

Version 1.1: 0810



**General Certificate of Education
June 2010**

CRITICAL THINKING

CRIT2

Unit 2 Information, Inference, Explanation

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

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 2 Information, Inference, Explanation

Section A

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
Questions 1 to 5 refer to Document A					
1	<p>The author clearly approves of the proposed coastal path.</p> <p>Identify <u>two</u> of the reasons he gives in paragraphs 1 to 3 in support of the path.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(4 marks)</p> <p>Quote from text or paraphrase:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that English people have legal right of access to only half the coastline • that English people have almost no legal right of access to beaches • that other less maritime countries do have access • that even where there are rights of way, they do not join up / run into private property / mean retracing steps. • the difficulty of getting an uninterrupted walk <p>(1 mark if reasoning identified / 2 if clearly summarised)</p>		4		
2	<p>With reference to paragraphs 4 to 7, how justified is the author's claim that the plan to throw open the coast to the public is 'a revolution'?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(3 marks)</p> <p>Since the question is an open one, marks are for the reasons.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is justified because: it is a reversal in the law; it follows in the tradition of the (working class) ramblers campaign / it is a challenge to rich landowners (by or for ordinary people); a response to popular demand • It is an exaggeration / not (fully) justified because: it is only a continuation of a general right to roam act; affects only a minority, namely ramblers; is a government imposed bill, not something won by a revolt or demonstration (like the Kinder Scout trespass) <p>(1–2 marks for a single, relevant but undeveloped reason; 3 marks for two or more relevant reasons, or one developed reason; or for a balanced / qualified answer giving a reason for each side.)</p>			3	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
3	<p>Refer to paragraphs 8 and 9 and comment critically on the argument attributed to ‘Members of the House of Lords’ in response to the Right to Roam Act, 2000.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(3 marks)</p> <p>A number of comments would be appropriate, e.g.:</p> <p>It is scaremongering / speculation / slippery slope reasoning, and the warning' has turned out to be unfounded. It does not give any convincing support to the claims that the bill is a travesty of justice etc.</p> <p>There is no support for the claim that the Bill is an attack on property, or an ‘attack’ at all; and it does not follow from this claim that there has been a ‘travesty of justice’. On the contrary, making landowners open up their property may be regarded as a just policy, and private property as unjust.</p> <p>The argument is more rhetoric than substance. It makes use of persuasive language, e.g. ‘travesty of justice’ or ‘devil worship’.</p> <p>It would be difficult to give a positive assessment, but candidates who attempt to could be credited for, e.g., Right to roam does affect / attack the owners' rights of ownership and is therefore unjust to them, whether intentionally or not; and / or that people who own property do have the right not to have their land abused, or live with the prospect that it might be used for drug parties etc.</p> <p>(1 mark for each relevant point up to 3; or 2–3 marks for any relevant and developed point.)</p>			3	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
4	<p>The National Farmers Union and others have called for voluntary agreements between landowners and walkers rather than compulsory legislation.</p> <p>Offer a plausible explanation for the unwillingness of campaigners and supporters of the coastal path to consider the alternative of voluntary agreements.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p> <p>E.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They fear that the voluntary agreements would be broken / withheld / changed. • They want the access to be of right, not dependent on landowner's permission. • They think that people are entitled to coastal access whoever owns the land. • They fear that no agreements would be made voluntarily. <p>(1 mark for relevant point; 2 if clearly made – e.g. as above.)</p>			2	
5	<p>Consider the argument Maxine Fox presents, which is quoted in the final paragraph of Document A.</p> <p>Her clearly implied conclusion is that the public should not be given access to privately owned beaches.</p>				
5(a)	<p>Briefly summarise Fox's reasoning for this conclusion.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p> <p>Fox argues that because people have paid a huge price for a private beach they expect a <i>private</i> beach. She implies that they are right / have a right to expect it and / or that their right to privacy should be respected / protected. (1)</p> <p>She also supposes / considers the possibility of undesirable visitors 'plonking themselves down' etc., and claims this would be awkward. (1)</p>		2		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
5(b)	<p>Comment critically on the quality of Fox’s reasoning, and assess any assumptions she makes.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(4 marks)</p> <p>Evaluation points</p> <p>An 'awkward' situation is not a strong reason for a right to privacy over a right to roam. (1–2)</p> <p>Also there are questionable assumptions that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • paying a ‘huge premium’ somehow entitles a person to more than normal privacy. • the kind of person who <i>might</i> come to the beach and / or that a person sitting on a beach drinking a can of beer is undesirable, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Candidates who spot this assumption but claim that <i>everyone</i> who enters the private property would be undesirable should receive 1 mark for it. It is not assumed that <i>all</i> such people would be undesirable. • a huge premium has been paid by private beach owners (e.g. some may have been inherited and never paid for at all) <p>Each assumption (1–2).</p> <p>On the other hand it could be argued that money <i>does</i> buy certain luxuries, one of which is privacy / solitude / right to exclude unwanted people from your property, and that a lot of money buys a lot of privacy. If this assumption is acceptable, then the grounds are stronger. (1–2)</p> <p>(For full marks the candidate must relate evaluation to the assumptions being made.)</p>			4	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
6	<p>Question 6 refers to Document B</p> <p>‘The dispute over the plans for a coastal path is all about conflicting principles.’</p> <p>To what extent do you agree with this comment?</p> <p>Briefly explain your answer with reference to Document B.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(3 marks)</p> <p>In agreement with the comment:</p> <p>It could be said that both sides talk about their <i>rights</i>: the right to roam or to have access vs. the right to ownership, privacy etc., and that these two rights are in conflict with each other. (1–2)</p> <p>In disagreement:</p> <p>It could be said that the landowners are merely being selfish / protecting their assets, etc., and / or that the ramblers want to have, for free, what others have had to work and pay for; or that plans to open up land are based on envy / motivated by the wish to attack those who are wealthy, privileged, etc. (1–2)</p> <p>Some candidates might legitimately say that not all of the debate is about rights / principle: part of it is about practical consequences such as a feared drop in property values, security issues, misuse by the public (drug parties, supermarket trolleys, etc.). (1–2)</p> <p>For full marks an answer must show some balance between agreement and disagreement.</p>	3			

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
7	Question 7 refers to Document C: the flow diagram and notes				
7(a)	<p>‘Uninterrupted use by the public for 20 years’ is one of the conditions used to decide whether or not a disputed footpath is a Public Right of Way’.</p> <p>Is it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a sufficient condition? • a necessary condition? • both necessary and sufficient? • neither necessary nor sufficient? <p>Give a clear reason or reasons for your answer.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(3 marks)</p> <p>The correct answer is ‘neither necessary nor sufficient’ (1).</p> <p>It is not necessary because it could have been dedicated ‘consciously and deliberately’ or created by public order (1). It is not a sufficient condition because there are still two other conditions which have to be met before a way becomes a PRoW (1).</p> <p>(For getting ‘not necessary’ and the correct reason, or ‘not sufficient’ and the correct reason, 1 mark.)</p>	3			
7(b)	<p>Using the flow diagram and / or the text identify <u>two</u> conditions which are sufficient but not necessary for the existence of a Public Right of Way.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the path has been specifically created (under the Highways Act) or if there has been a public path creation order • If a way has been consciously and deliberately dedicated. <p>(1 mark each up to max 2)</p>	2			

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
7(c)	<p>Explain why a path cannot be presumed to be a Public Right of Way if it has been used with the landowner's express permission.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p> <p>It cannot be presumed because that would indicate that the landowner had not (or at least might not have) allowed it to become a <i>right</i> for the public to use the way. Giving express permission would be like saying, 'You can use the path, but because I say you can, not because you are entitled to. It's still mine to permit.' Giving express permission would count as one kind of evidence of 'no intention to dedicate'. The idea of a <i>right</i> must be clear for 2 marks. (1–2)</p> <p>Candidates may give a weaker explanation in terms of the legal situation by referring to note IV or V. (1)</p>	2			
8	<p>Question 8 refers to Document D</p> <p>Examine the facts and estimates in Document D and assess the support they give for each of the following claims.</p> <p>Briefly explain the reasoning for your answers.</p>				
8(a)	<p>Given the population of the UK, there would be approximately 1 acre (0.004 km²) of land per person if all of it were shared equally.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p> <p>This is a reliable approximation from the data. The calculation / explanation is as follows:</p> <p>E.g.</p> <p>$1\text{km}^2 / 251 \text{ people} = 0.00398 \text{ km pp}$, and 1 acre is 0.004 km². (By approximately $1/250 = 0.004$.)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>$243\,000 \text{ km}^2 / 61 \text{ m persons} = 0.00398$. (By approximately $240 / 60\,000 = 0.004$.)</p> <p>(2 marks for correct answer and either explanation; 1 for correct answer + partially correct explanation or calculation along right lines.)</p> <p>Candidates who give the answer as 0.00398 and argue that the statement is <i>unsupported</i> have not taken account of it being <i>approximately</i> 1 acre. Give 1 mark for the calculation, if made.</p>		2		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
8(b)	<p>There is an average of 2.5 persons per household in the UK. <i>(3 marks)</i></p> <p>This is a reasonable estimate based on the figures in the legend top left of Doc. D: 61m (pop.) / 24m (households), but candidate should recognise that there are factors which could render it inaccurate.</p> <p>Acceptable answers: It is supported + calculation: 1–2)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>This is not supported fully / entirely / reliably etc. (1), because it does not take into account e.g. homeless, students in flats, people living in caravans, etc. (+1 or 2)</p> <p>It is not possible to work out the mode or median average from the data. (+1)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Up to full marks if candidate answers that this is a reasonable estimate and / or probably right provided there are not more than 1 million people / large numbers of people in above categories; or that these factors (or others) may make the claim unreliable, etc. (2–3)</p> <p>No mark for simply saying Supported or Not supported, without any reason or qualification.</p>			3	
8(c)	<p>The average density of population in residential areas of the UK is at least 16 times higher than the average density in the UK as a whole. <i>(3 marks)</i></p> <p>Not supported / unreliable (1), because (e.g.):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data is only about land that is <i>owned</i>, not land that is occupied / residential. (1–2) • There is no information about people who live (or reside) on land other than that in the blue segment (owned by the 16.2 m homeowners). E.g. on land rented from the large landowners (purple segment) or the state, such as council owned estates (yellow segment). This would affect the density of population. (1–2) • There is no evidence about residential land / no clarification of what is meant by 'residential'. (1–2) <p>NB Some candidates may use the data in the light blue segment as an <i>indication</i> of population in residential areas but the claim remains unsupported.</p>			3	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>They might calculate (or estimate) as follows:</p> <p>Population density is people per Km². So, for the blue area:</p> <p>(Homeowners x Average persons per household) / Residential Km² = Pop. Density</p> <p>i.e. (16,200,000 x 2.5) / 10,500 = 3,857 (people per Km²)</p> <p>However, we know from Document D that the average pop. density of the UK is 251 (people per Km²). Is it one sixteenth or less than the density of the 'residential area'? No.</p> <p>251 x 16 is over 4,000 (4,016 people per Km²).</p> <p>Therefore even on this basis the claim is unsupported – the pop. Density of the 'residential area' is <i>not</i> sixteen times higher.</p> <p>For appropriate reasons / calculations, +1</p> <p>For making clear that it is an <i>assumption</i> that the light blue segment is an indication of population in residential areas, +1</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
9	<p>It's all very well to talk about the right to roam if you are just thinking about other people's property. There is a good name for it – the politics of envy. That's all it is: "I can't have it. I can't afford it, so you shouldn't either." But just think if someone came in your living room and said, "This is nice, I think I'll have a picnic." You'd soon change your tune. It's right-to-home that matters not right-to-roam.</p> <p>Suggest <u>two</u> ways in which the above argument could be assessed as weak or flawed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(4 marks)</p> <p>Naming or identifying a flaw / weakness correctly, without explaining it in terms of an assessment. (1)</p> <p>Naming or identifying a flaw / weakness correctly and explaining assessment. (2)</p> <p>E.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a straw man: very few people would argue that it is wrong because I can't have it / afford it. That is <i>envy</i>, but there are much stronger arguments available than that. • It is a very weak analogy. No ordinary person would want to have a picnic in a living room. The issue is around open countryside, so it is irrelevant to compare people's homes where there is no room to roam and no one would try. • The analogy could also be described as a straw man – it misrepresents the right to roam as a right to invade the home, or misrepresents roaming as comparable to entering homes. • The argument is <i>ad hominem</i> because it seeks to show that supporters of the right to roam are unprincipled: (a) They are motivated by envy (b) They would give up their support for the right if they owned land. This does not affect the truth of the supporters' claim. • A false dilemma is suggested in the <i>final sentence</i>. Right to roam and right to home are not mutually exclusive. Candidates must indicate where this takes place – it is not a flaw of the whole argument. • <i>Explaining</i> a weak or false assumption, such as that supporters of the right to roam cannot afford private land. 		4		
Section A total 40		16	24	0	

Section B

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
10	<p>Construct a reasoned case for or against the following statement.</p> <p>‘All open land should be public land. There is no case for protecting landowners or compensating them for public access to their property.’</p> <p>In presenting your case you should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • produce a structured argument with a clearly stated conclusion or conclusions • draw on relevant information and evidence found in the source documents; you may also draw on your own knowledge and experience if relevant • consider any general principles that may apply • consider and respond to possible counter-arguments. <p style="text-align: right;">(30 marks)</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.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All open and uncultivated or unused land should be public, but people's privacy should be protected; and they should be compensated if they have bought the land and its value has gone down because the law has been changed. • There can be no justice in opening up private property to the general public, except where the legal landowner agrees. <p>Reasoning for the proposition could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the huge inequalities cited in the data; • the greater access in other countries; • the beauty of coastlines and the fact that many people are denied the chance to enjoy them; • the principle that land belongs / should belong to everyone not just to the rich; • the fact that if land was shared equally everyone would have far more than the average person has. 				
			2	2	26

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>Reasoning against could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the fact that there are already national parks and hundreds of miles of footpaths; the fact that half the coast and all the Scottish coast is already available; the fact that many landowners give permission and dedicate paths; the right of individuals to spend their money as they wish, including purchasing land; the right of people to enjoy their property without interference; the idea that public access demands are just driven by envy. the argument that the public misuse land / abuse access to land by leaving litter, noise, dogs fouling, etc. the argument that sheer numbers of walkers / bikers etc. erode the land. <p>These are just examples of points that could be made and do not constitute an exhaustive list. The essays are assessed entirely by application of the generic mark scheme (below) which grades the quality of the reasoning and communication, use of information etc. There is no right or wrong or preferred conclusion.</p> <p>For higher grades the points made need to be <i>developed</i>, e.g. with use of information and evidence, explanation, examples and / or counterexamples, analogies, principles, definitions, clarifications, anticipated objections and responses to them. Making many superficial points may not score as well as two or three very well developed ones.</p> <p>Appropriate use should be made of information in the documents and / or candidate's own knowledge or experience.</p>				
	Section B Total 30		2	2	26
	Total Section A + Section B = AO1: 26% AO2: 37% AO3: 37%				

Generic mark-grid for Section B:

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