

Critical Thinking

Advanced Extension Award **AEA 9913**

Combined Mark Schemes And Report on the Components

June 2005

9913/MS/R/05

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 2005

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 Extension Award Critical Thinking (9913)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
9913	AEA Critical Thinking	1

REPORTS ON THE COMPONENTS

Unit	Content	Page
9913	AEA Critical Thinking	12
*	Grade Thresholds	15

Mark Scheme 9913
June 2005

Section A**Multiple Choice**

One mark for each correct answer.

1 A

2(a) A

2(b) E

3 C

4 B

5 E

6 B

7(a) B

(b) E

8 A

9 D

10 C

11 C

12 D

13 D

Section B

- 1 **Implication** – orange will give you something better to do. (1 mark)

Challenge explanation: Lack of communication may not be a problem/Having nothing to do may be due to (e.g.) lack of money, lack of transportation, lack of friends. Accept any other similar suggestion. (1 mark)

[2]

- 2 (a) **Conclusions**

'The growth of text messaging threatens to lead to a widespread decline in young people's ability to use the power of (the English) language to its full potential. (1 mark)

Accept 'paragraph 1', or paraphrase.

Irrelevant paragraphs

Paragraph 3 (the comparison with mobile LCD computer games consoles) (1 mark)

Paragraph 7 (the risk to health) (1 mark)

[3]

- 2 (b) **Opposing argument**

'Some see any form of communication as being good for developing language skills' (1 mark)

Statement to weaken this

If spelling was a problem prior to the development to texting. (1 mark)

[2]

- 2 (c) **Photograph**

Award 1 mark each for up to two of the following:

The person texting shows an interest in a masterpiece of English which does not support 'mindless'.

Text speak is not being used, which does not support 'they cannot spell'.

The task is **purposeful** and not 'mindless'.

The picture/text below implies the person is **an adult**, which does not support 'decline in young people's ability'.

The person texting is **on the move**, which does not support the risk from 'increasingly sedentary lifestyle'. [2]

- 2 (d) **Analogy**

'Just as the typewriter has been superseded by the wordprocessor /computer, so conventional English risks being superseded by text speak in time.' (1 mark)

Weakness

Whereas the typewriter was replaced by a technology that performed the same function more efficiently, conventional English and text speak have different functions and can be used side by side. (1 mark) [2]

- 2 (e) **Weakness in the reasoning from statistics.**

Award 1 mark each for up to three correctly stated weaknesses e.g.

Significance - 1999 – 2001 marked the early years of texting. The 1000% increase would therefore not be sufficiently significant to suggest 'dominates', if the previous years evidenced little usage.

Relevance:

- One billion text messages would not be as significant if the number of users was higher.
- There is nothing to say that the international or Finnish text messages were sent by 'the young'.

Significance - The increase may have been the effect of a group of ardent users rather than indicating a general 'growth' that is threatening.

Causal connections - The number of Finnish text messages may have been the result of shyness rather than despite it.

Also the number of their text messages may not be 'quite an achievement', because as a nation they may have owned a greater proportion of mobile phones due to the availability through Nokia, therefore representing fewer texts per person.

Relevance - There is nothing to indicate that the 13% of mobile phone owners ending relationships are the young. This evidence is therefore weak support for the claim that 'the young are in danger...'

Significance

- Since we are not told the percentage of the population who own mobile phones, 13% may be a very small number of the total population.
- 13% has little significance, as we are not told the percentage of those who ended relationships in a similar manner before texting, for example by letter or via a friend.
- In addition it may be considered that in some cases this was the more appropriate manner to end the relationship. **[3]**

2 (f) Weakness in reasoning

Award 1 mark each for up to four additional correctly explained weaknesses e.g.

Exaggerated consequence/slippery slope

- Shakespeare in text speak is far removed from the rapid growth of texting.
- Risk of obesity is far removed from increasing sedentary lifestyle.
- A divide between the generations is far removed from coded text speak.

False appeal to tradition - That there is actually an unchanging conventional English that can be distorted.

False assumption - That the older generation do not/cannot use text speak.

Conflation - Of texting with text speak. Predictive text used as an alternative to text speak would not involve the problem of a 'coded language'.

Inconsistency - Texting is claimed to be a fad, which is inconsistent with the author's claim that English risks being superseded by text speak 'in time'.

Irrelevance Accept

Explanation of why paragraph 3 is irrelevant.

Explanation of why paragraph 7 is irrelevant.

Paragraph 2 does not provide evidence about English.

[4]

[18 marks]

3 The justification of the NICE recommendations that 3 free IVF cycles should be provided by the NHS.

Identifies	Isolated specific issues (1)	one dilemma (2)	two dilemmas (3)	(Max 3)
Selects relevant reasoning	to support their argument (1)	to counter their argument (1)		(Max 2)
Counters correctly	one point (1)	two points (2)		(Max 2)
Evaluates correctly	one point (1)	two points (2)		(Max 2)
Uses principles	infers a principle (1)	uses one principle (2)	uses two principles (3)	(Max 3)

AO2 [2], AO3 [5], AO4 [5] [12 marks]

The reasoned case should include some of the following points:

Issues

The weakest cases will **raise isolated specific issues e.g**

Should we have the right to produce children?

Should the government have the duty to facilitate parenthood/fertility in its absence?

Should any groups be excluded from right to IVF?

Should IVF take priority over other NHS needs?

What should we expect from the NHS?

What should we define as health and disability?

Dilemmas

Stronger cases **should present opposing responses e.g.**

The NHS duty to offer IVF as a right to produce children v the duty to provide other areas of treatment e.g. cancer detection, transplants, casualty

The duty to end the postcode lottery and rationing by wealth (equal access) v the duty to provide an affordable budget

The right to produce children v the right to 'waste' embryos

Evaluation of relevant reasoning data and resources e.g.

Assessment of the role of the NHS would help to clarify what level of service we could expect.

Clarification of 'physical and mental health' and 'disability'. If IVF treatment promotes the former and prevents the latter, we might expect the NHS to provide this service.

Reasonableness of the cost of 85 million a year – at £2,771 per cycle, this could treat a maximum of 30,675 women and with a success rate of 25% produce 7,668 births. Or at £8,313 per 3 cycles, treat 10,225 women and with a success rate of 50% produce 5,112 births. If other NHS procedures involved similar unit costs, we might expect it to provide this service.

Appeal to economy - Women under 40 are excluded without justification. The implied appeal to economy reflects an unjustified value judgement for restricting this service.

Restricting the options - Paul Burstow claims it will *probably* 'mean cuts elsewhere in NHS services', whereas the government could raise finance from elsewhere.

Slippery slope - Stephen Pollard claims, "Forcing health authorities to provide IVF treatment, means in effect redefining the purpose of the NHS to include the provision of *all* treatments, rather than just those that are clinically necessary", which does not allow for discrimination in levels of need.

False cause/post hoc - Stephen Pollard claims, "80% of the 27,000 current annual IVF attempts are done privately. That is because the existing consensus is that there is no such right (to children), and thus no such NHS duty (to provide treatment)." However, those seeking IVF privately may do so for speed or quality of treatment rather than principles of private v public provision.

Ad hominem - Mary Dejevsky attacks health administrators and doctors "who will fight anything that restricts their freedom to treat and prescribe", rather than their reasoning.

Specific to general - She generalises from the standardisation of IVF provision to provision of other treatments, whereas there may be specifics that prevent this.

Generalisation that women over 40 have a slight chance of conception, whereas reduced chances of conception may be characterised by criteria other than age.

Assessment of the right to parenthood is fundamental to the question.

Clarification - If the "right to establish a family" simply means the **right to** produce children rather than the **opportunity to** do this, then we might not expect the NHS to provide IVF.

Appeal to tradition - Article 12 represents an appeal to tradition rather than a reasoned case.

Assessment of the credibility of the sources would inform the discussion of the reliability of the claims. Vested interest by Prof Ian Craft, London Fertility Centre, to advocate embryo donation. If not motivated by genuine concern, this could result in furtherance of this work.

Principles

Should identify principles which arise and use them to strengthen their cases e.g.

It is desirable/good to produce children.

It is a human right to produce children/parenthood is a human right.

Only certain categories have the human right to produce children.

Economic grounds should limit human rights.

It is a human right to dispose of embryos.

The government has a duty to enable this human right where it is desired.

There is a right to equal access of treatment.

Section B AO1 [5], AO2 [10], AO3 [10], AO4 [5] **Total: [30]**

Section C

Specific points to supplement Generic Performance Descriptions:

Clarification parameters of the question

Degree of use – Everyday routine tracking would indicate a more concerned parenting than specific tracking in more dangerous situations.

Age range – Tracking could be limited to a particular age (young children who might wander off) or to particular risks (teenagers at night), rather than tracking of all children.

Select relevant issues, combine conflicting views, support with relevant examples, develop further reasoning on both sides of the argument e.g.

ISSUE 1 To prevent the law being broken

Conflict **ought v can**
Parents have a legal duty to protect their children.

Document 8 ‘According to Carolyn Hamilton of the Children’s Legal Centre, the general view taken by child protection professionals is that a parent should not leave children under 12 alone for more than 20-30 minutes.’

Document 7 **However** tracking devices might not facilitate this.
Mr Carr ‘The message implicit in the services is that knowing where your child is, is the same as knowing they are safe, which is absolutely not true.’

Further reasoning

Cultivating an adult community of care might provide a safer environment for children than a device which simply reports where they are. If adults in general viewed children as a joint social responsibility fewer accidents and less anti-social behaviour might occur.

Counter reasoning

However present concerns over child abuse might limit adult response.

ISSUE 2 To prevent harm

Conflict **prevention v freedom**
Tracking devices can be used to help protect children from harm.

Document 4 SOS Response suggest, ‘The monitoring devices would also be fitted with a panic button that could be pressed if a child or teenager was lost, needed help or, more rarely, had been abducted. Pressing the button would instantly alert parents via phone that something was wrong.’

Document 5 Reading University scientist Kevin Warwick is also trying to develop a locator that would be implanted into children. ‘The technology is not much of an infringement, ... if it saves just one life, it would be worth it.’

However this would limit personal freedom, especially that of teenagers.

Document 5 Professor William Yule claims ‘This sort of thing surely breaches the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child.’

Further reasoning

Although tracking devices are only a small technological progression from using such devices as text messages or mobile phone calls to let parents know their children's whereabouts, especially as the child has the choice as to whether to switch on the device,

Counter reasoning

The fact that many are automated or even implanted takes away the choice about whether or not to make contact with parents.

ISSUE 3 When child self-regulation is not an option*Conflict*

Paternalism v self-control
Children are not able to protect themselves from harm.

Document 8

'Other researchers further claim that parental supervision inoculates children from many of the dangers they face. They contend that 'parental monitoring has been inversely associated with anti-social behaviour, drug use, tobacco use and early sexual activity'.

Document 8

However tracking devices might inhibit learning from risk taking.
 Furedi claims, '...many risks that are well worth taking because of their stimulating effect on a child's development are simply avoided.'

Further reasoning

With present concerns over health and safety, a parent might be seen as negligent if risk taking led to a fatal injury, even in a simple task as in encouraging young children to cross the road themselves.

Counter reasoning

However it could be argued that risk taking is part of learning to become autonomous – to learn to judge the level of risk and to ask for help where the risk seems too great.

Assess the credibility of documents/sources within them e.g.*Document 4***Vested interest**

by Michelle Riddy to claim 'Many parents of young children and teenagers would like to ease their fears for their offspring by regularly checking where they were and that everything was fine.' as promotion of parental concern might increase the sale of her product.

*Document 5***Bias**

of the survey by nVision, as outline survey participants may be predisposed towards computerisation and technological devices.

*Document 7***Vested Interest**

By Jon Magnusson to instil confidence in this product even if there were shortcomings '... said he was satisfied his service had the appropriate verification and security measures in place to protect children.'

*Document 8***Bias**

by Furedi in his use of language to present the opposing viewpoints e.g. 'excellent study', 'compelling evidence' and 'fortunately' describe the three sources that support his views, whereas 'unfortunately', 'frighten', 'obsession', 'excessively' and 'paranoia' describe the opposition.

Evaluate the reasoning and data offered e.g.

Conflation Document 4 Michelle Riddy claims, 'You can now let your children out again because you can find out where they are.' The implication is that they will be safe, but this conflates knowledge with safety.

Weak parallel Document 5 Kevin Warwick claims, 'The technology is not much of an infringement. 'Children have their ears and bodies pierced. This does not amount to much more than that.' However although the biological method of implantation may be similar, the function is different, the latter being to track the child regardless of choice.

Slippery slope Document 6 Frank Furedi claims, 'We are teaching our children that society is a very dangerous place. We're telling them to be scared of life, to distrust everyone.' However there is a large step between being aware of danger and distrusting everyone.

Causation Document 8 'Parental monitoring has been inversely associated with anti-social behaviour, drug use, tobacco use and early sexual activity.' The implication is that supervision modifies behaviour, whereas the behaviour may be the result of restricted opportunity to be anti-social.

Slippery slope Document 8 'Unfortunately, parental supervision is today always interpreted as a positive virtue so parents can never spend too much time supervising their youngsters.'

Document 8 'Even though very few parents are prosecuted in these circumstances, the strict guidelines convey a clear message about what society expects of parents. And that expectation is founded on the premise that parents can never do too much to protect their children.'

In both there is an exaggerated conclusion which is far removed from the initial claim.

Causation Document 8 '... a climate of permanent panic that invites a guilt-ridden style of parenting. The loss of small children's freedom is one consequence. Children's freedom has never been restricted as it is today. A study by Dr Mayer Hillman of the Policy Studies Institute indicates that while 80% of 7- and 8-year-olds went to school by themselves in 1970, fewer than 10% are now allowed to do so.' However the reason why children may not now go to school themselves could be the increased distance they live from school now requiring transport, or the increased number of children dropped off on the way to parental work, the greater number of family cars available to drive children to school.

Causation Document 8 'A Glasgow researcher, Stuart Waiton, has produced compelling evidence that counters the fear that children are at greater risk than in previous times.' However the fall in crime against children may be because parents have given greater supervision. Therefore the figures would not be an indication that it is safe to remove supervision.

Section C – Generic Performance Descriptions

		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	
AO2 1 mark	Clarify the question		The question is clarified successfully to direct the answer. [0-1]	As in Level 2.	
AO3 1 mark	Present a clear, logical and coherent argument.	The argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • may not be well formulated • has little or no sign posting • may not be easy to follow • may lack consistency [0-1] 	The argument – evidences Level 3 characteristics in parts but these are not maintained throughout i.e. is generally ... or evidences Level 3 characteristics but tends to be superficial/unambitious. [2]	The argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • is well formulated • is clearly signposted • is easy to follow • is consistent • is complex. [3] 	
AO4 2 marks	Organised in an identifiable framework.				
Marks should not be awarded for the quality of English (spelling, punctuation, grammar) or the quality of the persuasiveness/rhetoric, or the quality of description or summary – but rather for the strength of the composition of the argument.					
AO4 6 marks	Select relevant issues to direct the argument. Combine different points of view to construct the argument.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 central issue selected with <i>inappropriate</i> attention paid to peripheral or irrelevant points. • the conflicting perspectives of 1 issue are broadly identified with some supported example from text and there is some attempt at integration. • The conclusions are presented without strong argument or no conclusion is drawn. [0-2] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 central issues are selected with <i>some</i> attention paid in parts to peripheral or irrelevant points. • The conflicting perspectives of 2 issues are identified with supporting examples from texts and <i>are</i> integrated. <p>The conclusions are presented tentatively within the outline of possible alternatives. [3-4]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 central issues selected with <i>little</i> attention to peripheral or irrelevant points. • The conflicting perspectives of 3 issues are clearly identified with forceful examples from texts and successfully integrated. • The conclusions <i>are reached through strong argument.</i> [5-6] 	
AO2 7 marks	Evaluate the credibility of the documents. Evaluate the strength and relevance of the claims.	An attempt is made to evaluate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the credibility of 1 document [0-1] • 1 point of reasoning/evidence. [0-1] 	<i>An attempt</i> is made to evaluate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the credibility of 2 documents [2] • 2 points of reasoning/evidence [2] 	The following are successfully assessed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the credibility of 3 documents [3] • 3-4 points of reasoning/evidence [3-4] 	
AO3 3 marks	Develop the reasoning with additional examples to support and challenge the argument.	An attempt is made to support the reasoning of one side of the argument with little or no additional evidence/examples. [0-1]	Additional relevant reasoning is given to present one side of the argument with relevant evidence/examples. [2]	Additional relevant reasoning is successfully given to both present one side of the argument and assess the counter argument with relevant evidence for at least one side. [3]	
AO2 AO3 AO4	evaluate develop and present synthesize	overall 16 [8] 8 [4] 16 [8]	0-6 marks	7-13 marks	14-20 marks

Report on the Components June 2005

Principal Examiner's Report 9913

General Comments

The candidature increased again this year, this being reflected in both a greater number of participating Centres, and higher entries per Centre. On the whole candidates had been wisely selected and produced responses which were precise and perceptive, often with a flair for originality in exemplification and alternative thinking or expression. However in some large-entry Centres, a significant number of candidates appeared to be well out of their depth, often missing out the evaluative elements in certain questions. These candidates skewed the performance towards the lower end.

The strongest candidates accessed many marks for points of evaluation. Weaker scripts however gained the majority of their marks for analysis and construction of argument.

It was encouraging that, in general, responses to Section B Question 3 and Section C tended to be much more focused upon the task than in previous examinations. There were far fewer responses that carried on for page after page without addressing the specific requirements of each element of the question. The majority of candidates attempted appropriate responses to all elements of the paper, demonstrating knowledge of what was expected of them.

For the first time, however, there was evidence that candidates from a small number of Centres adopted a strictly minimalist approach to the longer questions. They tackled each bullet point in turn without any attempt to work up their responses into a full-length, coherent and fluent argument. Such responses often did not attract many marks, as their brevity was often detrimental to the skills required.

Candidates appeared to have apportioned their time well, with little evidence of curtailed or rushed responses in Section C. A number of candidates chose to answer the Multiple Choice questions after Section B, suggesting that they were familiar with their own strengths in relation to the specification and had planned accordingly.

It was encouraging that candidates were much more focused upon the tasks set than in previous years. This led to more tightly argued responses, which evidenced clarity and precision.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A: Multiple Choice Questions

Multiple Choice answers were written clearly with very few altered answers. Some candidates lost time by ruling off between individual answers, or copying out each answer rather than identifying it by letter. One candidate answered with the same letter throughout, thus gaining very few marks.

The most commonly correctly answered were Questions 7 (a) and 7 (b). Questions 4, 5, 12 and 13 were also correctly answered by many candidates.

Section B: Short Response Questions

- 1 Very few candidates saw the advertisement as pointing to increased power of communication to enable a more social lifestyle, the majority going no further than paraphrasing 'clicking your heels' as being bored and with nothing to do. They then challenged this claim by suggesting that so much texting could be as boring as having nothing to do.

Others became sidetracked by details such as the small print (500 texts per weekend) at the end of the advertisement, or the possibility of more attractive offers elsewhere. Several assumed that the question required one to have seen 'The Wizard of Oz' and to have remembered the significance of clicking one's heels in that context.

- 2(a) Most candidates had no difficulty in identifying the right conclusion of the argument in Document 2, but tended to render it incorrectly by omitting the key words 'growth' and 'threatens', which made the claim stronger than the author intended.

Even when they had not made the correct identification, candidates usually realised that the third and seventh paragraphs had nothing to do with the main thrust of the argument. However some were tempted by paragraph two, which in fact gave support to the conclusion, in that it sought to demonstrate that the rapid growth of texting was threatening.

- 2(b) All but the weakest candidates homed in on the fifth paragraph in their quest for the assertion that the author sought to counter, but few appreciated that the easiest way to demolish the author's response was to claim that young people had had problems with spelling long before the emergence of texting.

- 2(c) The strongest candidates successfully contrasted the evidence in the photograph with the criticisms expressed in the passage, identifying the more pertinent clues of mobility, correct English, lack of abbreviation or purposeful activity.

The weakest, however, were more concerned with the antiquity of the mobile phone or the fact that the person was using her left hand, or that she must lack confidence because both thumbs were not being employed. None of these had implications for the reasoning of the passage.

- 2(d) Most candidates directed their attention to the fourth paragraph as the source of the analogy that required assessment. However the weakest selected 'For example' rather than 'Just as' and selected 'ruf2t' rather than typewriters and word processors. Others focused upon the parallel drawn between computer consoles and mobile phones in paragraph 3.

Only the most analytical correctly explained why the analogy was inappropriate, focusing upon the replacement factor of typewriters and computers being different from the possibility of the English language and text speak being used at the same time. Many candidates, however, missed the focus bringing in their own value judgements, claiming that the development of technology was a good thing whereas the replacement of conventional English by text speak was self evidently detrimental.

- 2(e) The strongest candidates scored well, directly assessing the use of statistics succinctly and expertly. Others however did not always distinguish between the assessment of statistics and other weaknesses in reasoning.

Most gained marks at some point, often amidst a great deal of verbiage. Quite often a longer response started off with an instinctive reaction that something must be wrong at that juncture, with the correct point of assessment gradually becoming evident. A significant number of candidates reasoned that one billion text messages was not many for a nation of 5 million people, working out how many messages per week this would involve. However they failed to consider that not all the populace would have been mobile phone users or senders of text messages.

- 2(f) The strongest candidates readily identified the slippery slopes and the assumption that the English language was a fixed entity.

Weaker candidates tended to challenge the claims rather than look for weaknesses in the reasoning. Some claimed that obesity is caused by bad diet rather than texting, whilst others retorted that one does not talk in text language.

- 3 Candidates who focused upon what was required by the question, as detailed in the bulleted guidance, tended to score highly. However, many candidates omitted to include any evaluation and a minority also omitted either dilemmas or principles or both. This significantly reduced the number of marks that these candidates achieved.

The majority of candidates selected two points of reasoning, one for and one against the proposition. Claims were also readily countered, often focusing upon NHS aims, the increased cost or the ethics of embryos being 'wasted'. Only the strongest responses identified the conflicting options within dilemmas. Most simply pointed out problems such as 'Would the NHS be able to fund the increased cost?'

Many candidates endeavoured to construct principles or to adapt them from the text. Such attempts however often foundered because they were encumbered with too much specific detail, thus losing their universality. The most successful responses centred around the right to produce children or to have a family. Several used the concept of equality or the utilitarian theory to construct effective principles centring on the distribution of resources.

Section C

Although there were fewer elegantly written responses with evidence of original thinking than in previous sessions, a pleasing number of candidates produced highly structured fluent answers which proceeded expertly from one requirement to another, often including both sides of three issues, fully supported with pertinent references from the documents. Further arguments, often witty, were also plentiful. These candidates often sought to define the parameters at the outset, looking at the types of device referred to, or the age at which they would be appropriate.

When assessing the credibility of the sources, the strongest answers made full reference to the possible vested interest of those marketing the products. However, the assessment was often too facile, for example claiming that the BBC was a reputable source, with no further comment, or that the Observer should be trusted because it is a broadsheet newspaper.

The strongest candidates gained several marks for evaluation often focussing on the earring and implant as being an inappropriate comparison. Many also identified a reverse causation, in that there might have been a decrease in crimes against children because parents had been more cautious. Some, however, faltered when trying to point out lack of statistics in certain areas.

The middle range candidates tended to repeat the same material with little coherence or evaluation of the reasoning or data. These candidates were inclined to label sources as 'expert', 'biased', or 'reliable', instead of analysing their strengths and weaknesses in depth. Whilst a few candidates fabricated unrealistic evidence and statistics to support their further arguments, the majority made good use of everyday experience thus gaining marks.

The weakest answers largely fell into two camps. Some were much too short with only a few lines written, with a fleeting reference to one or other side of a relevant issue. Other elements of the question were usually omitted, apart from the odd aside which occasionally stretched to become a further argument. The longer, weaker answers tended to be restricted to indiscriminate quotation from the text, with no comment whatsoever.

**Advanced Extension Award Critical Thinking (9913)
June 2005 Assessment Session**

Component Threshold Marks

Component	Max Mark	Distinction	Merit	Ungraded
1	15	9	6	0
2	30	17	11	0
3	20	11	6	0

Overall

	Distinction	Merit	Ungraded
Percentage in Grade	21.41	74.09	100.0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	21.41	52.68	25.92

The total entry for the examination was 269.

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

OCR Information Bureau

(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 2005

