

Version 1.1: 0810



**General Certificate of Education  
June 2010**

**CRITICAL THINKING**

**CRIT1**

**Unit 1      Critical Thinking Foundation Unit**

***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 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.

# Critical Thinking Mark Scheme

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

# Unit 1 Critical Thinking Foundation Unit

## Section A

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
<p><b>Questions 1 and 2 refer to the online discussion in Document A.</b></p>					
1(a)	<p><b>Patrick believes that it is a bad idea for newspapers to be entirely funded by advertising.</b></p> <p><b>Identify the reasons he gives.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p>(Because) In an economic recession, companies are less prepared to spend money on advertising</p> <p>We don't want the newspapers to have to cut back on the news just because they have less money coming in</p> <p>[1] for each of the above (or suitable paraphrasing)</p>		2		
1(b)	<p><b>Identify <u>one</u> implicit assumption Patrick makes.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p>The following are examples of correct answers:</p> <p>(The) News costs money / The news is (one of) the more / most expensive costs / Newspapers will (be prepared to) cut back on news if their advertising revenue declines / if companies cut back on advertising this will include advertising in newspapers (eg. Not just television / radio).</p> <p>(Not that advertising is the only / primary source of revenue; this is what Reader 1 proposes, and what Reader 2 argues / explains as not desirable)</p> <p>For clear, precise articulation of an implicit assumption [2] For unclear / imprecise expression [1]</p>		2		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
2	<p><b>Safia gives an analogy to support the claim that ‘Just because the news is online doesn’t mean it has to be free’.</b></p> <p><b>How much support does the analogy provide? Explain your answer. (4 marks)</b></p> <p>The analogy is a good one in that it shows that the internet isn’t necessarily free. Therefore it provides some support for the claim. [ 1–2]</p> <p>Also, the argument is saying that it doesn’t <i>have</i> to be free, not that it <i>will</i> or <i>won’t</i> be free; the weaker conclusion makes the argument / analogy stronger (and the support perhaps even ‘good’) [1–2]</p> <p>Candidates could also argue that music costs money to make, but facts also have a cost – to this extent the analogy is again a good / relevant one [1–2] However, the music industry is still losing lots of money / fewer people buy music (and there is often talk about the death of the record industry etc) [1–2]</p> <p>Also news is different to music in that music is under copyright but information is, in this sense at least, free / costs are different in obtaining information and producing music [1–2] On the basis of the differences between the things being compared, candidates are entitled to judge that the analogy / the support it provides is weak / minimal (even perhaps ‘no support’) [1–2]</p> <p>The pleasure / entertainment music gives plus the desire to listen to some songs again and again will lead to a lot more iTune sales than sales of internet news. People wont pay to have the same news repeated again and again (1– 2)</p> <p>Candidate doesn’t need to give a balanced, middle-of-the-road response to get all 4 marks.</p>			4	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
<b>Questions 3 to 6 refer to Document B.</b>					
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Look closely at the first section of the dialogue:</b></p> <p><b>SAM</b> You should get a proper paper, not that freebie rubbish.</p> <p><b>JACK</b> Why?</p> <p><b>SAM</b> It's all celebrity gossip! The only real news is stuff they've got second hand.</p> <p><b>JACK</b> Who cares where they get it from? Anyway all papers get some of their news second hand.</p> <p><b>SAM</b> Yes, but unless there are people finding out real news somewhere, there won't be any news at all!</p>				
<b>3(a)</b>	<p><b>What is Sam's conclusion?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(1 mark)</i></p> <p>You should get a proper paper (not that freebie rubbish) [1]</p> <p>Accept, 'you should read a proper paper' or 'you shouldn't read freebie rubbish'.</p> <p>Accept any responses which notice the erratum discrepancy <b>between</b> source document B 'get' and Q3 'read'.</p>		<b>1</b>		
<b>3(b)</b>	<p><b>Identify <u>two</u> reasons that Sam gives in support.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(2 marks)</i></p> <p>Candidates could choose any of the three claims he offers:</p> <p>It's all celebrity gossip!</p> <p>The only real news is stuff they've got second hand.</p> <p>(Yes, but) Unless there are people finding out real news somewhere, there won't be any news at all!</p> <p>Candidates may feel that the first two claims boil down to one reason, i.e. that: There is no / a lack of 'real' news (and instead merely celebrity gossip) [1] for each of the above (or suitable paraphrasing)</p>		<b>2</b>		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
3(c)	<p><b>Identify either <u>one</u> value judgement or <u>one</u> general principle that underlies his reasoning.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p>There are several contenders, the most obvious being:</p> <p>That (real) news is important</p> <p>Or: That we need to protect / fund the finding out of the (real) news</p> <p>There is also the implied view, in response to Jack's rhetorical question, that it <i>matters</i> where that newspaper, or newspapers in general, get their news from / or that it is a <i>bad</i> thing for newspapers to just get their news second hand</p> <p>He also assumes that you shouldn't care (so much) / (want to) read about celebrities / celebrity gossip; or that celebrities are not worthy of 'real' news</p> <p>For clear, precise articulation [2]</p> <p>For unclear / imprecise expression [1]</p>		2		
3(d)	<p><b>Identify and explain <u>two</u> examples of persuasive language in this first part of the dialogue.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(4 marks)</b></p> <p>Candidates may select 'proper', 'real news' as being leading language / begging the question; 'freebie rubbish' could be seen as emotive / pejorative; also 'celebrity <i>gossip</i>' – suggests is all (necessarily) trivial, when could be more serious news / just because celebrities does not mean 'gossip'!</p> <p>Jack's use of a rhetorical question, 'Who cares...?', tending to belittle the idea that it matters where the news comes from, and totally dismissing the view of his opponent, who obviously cares.</p> <p>1 mark for each correct identification and 1 mark for each explanation.</p> <p>If a candidate identifies the wrong language / word as persuasive, but gives a reasonable explanation in each case which shows they understand how persuasive language is intended to emotionally pressure an opponent, then ½ mark for each one (total = 1). If only one such explanation then ½ becomes 0.</p>		4		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
4	<p><b>On two occasions Jack accuses Sam of putting forward a slippery slope argument. How fair is <u>each</u> of these accusations?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(6 marks)</b></p> <p>First case: No. People finding out the news somewhere is arguably a necessary condition for there being any news! (1–2)</p> <p>Second case: Also a necessary condition for democracy to function well for the citizens to be informed / politicians not to be able to control what we read / hear; perhaps conclusion that there would be no democracy is a little too strong, therefore candidates could judge that the argument is a little slippery, but that the conclusion does partly follow. (1–2)</p> <p>There is also a case for the second argument being more slippery as a result of Sam’s possible over-statement of this case (‘totally powerless’, ‘whole democracy would fall apart’). (1)</p> <p>Democracy might be transformed not fall apart. For example, information is disseminated by citizen journalism or new media and political parties. Party membership could increase and re-invigorate democracy. Such information sources would have vested interests but then so do our newspapers (tend to be party affiliated). Sam also forgets BBC licence fee funded. (1–2)</p> <p>In each case candidates should be credited for: recognising where the possible slipperiness lies; explaining whether or not the criticism is justified Award up to maximum of [6]</p> <p>[NB award [1] for showing understanding of what a slippery slope is, even if rest of the answer lacks effectiveness.]</p> <p>½ mark for each correct judgement, i.e. not slippery slope in first one. It is a slippery slope in second one.</p> <p>If only get one of these right, then don’t credit this as 1 mark – BOD (benefit of doubt)</p>			6	



No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
5	<p><b>Jack gives a further criticism of one of Sam’s arguments:</b></p> <p><b>JACK ...And it (your argument) also shows you are very naïve. Everyone knows that journalists make up any old rubbish in order to sell papers. And anyway, you think that newspapers have this noble aim of only telling us the truth? They’re all owned by big powerful companies which have their own political agendas, their own allegiances. They tell us what they want us to hear.</b></p>				
5(a)	<p><b>Identify the implied intermediate conclusion.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p>(That) Newspapers do <i>not</i> have the noble aim of just telling us the truth.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for answers referring to newspapers not telling the truth.</p>		2		
5(b)	<p><b>Is Jack guilty of an unfair ad hominem attack on Sam? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(3 marks)</b></p> <p>Candidates may feel that, in calling Sam naïve, Jack’s argument is guilty of an (unfair) ad hominem attack; however, while it is harsh, this is both <i>supported by</i> argument, and also Jack is responding to Sam’s <i>argument</i>, therefore this is not a fair criticism! (3)</p> <p>Candidates may argue that there is an element of ad hominem, but that it is not unfair (for similar reasons) (1–2)</p> <p>Bare reference to ad hominem and calling Sam naïve = [0 marks]</p> <p>Reference to ad hominem / naïve remark, and saying it’s unfair = [0 marks]</p> <p>Reference to ad hominem / naïve remark, and saying it’s fair/not guilty = [1mark]</p> <p>Reference to ad hominem/naïve, saying it’s fair, and showing / explaining why = [2–3 marks] depending how well this is done. (see first paragraph on this).</p>			3	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
5(c)	<p><b>Explain <u>two</u> other ways in which Jack’s argument might be challenged.</b> <b>(4 marks)</b></p> <p>Jack’s argument relies on an allegation (about journalists) [1] that is clearly massively exaggerated (for rhetorical purposes) [1] (could be said of his view in general that he is being cynical rather than sceptical [1]). Merely pointing out that Jack attacks journalists is not sufficient for a mark.</p> <p>Jack being hypocritical / inconsistent, because he himself produces a naïve / crude argument. (a case of the kettle calling the pot ‘black’) [1]</p> <p>It also uses an Appeal to Popularity in ‘Everyone knows that...’ [1] – this is an irrelevant appeal which does nothing to substantiate the allegation [1]</p> <p>The view put forward about newspapers / journalists / the media is rather simplistic [1] It also relies heavily on assertion/ explicit assumptions about the interests and motives of the big media companies (i.e. no real justification / lack of evidence is given for this viewpoint) [1] ad hominem against the media. [1]</p> <p>In asking, and then arguing against, the rhetorical question ‘You think that newspapers have this noble aim of only telling us the truth?’, Jack is arguably making a straw man of Sam’s position [1] (Explaining why this is likely to be a caricature of Sam’s view: [1])</p> <p>Award up to maximum [4]</p>			4	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
6	<p><b>Consider the following contribution by Jack:</b></p> <p><b>JACK Look. You can't copyright facts, simple as that. If someone gets hold of some piece of news and wants to publish it for free, say on the internet, or in a free paper, perhaps because they want to make some money from advertising, perhaps just because they feel like doing it – whatever – the point is, what's to stop them? You can't make it illegal to publish the facts – that's not exactly caring about democracy! Once you start controlling information in this way then you really are living in some kind of dictatorship!</b></p> <p><b>How successfully does this counter the arguments Sam provides in support of buying newspapers? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(4 marks)</b></p> <p>Any line of response is acceptable.</p> <p>Candidates could question the efficacy of Jack's contribution: a case can be made for it lacking direct relevance to the point Sam is making. Sam is not necessarily saying that no one should be allowed to publish news / the facts for free; just that people need to be paid as an incentive to go fact-finding in the first place. Sam is not saying facts should have copyright.</p> <p>Candidates could question the fairness of Jack's contribution: the distortion of Sam's views could be seen as a straw man, in that Sam has not advocated making free papers illegal; just that people have a (moral / social) duty to pay for a newspaper. Candidates could also flag up a possible appeal to emotion / fear, for example in the connotations of 'controlling information' and 'dictatorship'.</p> <p>They could also consider whether or not Jack himself is on something of a slippery slope: is having some sort of restrictions on free newspapers the same as 'making it illegal to publish the facts'? Is 'controlling information in this way' a sufficient condition for you to be 'living in some kind of dictatorship'? (Candidates will not be able to gain many marks for just raising these questions; they will need to consider the reasons for or against answering 'yes' or 'no' to them.)</p> <p>On a more positive side, the point about not being able to copyright facts is an important one, which does show a genuine problem that Sam's position (the view that people ought to pay for reading the news) faces. (Candidates could refer to Document A to corroborate this: that the inevitability of news becoming free online is something newspapers are having to come to terms with). For this reason, candidates can judge that Jack's contribution is not (entirely) lacking in fairness and / or effectiveness.</p> <p>Award relevant lines of response up to maximum [4]                      [NB while this is an evaluation question, candidates should be credited for recognising that Jack is not presenting an argument here, or at least, if he is, his conclusion is implied]</p>		4		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
<b>Questions 7 to 10 refer to Document C.</b>					
<b>7</b>	<p><b>Identify the author's main conclusion.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p>All those who believe that the news itself really matters / We should promise to buy a national newspaper every day and a local title as frequently as one is published in our neighbourhood. [2]</p> <p>I suggest a new year's resolution. (As an answer, this on its own scores [0]) We should buy a paper [1]</p> <p>News needs to be paid for / funded. (This gets [0] because it's too vague as to the source of the funding. Must refer to people buying papers to get [1])</p>		<b>2</b>		
<b>8</b>	<p><b>Suppose someone were to point out to the author, on reading his argument, that the existence and growth of information technology such as the internet means that information is easier to obtain than it used to be.</b></p>				
<b>8(a)</b>	<p><b>How might this weaken his argument?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p>It would weaken it in that the argument rests on the notion that the fact / information gathering aspect of the journalist's job has got harder / it would make the inference to 'It is becoming difficult for journalists to achieve this ideal' less secure [1–2]</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>It weakens the argument because free and easy internet access undermines the need for finding / paying investigative reporters. [1–2]</p>		<b>2</b>		
<b>8(b)</b>	<p><b>Given what he says in paragraphs 3 to 5, how might the author defend his argument from this objection?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p>The objection is nullified / weakened if it is assumed that internet merely circulates / comments on stuff / does not provide 'new' facts [1–2]</p> <p>NB. Merely repeating phrases from paragraphs 3-5 won't attract marks.</p>		<b>2</b>		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
9	<p><b>In order for paragraph 4 to provide support for his argument, the author is guilty of limiting / restricting the options.</b></p> <p><b>Is this criticism warranted? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(4 marks)</b></p> <p>Yes: there is a straightforward restriction of options (false dichotomy) in the assumption that if news is not funded in the traditional way (ie. paying investigative newspaper reporters), then the <b>only other</b> means of news gathering is the internet,</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>Not getting any quality news at all.</p> <p>However, there may be other possible sources of funding for proper investigative journalism paid for e.g. by advertising, or news by funded TV journalism, or investigative researchers paid for by internet websites.</p> <p>No: because (i) it may be true that these are the only options (ie. quality paid-for news, or no quality news at all – the internet / TV being dismissed by the candidate as second hand news or (ii) that the only options really are newspapers or the internet – TV journalism being dismissed by the candidate as second rate and / or parasitic on newspaper journalism/internet.</p> <p>Clear and balanced argument can get up to (4)</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p>Strong one-sided argument can get up to (4)</p> <p>One-sided argument with adequate support (2–3)</p> <p>One-sided argument and poorly supported (1)</p> <p>Discretionary mark for showing understanding of restricting options – (1–2) Yes / No (0)</p>		2	2	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
10	<p><b>Give your verdict of the strength of the overall argument in Document C, giving a brief explanation for your judgement.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(4 marks)</b></p> <p>Any suitable response ought to be credited.</p> <p>Best responses are likely to note that it is a strong argument; a surprisingly bold-sounding claim is made but the support is good; convincing! [1–2] (especially if applying P.O.C?) [1–2] Assumptions made are not especially debatable [1–2] language is mostly used fairly / rhetoric does not disguise poor reasoning / replace the reasoning, but add witty ‘garnish’ to good points [1–2]. Perhaps there is room to question the exact formulation of the conclusion, but the overall point would essentially remain [1–2] on a more negative angle, the conclusion itself is a bit useless in that it’s very ineffectual – what difference if any would it make if a few thousand readers really did act on it? Candidates could say that the argument is all a bit pointless in this respect...? [1–2]</p>		2	2	
	<b>Section A total 50</b>		21	29	0

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
11	<p><b>‘The news, like healthcare, or education, should be available for free for everyone.’</b></p> <p><b>Write a reasoned argument for or against the above statement.</b></p> <p><b>In answering this question you should:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>state your conclusion (or conclusions) clearly</b></li> <li>• <b>offer effective reasoning to support your conclusion(s)</b></li> <li>• <b>use the information, and respond to issues or arguments, in the source documents.</b></li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(20 marks)</b></p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>There is no right conclusion, but candidates need to take a clear position on the matter (even if the position is qualified in some way).</p> <p>Their position should be recognisable as a conclusion, and be consistent with the reasons / arguments which accompany it. Simply stating a view is not sufficient.</p> <p><b>Reasoning &amp; Use of documents</b></p> <p>Lines of argument / evaluation could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates could present a fruitful discussion of the comparison with healthcare and / or education. They could consider the extent to which the comparison is a good one. They could compare and contrast the issues involved in the provision of each of these things.</li> <li>• The relative importance of each could be considered: candidates could consider the extent to which the news is merely a commodity, or an essential public service. They could argue that the news is intrinsically different; or that the news is just as important; and that if we are to be consistent, it should therefore be treated and funded in a similar way. They could argue that the news is more important than healthcare and education: that a functioning democracy is more important (and a necessary condition for the others).</li> <li>• Candidates could question how accurate it is to say that healthcare and education <i>are</i> in fact free; they could think about possible senses in which they are and are not, and what significance these different interpretations will have on the comparison with the provision of news.</li> </ul>				20

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Candidates could argue that none of them should be free: take a free market approach to the question. (Nothing is intrinsically of value: <i>if</i> we value the news enough we <i>will</i> end up paying for it in some way or another.)</li> <li>• Candidates could explore the practical implications of their position. Should we / the state pay for the news with taxation? Should newspapers be produced by a body like the BBC, funded for by the tax payer? If they think the news should not be free, how (and how much) should it cost? Who should decide? (Market forces?) What about those on e.g. low / no incomes?</li> <li>• Candidates could ask whether, just because something is free, it ends up being valued. Candidates could advance the opposing view: that making healthcare and education (and the news) free means we value it less. (Perhaps some minimal free provision, but if you want any quality you have to pay for it)</li> <li>• Candidates could consider the sense of 'should', and the ethical implications of this term.</li> <li>• Candidates could demonstrate understanding of general principles and how to respond to them; they could point out how most / all general principles admit of exceptions, and that any general principle is hard to establish conclusively. They could consider if there are any counter-examples that might apply, and if so, what their significance is.</li> <li>• Candidates could question the possible vagueness of the claim – what is 'free'? Is the BBC 'free'? Is health / education really <i>free</i>? (Is anything really <i>free</i>?)</li> <li>• Candidates may want to consider the significance of principled statements when the situation is one of practical reality. What is the point / purpose of saying we ought to do X when it seems inevitable (for economic reasons / forces, that no individual can change or is responsible for) that X will not / cannot occur?</li> </ul> <p>[NB Candidates will receive limited credit for just repeating arguments or views present in the source documents; they need to either extend / develop the points further, or critique them in some way]</p>				



**GENERIC MARKING GUIDE, Question 11**

	<b>Award Level</b>		
<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Good response</b> Criteria well met. Communication is clear and appropriate.	<b>Reasonable response</b> Criteria partially met. Communication is mostly clear and appropriate.	<b>Limited response</b> Criteria barely met. Communication errors may impede understanding.
<b>Conclusion</b> A conclusion is clearly stated that is consistent with the reasoning, and directly responds to the question.	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Reasons / Lines of Reasoning</b> The above conclusion is well supported with reasons, contributory arguments, examples, clarification of terms. Counter-arguments considered and replied to.	<b>9 – 11</b>	<b>5 – 8</b>	<b>1 – 4</b>
<b>Use of source documents</b> Candidate has engaged critically with source material.	<b>5 – 6</b>	<b>3 – 4</b>	<b>1 – 2</b>

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

<b>AO Balance</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Total Section B</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Total Section A</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>-</b>
<b>Total Paper 1: [70]</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>20</b>