

Critical Thinking

Advanced GCE A2 H450

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H050

Mark Schemes for the Units

January 2007

H050/H450/MS/R/07J

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Critical Thinking (H450)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Critical Thinking (H050)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
F491	Credibility of Evidence	1
F492	Assessing and Developing Argument	11
F493	Resolution of Dilemmas	27
F494	Critical Reasoning	35
*	Grade Thresholds	50

**Mark Scheme F491
January 2007**

SECTION A**Question 1**

Credit any three correct weaknesses.

Do not credit generalised assessments that could fit any context or answers which assess the specifics of this case.

Forward slashes indicate alternatives.

Candidates may be credited for more than one point in each section.

Examples of correct answers:

In the context of such types of shipping or transport disaster:

There may be motives/vested interest to misrepresent the truth (interpret favourably/selectively report/falsify reports)

by the shipping company - to maintain public confidence in their business
- to avoid costly cases of litigation.

by those suffering from the consequences

- to gain greater compensation for lost goods.
- to gain compensation for lost lives of family members.

by the media

- to attract public attention to the dangers of such vessels.

There may be difficulties in perceiving the truth of the events

- There may be nautical technicalities which need expert knowledge to be interpreted correctly.
- The danger of the event might have distorted the perceptions of survivors.
- Generalisation from the report of a survivor reporting from one particular area might distort the interpretation of the events.

There may be difficulties in judging the truth of the reports

- Isolated reports from survivors may prevent the ability to refute or corroborate claims.
- Evidence from the wreck is difficult to retrieve to refute or corroborate claims.

3 x 1 mark

[AO3 3] [3]

Question 2

- (a) Credit one mark each for a correct difference.

Credit one mark for a correct effect.

Example:

Difference - The tilt of the ship would mean that some lifeboats would be near to the sea whilst others would be further away.
The roughness of the sea is not depicted on the drawing.
The panic of the passengers is not depicted on the drawing.

Effect - The varying difficulty/fear involved might explain the difference in numbers of people boarding at different points on the ship.
A rough sea might cause the lifeboats to sway in the air making it difficult to load them.
Panic might have affected the ability to fill the lifeboats. **2 x 1 mark**

- (b) Credit two marks for a developed explanation.

Credit one mark for a stated point.

Example:

Statement - This lifeboat appears to be quite full even with about 20 passengers.
Development - This might support Lowe's intention to 'prevent any effort to overload his craft [of 58] beyond a point which he already considered perilous,' if the two boats were the same size. **2 marks**

[AO2 4] [4]

Question 3

Credit **one mark** for each correctly identified criterion of credibility (accept synonyms), a **second mark** if this is used to correctly to assess the document, **an additional mark** if it is correctly supported from the text - *italicised below*. A quote in the form of a claim is not required: name may be sufficient. Quotes must be relevant to the criterion and assessment.

Do not credit assessment of individual claims or persons within the document unless the answer relates them to the assessment of the document.

Examples of correct answers that would gain three marks:

Document 3 titanic – titanic.com	Ability to observe/primary info	The transcript includes a photograph of survivors in the lifeboat, which if authentic would give an accurate impression of numbers	Caption - <i>'standard lifeboat approaching...'</i>
	Reputation/vested interest	As a website about the Titanic a possible vested interest to represent the events correctly, to maintain credibility	Website name - <i>'titanic-titanic.com'</i>
	Expertise	A detailed analysis is provided which would allow informed conclusions to be drawn	Table - <i>'Analysing Titanic's...'</i>
Exert from 'Sinking of the Titanic'	Ability to observe/primary info	Contains eye witness accounts of those loading the lifeboats, who would have first hand experience of the events	Named officer – <i>'Harold Lowe, C H Lightoller...'</i>
	Bias	The extracts are based upon the evidence of the officers, lacking the evidence of those being loaded to give their perspective on the events	<i>Evidence from three officers, 'Low and Lightoller'</i>
	Reputation/vested interest	Gives evidence from the United States Senate inquiry which could lend authority to the findings	Chapter heading – <i>'Inquiry by United States Senate'</i>
	Expertise	Contains evidence from those who should have been trained in evacuation procedure	Evidence from three officers, <i>'Low and Lightoller'</i>

2 x 3 marks as above for each of the 3 documents [AO2 18] [18]

Total Marks for Section A AO2 [22] AO3 [3] [25]

Question 4

Credit as follows:

- (a) **Implication:**
- That because the Titanic more than complied with the requirements it was suitably equipped/safe.
 - That there were sufficient lifeboats.
 - That the Board of Trade recommendations were exceeded.

(b) **Reason to challenge:**

Examples:

- If the requirements were outdated/needed revision.
- If the Titanic were bigger than the ships that the requirements were intended to safeguard.
- If the lifeboats did not look strong enough to hold 65 people.

- Support:**
- Lifeboat capacity was 1060 and yet the Titanic had 2,208 people on board/
 - There were only enough lifeboats for about half the people on board.

3 x 1 mark

[AO1 1, AO2 2] [3]

Question 5

Credit as follows:

- (a) **Claim:**
- The lifeboats had been tested in the shipyard as to their safe capacity for loading and lowering with sandbags/70 men. (1 mark)

(b) **Reduced relevance:**

- People might move and change the balance of the lifeboat which might reduce the relevance of using sandbags to test strength to carry 65+ people/the capacity for buckling.
- The swaying of the lifeboat as it was lowered might reduce the relevance of a test in a shipyard which would probably have been in calm waters.
- The tilt of the sinking Titanic might reduce the relevance of a test in a shipyard where the vessel would have been upright/level.
- The behaviour of people desperate/reluctant to get into the lifeboat might reduce the relevance, if sandbags had been used to test the capacity for buckling.
- Passengers who were smaller or larger than average might have affected the safe loading capacity.
- Passengers bringing baggage onto the lifeboat might have affected the safe loading capacity.

3 x 1 mark

[AO2 4] [4]

Question 6

Credit **one mark** for a relevant claim – *examples are italicised below*.

Plus one mark for correctly identifying whether this is strengthened or weakened by a relevant criterion.

Plus up to two marks for stating what is supposed to be true to make this assessment.

Examples of answers that would gain four marks:

Dr Dodge	His claim, ' <i>Many of these</i> [third class passengers] <i>were shot by the officers</i> ' is weakened by his possible lack of sight in the dark,	w	Ability to observe	if his boat had been launched and he was in the water or on its descent. These may have been warning shots into the air.
	As a doctor whether medical or professional, his claim above may be strengthened by a vested interest to represent the facts accurately,	s	Reputation/ vested interest	if concerned to preserve his professional standing.
	His account of his reasoned approach to the officer, ' <i>I waited...I asked...</i> ' is weakened by a possible vested interest to demonstrate negligence on behalf of the officers,	w	Vested interest	if motivated by the possibility of compensation from the shipping company/or reward from the newspaper to engage public sympathy.
	The claim above is also weakened by a vested interest to lie to avoid blame	w	Vested interest	if he had taken the place of women, children or the weak in the boat.
Officer Lowe	His claim that steerage passengers, ' <i>were glaring at the boat</i> ' might have been inaccurate,	s	Ability to observe	if his perceptions were influenced by the fear of the boat being destabilised by more passengers.
	His claim, ' <i>Had one more person leaped aboard her... it might well have proved to be the last straw</i> ' is strengthened by his expertise as an officer to judge the safe capacity of the boat,	s	Expertise	if this had been part of his training or past experience.
	The above claim is strengthened by the fact that he was testifying to the US senate inquiry where he might have a vested interest to represent the events accurately,	s	Reputation/ vested interest	unless there was a greater motive to avoid accusations of negligence.

	The above point may be reversed: A vested interest to avoid negligence,	w	Reputation/ vested interest	unless a greater motive to tell the truth at an inquiry.
	The above claim is weakened by a possible motive to present the events more favourably to defend the interests of the shipping company,	w	Vested interest	if he had misjudged the capacity of the boat.
	His reported claim that he ' <i>discharged his revolver three times into the air... to show that he was armed...to prevent any effort to overload</i> ' is weakened by a vested interest to avoid prosecution,	w	Vested interest	if he had fired at the crowd to prevent overload.

s = strengthens **w** = weakens credibility

[AO2 16] 4 x 4 marks [16]

Question 7

Credit two marks for a comparison which gives an evaluation of both sides, (one mark for one side or one mark for a stated comparison of both sides with neither side evaluated).

Expertise: Officer Lowe was likely to have had more expertise through training to judge the safety aspects, than Dr Dodge who was reacting to the effects of the decisions rather than the motives.

[AO2 2] 2 x 1 mark [2]

Total Marks for Section B AO1 [1] AO2 [24] [25]

Question 8

Corroboration**2 x 3 marks**

Credit one mark for a correct but unsupported point of corroboration.

Credit two marks for a correct point that is accurately supported with one reference to the text.

Credit three marks for a correct point that is accurately supported with two references to the text.

eg Both "Regulation run mad" and titanic-titanic.com claim that the lifeboats had been tested in Belfast.

(1 mark)

Regulation run mad claims, 'the lifeboats had been tested in Belfast on 25 March 1912...'

(Second mark)

titanic-titanic.com claims, 'The lifeboats had been tested in the Belfast yard...'

(Third mark)

Other points that could be supported:

Both Lowe and Lightoller point out that loading from the top deck reduced the safe capacity of the lifeboats.

Both the National Maritime Museum and Dr Dodge claim that the lifeboats were under filled and the photograph corroborates this.

Both the titanic-titanic.com table and Dr Dodge claim that some life craft were unlaunched.

Both the author Mowbray and Regulation run mad claim compliance with the Board of Trade regulations.

Conflict**2 x 3 marks**

Credit one mark for a correct but unsupported point of conflict.

Credit two marks for a correct point that is accurately supported with one reference to the text.

Credit three marks for a correct point that is accurately supported with two reference to the text.

eg There is conflict as to how the lifeboats were tested,

(1 mark)

Regulation run mad claims that they were tested, 'with 70 men being carried in each.'

(Second mark)

titanic-titanic.com claims that they were, 'loaded with sandbags to the full capacity of the lifeboat'.

(Third mark)

Other conflicting interpretations that could be supported:

The officers claimed that the boats did not look strong enough to be loaded to full capacity whereas both Regulation run mad and titanic-titanic.com. claim that they had been tested as being safe at this capacity.

Dr Dodge claims a drop of 50 feet to the sea, whereas the author Mowbray cites this as 70 feet.

Balance of evidence**4 marks**

Credit as follows:

A limited assessment with inaccuracies	1 mark
A thorough assessment with some inaccuracy	2 marks
A statement of what the sides believe	1 mark
An explanation of the problem sources	1 mark

Regarding the under filling of the lifeboats:

Differentiating between inference and claim would be an indicator of accuracy.

Candidates may wish to exonerate crew by pointing out problems caused by passengers and circumstances.

appropriate decisions made
National Maritime Museum
two officers
Lowe Lightoller
Sir Alfred Chalmers

v

inappropriate decisions made
titanic-titanic.com

The following sources support both sides:

Regulation run mad public confusion
Dr Dodge public fear of drop

Regulation run mad lifeboat capacity tested
Dr Dodge policy of women and children first
not enough men to launch boats
empty launching to pick up from
accidents

Weight of evidence

2 marks

Numerically the weight of evidence lies with **claims that the crew made appropriate decisions**
(1 mark)

with 3/7 sources leading to this conclusion, one source directly opposing and two sources
supporting both sides. (1 mark)

Quality of evidence

2 x 3 marks

Award one mark for each correct assessment, up to three marks for each side.

eg Ability to observe

The officers were present at the event and
able to assess the strains on the lifeboat directly.
(1 mark)

v The tests were in still waters, possibly with
sandbags and so not as realistic.
(1 mark)

Judgement - greater likelihood that.....

1 mark

Award the judgement mark only if it links with the assessment given.

Total marks for Section C [25] AO3 [25]

Quality of Written Communication

Credit as follows across all answers

5 marks

Level	Errors in spelling punctuation and grammar	Use of specialist vocabulary	Expression	Marks
1	Errors are intrusive	Little use of specialist vocabulary	Order and expression impede understanding	(1-2)
2	Errors are occasional	Occasional use of specialist vocabulary	Points exhibit some order	(3)
3	Errors are few, if any	Specialist vocabulary used where appropriate	Well ordered and fluent	(4-5)

TOTAL**AO1 [1], AO2 [46], AO3 [33]****[80]**

Mark Scheme F492
January 2007

Section A – Multiple choice

1	A	AO1 [1]
2	D	AO1 [1]
3	A	AO1 [1]
4	C	AO1 [1]
5	A	AO1 [1]
6	B	AO1 [1]
7	C	AO1 [1]
8	C	AO1 [1]
9	D	AO1 [1]
10	B	AO1 [1]
11	B	AO1 [1]
12	D	AO1 [1]
13	A	AO1 [1]
14	B	AO1 [1]
15	B	AO1 [1]
16	D	AO1 [1]
17	C	AO1 [1]
18	C	AO1 [1]
19	A	AO1 [1]
20	D	AO1 [1]

1 mark for each correct answer. Total mark to be doubled.

Total marks for Section A [40]
AO1 [40]

Section B

Where the mark scheme offers two marks it is for each accurately made relevant point. A comment that has the correct meaning, but lacks precision and/or detail would attract 1 mark. Example comments for 1 mark have been given but are for illustration only.

- 21 (a)** We should restrict the amount of television that is broadcast
(Allow some variation in wording such as the amount of television broadcast should be restricted.)

AO1 [1]

- 21 (b)** Watching television is dangerous to our physical and mental health.
(Accept: The whole basis of the argument (that watching television increases intelligence) is flawed.)

AO1 [2]

Examples for one mark

Television is bad for your mental and physical health.

- 22** For each precisely identified reason or equivalent paraphrase **2 marks**
Where individual reasons have been correctly identified but the expression is less specific or includes a minor reference to supporting evidence **1 mark**

The reasons given to support the conclusion are:

1. Television distorts important debates and ideas.
2. Watching television contributes to sleep problems in young children.
3. Watching television makes people depressed.
4. Watching television can also affect our physical health.
5. The whole basis of the argument (that watching television increases intelligence) is flawed.
6. Some types of television programme actually prevent us thinking.
7. Television is no different (to other activities such as smoking...)
8. (Accept: If we are not careful, the addiction of watching television will become more common than drug addiction.)
9. (Accept the answer to 21b but only credit once.)

AO1 5x2 [10]

Examples of 1 mark answers

Television distorts important debates between presidential candidates.

Watching TV gives young children nightmares.

Watching TV news can make you depressed

Watching TV news can make you pessimistic.

Watching TV can lead to health problems, like obesity.

The idea that complicated TV programmes lead to increased intelligence is wrong.

Television makes you switch off.

Television is just like other common things such as smoking.

- 23** Watching television increases intelligence.
(Award the mark if comment about global IQ is also included.)

AO1 [1]

24

Strength

If the reason is that it distorts important debates, it is hard to imagine a more important debate and if television is distorting the outcome of the debate (and election) there is good reason to think that this is an important example.

Weakness

The author is generalising from only one example. Presidential debates are very confrontational and may not be representative of the other debates or ideas put out on television/there is no reason to think that the effect in other areas/countries would be the same.

(For both marks to be awarded there needs to be some development/explanation of the theme of an unwarranted generalisation from the example.)

Either A02 [2]

Examples of versions that would attract one mark:

Strength

The author picks a very important example/the men involved are very powerful.

Weakness

There might be other sorts of debates that are not distorted.

The author is generalising.

The author only gives one example.

25 (a)

1. We would need to assume that a significant number of these children have spent some time/a considerable amount of time watching examples of the videos or DVD's mentioned, (but not 'no time' or 'all the time').
2. We would need to assume that a significant number of the children did not have sleep disturbances before they spent some time/a considerable amount of time watching examples of the videos or DVDs mentioned.
3. That a significant number/majority of the children do not have sleep disturbances as a result of some other factor (not related to cartoon/DVD watching.)
4. That a significant number/majority of the children do have sleep disturbances as a result of violent images seen on the TV/DVD.

Any one A02 [2]

Examples for one mark:

The children have watched a lot of videos/DVDs

All the children have watched a lot of videos/DVDs

The children did not have nightmares before.

The nightmares were not caused by some other factor.

Any answer with ALL — all the children.(ref to points 1 and 2).

Any answer that swaps video/DVD for TV (ref to point 1 and 2).

25 (b)

1. The author is using evidence about cartoons released on video or DVD which is not the same as evidence about watching broadcast television since the DVDs could have been watched elsewhere or TV could be watched without having seen these cartoon movies.
2. The evidence refers to the content of these cartoons, not their effects on children. The author is therefore using evidence about the *number* of images and drawing a conclusion based on their *effect*. This is a very poor argument.
3. Even if we allow for the above problem, the statistics still leave room for comment. We do not know what percentage of children's viewing consists of these videos and cartoons may only form very small part of children's viewing.
4. 62% is not a massive majority, especially as only half contain death, it is entirely possible that a significant number of children *with* nightmares are watching cartoons *without* images of violence and death.
5. Although there is evidence of violence it is possible that this violence is presented in such a slap-stick manner that no child would see it as upsetting.
6. Difficulties and inconsistencies in defining 'young children' could mean that the children with sleep disturbances are different to those children who are affected by the videos and DVDs.

(An answer that refers to there being no evidence that the cartoon violence was the only factor should not attract credit since the author only argues that they contribute to sleep difficulties.)

Any two A02 [2 + 2]

Examples for 1 mark:

Videos and DVDs might be different to the programmes on TV.

The children may react differently to the violence in the cartoons.

The children might watch very few DVDs like that.

62% is not a big majority.

- 26 NB** Since there is choice in this question, the answer to part (b) does not have to match part (a). A candidate could name one flaw but explain a different one.

1 Slippery slope/too big a jump/unwarranted conclusion.

Even if we do feel pessimistic after watching a news programme, becoming depressed and anxious is probably not a general reaction and is too far from the original point to be believable without additional argument — the author is guilty of running away with the impact and does not show/prove that each step would lead onto the next one.

Students can also see this in the last sentence of hypothetical reasoning — watching television to hospital beds full of depressed people is a ridiculous proposition — again they fail to show that each intermediate step would happen.

2 Appeal to popularity or democratic fallacy

The fact that everyone believes that something is true is not enough evidence to show that it is true. There could be many reasons why everyone believes something to be true and the belief still be wrong.

3 Hasty generalisation

The author may be overstating the case — not everyone does believe that the news is depressing and has drawn an overstated conclusion on the basis of limited evidence. This is an unreasonable conclusion to draw.

Any one AO1 [1] A02 [2]

Examples of answers for 1 mark:

Pessimism to depressed people is too big a jump/they are far apart.

Lots of people could be wrong.

- 27 (a)** The author means that it would not be possible to be sure that watching television alone/television was the only factor/ was responsible for the rise in global IQ scores.

AO1 [2]

Example of answer for 1 mark:

Reference to the problem of the relationship being a correlation rather than causal.

Identifying that there could be many other possible reasons for the rise in IQ scores.

(Candidates may write: That it is not possible to identify a causal relationship between TV viewing and IQ scores. This is only repeating the question and should not be given credit.)

- 27 (b)** Wide range of answers available to candidates — better education, rise in literacy, diet. Could also be credited for suggesting errors in measurement or lack of validity in the IQ test itself.

AO1 [1]

28

1. The author suggests that watching television is bad for us/dangerous. The fact that it may stop us thinking is not intrinsically bad as we are unlikely to be watching television in a situation where not thinking was harmful to us.
2. The fight/flight response is useful in situations of danger and is used to protect us, rather than place us in danger.
3. Relaxing is not only not harmful, it is good for us. Relaxing often features 'switching off' so not thinking may actually be good for us.
4. Some have suggested that mindless TV viewing and not thinking is the opiate of the masses and that this makes people less violent/reactionary etc. This might show that watching TV was beneficial, in a rather odd way.
5. Some mental health problems are caused by thinking too much so not thinking could be good for us.

(Candidates are likely to comment that 'not thinking' is not physically harmful. This does not engage with the question and should not attract credit.)

Any one

A02 [2]

Examples for 1 mark:

Some reference to it being a temporary period of time that wont harm us.

Switching off is good for you.

Watching TV means you are not out getting drunk and getting into trouble.

29 (a)

- The passage compares the increasing complexity of cars (or modern) to the increasing complexity of television programmes (or modern) and **the lack** of improved driving skills to **the lack** of improved/increased intelligence.
- A more sophisticated student might suggest that it compares the low probability of gaining intelligence through watching increasingly complex television to the (proven) low probability of gaining driving skills by driving increasingly complex cars.

A02 [2]

Examples for 1 mark:

Complex TV programmes are compared to complex cars.

Driving complex cars is compared to watching complex TV.

- 29 (b) **Only award 2 marks if the explanation fits the decision. 1 mark for partial performance.**

Supports argument:

1. They are both driven by consumer demand so potentially the knowledge/skill of people has *resulted* in changes in programmes and cars rather than the programmes/cars *causing* the changes in people. More simply, the consumer has a choice over which programme/car they use, suggesting the direction of any relationship. This would support the author's argument.
2. They are both similar in that we may not be aware of the complexity of both — few people will be aware of how complex braking systems etc. work just as people will not be aware of how the programmes were made — both are 'consumed' without thought.
3. The timescale of advances fits quite well/are similar and without any obvious evidence of better driving skills/lots of evidence that we are not better drivers, it might be reasonable to suggest something similar about intelligence.

Does not support argument:

4. They are dissimilar in that you do not need to know how a complex car works in order to drive it well. It is probably not possible to fully enjoy a complex programme without understanding it. It is therefore entirely possible for a complex car not to improve our driving skill in a way that is not possible with programmes.
5. The complexity of a car is not necessarily related to the driving experience (good drivers often prefer unsophisticated cars). This is unlikely to be true of a television programme (intelligent viewers do not prefer basic programmes).
6. They are dissimilar in that a physical skill is being compared to an intellectual skill - there is no reason to believe that the two are learned (or not) in the same way. Students might give examples here, like reaction times vs knowledge etc.
7. They are dissimilar in that it could be argued that a skill can be practised and improved so that a complex car might help. However, intelligence may be genetic and there is nothing that can be done to improve this. (Accept although this is back to front to the author's point.)
8. They are dissimilar in that learning to drive a complex car is a one off experience whereas new TV programmes require a new effort each time and therefore might have more effect on our abilities.
9. The features of a complex car do not help anyone learn the physical aspects of driving a car whereas the complex details of a programme might actually teach us something new. (Similar to the fourth point).
10. The complexity of cars could actually make us worse drivers as they are more difficult to drive and understand. It is hard to imagine that a complex programme could make us less intelligent.
11. Complex cars make driving easier with all the electronic and mechanical aids and this could make us lazier and worse drivers whereas any new complexity in a TV programme needs to be thought about.

Any one A02 [2]

Examples for 1 mark:

In both cases people choose what they watch and what they drive.

Nobody knows how either are made/work.

Both are recent technological advances.

People do not understand how cars work whereas lots of people do understand the plot of TV programmes.

They are two different skills.

- 30** There are two examples in the passage:
 If we continue to watch so much (television), (then) hospital beds will be full of depressed people.
 If we are not careful, (then) the addiction of watching television will become more common than drug addiction.

either A03 [2]

Award one mark for anything with the same meaning, but different wording.

31

1. The author needs to assume that a significant amount of the broadcasts are from America/have significant content on American themes. (All American would be wrong)
2. That a significant amount of the broadcasts have western themes of relationships/do not reflect Buddhist principles.
3. That the content of a significant amounts of the broadcasts is such that it promotes dissatisfaction with Bhutanese culture and society/traditions etc.
4. A significant amount of the programmes promote wealth and material gain/ show the benefits of this.

(For the second mark there needs to be some word that shows that the candidate has understood that not all of the content has to be like this. Words used could be: most, some, partly etc.)

Any one A02 [2]

Examples for 1 mark:

The broadcasts promote sex and western relationships.

The programmes are from America

The programmes contain sex outside marriage

The programmes go against Buddhism.

Examples of programmes that promote greed would be worth one mark — Who Wants to be a Millionaire etc.

('The programmes' is taken to mean all programmes.)

32 (a)

1. The isolated nature of Bhutan makes it an ideal example because it has not been exposed to other western influences that might also be thought to lead to violence or crime, such as computer games, wealth, greed... It would be easier to establish a causal link because of this.
2. The large difference in Buddhism and western values make the change clearer - from a society that set no value by material possessions to one that does. The dramatic nature of the change *may* make it easier to suggest a causal link, although this point would be easier to argue against than the first one.
3. The suddenness of the introduction also makes it easier to identify a causal link - the effects of TV may have grown in the west along with other trends that make it hard to decide what is really going on. In Bhutan going from no television to 46 channels is a dramatic change.

Any one A02 [2+2]

Examples for 1 mark

No other factors involved.

It's a sudden change/the change was very dramatic.

Buddhism and Western culture at opposite ends of spectrum

32 (b)

1. The TV was introduced in 1999 and the crime wave was in 2002. The gap between these two dates suggest that there may be other causal factors at work/we cannot be sure that it is the effect of TV when there is such a long time between the two dates. Students may like to refer to 'post hoc' reasoning, although 2 marks are not available for just saying post hoc.
2. There is also the issue of the modernisation - television was just one part of this. The crime wave could be a result of some other change in Bhutanese society.
3. Without evidence that the crime wave has continued since 2002 we cannot reasonably think that it was caused by TV/could have been caused by something else.

Any one A02 [2]

Examples for 1 mark:

May have been other factors involved.

Events too far apart to be sure.

Other changes in the county at the same time.

The author makes a post hoc fallacy/ flaw (without explanation).

33 The flaw is: false dichotomy/restricting the options/only selecting two options/either or flaw/excluded middle.

The author presents the two polar opposites without recognising that there are other options such as very limited TV broadcast by the Bhutanese government along Buddhist lines that would reinforce the Buddhist principles and presumably lead back to a more tranquil lifestyle.

AO1 [1] A02 [2]

Examples for 1 mark:

There could be a middle option/a third option.

34

1. The author suggests that the impact (but not popularity) of the programmes (on the students of Bhutan) from BBS **is less than** that of the programmes from the 46 satellite channels.
2. The author suggests that the impact of the programmes (on the students of Bhutan) from BBS **is not enough to counteract** the impact of the programmes from the 46 satellite channels.

A02 [2]

Examples for 1 mark:

The impact is not enough.

The impact is either the same or less.

- 35 The author is suggesting that the broadcasts were like a torrent and unstoppable; the author exaggerates the description to give us a sense of the energy with which TV was transmitted. Students might say 'full on' or something similar but we need more than that!

AO1 [1]

Total marks for Section B [50] A01 [26] A02 [22] A03 [2]

Section C

- 36** Individual freedoms are not limitless
 The state/we should intervene to reduce harm or self-harm
 Laws should be used to prevent harm or self-harm
 The rights of individuals are less than the good of the whole (or similar)

Any one A03 [2]

Examples for 1 mark:

We can't all do what we want.

Individuals are not as important as the whole community.

People should not be allowed to hurt others or themselves.

- 37** We would need to know that they were the ones who had 'won' the televised debates/the ones with the best appearance and snappy one liners, but not the best arguments.

A03 [1]

- 38** Award 4 marks for a developed answer with relevant examples for both sides of the comparison.
 Award 3 marks for a developed answer with a relevant example/or examples for only one side of the comparison.
 Award 2 marks for a simple answer with examples or a developed answer without examples
 Award 1 mark for an attempted answer with some reference to an example

There are many ways that candidates might answer this question. Answers should demonstrate an understanding of the comparison and an explanation of the relevant differences or similarities.

One clear difference is that the others have warnings associated with them in addition to any legislation — all the campaigns about the dangers of speeding spring to mind. It might be hard to argue that TV is similar given this difference in the level of warning/it might be easier to argue that there should be warnings about the danger of TV before legislation is considered.

There are issues about the age groups involved in that TV is broadcast to a younger audience so legislation is needed in the same way that we do not allow young people to buy alcohol or cigarettes. (there is a watershed already, but this hardly stops young people staying up late). In this way, TV may be seen as similar to smoking and alcohol.

There are differences in that alcohol and smoking are proven/scientifically proven/widely accepted to be addictive/harmful/dangerous whilst it is only suggested that TV might be dangerous.

There are differences in the degree of risk /harm or addictiveness. Smoking and alcohol are very addictive and cause a range of terrible physical problems. TV may only lead to feelings of pessimism and perhaps lower our intellectual abilities.

A03 [4]

Performance description for questions 39 and 40**Performance descriptions for 7-9 marks:**

Candidates present their own relevant further argument with a clear structure that includes at least two reasons supporting an intermediate conclusion. The argument is persuasive and relies only on one or two reasonable assumptions. The argument will also contain a further reason or reasons/examples/evidence/counter-examples that support the argument. The final conclusion is precisely stated.

Performance description for 4-6 marks:

Candidates present an argument that contains several reasons and there is an attempt to form an intermediate conclusion. The argument may be persuasive but relies more heavily on assumptions so that the link between reasons and conclusion is less clear. The argument may contain an example/evidence that has less relevance to the overall argument. The main conclusion is clearly stated.

Performance description for 1-3 marks

Candidates present an argument that contains one or more reasons of limited relevance to the main conclusion. There is no intermediate conclusion and use of examples is limited. The argument is unlikely to be persuasive without including several assumptions and the use of evidence is very limited. Conclusions are imprecise and unclear.

39 There are several possible approaches here:

To argue that the reason for the recent increase in obesity is school based — loss of playing fields;

To argue that the *recent* increase in obesity does not match the increase in TV viewing over *decades*;

To argue that other social changes — using cars more, nature of work etc. - during that time are far more significant than the hours spent watching TV;

To argue that the recent increase in obesity is the result of changes in shopping/food consumption rather than hours spent watching TV.

eg

CA: Although it has been suggested that the recent rise in obesity is related to increasing hours spent watching TV

R: There has been a dramatic reduction in the amount of exercise at schools

EV: School have sold off playing fields for housing estates/retail outlets

R: Most children do not now walk to school

IC: Therefore there has been a decrease in the amount of exercise taken by school children

R: Lack of exercise is a key factor in obesity

R: childhood obesity is a large part of the recent increase in obesity figures

C: The recent rise in obesity is related to lack of exercise not increasing TV viewing.

A03 [9]

- 40 There are several arguments left over here that students could tackle. Putting 'restricted' into the conclusion allows students to take this as meaning either restricting the time and length of the broadcasts or restricting the content of the broadcasts. Hopefully, this will give them more to argue about.

For the conclusion:

Suggestion that TV leads to copy cat violence
 Immoral nature of TV/leads to lack of morality
 Cultural/ racial biases — mainly white western views broadcast
 Restricting TV (in time terms) might have a knock on effect of promoting other desirable activities — reading, talking to people!

Against the conclusion:

This is a bit trickier because the conclusion is 'restrict' broadcasts rather than 'ban' them. The students need to show that restricting TV might lead to some less popular broadcasts being shelved to make way for more popular ones, if there is limited time available. There is the danger of censorship by the state so that only pro Government issues are broadcast.

There might be job losses as a result of a restriction.

Lots of valuable information about the world - may not make us more intelligent, but is certainly interesting and informative. Might be lost in restricted broadcasting. Arguments about free choice — but would need to show why it is different to alcohol (as dangers not proven in the same way/to the same extent for instance)

TV news may be depressing but allows to know what is going on when there are disasters/generates money for special causes. Restricted TV might only allow happy news!

eg

An argument that supports the author's conclusion:

R: Television broadcasts give details of many horrific crimes

Ex: Mass shootings at schools in America/Recent suicide bombers in London

R: Seeing these crimes may put ideas into people's heads/show them how to commit crime

EV: It has been suggested that several atrocities were copied from programmes shown on TV

IC: Therefore television broadcasts may lead to new crimes being committed

R: legislation is used to prevent or restrict crime in other areas

Ev: Anti -Terrorism laws

C: Therefore, television broadcasts should be restricted.

A03 [9]

An argument that challenges the author's conclusion (taking the restriction to be in the type of programme broadcast):

CA: Although restricting television might remove some unwanted types of programmes from our screens

EX: such as very violent/extreme/unpleasant programmes

R: The Government of the day could use the restrictions to choose what they want to broadcast, making sure that the programmes do not criticise them

IC: It is likely that programmes criticising the government would be lost from our screens.

EX: Satire shows/some types of news report/news night

R: A wide range of opinion and debate is a requirement of a healthy democracy

IC: Restricting TV broadcasts could lead to a less healthy democracy/loss of democracy (assuming this to be a valuable thing)

C: Therefore we should not place restrictions on television broadcasts.

A03 [9]

Total marks for section C [25] AO1 [1] A03 [24]

Quality of Written Communication

Credit, where written communication is found, as follows across Section B and C answers

	Errors in punctuation and grammar	Use of specialist vocabulary	Expression	Marks
Level 1	Errors are intrusive	Little use of specialist vocabulary	Points tersely expressed	1 – 2
Level 2	Errors are occasional	Occasional use of specialist vocabulary	Points exhibit some order	3
Level 3	Errors are few, if any	Specialist vocabulary used where appropriate	Well ordered and fluent	4 – 5

Section A total marks [40]

Section B total marks [50]

Section C total marks [25]

Quality of written communication [5]

Paper total [120]

**Mark Scheme F493
January 2007**

Preamble:

The Unit 3 Paper sets out to assess the candidate's critical thinking skills in the context of decision-making. To be successful, in general terms candidates need to be able to demonstrate the ability to handle key terms and concepts such as choice, criteria and dilemma and to come to judgements in the context of situations determined by a set of resources. The term dilemma is to be understood here in a broad sense as involving some kind of difficult choice to be made between two different actions. This in turn will lead to a consideration of the consequences of doing X and not doing Y.

The Assessment Objectives [AOs] and the allocation of marks.

The total mark for the paper is 80, allocated as follows:

- AO1 - **Analysis** of the use of different kinds of reasoning: 8 marks
- AO2 - **Evaluation** of different kinds of reasoning: 26 marks
- AO3 - **Communication** of developed arguments: 46 marks

This weighting is reflected in the different types of questions asked and in the application of the mark scheme.

Question 1

Problems in using Document 1

[6 marks]

- A problem identified without explanatory development/relevance to the document – 1 mark (up to six problems)
- A problem identified with limited/generic development/reference to the document – 2 marks (up to three problems)
- A problem identified and clearly explained with reference to the document – 3 marks (two problems)

Question 2**Identify and explain a number of factors [6 marks: A01=2; A03=4]**

The candidate is referred to Documents 2 and 3 and is required to identify and explain three relevant factors.

1 mark: identify a relevant factor;

2 marks: clearly identify and explain a relevant factor.

3 x 2 = 6 marks.

The sort of factors to be identified and explained might include::

- Political;
- Economic;
- Environmental;
- Animal welfare/wild life;
- Aesthetic.

Question 3**[24 marks]**

The candidate is required to select two of the criteria given and assess how far they might be of use when applied to two of the choices provided.

The candidate must:

- Refer closely to the criteria and choices they have chosen;
- Refer closely to the Documents contained in the Resources Booklet;
- Make evaluative judgments about the relevance and importance of each of the criteria selected, with clear reference to each of the two choices.

The marks per Assessment Objective are:

AO2 (Evaluation) = 12 AO3 (Communication) = 12

Marking will be by levels of response, as follows:

The candidate's response is likely to demonstrate:**Level One [1-7 Marks]**

- Limited application of at least one or two criteria to the choice selected;
- and that even where several of the criteria are applied, this is done in a sketchy/unconnected way;
- Some limited examination of the appropriateness of the criteria to the choice, though in a generalised/simplistic manner;
- Few relevant points of evaluation, probably in a random/unstructured way, with maybe some weak reference to flaws and assumptions being attempted;
- Only a very limited assessment of the material in the resources booklet, with few, and unconnected, comments on the utility of the evidence presented in the sources in the context of the appropriate criteria/choices;
- That, overall, analysis of the material and evaluation will not be communicated in anything approaching a thorough or sophisticated way;
- Arguments are likely to be sketchy and lacking in structure;
- Written communication: candidate will employ a style and form which, although generally fit for purpose, may contain significant errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation [spg] and lack coherence in places.

Level Two [8-14 Marks]

- Discrimination in the selection and application of relevant criteria to the choice selected, with some fairly limited awareness that criteria might be used to show problems with the choice being made;
- Some basic understanding and identification of possibly flawed reasoning in the resource material provided; and of the role assumptions might play in argument - assumptions involved in using criteria such as public acceptability or risk might have some impact upon decision-making, eg that opinion cannot be altered by decisive action; that risk is not acceptable depending upon circumstances;
- Some sensible comments on the credibility and utility of at least some of the sources, though perhaps not all of them. Overall, while evaluation and use of the sources will tend to be still fairly patchy and by no means thorough, there should be some evidence of understanding of at least some of the following considerations: authority, relevance, partiality/impartiality, meaning, clarity and completeness; sources should be being used,

to a limited extent at least, do more than to merely illustrate. - eg this source can be useful in helping us to assess the importance of this criteria in making a decision relating to this choice on the continuum because the source/evidence can be relied upon to reflect the large majority of the public/expert opinion etc;

- A basic presentation of their own reasoning, wherein relevant points are made to support some perhaps provisional conclusions. Arguments are still likely to be fairly loose in terms of structure; generalised and not well substantiated in places, though perhaps showing some evidence of dealing with different points of view;
- Written communication that is fit for purpose but still likely to contain some significant errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation.. Overall, there should be some, perhaps limited, evidence of coherence involving the use of some appropriate terminology of critical thinking.

Level Three [15-21 Marks]

- A clear understanding of how the criteria can be used both to support their selected choice and to identify and explain problems that might be connected with it;
- That in considering the appropriateness/relevance/helpfulness of criteria as applied to their choice, in the context of the resource material, they have recognised and evaluated different types reasoning in a way that is convincing, while perhaps not sustained throughout. And in doing this, they have demonstrated accurate use of relevant terminology in identifying flawed/questionable reasoning and recognised and evaluated the possible impact of assumptions upon arguments presented in support of and against a suggested course of action;
- A well balanced evaluation of the resource material to inform their argument, dealing confidently, overall, with issues such as authority, relevance, partiality/impartiality, meaning, clarity and completeness;
- Comments will be evaluative rather than just illustrative in nature - eg as in Level 2, plus, however, public opinion might conflict with other, perhaps more significant criteria, such as effectiveness and the impact of such and such a measure on minority groups;
- Effective and persuasive reasoning, demonstrating some clarity in the use of relevant terminology and in the expression of some complex ideas. There will be relatively few errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation.

Level 4 [22-28 Marks]

- The qualities described at Level 3, though overall in a more confident, sophisticated and sustained manner;
- A sound and perceptive selection and application of the criteria to their selected choice. All of the criteria do not have to be covered, but there should be evidence throughout of a firm understanding of how the application of different criteria might well be used to strengthen/weaken the case for a particular course of action;
- Sustained and accurate identification, explanation and discussion of the possible impact of flawed reasoning and of assumptions upon arguments presented in support of and against a possible course of action;
- A sustained and confident evaluation of the source material throughout to support their argument;
- Cogent and convincing reasoning that is very well structured so as to enable them to express/evaluate complex ideas/materials and to deploy relevant terminology accurately, confidently and to some purpose throughout. A high standard of spelling, grammar and punctuation, with few, if any, minor inaccuracies.

Question 4**[40 Marks]**

The candidate must identify and explain a relevant dilemma and present an argument that attempts to resolve it.

The marks per Assessment Objective are:

AO1 (Analysis) = 2

AO2 (Evaluation) = 10

AO3 (Communication) = 28

4 (a) The candidate needs to identify one dilemma. **[4 Marks: AO2=2; AO3=2]**

[Note: a dilemma is to be defined for our purposes in a broad sense as being a difficult decision to be made in the context of issues raised: should we do X as opposed to Y; should we give consideration A as against B?].

The candidate will:

- 1 mark:** identify an issue/problem connected to the topic but without showing any real evidence of attempting to frame it as a dilemma;
- 2 marks:** identify a relevant problem/issue and show some limited awareness of what is meant by a dilemma;
- 3 marks:** clearly identify and explain a relevant dilemma;
- 4 marks:** clearly and convincingly identify and explain a relevant dilemma, which involves a choice between alternatives that will both involve some unfavourable.

4 (b) Resolving the dilemma. **[36 Marks: 2/8/26]**

The candidate has to:

- Identify some relevant principles;
- Assess the extent to which these principles are helpful in trying to resolve the dilemma.

It follows that:

- any effective response will involve the identified principles being applied closely to the dilemma and them being assessed in terms of their relative effectiveness in helping to resolve that dilemma;
- that a consideration of more than one principle will be required to produce a higher level response. Although a set number of principles is not specified, the significance of the plural in the instructions should be recognised. A higher level response might be expected to be one that deals with three or maybe four principles, but a very good treatment of two might still result in a Level 3 or Level 4 mark. The quality of critical reasoning on display is what is being assessed.

Principles:

- General principles have implications that go beyond the case in point;
- Different kinds of principle a candidate can refer to might include: legal rules; business or working practices; freedom of expression; equal respect for individual/group differences/identities; moral guidelines; the sanctity of life; medical ethics.

- Ethical Principles/ Ethical Theories. Candidates might wish to respond to the dilemma via an explanation and application of some relevant ethical theories. This is perfectly acceptable, providing the result is not merely an exposition of ethical theories with little or no real application to the problem at hand. Candidates will not be required to identify standard authorities such as Bentham or Kant; or even necessarily be required to use terms such as utilitarianism, etc. Candidates who do deploy a more specific knowledge of Ethical theories will still only be credited by applying identified principles to the dilemma in order to produce a reasoned argument that attempts to resolve it. The specifications for this Unit, however, do provide examples of principles/ethical values that could be applied to this question, including: need, desert, right; deontologies (to do with duties); egalitarianism; consequential ethics; elitism; prudentialism; egoism; altruism; hedonism. Although this list is not meant to be prescriptive, and candidates will not necessarily have to use the more specific terms used, it should come as no surprise if a high level response will be one which confidently employs some of the terms similar to or synonymous with the above.

Marking will be by levels of response, as follows:

The candidate's response is likely to demonstrate:

Level 1 [1-9 Marks]

- Some limited awareness of what is meant by a dilemma and a principle, though only in a partial, generalised or somewhat vague way;
- Some attempt to identify at least one principle, though perhaps in a fairly loose form such as 'such and such is wrong because...' The candidate will attempt a fairly basic explanation of the possible relevance of a principle(s) to the dilemma/problem. Similarly, the candidate will attempt to show some limited application of the principle(s). There may be few, if any, examples included;
- There may be some limited evidence of the candidate trying to form some sort of an assessment of how useful such a principle(s) might be in helping to resolve the problem identified. It is likely, however, that this will be done in a way that is somewhat disjointed, with random and isolated points being made;
- Only a limited ability to produce coherent reasoning, with little evidence of effective use of specialist vocabulary/terminology relevant to critical thinking. It is likely, too, that there will be significant stylistic weaknesses and errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation.

Level 2 [10-18 Marks]

- At least a basic understanding of how a dilemma involves having to make difficult decisions with some likelihood of unfavourable consequences whatever is decided - that a dilemma involves more than just a simple choice between alternative courses of action;
- That they can identify relevant principles - generally at least two, though a well developed treatment of one principle might be acceptable for Level 2;
- At least some basic understanding and competence in applying principles to the dilemma. Some awareness of how the different kinds of reasoning that might be at least implied in using certain sorts of principles/ethical theories might impact upon an argument in which they are being employed. For instance, some assumptions might be articulated, even if in fairly limited/patchy way.

- Some evidence of basic reasoning, involving the construction of an argument in which reasons are perhaps few or under-developed and in which evidence/examples tends to be sketchy and/or to contain some weaknesses;
- Some limited ability to combine different points of view in the reasoning presented, combined, perhaps with some suppositional reasoning;
- Some effective communication, in which the form and style of written response will be, on the whole, fit for purpose, containing at least some evidence of using the language of critical thinking. Spelling, grammar and punctuation will be of a fair standard, although will still be likely to include a number of stylistic weaknesses and errors.

Level 3 [19-27 Marks]

- That a sufficiently focused dilemma has received a generally confident and developed treatment in which at least two relevant principles are clearly identified, explained and applied, with effective use of examples/evidence;
- A clear understanding of how each principle identified might be more or less useful in helping to resolve the dilemma, with some identification and effective explanation of possible strengths and weaknesses and flaws and assumptions that might be associated with using reasoning based upon principles/ethical theories in certain contexts;
- Effective and persuasive reasoning, including suppositional reasoning, relevant to the issues raised, which frequently employs vocabulary and terminology appropriate to critical reasoning involving some complex subject matter. Evidence/examples will generally be well chosen and apt;
- Written communication in a form and style that is clear and accurate and which contains few errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation, although perhaps with some minor inaccuracies.

Level 4 [28-36 Marks]

- A strong and well developed argument that leads to a confidently expressed resolution of the dilemma - in which it is perhaps acknowledged that such a resolution can be at best only partial and still involve some unfavourable consequences overall. There will be evidence throughout of cogent and convincing reasoning;
- The knowledge, understanding and ability to deal with a number of principles very well, although a very skilful and cogent treatment and application of two major principles or ethical theories could be sufficient to achieve the highest marks;
- Clarity and purpose throughout in the explanations of relevance and the application of principles to the dilemma. Evidence/examples will be very well chosen, apt and skilfully employed to support points being made;
- There will be evidence of a keen awareness of context, with principles being applied specifically to the dilemma in question;
- That clear and valid judgments have been made in coming to an attempted resolution of the dilemma, with evidence of some well developed suppositional reasoning;
- A standard of written communication that is very well suited to the handling of complex subject matter, with relevant material and ideas being very well organised and clearly presented. There should be frequent and very effective use of language and terminology appropriate to critical thinking. There will be few, if any, errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation. Meaning will be clear throughout.

**Mark Scheme F494
January 2007**

Section A – Multiple Choice

1	B	
2	C	
3	D	
4	B	
5	C	
6	B	
7	C	
8	D	
9	B	
10	D	
11	B	
12	D	
13	C	
14	D	
15	D	
16	B	
17	A	
18	A	
19	C	
20	A	

Section B

Coverage of Assessment Objectives

AO1 – analysis of reasoning:	17
A02 – evaluation of reasoning:	30
A03 – development of reasoning:	18
Quality of Language	5

In all cases performance descriptors refer to candidates performing at the top of the band. Any candidate performing above the descriptor enters the bottom of the next band.

Annotations.

The marks for each part of a question should be written in the margin. The marks for a whole question should be written in the margin and circled.

Where levels of response descriptors are used, the level should be written in the margin by the mark, eg Q25, L4, 17.

Ticks should be avoided, especially where they do not add up to the number of marks given.

Analysis Questions

It is helpful to put the following abbreviations in the left hand margin:

R	where reason is precisely and accurately identified.
IC	where intermediate conclusion is precisely and accurately identified.
Ev	where evidence is precisely and accurately identified.
Ex	where example is precisely and accurately identified.
CA	where counter claim or counter argument is precisely and accurately identified.
St	where accurate indication of structure is given.
G	where gist is given.

Evaluation Questions:

In evaluation questions, it is helpful to put the following abbreviations in the left hand margin:

S	where strength is identified
W	where weakness is identified
E	where evaluative comment is made
I	where the impact of strength or weakness is considered.

Development of Reasoning Questions:

R	Reason
SR	Strand of Reasoning
A	Argument depends on (glaring) assumption
IC	Intermediate Conclusion
Ex	Example
Ev	Evidence
CC	Counter claim presented
CA	Counter argument presented
RCA	Response to counter argument or counter claim.
P	Use of argument based on principle
Ag	Use of argument based on analogy
HR	Use of Hypothetical Reasoning

21 Identify and briefly explain the function of the following elements in the structure of Purves' argument:

- a)** The streets must be seen to be safe whatever the cost and however many sensitivities are bruised to make them so. (Paragraph 3) **[2]**

This is an intermediate conclusion supported by much of the reasoning (esp paras 4, 5, 6) and giving support to the main conclusion.

Intermediate conclusion supported by the reasoning in paras 4, 5, 6 (2 marks)

Intermediate conclusion supporting main conclusion (2 marks)

Intermediate conclusion (1 mark)

Reason to support main conclusion (1 mark)

- b)** Evils flow from unsafe public areas. (Paragraph 6) **[2]**

This is a reason to support the claim that streets, parks and alleys must be safe. It is supported by examples of evils caused by unsafe public areas.

Reason to support the claim that streets parks and alleys must be safe (2 marks)

Reason supported by examples of evils caused by unsafe public areas (2 marks)

Reason (1 mark)

- c)** You can argue that tolerating a certain amount of lawlessness and disruptive scruffiness is the price we traditionally pay for freedom and privacy. (Paragraph 7) **[2]**

Introduces the second strand of reasoning about the government chipping away at the freedom which makes us tolerate lax street policing. (2 marks)

Begins different strand of reasoning about freedom and policing. (2 marks)

Add 1 mark answers at standardisation.

- d)** The present combination of skimpy street policing with intrusion and pompous tellings off is the worst of both worlds. (Paragraph 9) **[2]**

Main conclusion. Supported by the bulk of the reasoning. (2 marks)

Main conclusion. (1 mark)

22 Analyse in detail the structure of the reasoning in paragraph 4 by identifying elements such as reasons, intermediate conclusions etc.

[9]

Performance descriptors refer to candidates performing at the top of the band. Any candidate performing above the descriptor enters the bottom of the next band.

	Performance descriptors
Level 4 7 – 9	Candidates demonstrate thorough understanding of argument structure, including some complexity. Candidates are able to identify elements of complex reasoning accurately using appropriate terminology. Mistakes are rare and not serious.
Level 3 5 – 6	Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of argument structure. Candidates are able to identify most elements of reasoning accurately using appropriate terminology. They may make mistakes, occasionally serious ones.
Level 2 3 – 4	Candidates demonstrate basic understanding of argument structure. Candidates are able to identify some elements of reasoning accurately using appropriate terminology. They may mix this with gist and misunderstanding.
Level 1 1 – 2	Candidates demonstrate weak, limited understanding of argument structure. Candidates may provide poor paraphrases of isolated elements of arguments or give overall gist.

- R1 Children are not interviewed for government surveys
 R2 Many of them do not report the moment when their mobile or gadget is taken, with menaces and insult and bruises.
 IC1 [so] street robberies from children under 16 are not recorded
 Ev When the Home Office did a separate survey, in 2003, it found that more than a third of 10-15 year olds had been victims of a “personal” crime of this sort; one in five had been hit.
 A1 So the real figures are probably even worse than the published figures (unstated IC)
 A2 The poorest, the oldest and the youngest can afford hi-tech gadgets, but cannot afford to protect them.
 IC2 In a world where safety depends on the self-financed insulation of the car or the fortress home the victims are the poorest, the youngest and the oldest.
 IC3 Apart from anything else, it [the streets safe] is a matter of social justice.

Accept IC3 labelled as C. R1 and R2 independently support IC1. IC1 and Ev support A (unstated IC), which together with A2 supports IC2, which supports IC3. Only top band answers are likely to identify A1 or A2. Good and excellent answers will show some or all of these relationships of support using words or a diagram.

- 23 Evaluate the support given by the reasoning in paragraphs 2 - 6 to Purves' claim that, 'The streets must be seen to be safe whatever the cost and however many sensitivities are bruised to make them so.'

[18]

Performance descriptors refer to candidates performing at the top of the band. Any candidate performing above the descriptor enters the bottom of the next band.

	Performance Descriptors
Level 4 13 – 18	Candidates demonstrate sound, thorough and perceptive evaluation of strength and weakness of Purves' reasoning with consistent and accomplished evaluation of their impact on the support for the claim that, 'The streets must be seen to be safe whatever the cost and however many sensitivities are bruised to make them so.' Candidates select key points to evaluate. Inappropriate forms of evaluation are rare and not serious. <i>Candidates have evaluated the support for Purves' claim, making some relevant points to support their evaluation.</i>
Level 3 9 – 12	Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of weakness in Purves' reasoning and evaluate the impact of weakness on the support for the claim that, 'The streets must be seen to be safe whatever the cost and however many sensitivities are bruised to make them so.' Candidates begin to evaluate strength more clearly. Candidates select points to evaluate, but not always key points. Inappropriate forms of evaluation (disagreement, counterargument, false attribution of weakness) may occur. <i>Candidates have made a mixture of relevant evaluation and inappropriate or irrelevant points in an attempt to evaluate the support for Purves' claim.</i>
Level 2 5 – 8	Candidates demonstrate basic awareness of strength and weakness in Purves' reasoning. Valid points may be isolated, but candidates begin to evaluate the impact of weakness on the overall reasoning. Candidates may attribute weakness inappropriately and occasionally disagree with the reasoning or provide counterarguments rather than evaluating it. <i>Candidates make the odd relevant evaluative point amidst description and irrelevance. Points taken individually.</i>
Level 1 1 – 4	Candidates demonstrate weak, limited awareness of strength and weakness in reasoning. They make random points, attribute weakness inappropriately and have little awareness of the impact on the overall reasoning. Candidates tend to disagree with the reasoning rather than evaluate it. <i>Candidates' responses are overwhelmingly irrelevant, descriptive or wrong.</i>

Overall evaluation:**Key point:**

Reasonable support is provided for the claim that the streets must be seen to be safe (as a matter of social justice, shared areas, social cohesiveness, risk of vigilantes) but very little is provided for the second part of the claim 'whatever the cost and however many sensitivities are bruised to make them so.'

Evaluation should be supported by comments which might include:**Flaws in the reasoning and their impact on the strength of the reasoning.**

Para	Flaw	Impact
2	Causal flaw: No evidence given that the cause of being safer at home is self-financed alarm systems, or that lax policing is the cause of increase in street robberies.	<p>This flaw underlies the whole argument. It is because of this supposed causal relationship that responsibility for safe streets is passed to the police and is not a matter of individual responsibility. If this causal relationship does not hold, then the rise in street robberies etc is less of an issue in terms of social justice. The police might be doing a fine job of protecting the old and vulnerable at home. Police efforts may mean that the young are safer than they would otherwise have been on the streets. Thus, without this causal relationship, safe streets are less an issue of social justice.</p> <p>However, even if this causal relationship does not hold up, other reasons for having safe streets (shared areas, social cohesiveness, risk of vigilantes) do provide support.</p> <p>So, at this point, the causal flaw weakens but does not deny support to the claim that 'the streets must be seen to be safe.'</p>
2	Straw Person: parody of opposing argument (fortress, scrapping ideals of safety which may never have existed and have little relevance anyway)	Purves is arguing against an attitude which is at best exaggerated. This does not mean that her claim that the streets must be seen to be safe is not supported.

5	Generalises that, because the police haven't stamped out one particular kind of crime, that they have not been successful.	This is largely rhetorical and answers the straw person rather than the real problem. Although this reasoning does not support her argument does not damage the argument; we only need to accept that there is a problem with street safety for her argument. We don't need to accept the flourish saying the police having nothing to be smug about.
6	Causal flaw: ignores other causes of evils such as disaffection, mistrust, selfishness,	However, this is not fatal to the argument, as unsafe public areas almost certainly do exacerbate these problems, and Purves does not need to claim that they are the only cause. So, we can accept that the streets must be seen to be safe.

Assumptions which must be made and their impact on the reasoning.

Para	Assumption	Impact
2	'less serious' assaults are rising <i>because</i> the police are not doing their job / skimpy street policing.	If we do not accept this assumption, we do not have to accept that it is the police's job to make the streets safe. But we may still agree that the streets do have to be seen to be safe, so this claim is still supported.
2	It is unreasonable to expect us to take reasonable precautions against theft and robbery.	Again, if we don't accept this, the responsibility for the crime figures lies less with the police and more with us as members of a society.
	A failure to reduce street crime equates to a lack of desire to do so.	Little impact.
4	The youngest and the oldest can afford portable high-tech goods but cannot afford to protect their property.	This can be challenged. Perhaps it is a case of choices people make rather than vulnerability and social justice.
	So the real figures are probably even worse than the published figures.	Fine. Supports conclusion.
5	Assumes that if something is nasty and frightening it can't be a normal part of growing up.	Can easily be challenged. But something can be a normal part of growing up and still be something we wish to improve. So, although this is a weak response to a counter argument, it does not really weaken support for the claim.

How well the claim is supported by reasons and intermediate conclusions.

The claim that the streets must be seen to be safe is well supported, mostly by the brief reasons in paragraph 6. The implication that it is the police (and government) who must see to this, rather than a matter for individual social responsibility is not well supported. There is no support at all for the idea that this must happen, 'whatever the cost and however many sensitivities are bruised to make them so.' This claim is entirely rhetorical and unsupported. It ignores a good many reasons which would suggest that bruising sensitivities can lead to less safe streets and may contradict the reasoning relating to vigilantes.

The effectiveness of the use of evidence and examples.

Para	Evidence/example	Effectiveness
2	Rise of 10% in assaults and unspecified rise in street robbery with no context used to show we are less safe on the streets.	Need more information to draw such a strong conclusion. There are other crimes which may affect us on the streets which are not mentioned.
4	Notes lack of evidence from under sixteens (good).	Assumes that more of them are victims, not fully supported.
	Uses separate survey from 2003	it is Home Office, therefore probably fairly reliable, although may wish to record figures in such a way as to minimise the problem or serve other interests. However, we cannot compare this with the 2005 figures – we know only that there has been a rise in overall street robbery, not actual figures. So does not demonstrate that problem is worse now, or that young more vulnerable.
5	16 – 25 figure	Not clear whether figures are from HO survey or 2005 crime figures.
5	Example of lad in hoody and evidence from further survey indicate that the young are robbing the young.	This indicates a failure of policy – does not show that the police have 'nothing' to be smug about.

- 24 Evaluate Purves' move in paragraphs 7– 9, from justifying the need for safe streets to the claim that, 'The present combination of skimpy street policing with intrusion and pompous tellings off is the worst of both worlds.'

[12]

	Performance Descriptors
Level 4 10 – 12	<p>Candidates demonstrate sound, thorough and perceptive evaluation of strength and weakness in Purves' reasoning in her move from the need for safe streets to the claim that, 'The present combination of skimpy street policing with intrusion and pompous tellings off is the worst of both worlds.'</p> <p>Candidates select key points to evaluate. Inappropriate forms of evaluation are rare and not serious.</p> <p><i>Candidates have evaluated Purves' move from one claim to another, making some relevant points to support their evaluation.</i></p>
Level 3 7 – 9	<p>Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of weakness in Purves' reasoning in her move from the need for safe streets to the claim that, 'The present combination of skimpy street policing with intrusion and pompous tellings off is the worst of both worlds.' Candidates begin to evaluate strength more clearly. Candidates select points to evaluate, but not always key points. Inappropriate forms of evaluation (disagreement, counterargument, false attribution of weakness) may occur.</p> <p><i>Candidates have made a mixture of relevant evaluation and inappropriate or irrelevant points in an attempt to evaluate the support for Purves' conclusion.</i></p>
Level 2 4 – 6	<p>Candidates demonstrate basic awareness of strength and weakness in reasoning. Valid points may be isolated, but candidates begin to evaluate the impact of weakness on the overall reasoning. Candidates may attribute weakness inappropriately and occasionally disagree with the reasoning or provide counterarguments rather than evaluating it.</p> <p><i>Candidates make the odd relevant point amidst description and irrelevance. Points taken individually.</i></p>
Level 1 1 – 3	<p>Candidates demonstrate weak, limited awareness of strength and weakness in reasoning. They make random points, attribute weakness inappropriately and have little awareness of the impact on the overall reasoning. Candidates tend to disagree with the reasoning rather than evaluate it.</p> <p><i>Candidates' responses are overwhelmingly irrelevant, descriptive or wrong.</i></p>

Indicative content**Key points**

This move depends on the assumption that it is lax or skimpy street policing which have caused our lack of safety on the streets. If this cannot be said to be the case then we do not have the worst of both worlds; it is not the government which is not ensuring our safety. The example of Singapore confuses rather than clarifying the argument. Furthermore, Purves' examples do not really show that the government is invading our private lives. With the exception of the example of the police acting outside the law, these are better examples of pompous tellings off than of government chipping away at our freedom. Purves' examples do not really show that the government is reducing our liberty, so whilst we might agree with her conclusion, her reasoning does not fully support it.

Examples

Para	Example	Impact
7	Singapore	Sustained example with complex impact on argument. The harsh penalties for mugging and dropping litter are implied to be counter to a prevailing idea of how we should be. It is implied that they are too harsh. Such social control is also said to make the streets in Singapore safe. We are led to question the wider cost of making the streets safe, thus introducing the dichotomy of safety and liberty. Our priorities and ideas of what is important to us as British citizens (safety or liberty) is also raised. The image of a woman walking around alone at night is contrasted with our 'scrapping' of medieval ambition of unmolested women. As Purves is in both cases talking about street robbery and fighting, not quite appropriate.
8	Singapore	Singapore's social control is juxtaposed with our desire for freedom. It is implied that it is an either or situation. This is used to show that liking freedom and privacy underlies our toleration of lax policing. It is not strictly rational. Overall, this example confuses more than it clarifies. Singapore is an extreme example, and we cannot be sure that it is the harsh social control which leads to safety – or even lack of crime reporting. It distracts from the aim of creating a level of freedom which is compatible with safety. It also undermines Purves' earlier claim that the streets must be made safe whatever it costs.
8	CCTV	Does not restrict our freedom to act, or appear to have any consequences on our freedom. We cannot be sure there wouldn't be more muggings without it. Much of it is not state-run.

8	DNA	Worrying implications – police acting outside the law. However, does not affect anyone’s freedom to act freely within the law.
8	DVLA	Stupid and likely to lead to increase in burglary rather than invasive or restrictive of our actions.
8	Identity cards	It’s the database rather than the cards which is invasive of privacy, and the compulsory cost. Useless and annoying rather than restrictive, perhaps.

Assumptions

Para	Assumption	Impact
7	Singaporean punishments are the cause of safe streets.	If they are not, the example and the argument do not work well.
7	Low crime figures and safety of women at night implies low street robbery figures	This may well not be the case – British overall and serious crime figures have fallen, despite a rise in street crime.
9	Un-skimpy (or strict or tough) street policing would sort out street crime.	If this is not the case, Purves’ conclusion does not hold.

Flaws

Para	Flaw	Impact
7	Causal flaw: assumes that strict punishments for litter louts etc are the reason for street safety.	See above.
8	Straw Person: misrepresents the government’s aims and actions,	By being rude about the government and knocking down an easier target than actually exists, Purves fails to provide support for her conclusion. If the government are genuinely trying to find the best solution for the British, Purves’ claims that the government is not making us safe is weakened. However, the use of the straw person does not undermine the point that feeling unsafe and nagged is a bad combination.
8	Conflation of dignity and freedom	Slightly weakens reasoning but not significantly.

9	Ignores the possibility that these measures might actually improve out security. 'Intrusion' might be the form of policing that is necessary.	
3 / 9	Contradiction	The streets must be seen to be safe whatever it costs and however many sensitivities are bruised to make them so is contradicted by the argument that the government 'reduces our dignity daily, generally in the name of security,' and that we must not sacrifice freedom or privacy for safety.

Develop your own reasoning

- 25 'Freedom is meaning less without safety.'
Write your own argument to support or challenge this claim.

[18]

	Performance Descriptors
Level 4 13 – 18	Candidates produce cogent, sound and perceptive reasoning using clear strands of reasoning. Reasons and intermediate conclusions give strong support to conclusion and argument structure is accomplished, possibly complex. Blips rare. Language clear, precise and capable of dealing with complexity. Candidates anticipate and respond effectively to key counter arguments.
Level 3 9 – 12	Candidates produce effective and persuasive reasoning. Reasons and intermediate conclusions mostly support the conclusion well with occasional irrelevance or reliance on dubious assumptions. Arguments may be simple, clear and precise, or may demonstrate increased complexity with some blips. Language clear and developing complexity. Candidates may anticipate and respond to counterargument.
Level 2 5 – 8	Ability to produce basic reasoning with reasons which give some support to a conclusion but may rely on a number of dubious assumptions. Clear, straightforward, perhaps simplistic. Occasionally disjointed. Language simple, clear. Candidates may include a counter argument or counter reason, but respond to it ineffectively if at all.
Level 1 1 – 4	Limited ability to reason. Disjointed, incoherent. Reasons often do not support conclusion. There may not even be a stated conclusion. Language vague.

Candidates will not have time to produce thorough arguments covering all possible strands of reasoning and responding to all counter arguments. We should reward candidates who have demonstrated the ability to argue cogently, coherently and concisely. We are looking for an intelligent, thoughtful, structured response.

Quality of Language

5	Coherent and competent language capable of dealing with nuance and complexity. Technical terms are used accurately and appropriately.
4	Good use of language to communicate critical thinking points. Tends to use technical terms appropriately. May include slightly stilted note form (omitting subject, for example) providing points are made clearly. May be succinct rather than flowery.
3	Basically sound – grammatically sound but not especially fluent or competent. Possibly inclined to use sophisticated vocabulary in a rhetorical way with little regard to meaning. May misuse technical terms occasionally.
2	Containing basic mistakes, including in technical terms, but conveys meaning. Tends to be vague – for example using 'it' without clear reference.
1	Incoherent, disjointed, grammatically weak and fails to convey meaning.

General guidelines for quality of language:

We want to credit language which means something, and which is clear, succinct and precise.

We want to credit communication of good thinking.

We do not want to over-reward flowery or waffly language which says very little.

We do not want to penalise candidates for slips of the pen caused by pressure of time.

**Advanced GCE Critical Thinking (H450/H050)
January 2007 Assessment Series**

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
F491	Raw	80	50	42	34	26	19	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
F492	Raw	120	74	65	56	47	39	0
	UMS	180	144	126	108	90	72	0
F493	Raw	80	61	54	47	40	34	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
F494	Raw	120	70	61	52	43	35	0
	UMS	180	144	126	108	90	72	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
H050	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
H450	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
H050	7.5	21.1	40.6	63.0	80.4	100.0	2173
H450	33.3	66.7	66.7	91.7	100.0	100.0	12

519 candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;
http://www.ocr.org.uk/exam_system/understand_ums.html

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU**

OCR Customer Contact Centre

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity**

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553**

© OCR 2007

