



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

**Critical Thinking**

**CRIT1**

**(Specification 2770)**

**Unit 1: Foundation Unit**

**Final**

***Mark Scheme***

---

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from: [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

**Copyright**

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

# Critical Thinking Mark Scheme

## INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

## Marking methods

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

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

## Marking using CMI+

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

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

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

### Levels of Response marking

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Students will have to:

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

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

## Unit 1 Critical Thinking Foundation Unit

### Section A

Questions 1 to 3 refer to Document A

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
1	<p>In paragraph 1, it says that McMullan defended hacking as a legitimate means of obtaining information.</p> <p>Given that phone hacking is illegal; suggest <u>one</u> other possible meaning that the word 'legitimate' might have here.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p>		2		

Morally permissible / morally acceptable / morally good / morally right/ justified/ permissible/ acceptable/ moral/ ethical/ good/ fair/ reasonable/ understandable/ OK to do [2 marks]

Credit 1 mark for "effective in getting results"/ useful/ it works

Zero marks for 'legal' or 'lawful'.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
2	<p>In paragraph 2, McMullan says, “what the paper was doing was justified as the British public bought the paper in their millions.”</p> <p>Explain the flaw in McMullan’s argument.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(2 marks)</b></p>		1	1	

Appealing to the belief that the end justifies the means. The popularity of the end product doesn’t justify the means by which it was produced.

Appeal to popularity: it’s the flaw of thinking something right or true just because lots of people think so. In this case, that millions of people buying the paper means it’s right to use the relevant means to get the stories they buy. (Even if evil sells well, this doesn’t turn evil into good.)

Credit 2 marks for a full explanation with or without the name of the flaw, but only 1 mark if just the name of the flaw is given eg Appeal to popularity/ or ends justifies the means

An acceptable alternative is to point out that the flaw lies in McMullan wrongly assuming that the public would still have bought the paper if they’d known the stories were got by phone hacking.

Credit 1 mark for partial answers: eg selling well doesn’t make you right.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
3	<p>Read what McMullan says in paragraph 4, reproduced below, before answering Question 3.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>“Sometimes you have to enter a grey area that I think we should sometimes be applauded for entering, because it’s a very dangerous area. My life has been at risk many times, at home more than in war zones. I used to get a death threat at least once a month for 15 years of my career.”</b></p> <p><b>Comment critically on what McMullan says in Paragraph 4.</b>  <span style="float: right;"><b>(6 marks)</b></span></p>				
			2	3	1

McMullen suggests that there are occasions when entering morally dubious territory is justifiable or praise worthy. He develops this point with reference to journalists working in war zones. McMullen tries to connect phone hacking to war journalism by pointing out his receipt of death threats while writing stories about celebrities etc.

Candidates may challenge the principle, the comparison and the significance of death threats.

**Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.**

Level	Marks	Description
Good	5 – 6	One or more of the main points of the reasoning (as identified above) have been correctly recognised and challenged or defended with relevant critical comments and supporting reasons/ explanations or examples.
Intermediate	3 – 4	The general direction of the reasoning is recognised and one or more appropriate critical comments are made with some supporting reasons.
Basic	1 – 2	One or more evaluative comments are attempted showing some understanding of the text. Mainly assertive and judgmental.

**Specifics:**

**Negative Points:**

Invalid move from an area being very dangerous, to it being laudable or praiseworthy to enter it. There’s such a thing as being stupid about danger.



Why should people only be sometimes applauded for entering a dangerous area? Why not always? No reason is given for this restriction.

The two uses of 'sometimes' are different. It's unclear whether you should be only applauded for a proportion of the entries to a grey dangerous area, or whether you should be applauded for all of these. The second 'sometimes' could go either way. (ambiguity)

Vagueness: what exactly is meant by a 'grey area'? (illegal? semi-legal?)

Death threats could have easily been hoaxes whereas bullets in a war zone are very real.

The death threats may be understandable because he is doing something wrong and abusing people's rights.

Once a month isn't very often when compared with being under continuous fire in a war zone.

Talking about danger and threats may be seen as an appeal to pity/ emotion.

He has survived for 15 years with these threats at home, but it's very unlikely he would have survived 15 years being constantly in a war zone.

How much does he know about war zones? We're not told. If he has been in war zones, were they typical of war zones in general? If not, then evidence is weak.

He's under pressure at the inquiry. He has a strong motive for ramping up the dangers in domestic journalism so as to come across as some sort of moral hero on the side of truth.

He has the law and the police to protect him at home, whereas in a war zone there is no such protection.

**Positive Points:**

Principle of charity would allow McMullan some leeway on his use of 'sometimes' as it's common usage to throw this term about like this. And nothing much hangs on which way to take it.

The same goes for the use of 'grey'. And surely, in the nature of the case, this has to remain a bit vague because we are talking about greyness which is the archetypal 'no man's land'. 'Grey' stands for 'fuzzy' so how on earth can you consistently have a precise, high-definition fuzziness. So McMullan shouldn't be blamed for the vagueness as it is in the nature of these words to be so.

A threat a month for 15 years amounts to 180 death threats which is probably more than the average soldier would have in a war zone. Is it likely that 180 bullets would be aimed just at him?

War may contain significant periods of quiet / lulls in the fighting. If one were in a war zone in such a period then the threats would probably be less than McMullan faced at home.

As a reporter in a war zone, perhaps McMullan was comfortably ensconced with international journalists in some hotel so they were safely out of danger, under control by the military, and could take no pictures of the fighting / atrocities. In this case, McMullan may have been in more danger at home than in the war zone.

**Questions 4 to 8 refer to Document B**

<b>4</b>	<p><b>Read the following extract before answering Question 4.</b></p> <p><b>Vicky      Call me crazy, but I think McMullan is right, because sometimes the end justifies the means. And if truth is the goal we seek, then any means of getting it is justified, including hacking into people’s phones.</b></p>				
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>AO:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Analyse Vicky’s argument by identifying the conclusion and reasons.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(3 marks)</b></p>	<b>3</b>			

Conclusion: I think McMullan is right. (accept also: McMullan is right/ phone hacking is justified) [1 mark]

Reason: Sometimes the end justifies the means. [1 mark]

Reason: If the truth is the goal we seek, then any means of getting it is justified, including hacking into people’s phones. [1 mark]

Award [3 marks] for all of the above.

Award [2 marks] if candidate only identifies 2 parts of the argument.

Award [1 mark] maximum for paraphrase.

Credit 1 mark BOD if candidate includes, “Call me crazy” in the conclusion.

Credit 1 mark BOD if candidate omits ‘including hacking into people’s phones’ from the final reason.

NB: If candidate does both these BOD things, then deduct 1 mark from total.

Zero mark for “any means of getting it is justified” offered as a reason on its own.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
5	<p><b>Louise responds to Vicky’s opening argument by claiming that, for her argument to work, she has to assume that “truth is always more important than anything else”.</b></p> <p><b>Is Louise right? Briefly explain why / why not.</b></p>				
		<b>(4 marks)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	

For Louise being right.

Louise is right to claim that Vicky must assume this. By saying “any” means is worth pursuing to get to the truth, she must believe that the truth is the most important thing of all, for if it wasn’t, there would be some means she would stop at, because it’s more important not to use it than to get at the truth, and this would prevent her from using the word ‘any’, which has no exceptions. The truth must beat anything else.

Credit up to 4 marks for answers along these lines.

Award [1 mark] for focusing on the key word “any”, even if the explanation is unclear or unpersuasive.

Award the remaining [2 – 3 marks] for a plausible explanation involving the exceptionless of “any” and the claim “the truth is “always” (another key word) the most important thing.

Against Louise being right

By saying “if the truth is the goal we seek” Vicky allows the possibility that the truth is not always the most important thing.

Also, she doesn’t claim that even if we do seek the goal of truth, that this is the most important goal. Just because truth is a, or even the goal doesn’t mean it is the only goal or the most important one.

Award 1 mark for focus on “if” or “the goal”

Award the remaining [2-3 marks] for a plausible explanation along the above lines

NB Some answers may use both these approaches so credit these according to the above outlines.

<b>6</b>	<b>Read the following extract before answering question 6.</b>				
	<b>Vicky Look, the truth is more precious than anything else, including people’s so-called right to privacy. For one thing, the hard-won truths of modern medicine were got by invading the body’s privacy; teams of medical students literally hacking into corpses with their saws and knives. And not just corpses. There’s invasive surgery too. And what about brain scans? What’s more important, the body’s health or mobile phones? Medical researchers are just like phone hacking journalists – they invade people’s privacy to get at the truth. And if it’s good enough for medicine, it’s good enough for journalism.</b>				
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>AO:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Vicky’s argument depends on her use of an analogy between phone hacking and medical research.</b>				
	<b>Assess the strength of this analogy.</b>	<b>(5 marks)</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	

The analogy is weak. There are too many significant differences between phone hacking and medical research to make the comparison plausible.

**Differences:**

The truths that medical research is mainly after are far more crucial to human health and well-being than are the truths of celebrity gossip got by phone hacking. Medical research helps people live longer and healthier, whereas phone hacking doesn’t.

Much medical research is invasive only on condition the researchers get permission from their subjects, eg People leaving their bodies for medical research, whereas phone hacker journalists did it secretly without people’s permission.

Invasive operations need written consent from the patient, but phone hacking doesn’t.

Hippocratic oath protects subjects from medical abuse, but there is no comparable journalistic oath.

In medicine the patient / immediate subject is the focus of attempts to help them, whereas in phone hacking, the whole point was to entertain the public at the expense of the subject / victim.

Privacy doesn’t apply to corpses.

**Similarities:**

Both are seeking truth.

Both are in some sense invasive of ‘privacy’ in the sense of the inner working of things.

In the past, (19thC), medical researchers, in their search for corpses to dissect, didn't bother to get permission from relatives or the deceased (prior to dying). [However, this similarity actually weakens the argumentative force of the analogy because its point was to make phone hacking look good, but this similarity makes phone hacking look bad because it's also a bad feature of medicine's murky past.]

However, some animal experiments in the name of medical research, especially on higher mammals, seem immoral in a similar way to phone hacking, in that there is often a lack of respect for the animals' privacy – their desire to be alone sometimes instead of always being under the spotlight of the observers.

**Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.**

Level	Marks	Description
Good	4 – 5	Perceptive critical comment has been made on the relevance of the comparison and/or on any relevant differences, leading to an appropriate evaluation.
Intermediate	2 – 3	Some critical comment made on the fairness or relevance of the comparison and evaluative judgment offered.
Basic	1	Some comment offered on similarities and differences.

Credit up to 4/5 marks for an assessment which sees the analogy as weak on the whole, and covers 2 or more differences; reference may be made to one or more similarities in order to explain why they are less significant.

<b>7</b>	<b>Read the following extract before answering Question 7.</b>				
	<b>Louise</b>	<b>But some truths are a waste of time because they're worthless. For example, no one knows the truth about how many hairs you have on your head, but that doesn't give other, weirdly curious people the right to invade the privacy of your hair with a comb and a magnifying glass so as to discover the truth which is "more precious than anything else".</b>			
	<b>Vicky</b>	<b>You're making my case look ridiculous by twisting what I said, just to win the argument...</b>			
<b>No.</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>AO:</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Name the flaw Vicky is accusing Louise of making, and assess whether Vicky's accusation is fair.</b>	<b>(5 marks)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

<b>Level</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Description</b>
Good	4 – 5	Straw man flaw must be named, for 5 marks. Critical comments are convincing and effective. Strengths and weaknesses are correctly identified and an appropriate judgment is reached.
Intermediate	2 – 3	Evaluation is largely correct and focused on relevant flaws and strengths of Vicky's accusation. Explanation is present but may lack development and some assessment opportunities may be missed.
Basic	1	Evaluation may be limited to identifying the straw man flaw or answers may be limited to making only one relevant evaluative comment.

Straw Man / person [1 mark]

For it being a fair accusation:

Using the Principle of Charity, Louise should have understood Vicky as meaning or assuming that we are dealing with important truths, and not utterly trivial ones such as numbers of hairs on a head. When people talk about ‘the truth’ they generally mean ‘truth with a capital T’– ‘higher’ truths of morality, religion, law, and so on. By taking Vicky too literally, eg truth with a lower case t, and her use of ‘any’, she has twisted her obvious and intended meaning in order to gain a cheap victory.

For it being an unfair accusation:

Vicky didn’t qualify her use of the words ‘truth’ and ‘any’ and so left herself open to be taken literally. Any subsequent shifts of meaning that she attempts in order to avoid a defeat in argument will look like an ad hoc manoeuvre. Many people are fanatical for truth and will do what it takes to achieve it including murder (‘any means’). So it could be argued that Louise is merely drawing out the logical consequences of Vicky’s claims, and is being fair to her. She is making her case look ridiculous, but it’s because she is using a *reductio ad absurdum*, not a straw man, and there is nothing logically wrong with this argumentative technique.

Award up to 5 marks for a good explanation along either of the above lines, or a balanced view incorporating both.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
8	<p><b>At the end of Vicky’s speech about the ‘secret truths about powerful politicians and famous celebrities’ she claims that:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>“If the public find them interesting, then they are in the public interest.”</b></p> <p><b>Explain how Vicky commits the flaw of equivocation here.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(4 marks)</b></p>		1	3	

The equivocation is on the words ‘interesting’ and ‘interest’.

The two meanings are as follows.

Something can be interesting in the sense of attracting our curiosity; it might be unusual, amusing, amazing, intriguing, etc. but none of these entails that it will somehow benefit us, or that it is rightfully our concern. It may be, or it may not.

But something which is in our interest definitely is a proper concern in terms of our future welfare / benefit, and this may be the case without it being in the least bit interesting, eg Tax rates, which are mind-numbingly boring.

The flaw is in moving seamlessly from one meaning to the other as if there were no difference. Just because something is interesting, it doesn’t follow that it is in our interest.

[1 mark] for an explanation of equivocation in general, if this is all they do.

[1 mark] for identifying the relevant words “interesting” and/or “interest”, even if explanation of their meanings is poor.

The remaining marks [2-4] will depend on how clear and plausible are the explanations of the two different meanings.

(Maximum of [2 marks] for only one meaning explicated.)

**NB:** There’s just a chance that a candidate might choose the word ‘public’ instead of ‘interest(ing)’. A case can be made for this also being equivocal.

**Eg** The first use of ‘public’ refers to only those actually buying the newspaper, but the second use of ‘public’ refers to the general public, ie The citizenry at large/whole population.

It is also an invalid move to infer that just because those who buy the papers find x interesting, that means it must be in the interest of the whole of the population (even if the words ‘interest(ing)’ are treated univocally.)

So credit as above, up to 4 marks for a clear explanation of the two meanings of ‘public’. If a candidate does both (interesting/public), simply combine the marks.



**Questions 9 to 11 refer to Document C**

<b>9</b>	<p><b>Read paragraph 2, reproduced below, before answering Question 9.</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>He added: “Phone hacking is a perfectly acceptable tool – given the sacrifices we made – if all we are trying to do is to get to the truth. I didn’t think anyone realised that anyone was committing a crime at the start. In 21 years of invading people’s privacy I’ve never actually come across anyone who’s been doing any good. Privacy is for paedos. Privacy is evil. It brings out the worst qualities in people, such as hypocrisy. It allows them to do bad things.”</b></p>				
No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
9	<p><b>Analyse the structure of McMullan’s argument in this passage, identifying the conclusion and reasons.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(7 marks)</b></p>	7			

Main Conclusion: Phone hacking is a perfectly acceptable tool – given the sacrifices we made – if all we are trying to do is get to the truth. [2 marks].

Credit [1 mark] if just put “phone hacking is a perfectly acceptable tool” on its own or with “given the sacrifices we made”

No marks for just putting: all we are trying to do is to get to the truth OR “given the sacrifices we made”, as the main conclusion.

R. I didn’t think anyone realised that anyone was committing a crime at the start. [1 mark]

R. In 21 years of invading people’s privacy I’ve never actually come across anyone who’s been doing any good. [1 mark]

IC/R. Privacy is evil. [1 mark for R: 2 marks for IC as long as same part/s] of the supporting reasons for the IC are identified, ie knowledge of subargument structure.

Only [1 mark] for “privacy is evil” as IC if not accompanied by supporting argument

Supported by the following:

R. Privacy is for paedos [1 mark]

R. It brings out the worst qualities in people, such as hypocrisy. [1 mark]

R. [or as part of R6.] It allows them to do bad things. [1 mark]

NB The boxed marks above are only creditable as reasons for the IC.

Credit 1 mark for each of the above, correctly identified as reasons or conclusion. [up to max 7].

If answer is a general restatement or paraphrase of what McMullan has said, without clear identification of the parts of the argument, (eg McMullan says this then he states that, etc.), then [max 2 marks].

**NB:** Do not give credit for:  
Mistaking an R for MC or vice versa  
Mistaking an IC for MC or vice versa  
Just assessing strength of argument, but if in the course of the assessment, parts are identified then award for this.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
10	Give a critical evaluation of McMullan’s overall argument in paragraphs 1 and 2 of <u>Document C</u> ; comment critically on his reasoning and use of language.  <p style="text-align: right;">(8 marks)</p>		2	5	1

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	Marks	Description
Good	6 – 8	<u>Additionally</u> : one or more aspects of the reasoning and/or rhetoric are critically assessed, with perceptive challenges or supporting comment.
Intermediate	4 – 5	An evaluative judgement is given, (positive, negative or balanced), with some appropriate justifying reasons. May address the use of language and its effectiveness or otherwise.
Basic	1 – 3	One or more evaluative comments are attempted. A strength or weakness is identified.

Basic level candidates will typically mention / explain one or two features.

To get to mid-level a candidate needs to cover about two or three good points well, and top level needs three or four of these. Examiners to use their professional judgment.

For example, if a candidate confines their comments to use of emotive language then their avoidance of more meaty logical assessment will place them in the bottom level but they could be close to the top of this level if they do a good job.

In contrast to this, if a candidate spots the contradiction in the argument, this is a significant criticism and is difficult to do, so if they do a good job on this this would on its own put them in mid band.

Offering alternative explanations for McMullan only finding bad stuff when invading people’s privacy could also get to mid band on its own if done well.

And various combinations of these assessments will increase the level performance, eg If a candidate not only explains the contradiction but also gives alternative explanations of McMullan finding only bad stuff, then this looks like a top level answer, even if they don’t cover emotive language etc. A candidate doesn’t have to do everything to get the top band.

**Specifics:**

Emotive use of words such as ‘scum’: summons up pictures of filth, and disgust associated with the smelly and dangerous substances that accumulate on the surface of stagnant water.

It's the stuff you want to avoid. It sets the reader very much against anyone described in this way.

'branded' summons up pictures of cattle and the literal branding or burning a permanent mark on them. It sends out the strong message that these people are beneath the value of the brander (cattle) and that they are permanently this way. Can't change their spots. There's a difference "good of our readers" and "the public good" (equivocation)

The contradiction / inconsistency is found in the contrast between his use of the word '**illegal**' in the first paragraph, and his claim that he "didn't think anyone realised that anyone was committing a **crime** at the start". 'Crime' is the operative word here because crimes are by definition illegal, so if no one thought crimes were being committed at the start, how could Brooks and Coulson possibly have said that 'sometimes you have to enter into an...illegal area', as McMullan claims? Phone hacking cannot at the same time be seen as not a crime but also an illegal area.

Whatever Brooks & Coulson did or didn't do is irrelevant to Mc Mullan's argument for phone hacking.

McMullan falsely assumes that the only reason he never found anyone doing good was because they were bad people. But an alternative explanation is that the reason McMullan never found anybody doing any good in private is that he was only looking for / interested in / expected the bad and so that's all he saw / registered, so it became a self-fulfilling prophecy. Any good was ignored or filtered out of his memory / consciousness.

Another alternative explanation is that as a tabloid journalist, he only got to investigate bad people, and these are not representative of people in general. It's not that all people are up to only bad stuff in private, but that he only got to invade bad people's privacy, giving him a distorted view of humanity.

Assumption that truth justifies the abuse of human rights (eg to privacy). But a torturer could use this defence to justify torture to get at the truth.

Heavily slanted / biased claims regarding privacy as for paedos, and as evil, as if there wasn't another side to this. The truth of these premises can be easily challenged. Privacy is for those at prayer, for the secret donation to charity without trumpeting this to the world. Privacy is for thinking, is for creativity, is for sanity, and for individuality, and for decency and dignity, etc.

On the positive side, McMullan may be justified in calling Brooks and Coulson "the scum of journalism" despite this being emotionally charged because if they did what they said they did then this emotion is justified and his remarks are fair comment.

In para 2 McMullan at least offers some evidence for his views (21 years of experience, etc) even if it is slanted.

Possible "hasty generalisation" from Mc Mullan's own experience of what people do in private, to what people in general use their privacy for - "Privacy is evil"

Possibly some candidates may see Mc Mullan's claim never to have come across anybody doing any good in private, as an "appeal to ignorance". If they explain this well then some credit is deserved.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
11	<p>At the end of <b>Document C</b>, a reader comments on McMullan’s argument by stating that:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>“This is the guy who openly admits to fiddling his expenses! How can we trust anything he says?”</b></p> <p>Is this an effective challenge? Explain your answer.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(4 marks)</b></p>		1	3	

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	Marks	Description
Good	4	Critical comments are convincing and effective. Strengths and weaknesses are correctly identified and an appropriate judgment is reached. Candidates engage critically with the most important features of the argument and specific flaws cited are clearly explained and / or likely to be labelled accurately.
Intermediate	2 – 3	Evaluation is largely correct and focused on relevant flaws and strengths. Explanation is present but may lack development and some assessment opportunities may be missed.
Basic	1	Evaluation may be limited to identifying merely a minor flaw or strength, e.g. an emotive use of a term or a common-sense claim that’s obviously true, or answers may be limited largely to assertion with vague justification, e.g. that the argument is clear.

This could be seen as an ineffective challenge to McMullan.

Could be an Ad Hominem flaw. Just because McMullan is a thief doesn’t mean he is not to be believed. Taking someone’s property illegally doesn’t make any of one’s statements wrong, let alone all of them. The reader attacks the person as a way of undermining his argument.

The second flaw is one of self-contradiction (and is rather amusing).

The reader's case against believing **anything** McMullan says, relies wholly on the reader's belief that McMullan is a thief. But his belief that he is a thief relies wholly on his belief that McMullan's admission, that he is a thief, is true!

This is self-defeating like all self-contradictions. Only one of these claims can be true, and it makes the other one false – as explained below.

If the reader believes that McMullan is a thief, then the reader shouldn't believe anything McMullan says, including his claim to be a thief, so the reader should not believe that McMullan is a thief.

And if the reader does not believe that McMullan is a thief, he's got no reason to think McMullan is lying when he claims to be a thief, so the reader should believe McMullan's claim to be a thief. He can't have it both ways.

On the positive side, a candidate may consider that the reader's comment has some merit because fiddling expenses is a kind of lie, and a fair amount of money was involved over a fair period of time, so there is a certain likelihood that McMullan's fiddling extends to verbal trickery. If the fiddling is symptomatic of a character flaw in McMullan, this may be a general feature of his behaviour. But the reader clearly exaggerates the chances of this happening, and ignores the pertinent fact that McMullan is testifying under oath at a public inquiry; this weakens their challenge.

NB As long as a candidate gives a nuanced account of the positive side of the reader's remarks (as above) they can still get top marks even if they don't mention the other two negative points.

Credit up to 4 marks for a clear and accurate explanation of any one or more of these points.

**Section B (see Generic mark-grid, page 25)**

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
12	<p><b>Write a reasoned argument in response to the following claim.</b></p> <p><b>‘Privacy is for people who have something to hide. Things like phone hacking, computer hacking and the use of CCTV cameras are good because they protect the public from evil done in private.’</b></p> <p><b>In your answer 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>				<b>20</b>

**Arguments for:**

Protection of the public is paramount and is the duty of government. So police should have the right to use hacking etc. to reveal things like possible terrorism planned in private, or child abuse.

Privacy is not a right if you're up to no good. In that case you forego your right to privacy. Bible: "Men love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil."  
 (McMullan backed by God)

If you have nothing to hide then you shouldn't worry who's looking / listening.

True, the police should only invade privacy if they have good reason to suspect criminal activity, so we shouldn't have to be on camera 24/7 like in Orwell's "1984", but this means privacy is always provisional, not absolute.

With non-police and non-criminal activity in private, this invasion of privacy may still be justifiable if done by a free press to people who are already in the public eye, eg Celebrities / politicians, because,

- i) The press serves the public in a democracy and if many people enjoy hearing about the 'private' lives of celebrities then this maximises happiness and is good (utilitarianism).
- ii) Celebrities want to be in the public eye, but they can't draw a line around their private sphere anywhere they feel like it or wherever it suits them. This is arbitrary, especially if they have given a tabloid access to their wedding.

Truth is valuable and privacy hides truth, therefore privacy is negotiable when it comes to truths that the public want to know.

Stars, (eg Footballers) like to manage their image so as to make millions endorsing products, but often this image is fake and the public is duped. It is far better that they be 'outed' even if it's by hacking. The end justifies the means.

**Arguments against:**

No need to be against ALL invasion of privacy, for example, in cases of suspected terrorism or child abuse then this is perfectly acceptable if done by the police for protection of the public and the children concerned.

Privacy in itself is not evil. At worst it is morally neutral (like money); it can be used for good or bad, eg Secret donations to charity, or diplomacy to avert war, as opposed to insider dealing.

At best it is essential for any kind of tolerable life as an individual distinct from the crowd. Human nature needs its own private space to think our own thoughts and be ourselves without always being on display.

Even staring is considered rude for this reason.

The individual's right to privacy trumps the desire of the public to hear juicy noncriminal trivia. This may harm the individual far more than it benefits the public, because each member of the public has only a slight and passing enjoyment at reading the newspaper, but the individual's life can be ruined.

If a celebrity is famous for their films then the public only have a right to know about their movie career, not the private details of their life outside their job as an actor. This requires the celebrity's permission. The line drawn between professional life and private life is not arbitrary.

There's a danger of turning society into one governed by general and intrusive surveillance, not just by government (CCTV cameras seemingly everywhere) but by the press's irresponsible use of things like phone hacking.

Nightmare of 'Big Brother' as depicted by Orwell.

It reflects badly on the state of public morality that they have this appetite for sleaze and celebrity gossip. Pandering to that just to sell papers doesn't justify invading an individual's privacy when they haven't broken the law.

Hacking is illegal and the law should be obeyed, therefore it shouldn't be done.

Hacking is disrespectful to an individual's ownership of their own private space because it is done without the individual's permission or knowledge.



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

<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Award Level</b>		
	<b>Good response</b>	<b>Reasonable response</b>	<b>Limited response</b>
	Criteria well met. Communication is clear and appropriate.	Criteria partially met. Communication is mostly clear and appropriate.	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>

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

**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>Totals</b>
Qu 1	2			2
Qu 2	1	1		2
Qu 3	2	3	1	6
Qu 4	3			3
Qu 5	2	2		4
Qu 6	1	4		5
Qu 7	2	3		5
Qu 8	1	3		4
Qu 9	7			7
Qu 10	2	5	1	8
Qu 11	1	3		4
<b>Total Section A</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>50</b>
Qu 12			20	20
<b>Total Section B</b>			<b>22</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Paper Total: [70] Marks</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>Paper Total: [70] Percentage</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>100%</b>