone could be watched all of the time, if that is indeed the opponents' worry.</li> </ul>				



No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="280 297 1257 501">• ‘Surveillance cameras aren’t a menace, they’re valuable hi-tech tools... in the fight against the growing crime-wave which is the real enemy.’ A weak argument, technically a false dichotomy. Cameras could be valuable tools <i>and</i> a menace. The threat of an ‘ever-growing crime wave’ is an unsupported assumption / claim, as is the claim that this is the real enemy.</li> <li data-bbox="280 521 1257 658">• ‘If you’ve nothing to hide, you’ve nothing to fear.’ Again, a dubious assumption, and a sweeping generalisation. It implicitly assumes that no one is or will be wrongly suspected / framed / blackmailed / coerced...; i.e. that the data from the surveillance won’t be abused.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="280 689 884 723">1-2 : 1 or 2 recognisable evaluative comments</p> <p data-bbox="280 757 1062 790">3-4: 2 supported evaluative comments (or 1 well developed)</p> <p data-bbox="280 824 1235 857">5-6: 3 or more well-supported evaluative comments (or 2 well developed)</p>				
	<b>Section A total 40</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>

**SECTION B**

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
10	<p><b>Construct a reasoned case for or against the following statement.</b></p> <p><b>‘Surveillance cameras have no useful purpose and no place in a free and open society’.</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>(30 marks)</b></p>				
	<p>The conclusion should be a clear affirmation or qualification of the above proposition; or a challenge to <i>all or part</i> of the claim. For example some candidates may argue that cameras have a useful purpose but are still a menace; or that they are a menace, but are a price worth paying for fighting crime.</p> <p>Support for the statement, or parts of the statement, could include:</p> <p><b>For the proposition:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• summary of the findings that show the limited effectiveness of CCTV in reducing crime, and solving crimes that have occurred;</li> <li>• comment on the quality of images, lack of supervision;</li> <li>• comment on cost and use of police time to watch cameras instead of being on the beat;</li> <li>• enlargement on the explanations and concerns in DOC A;</li> <li>• comment on the large numbers of cameras, the disproportionate number in the UK, and lack of official figures, suggesting that they are out of control;</li> <li>• comment on the scope for abuse, affront to privacy, danger of misuse by future more extremist governments / agencies – e.g. to control opponents / stifle protest;</li> <li>• introduction of principles re. freedom from intrusion / right to privacy and anonymity;</li> <li>• aesthetic comments on the ugliness, sinister appearance of CCTV (e.g. response to photo in Doc A).</li> </ul>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p><b>Against:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>challenge to the claims of uselessness on grounds that the cameras are effective but need to be used more intelligently;</li> <li>observation that on the occasions when CCTV does work there have been many important arrests: their rarity doesn't make them less important – imagine the Ipswich murderer still at large!</li> <li>observation that the real problems with cameras is that they are <i>not</i> 'everywhere'; if they were, criminals would not just be able to move elsewhere;</li> <li>develop the argument in Q9 that if you have nothing (criminal) to hide cameras are not a threat to freedom and privacy, but a defence of both;</li> <li>suggestion that CCTV may reassure some people, make them feel more secure;</li> <li>balancing of conflicting principles: right to freedom v right to protection from crime.</li> </ul> <p>The above points are examples only of lines that could be taken. It is not an exhaustive list nor a list of requirements. The essays will be marked primarily by application of the generic mark scheme (overleaf) which grades the quality of the reasoning and communication.</p> <p>For higher grades such points would need to be developed with examples, sub-arguments, explanations, justifications etc. Making many cursory points may not score as well as two or three well developed ones.</p> <p>Appropriate use should be made of information in the documents and/or candidate's own knowledge or experience.</p>				
		<b>Total Section A</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>
		<b>Total Section B</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>26</b>
		<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>26</b>

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

Criteria	Award level		
	<b>Good response</b> Criterion thoroughly met, with insightful comments and communication that is clear and appropriate	<b>Reasonable response</b> Criterion partially met with communication that is generally clear and appropriate	<b>Basic response</b> Limited achievement of criterion with communication which may impede understanding
<b>Conclusion</b> A conclusion is clearly stated that is consistent with the reasoning, and directly responds to the question	4	2 – 3	1
<b>Reasoning</b> The above conclusion is well supported with reasons, contributory arguments, examples, clarification of terms, etc.	9 – 12	5 – 8	1– 4
<b>Use of information</b> Relevant references are made to the documents and/or to other relevant information or experience. *	5 – 6	3 – 4	1– 2
<b>Reference to principle</b> One or more general principles are introduced relevant to the arguments.	4	2 – 3	1
<b>Counter-argument</b> Challenges and objections are anticipated and answered effectively.	4	2 – 3	1

\* 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 'good response' (5-6).