Version 1

General Certificate of Education (A-level)
June 2013

Critical Thinking CRIT3

(Specification 2770)

Unit 3: Beliefs, Claims and Arguments

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334).
Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

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 Questions 1–9, 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 Question 10, 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.**

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 3 Beliefs, Claims and Arguments

Section A: Beliefs and Claims

Question 1 refers to Document A.

No.	Question AO:	1	2	3
1	**Give <u>three</u> features of dreams mentioned in <u>Document A</u> that you think a good theory of dreaming ought to be able to explain.** ***(3 marks)***	3		

The fact that everyone dreams (and our apparent need to dream) [Can be credited separately]

Facts about the content of our dreams (its bizarre nature etc), or the experience of dreaming (its emotional intensity)

The apparent correlation with its stage in the sleep cycle / the fact that it occurs at specific phases in our sleep / the correlation with REM sleep

Accompanying physiological features such as rapid eye movement

[1] for any relevant feature as per above.

Questions 2 to 4 refer to Document B.

No.	Question AO:	1	2	3
2	**In paragraphs 4 and 5, a logical problem for Freud's theory is anticipated and then a solution offered.** **What is the problem – and how successfully, in your view, is it resolved?** **(*5 marks*)**	**1**	**3**	**1**

The potential logical problem is a problem of coherence in the notion of an unconscious wish, it being suggested that wishes by definition must be conscious.

The solution is to divide the mind into different parts – some of which are more or less conscious than others / to have parts of the mind which are not conscious in the normal sense.

On the surface, this resolves the contradiction – but it could be seen as merely playing with words / a kind of ad hoc manoeuvre – to redefine the mind as something that can be conscious or unconscious in order to escape this contradiction. If the notion of an unconscious wish or desire is incoherent, it doesn't help to say it occurs in the part of the mind which is not (fully or normally) conscious.

Having said this, it could be that the notion of an unconscious wish is not itself incoherent, since you would only think this if you assumed that the mind was by definition conscious in all its parts (i.e. a question-begging definition / assumption).

Candidates are not expected to provide as thorough or as technical an answer as this.

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	Marks	Description
Good	5	Clearly articulated expression of the (logical) problem, and well-developed, appropriately weighted evaluation of the solution offered.
Intermediate	3 – 4	Candidates show understanding/awareness of the problem, but expression lacks precision; some critical but undeveloped evaluation of the solution offered.
Basic	1 – 2	Candidates correctly identify the problem but critical comment is wayward; OR: offer some relevant comment on the author's claims

No.	Question AO:	1	2	3
3	**In paragraph 8, the author considers a prediction which Freud's theory should support.** **How is the prediction used to challenge Freud's theory, and is it an effective challenge?** **(*5 marks*)**	**1**	**2**	**2**

The prediction is that people who have undergone psychoanalysis ought to dream less. (Candidates do not need to quote this; it will be embedded / implied in their answers.)

The paragraph presents a criticism of Freud's theory in the form of a piece of disconfirming and potentially falsifying evidence / evidence which is inconsistent with the theory.

The criticism is that a supposed consequence or prediction of Freud's theory is not borne out in practice, i.e. *if* the theory is correct, then we would expect to see X – but we don't. Therefore, it is implied, the theory cannot be correct.

This form of reasoning is potentially very powerful: it is a valid argument and, if the premises are true, proves the theory must be false. This potentially presents a very strong criticism/ problem with the theory. However attractive a theory on paper, if its predictions turn out to be false then it ought in principle to be discarded. It is also strong in that it is not a single piece of falsifying evidence (which could perhaps be explained away by being an anomaly), but refers to 'people'.

The evidence here is not conclusive, though, and therefore nor is the falsification of the theory. For a start, the theory does not say that all dreams represent repressed unconscious wishes; there is nothing to say that someone who has been 'cured' of their existing mental problems couldn't still have wish-based dreams (like the glass of water example Freud himself gives).

Secondly, who's to say we won't have new wishes to repress – i.e. once the repressed childhood wishes are out in the open and have been dealt with, perhaps new desires could arise that we deem unacceptable and which find expression in our dreams?

Finally, it could be that the psychoanalysis is not successful; the psychiatrist is not good enough / has not got to the root of the problem / interpreted the dream properly…

Any other valid points (along these lines) should be credited – these are just examples; use levels to assess wherever possible!

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	Marks	Description
Good	5	Well developed, appropriately weighted evaluation of the challenge made by the claims, counter claims, arguments on the hypothesis.
Intermediate	3 – 4	Some critical but under-developed evaluation of the effect of the claims on the hypothesis.
Basic	1 – 2	Some relevant critical comment on the hypothesis and counter-claims.

No.	Question AO:	1	2	3
4	**Further criticisms of Freud's theory are presented in paragraphs 9 and 10.** **Select one of the criticisms and explain <u>one</u> way in which Freud's theory could be defended against it.** **(*3 marks*)**	**1**		**2**

- Freud's theory says that dreams can *often* express repressed / disguised wishes; this is not a necessary feature of dreams (yet this defence would not explain why animals / children dreamt *more*...)

- He also says they can simply express wishes or desires, such as the desire to drink water. It's perfectly plausible small animals etc could have such desires.

- Children and animals etc may be more plagued by desires / unfulfilled wishes than e.g. adult humans; animals have to struggle harder to obtain basic needs, and children have less control over their lives / existence, often frustrated by things they are not allowed or able to do...

- Dreams do not only happen in REM sleep / we do not know for certain when dreams occur and whether or not REM must accompany it... i.e. questioning the assumption behind the connection between REM and dreaming.

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	Marks	Description
Good	3	For a clearly relevant, succinct and effective rebuttal of a criticism raised in the text.
Intermediate	2	Relevance is fairly clear and goes some way to rebutting the criticism raised in the text.
Basic	1	Some attempt to rebut a problem raised in the text but attempt is largely ineffective e.g. relevance is unclear or expression is poor.

Question 5 refers to Document C.

No.	Question AO:	1	2	3
5	**Assess the support in paragraph 3 for claiming that 'dreaming is an automatically pre-programmed activity of the brain'. (*5 marks*)**	1	4	

The support is based on the empirical findings that (1) all people have dreams; and (2) that the dreaming phase of the sleep cycle happens at regular intervals and has a predictable length.

The support is less than conclusive. The first piece of evidence IS consistent with the theory, but it is also consistent with Freud's theory (or indeed any other). It doesn't really add very much. The second piece is more useful l / relevant; it does seem to show a close correlation between brain activity / physiological events and dreaming.

The regularity seems to show that this is something fixed and which happens against our will to this extent the support is effective. However, it does not necessarily imply what it says it implies. 'Implies' is very strong – although it depends whether it is meant in the strict logical sense, or the looser colloquial sense of 'suggests'. Presumably it must mean the latter. If the latter, the support is more effective (since the claim itself is weaker). There is also some ambiguity in the claim itself, that 'dreaming is an automatically pre-programmed activity of the brain'.

The *cause* of dreaming could be pre-programmed, but it does not mean that our dreams are / that what *happens* in our dreams is; nor that the *function* of dreaming is thus explained. (There is an ambiguity between 'dreaming' as in the *act* of dreaming; and 'dreaming' as in what is actually dreamed of, or the significance of dreaming).

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	Marks	Description
Good	5	Well developed, appropriately weighted assessment of the justification given for the claim, demonstrating sound understanding of requisite methodology.
Intermediate	3 – 4	Some appropriate assessment of the justification for the claim, showing some familiarity with the methodology.
Basic	1 – 2	Some relevant comment on the claim and reasoning given for it.

Questions 6 and 7 refer to Documents B and C.

These questions require you to compare Freud's wish fulfilment theory (WFT) with the activation-synthesis theory (AST).

No.	Question AO:	1	2	3
6	**Supposing it were true that 'dreaming is an automatically pre-programmed activity of the brain', how damaging would it be for Freud's theory?** **(*4 marks*)**	**1**	**3**	

Going by the text alone, the answer is (probably) not very damaging – and certainly does not give conclusive refutation. Freud could *agree* that there are physiological triggers – the notion that we have this mechanism that puts us into this state where the repressed wishes kick in / where a different part of the psyche is able to find expression is perfectly consistent with Freud's theory. After all, it doesn't happen when we are awake!

However, the evidence does suggest that physiological factors are important, and indeed necessary conditions for the dreaming process to occur. A Freudian interpretation that tried to deny this would be playing a dangerous game here, and would need to be able to explain the (undeniable) correlation between the physiological events and dreaming as being, e.g. a coincidence.

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	Marks	Description
Good	4	Well developed, appropriately weighted evaluation of the challenge made by the claims, counter claims, arguments on the hypothesis.
Intermediate	2 – 3	Some critical but under-developed evaluation of the effect of the claims on the hypothesis.
Basic	1	Some relevant critical comment on the hypothesis and counter-claims.

No.	Question AO:	1	2	3
7	**Critically compare how successfully Freud's and Hobson and McCarley's theories explain dreaming.** **Assess their explanatory power in terms of:** • **scope** • **simplicity.** **(10 *marks*)**		**7**	**3**

Scope

Both theories offer explanations for why dreams occur, and for features of our dreams (strange, baffling / apparently mysterious content). They both explain why we all dream; and to some extent also why we 'have' to dream.

However, Hobson/McCarley's doesn't seem to explain so well why we 'need' to dream, why we are disturbed, physically and psychologically if we are not allowed to dream; why is it harmful for us to <u>not</u> go through this process of interpreting random brain noise (i.e. Dement's findings)?

Neither does it explain so easily phenomena such as recurring dreams, or the fact that there seem to be common dream 'themes' common across people, such as falling and flying, and escaping / being on the run – things that are unlike day-today life experiences but which have obviously rich symbolic connotations.

It could be argued that Hobson/McCarley's theory fares better with the physiological facts of what happens in our brains, the fact that dreams take place as part of a cycle... However, Freud's theory does not preclude physiological goings on; it could be that we need to be allowed into a state whereby the unconscious desires / wishes can then 'seep' through.

Hobson/McCarley's theory is better at explaining why other animals etc dream; and it doesn't suffer from the criticism that people who undergo psychoanalysis do not cease to dream (i.e. the problems Freud's theory encounters).

Simplicity

In terms of simplicity, Hobson/McCarley's theory seems to win. Freud's theory requires there to be different levels of the mind; it also requires a whole load of theory to interpret the actual dreams correctly – for example we need to know what different things mean...

Hobson/McCarley's theory arguably requires an extra explanation for *why* there is this random brain noise in the first place. This could be seen as a sign of (unnecessary) complexity; on the other hand, the evidence is there that this occurs, so it is consistent with the facts. It could just be a 'fact' of our physiology, perhaps a by-product of the way we happen to have evolved; there may be no adequate explanation (analogy with e.g. other things that we are left with...)

This is a difficult question, and there should be no 'right' answer. Any plausible lines of assessment that invoke the terminology / techniques / conceptual devices for evaluating theories should be credited.

Candidates should be credited for any relevant / plausible judgements concerning the scope / simplicity of the two theories.

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	**Marks**	**Description**
Good	8 – 10	Well developed, appropriately weighted and thorough evaluation of the hypotheses in terms of both scope and simplicity. Responses demonstrate sound understanding of the requisite methodology and Critical comments are clear and effective.
Intermediate	4 – 7	Some appropriate assessment of the hypotheses in terms of scope and simplicity (at the lower end responses are likely to be skewed towards one or the other). Some familiarity with the methodology is shown; comments are largely clear but with varying degrees of effectiveness.
Basic	1 – 3	Some relevant comment on the hypotheses and/ or supporting evidence.

Section B: Arguments

No.	Question AO:	1	2	3
8	**Read the following argument.** **'If dreams are simply a matter of interpreting random stimuli from the brain stem, it follows that dreams are completely uninformative. According to the AST, dreams involve nothing more than the interpretation of random stimuli. We can therefore learn nothing about ourselves from analysing our dreams.'** **Is the following argument sound? Explain your answer.** **(*5 marks*)**	**3**	**2**	

On the surface this is a valid argument – a deduction of the form 'If X, then Y; X; Therefore Y' (i.e. a case of *affirming the antecedent*).

However it would be wrong to classify this argument as sound. This is because the truth of the first premise – the conditional statement 'If dreams are simply a matter of interpreting random stimuli from the brain stem, it follows that dreams are completely uninformative' – is debatable: even if dreams were the result of us interpreting 'random' stimuli from the brain stem, the way we choose to interpret the stimuli could still be informative (in the same way e.g.. inkblot tests where the ways subjects interpret the shapes on the paper can supposedly be revealing about character.) [NB Such a response is sufficient for full marks.]

There are other reasons why the argument ought not to be classified as sound. For example, the truth of the second premise could also be questioned: the theory only says that this is the cause of our dreams; it does not say that dreams are 'nothing *more*' than this – it is perfectly compatible with the notion that dreams could still be revealing (for reasons outlined above).

There is also an important implicit assumption that the AST is *correct* in its analysis of our dreams: the conclusion depends on this assumption, and since this is only one of the theories on offer, it is unwarranted. Without this assumption, the argument is, technically speaking, both unsound and *invalid*.

Candidates should be awarded for any relevant critical comment (analytical or evaluative), yet to score full marks they need to show understanding of the terminology required for assessing soundness / validity of arguments.

Candidates should be awarded for their correct use of the terms 'valid' and 'sound' even if their judgements are incorrect / unconvincing.

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	Marks	Description
Good	5	Candidates show clear understanding of the notions of argument validity and soundness and their analysis is accurate and assured.
Intermediate	3 – 4	EITHER: Candidates show some understanding of the notions of argument validity and soundness; they apply this to provide an analysis which is partially correct. OR: They show good understanding of the theory, but their application is incorrect.
Basic	1 – 2	Little understanding of the theory evident but some analysis and/ or critical comment on the argument is offered.

9	**Read the following argument.** **There is no need to consider theories such as Freud's or the AST, since dreams can be explained perfectly well by evolution. It has been scientifically proven that we can become better at performing tasks by imagining them before we perform them. When you imagine performing an activity, your brain responds as if you actually are performing the activity. If you imagine seeing something, the part of your brain that is involved in vision becomes active. If you imagine moving a part of your body, the part of your brain that you would use to move that part of your body becomes active. Athletes often use mental imagery in this way to improve their performance. I f it can be helpful to imagine a situation before it happens, it could be even more helpful if your brain actually treats the situation as though it is happening. Dreaming can therefore be seen as an evolutionary advantage, as a way to 'kid' ourselves that we are facing real dangers, in order to learn how best to respond to them when they actually arise.** Source: adapted from www.meaningofdreams.org

No.	Question AO:	1	2	3
9(a)	**Explain the reasoning that the author uses in the above passage. (*7 marks*)**	**7**		

The conclusion is:

Dreams can be explained perfectly well by evolution.

This can be thought of as being an intermediate conclusion supporting the further main conclusion, that there is no need to consider theories such as... or that the overall conclusion is a compound of both of these claims. Either way, it is the claim that dreams can be explained perfectly well by evolution that the rest of the passage is setting out to justify.

The claim that dreams can be explained perfectly well by evolution is based on two hypotheses / conjectures (which can be thought of as reasons; or a reason and an intermediate conclusion):

HYP/ REASON 1: If it can be helpful to imagine a situation before it happens, it could be even more helpful if your brain actually treats the situation as though it is happening.

(And therefore)

HYP/ REASON 2/ IC: Dreaming can be seen as an evolutionary advantage, as a way to 'kid' ourselves that we are facing real dangers, in order to learn how best to respond to them when they actually arise.
[NB candidates that recognise these specifically as hypotheses, rather than simply reasons, ought to be credited – i.e. top band should mention this]

As well as this, there is the claim that: We can become better at performing tasks by imagining them before we perform them. This claim is what prompts the first of the two hypotheses; and the next four claims serve to substantiate / illustrate this claim.

Candidates ought to recognise that while this fact or phenomenon may be what prompts the first hypothesis, it would be wrong (and certainly unfair) to think of this as being a *reason for* thinking that the first hypothesis *is* true; i.e. it would be wrong to construe the first hypothesis as being an inference from, or intermediate conclusion based on, this claim. (To do so it would make the argument a very bad one, and fail to see it as the kind of argument it is, namely an argument to the best explanation – see evaluation.)

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	**Marks**	**Description**
Good	6 – 7	Candidates give an analysis of the way the reasoning works that is both thorough and accurate.
Intermediate	3 – 5	Candidates give an analysis that correctly identifies some of the key parts of the argument and/ or correctly explains some of the reasoning.
Basic	1 – 2	Candidates correctly identify at least one part of the argument; OR: show understanding of the terminology and/ or methodology relating to argument analysis even though their analysis is incorrect.

No.	Question AO:	1	2	3
9(b)	**Critically evaluate the reasoning.** **(*8 marks*)**		**5**	**3**

Evaluation

The main critical points are going to be on the role of explanation – assessing the confidence with which we can infer the conjectures / hypotheses as actually being acceptable / the best explanations; how plausible they are, what grounds there are in terms of confirming evidence, how speculative they are.

A first / central point to make is that, just because something can be explained (perfectly well) by something, it does not mean we have to accept the explanation / do not need to consider other explanations. In fact, in order to (provisionally) accept an explanation – we must consider what if any other theories there are (since the only way to argue *for* an explanation is to (try to) show that it is the *best* explanation).

For this reason, the move from the intermediate conclusion to the main conclusion is flawed, and the main conclusion as it stands does not follow. (Candidates could emphasise this by pointing to the fact that the argument fails to consider the other hypotheses / does nothing to discredit them; however, this is not necessary as this point has already been made.)

As for the claim that dreams can be explained perfectly well by evolution, there is some grounds for accepting this – but only in the sense that they can be explained.

There is however room for more critical discussion of the actual grounds for accepting the evolutionary theory as merely a hypothesis.

As mentioned above (in the analysis section), it cannot be inferred from the 'fact' that it can be helpful to imagine things before they happen, that it could be even more helpful if your brain actually treats the situation as though it is happening (i.e. the first hypothesis cannot be inferred from this). As it stands it is purely conjecture.

The second hypothesis (that 'Dreaming can be seen as an evolutionary advantage, as a way to 'kid' ourselves that we are facing real dangers, in order to learn how best to respond to them when they actually arise') is perhaps a reasonable / plausible one (made more so given the comments later, see next question) – even so it is only as good as the conjecture of hypothesis 1; i.e. it requires us to accept the first hypothesis, which as we have seen ought to be seen as purely conjectural. Therefore, though interesting, it must remain largely conjectural / speculative and is far from established from the argument / evidence as it stands.

Candidates could point out that this conjecture is supported further if you think about the contents of dreams – but it ought to be acknowledged, at least implicitly, that this is not provided in the argument as it stands. (Candidates may want to comment further on this, by pointing out that the argument provides no indication that dreams allow us to rehearse for *dangerous* situations – in other words nothing about the content of dreams, which could perhaps help.)

Candidates might want to point out that there is some lack of clarity – Dreams can be explained perfectly well by evolution is not to say that evolution *is* the correct explanation.

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	**Marks**	**Description**
Good	7 – 8	For two or more relevant, perceptive, and *thoroughly* developed critical comments supporting or challenging the argument, and used to support an evaluative judgement about the argument as a whole. The response will demonstrate a clear understanding of the target argument.
Intermediate	4 – 6	For two or more relevant but perhaps partially explained points relating to the effectiveness or otherwise of the argument, and / or warrant for the claims. The response will demonstrate a broad understanding of the target argument.
Basic	1 – 3	For some relevant evaluative judgement related to the strength or weakness of the argument with some basic (usually under-developed) attempt at explanation or justification.

For Question 10 use the Generic mark-grid, page 19.

No.	Question AO:	1	2	3
10	**Read the statement below, then answer the question that follows.** **'Why bother wasting time trying to understand dreams when there is so much we have yet to learn about the real world?'** **Present a concise but well-argued case in response to the above question.** **(*15 marks*)**			**15**

Any relevant line(s) of argument ought to be credited. Candidates can base their arguments around material in the source documents, or rely entirely on material of their own.

A discernible position needs to be advanced, though it is not essential that they clearly state a single, main conclusion. They may largely agree or disagree with the position implied by the question; or they may argue that the position as expressed contains too many ambiguities for a side to be taken. (Candidates should be given credit for unpicking and attempting to clarify the possible meanings present in the statement; candidates who select plausible interpretations and then offer relevant responses are likely to be in the top band.)

Examples of response:

Candidates can question what is meant by 'real' – and attack the assumptions implicit in the question itself. For example, there is the assumption that the real world is the world we experience when we are awake, but many philosophical and religious traditions (e.g. Buddhism / Platonism / Hinduism) have questioned this.

There is also the value judgement – why are 'real' world questions / problems more interesting / pressing than (inner) questions about ourselves/ who we are? Perhaps greater insight into who *we* are will enable us to make better use of the world around us.

The best responses will likely see this as presenting something of a false dichotomy – time spent understanding our dreams could well help us to understand the 'real' world. Scientists, artists, philosophers all have found inspiration at times in dreams for their theories about the real world. Besides, why are our dreams *not* part of the real world?

Even if the distinction was meaningful, there is no reason to suggest that we couldn't do both!

Generic mark-grid for Section B, Question 10:

	Award level		
CRITERION:	***Thoroughly met, well-structured and clearly expressed***	***Partially met with adequate expression and structure***	***Inadequately met.*** ***Basic response with some weaknesses of expression / structure***
Appropriate conclusion, relevant to the question and consistent with candidate's reasoning	3	1 – 2	0
Strong supporting reasons: 2 or more, or 1 thoroughly developed	5 – 6	3 – 4	1– 2
Supplements to reasoning (1 or more of): example; analogy; evidence; explanation; principle; reasoning; anticipating and responding to objections	5 – 6	3 – 4	1– 2

- 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 full credit
(5 – 6).

Distribution of marks across the questions and assessment objectives for Unit 3

AO Balance	AO1	AO2	AO3	Totals
Qu 1	3			3
Qu 2	1	3	1	5
Qu 3	1	2	2	5
Qu 4	1		2	3
Qu 5	1	4		5
Qu 6	1	3		4
Qu 7		7	3	10
Total Section A	**8**	**19**	**8**	**35**
Qu 8	3	2		5
Qu 9(a)	7			7
Qu 9(b)		5	3	8
Qu 10			15	15
Total Section B	**10**	**7**	**18**	**35**
Paper Total: [70] Marks	**18**	**26**	**26**	**70**
Paper Total: [70] Percentage	**26%**	**37%**	**37%**	**100%**