

## Critical Thinking

Advanced Extension Award **AEA 9913**

# Combined Mark Schemes And Report on the Component

---

**June 2006**

9913/MS/R/06

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.

The mark schemes are 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.

The reports on the Examinations provide information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Mark schemes and Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers.

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

© OCR 2006

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](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## **CONTENTS**

### **Advanced Extension Award Critical Thinking (9913)**

#### **MARK SCHEMES FOR THE COMPONENT**

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
9913	AEA Critical Thinking	1



**Mark Scheme 9913  
June 2006**

**Section A****Multiple Choice**

**One mark for each correct answer.**

1. C
2. (a) E (b) B
3. (a) D (b) C
4. D
5. A
6. (a) B (b) A
7. D
8. B
9. E
10. B
11. C
12. A

**Section B**

- 1 (a) The association is 'funded by solid fuel producers and distributors'.  
As such their expertise in the market might **strengthen** the quality of their advice.  
Alternatively a vested interest to sell their products might **weaken** this. **2 x 1 mark**

- (b) The first photograph and heading – '21 century lifestyle' with a modern enclosed fire could be used to challenge
- the claim that rural communities who heat their rooms are backward looking
  - the claim that fires are uncontrolled.
- 2 x 1 mark**

- 2 (a) **Intermediate conclusion**  
Burning fires simply involves too many dangers. **1 mark**

**Additional factors**

(Paragraph 5 and 6) discusses efficiency and conservation.  
(Paragraph 7) criticises out moded practice.  
Accept relevant quotations.

- (b) **Assumptions** **2 x 1 mark**

Award 1 mark each for up to two of the following:  
In relation to open fires central heating

- is less dangerous in the home
  - requires a fuel whose extraction is less dangerous/does not use solid fuels
  - causes less pollution/less harmful to the environment
  - is more efficient
  - is more modern.
- 2 x 1 mark**

- (c) **Further evidence**

Award 1 mark each for any of the following that would weaken the claim:

- if the fuel that had been used in fires had been smokeless.
- if the fires had been in the countryside where the fumes had been diluted.
- if the deaths had been caused by other reasons exacerbated by pollution from fires.

Award 1 mark each for any of the following that would weaken the case:

- if the boiler uses a fuel derived from coal/fossil fuel e.g. gas from a coal fired generator.
- if the boiler consumes more energy because it heats more rooms or is easier to use and therefore is used more often/wastefully.
- If the boiler consumes fuel that costs more energy to extract or transport.

Credit other valid further evidence

**2 x 1 mark**

- (d) **Stated and countered claim**

The open fire is a symbol of 'warmth, light and security'

**1 mark**

**Weakness**

- Conflation of open fires with coal fires.
- 'Appeal to Modernity' where practices may not necessarily be better than the past.
- Reference to sentimentality attacks the characteristic of the opponent rather than their reasoning.
- Assume sentimentality is a bad thing.

**1 mark**

**(e) Analogy**

That mining should be banned as barbaric, being similar to banning sending children up chimneys for the same reason.

**1 mark****Weakness**

- Children had no choice, whereas miners choose their job.
- The conditions for children were not monitored whereas miners are protected by health and safety measures

**1 mark**

- (f)** Candidates might give reasons such as why renewable energy (in general or specific forms such as wind or solar energy) should be the way forward, pointing out that these fuels are unsuitable - as the supplies of oil are uncertain, or because British supplies of natural gas are running out.

**3 marks****[18 marks]****3****(a) Key dilemma**

For a **correctly phrased dilemma**

**1 mark**

and a further 2 marks if the **harm caused by each option is correctly stated** **plus 2 marks**

Either the wind farm should go ahead - causing possible harm to wildlife, peat lands and tourism or it should be refused - resulting in a lost opportunity for the local economy and renewable energy.

**3 marks**

For simply identifying **conflicting options** e.g.

The duty to provide jobs	v	the duty to protect tourism
The need to promote renewable energy	v	the need to protect landscape and wild life

**2 marks**

For simply **raising an issue** e.g.

What should we define as environmentally friendly?

Should the economy come first?

Should human welfare take priority over that of birds?

**1 mark****(b) Principles**

For a relevant principle **supporting** the proposal

**2 marks**

For two of these

e.g. The governing body has a duty to adopt those measures that would benefit the greater number of people even if it causes harm to some communities.

The governing body has a duty to ensure a sustainable economy.

It is right to conserve the earth's natural resources.

It is right to replace polluting fossil fuels with renewable energy sources.

**3 marks**

Award one mark for an expression that embeds a principle but does not explicitly express it.

N.B. Award no marks for a principle that would lead to the proposal being rejected

e.g. It is right to protect endangered species/areas of outstanding beauty.

Local inhabitants have the right to reject plans that would harm their environment.

**(c) Counter reasoning**

Candidates need to counter the stance made by **the opposition** e.g.

Although the protection of rare birds is important, this needs to be seen in the

context of the survival of the planet as a whole through the reduction of carbon emissions.



Although the windfarm might impact on the unspoilt image, tourism might in fact benefit from such a plan, as it might be advertised as a technological attraction as nuclear power stations do at present.

Sometimes governments have a conflict of duties. Although there is a duty to protect biodiversity there is also a duty to ensure that there is sufficient employment.

**3 x 1 mark**

**(d) Weakness in reasoning**

Candidates need to evaluate the claims made by **the opposition** e.g.

**Significance** If the claim that the building on peat lands releasing carbon into the atmosphere is seen as a single event and set against the long term production of power by wind farms which reduces carbon emissions significantly, then the criticism of releasing carbon is weakened.

**False parallel** If the wind farms in Lewis are predominantly on flat moorland, then the parallel with the wind farm in Ireland is not so relevant.

**Ambiguity** Does the 9% mean that 9% of the breeding population of all the red throat divers is in the Lewis peatlands? Or do these constitute 9% of the breeding population of all birds breeding in GB?

**Significance** There is no indication of how much Lewis contributes to the £33 million per year. If the amount is a small percentage, the reasoning about the loss to tourism would be weak.

**Bias** The findings of the poll might be biased, as those conducting it were concerned residents and as such might have a vested interest to influence the responses. This might weaken the result.

**Appeal to popularity** A majority does not necessarily justify the correctness of an argument. The inhabitants of Lewis may be wrong in their opposition.

**Appeal to fear Uses** emotive language 'catastrophic bog slides' as a method of persuasion rather than reasoning.

**3 x 1 mark**

**Section B A01 [5], A02 [10], A03 [10], A04 [5]**

**Total: [30]**

## Section C

Specific points to supplement the Generic Performance Descriptors:

### **Clarify parameters of the question e.g.**

The **minimum age** is not specified: the lower the limit, the greater the restrictions that would need to be introduced in any licence.

No indication is given as to the **time span** of the provisional licence: the longer the period of time it applies to the young person, the greater the infringement upon freedom.

**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**

**The government has a duty to ensure that laws preventing underage drinking can be upheld.**

*Document 5*

The Home Office recognises the need to deal with the problems of underage drinking, 'The new licensing structure will give police and local authorities greater powers to deal with the minority who abuse the licensing laws'.

**However the present increased powers alone might not control this, pointing to the need for additional/alternative measures.**

*Document 7*

'In spite of noble intentions and the expenditure of massive amounts of time, energy and money, the best evidence shows that our current abstinence-orientated alcohol education is ineffective'.

*Document 6*

Inspector Barnes pinpoints the problem with the present system, '...fake ID is easy to get - landlords can't always tell who hits the mark'.

*Further reasoning*

Other measures could include the promotion of clubs for under 21s where alcohol is not served at all, or where there are restrictions upon the licensed premises in line with those proposed for the under 21s.

*Counter reasoning*

However those under 21 might not wish to frequent such venues.

### **ISSUE 2**

**To prevent harm**

*Conflict*

**protection of society v restriction of freedom of the individual**

**A provisional licence could be used to help protect society from the excesses of underage drinking.**

*Document 7*

Those suggesting the provisional licence claim, 'clandestine overindulgence could give way to public self-regulation, with the penalty for abuse being revocation of the privilege'.

*Document 4*

Examples of harm:

Maxine Frith, 'Doctors are now seeing girls as young as 17 with cirrhosis of the liver due to excessive drinking. The Government estimates that alcohol related harm costs the country £20bn a year'.

**However this would limit the present personal freedom of 18 to 21 year olds, the majority of whom, from the figures, comply with the law.**

*Document 5* The Home Office statistics for December evidenced an average of four fixed penalty notices for troublemakers per licensed premise. The figures do not identify what percentage of these are under 21, but this is a small percentage of the drinking clientele.

*Further reasoning*

A provisional licence to include those under 18 could bring drinking in line with the minimum age for smoking, thus dealing with what teenagers see as an inconsistency in legislation.

*Counter reasoning*

However it could be argued that the social effects of excessive drinking are greater than those of excessive smoking. These are also more immediate than the more long term effects of passive smoking.

**ISSUE 3 When youth self-regulation is not an option**

*Conflict* **Paternalism v self control**  
**Underage drinkers do not always have the self control to protect themselves from harm.**

*Document 4* According to the European School Survey Project on Alcohol, 'One in three girls and one in five boys aged 15 to 16 admitted to binge drinking three or more times in the previous month', perhaps indicating the need for the greater supervision that a provisional drinking licence might afford.

**However the youth in other societies have self regulated without the need for such measures.**

*Document 7* 'Many groups around the world have learned to consume alcohol widely with almost no problems'.

*Further reasoning*

There are restrictions in other areas where young people are considered to be at risk from their own actions. A provisional drinking licence could be seen as being in line with other levels of restriction e.g. via censorship in viewing films of an adult nature.

*Counter reasoning*

However, learning from experience is often seen as valuable to encourage an autonomous adult.

**Assess the credibility of documents/sources within them e.g.**

**Document 4 Expertise**

of Martin Plant in addiction studies as a professor in that field, to be able to present reliable information relating to the trend in alcohol related liver disease being evidenced in those in their twenties and thirties.

**Vested interest**

by the British teenagers to exaggerate their 'binge' drinking as being at three or more times in the previous month, if they wanted to fit in with this image.

**Document 5 Vested interest**

by the Home Office to present the figures accurately to protect public confidence in their role, but at the same time a motive to selectively present the figures relating to abuse, to justify the need for increasing measures to combat underage and 'binge' drinking.

**Document 6 Neutrality**

of Alcohol Concern, who claim that raising the age limit would have little impact, as it would be in their interest to support such measures if they thought that they would be effective.

**Document 7 Experienced insight**

of Hanson and Heath into the drinking habits of students on campus, to suggest that a provisional drinking licence might be of help.

**Evaluate the reasoning and data offered e.g.****Document 4 Significance**

The increase in alcohol-related deaths rising by 20% and cirrhosis of the liver by 50% might represent only a few cases if the initial rate of increase was small, as indicated by the graph.

**Document 5 Significance**

The figures from the Christmas campaign period may be unrepresentative of alcohol abuse incidents in other parts of the year: less than usual if the cold weather limits people spilling out onto the streets or more than usual as it is a festive time of the year.

**Document 6 Significance**

The implication is that 48% of 15 year old girls having a drink each week is a problem, however no context is given. This could be a glass of wine at a family dinner, something which is argued to be successful in avoiding alcohol abuse in continental practice.

**Document 7 Weak parallel**

Successful avoidance of alcohol abuse in Italy and Greece may be due to factors not relevant in the UK or US, such as the nature of the wine in the area, or its cost.

## Section C – Generic Performance Descriptions

		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	
<b>AO2</b> <b>1 mark</b>	<b>Clarify</b> the question		The question is clarified successfully to direct the answer. [0-1]	As in Level 2.	
<b>AO3</b> <b>1 mark</b>	<b>Present</b> a clear, logical and coherent argument.	The argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• may not be well formulated</li> <li>• has little or no sign posting</li> <li>• may not be easy to follow</li> <li>• may lack consistency [0-1]</li> </ul>	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"> <li>• is well formulated</li> <li>• is clearly signposted</li> <li>• is easy to follow</li> <li>• is consistent</li> <li>• is complex. [3]</li> </ul>	
<b>AO4</b> <b>2 marks</b>	Organised in an identifiable framework.				
<b>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.</b>					
<b>AO4</b> <b>6 marks</b>	<b>Select</b> relevant issues to direct the argument.  <b>Combine</b> different points of view to construct the argument.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>1 central issue</b> selected with <i>inappropriate</i> attention paid to peripheral or irrelevant points.</li> <li>• the conflicting perspectives of <b>1 issue</b> are broadly identified with some supported example from text and there is some attempt at integration.</li> <li>• The conclusions are presented without strong argument or no conclusion is drawn. [0-2]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>2 central issues</b> are selected with <i>some</i> attention paid in parts to peripheral or irrelevant points.</li> <li>• The conflicting perspectives of <b>2 issues</b> are identified with supporting examples from texts and <i>are</i> integrated.</li> </ul> <p>The conclusions are presented tentatively within the outline of possible alternatives. [3-4]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3 central issues</b> selected with <i>little</i> attention to peripheral or irrelevant points.</li> <li>• The conflicting perspectives of <b>3 issues</b> are clearly identified with forceful examples from texts and successfully integrated.</li> <li>• The conclusions <i>are reached through strong argument</i>. [5-6]</li> </ul>	
<b>AO2</b> <b>7 marks</b>	<b>Evaluate</b> the credibility of the documents.  <b>Evaluate</b> the strength and relevance of the claims.	An attempt is made to evaluate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the credibility of 1 document [0-1]</li> <li>• 1 point of reasoning/evidence. [0-1]</li> </ul>	<i>An attempt</i> is made to evaluate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the credibility of 2 documents [2]</li> <li>• 2 points of reasoning/evidence [2]</li> </ul>	The following are successfully assessed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the credibility of 3 documents [3]</li> <li>• 3-4 points of reasoning/evidence [3-4]</li> </ul>	
<b>AO3</b> <b>3 marks</b>	<b>Develop</b> 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]	
<b>AO2</b> <b>AO3</b> <b>AO4</b>	evaluate develop and present synthesize	overall 16 [8] 8 [4] 16 [8]	0-6 marks	7-13 marks	14-20 marks

# **Report on the Component June 2006**



## CONTENTS

### Advanced Extension Award Critical Thinking (9913)

#### REPORTS ON THE COMPONENT

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
9913	AEA Critical Thinking	4
*	Grade Thresholds	9





## **Principal Examiner's Report**

### **Critical Thinking AEA 9913/01/02/03**

#### **General Comments**

The performance this year was very pleasing, with candidates accessing a wide range of marks. At the lower end few gained less than 20 of the possible 65 raw marks, so that most were within striking distance of a Merit, whilst a creditable 52 represented the upper limit. The highest scoring candidates performed well in all three sections of the examination paper, although the norm was to excel in one section and to do moderately well in the other two.

The type of Centre entry varied greatly, with the usual number of single-candidate entries, more between eight and thirty candidates and one Centre in three figures. Interestingly, roughly the same range of marks was accessed in each type of Centre entry.

This year, candidates appeared to be much more aware of what was expected, with very little loss of marks or time due to misinterpretation of the question, although there were still those that gave an explanation as well as the letter for the multiple choice answers. Higher marks were reached in Section B, with better use of specialist terminology. Evaluation skills were also more fully evidenced, especially in Question 3.

The change in format to Question 3, requiring the elements of an argument rather than the argument itself, meant that more candidates had time to develop fully fledged answers in Section C. There was increasing evidence of candidates leaving the multiple choice questions in Section A until the end, perhaps to give themselves stricter control over the time spent in this section.

#### **Comments on Individual Questions**

##### **Section A**

Encouragingly, this year several candidates gained full marks for the multiple choice questions, the standard of response appearing to have risen overall. The most accessible proved to be Q2a, 5, 6a, 6b, 7 and 12, whilst those marks least accessed were Q2b, 3b, 9 and 10.

Where there was a low level of response on this section, it was often the weakest performance of candidates who reached distinction levels in one other section. This patchy performance is typical of an overall Merit. Difficulty with multiple choice questions alone should therefore not be a determining factor in discouraging candidates from entering the qualification.

## Section B

Pleasingly more candidates accessed over 20 marks on this section than last year. The majority performed better in Q3, where the questions were more predictable. Unfortunately some candidates lost time by writing at length when there was no need, appearing to be reluctant to abandon an apposite point once they had located it. Candidates need to be made aware that Section B calls for focused, *short* response answers.

- 1 (a) The majority of candidates that latched on to the credibility issues raised by the material in Document 1 identified either vested interest or expertise, usually the former. Stronger candidates used vested interest in a focused manner, whilst the weaker expressed this as bias, although they usually went on to explain the potential motive of the Solid Fuel Association.
- (b) Those who homed in on the photographs readily saw how they contradicted the assertions made in Document 2. A pleasing number identified either the 'backward looking minority' or the 'barely controllable' claim, usually the former, and successfully demonstrated how it was countered.

Weaker candidates concentrated on the wording in Document 1 and found great difficulty in identifying direct challenges to claims in Document 2.

- 2 (a) Surprisingly few candidates correctly identified the intermediate conclusion, 'burning fires involves too many dangers', many homing in on one of the reasons that supported this. Those who did identify it, quite frequently loosely paraphrased it, or added additional reasoning. Nevertheless the majority identified efficiency as one of the additional factors, although few identified the outmoded practice. The weakest answers appeared not to be aware that pollution simply referred to another danger.
- (b) The majority of candidates identified at least one correct assumption; usually that central heating is safer or more efficient than open fires. The weaker tried to introduce a new element of comparative cost.  
It was pleasing that only the weakest candidates used absolutes instead of comparatives, such as 'no pollution' or 'no danger'.
- (c) This was the least successfully answered question. Relevant further evidence was rarely presented in an appropriate format, although many did manage to convey in general terms the idea that there were other factors giving rise to pollution.  
However, many identified that central heating still consumes fossil fuels and therefore contributes to the depletion of resources, whilst a few identified that the ease with which central heating can be turned on can make it much easier to use wastefully.
- (d) Most candidates correctly identified the assertion countered as the 'symbol of warmth, light and security'. Of these, many either correctly identified the weakness in the counter as an Ad Hominem flaw or expressed it in words that could be credited. A few identified an Appeal to Modernity, whilst no one sought to explain a conflation of terms.
- (e) The strongest candidates scored well, identifying the analogy between young chimney sweeps and adult miners. A minority omitted the question, suggesting a lack of understanding of the word analogy. Of those that suggested an alternative, 'an imaginary Dickensian past of toasting crumpets' featured strongly.

About half of those who correctly identified the analogy managed to adequately express reasons for the weakness, with the weakest seeking to focus incorrectly upon the issue of women.

- (f) Most candidates managed to score some marks for the further argument although few accessed full marks. Quite often the reasons given did not follow on from one another or relate to the regulations in question and many omitted an identifiable conclusion. A surprisingly small number suggested that it would be better to concentrate on developing renewable energy.

Candidates need to be guided by the number of marks available. Three marks should indicate that a mini essay is not required. There were many overlong answers with convoluted sentences, sometimes from an entirely personal angle, 'If I was to challenge the regulations, I would first of all point out...' Further arguments need to have a tight structure whereby reasons support a relevant conclusion. It may be that three or four sentences will access the marks in this way.

- 3 A few candidates treated the four questions as a single exercise, or at least merged together (c) and (d) which made it difficult to disentangle weakness from counter argument and to credit each part appropriately. The answers to (a) and (b) would suggest that there needs to be more direct guidance upon how to express dilemmas and principles, if candidates are to access these marks.

- (a) Only the strongest candidates correctly expressed the key dilemma. Almost invariably, conflicting options were explained somewhat verbosely, but not the dilemma itself. Most identified the harm of going ahead with the wind farm, but expressed the counter as the benefits of renewable energy rather than the corresponding harm of missing out on the opportunity that it would represent.
- (b) The strongest candidates expressed succinct, relevant principles. However some simply referred to an ethical theory such as Utilitarianism, without constructing a principle from it that would be relevant to this issue.

The weaker constructed maxims that were so specific to North Lewis that they could be considered to be advice or recommendation, such as 'The Scottish Executive should listen to the people of North Lewis' often followed by, 'because they are the ones that elected them.' The weakest simply drew up an agenda of suggestions based on Document 3.

- (c) The strongest candidates correctly identified claims from the text before attempting to counter these. The most commonly correct counter reasoning focussed upon the idea that the wind farm might actually promote tourism rather than detract from it.

Only the weakest candidates tried to counter the proposition rather than the opposition. By way of contrast, many more simply provided fanciful counter arguments, rather than countering the reasoning of the opposition.

- (d) The strongest candidates produced creditable points of weakness. Of those that did, the most common were the implied generalisation of the Galway bog slide to other wind farm projects and the possible bias of the North Lewis poll.

The weakest answers cited lack of evidence or disappointingly enlarged upon what they had introduced in (c).

## **Section C**

This Section was tackled far more successfully than in the past, with many candidates producing well structured and spirited arguments in favour of the idea of lowering the drinking age and introducing a drinking licence. However for some, this was all they gained credit for, as not enough attention was paid to the requirements of the bulleted guidance. The weakest candidates tended to plod from one document to the next, making the same points, instead of using the rubric to aid the structure of their answers.

Only the strongest candidates specifically set out parameters, although several mentioned (seemingly by accident) things that could be credited as parameters. Early clarification of parameters was sometimes confused with outlining what the candidate intended to write about.

Assessment of the credibility of the documents was perhaps the most successful element of this Section. Often, however, exhaustive examination of credibility was merely superficial and precluded much else. In weaker answers many points were too facile to gain credit, such as 'The Independent is a broadsheet newspaper, even though it has been reduced in size, and therefore it is still a reputable source.'

The strongest candidates addressed the key issues, explicitly addressing both sides of the conflict. These were included implicitly by weaker candidates, although often only one side was discussed - such as the need to address the problem of under age drinking without consideration of the ability to address the problem. On the whole the harm to the individual was the greatest concern, whereas the harm to society was largely unaddressed. The weakest of candidates simply strung together a plethora of quotations, with little attempt to do anything other than to describe the arguments presented in the documents.

Very few candidates attempted anything recognisable as evaluation of the reasoning. Of those that did, the most commonly evaluated was the weak parallel between the US and the UK and the significance of the £20 billion cost of alcohol related harm not referring specifically to underage drinkers.

Further reasoning, where present, went little beyond that which was presented in the documents. Most candidates wholeheartedly agreed with the recommendation and could find little to challenge it, other than the possibility of a new class of underage drinkers at 14-16 yrs.

## **Overall**

Encouragingly in this session there were more precisely focused answers using appropriate specialist terminology. If Centres wish to improve the performance of their candidates, the areas that can be usefully addressed are the expression of dilemmas and principles in Q3 and closer attention to the bulleted guidance in Section C. Other useful guidance can be gained from exemplar Distinction scripts examined in the OCR AEA Inset feedback in the autumn term. If candidates spend time working by themselves, the skills required are introduced in the OCR endorsed Heinemann texts 'Critical Thinking for OCR.'

**Advanced Extension Award Critical Thinking (9913)  
June 2006 Assessment Series**

**Component Threshold Marks**

Component	Max Mark	Distinction	Merit	Ungraded
1	15	9	6	0
2	30	16	11	0
3	20	10	7	0

**Overall**

	Distinction	Merit	Ungraded
Percentage in Grade	23.23	51.18	25.59
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	23.23	74.41	100.00

The total entry for the examination was 297.



**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](mailto:helpdesk@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2006

