

GCE

Critical Thinking

Advanced GCE A2 H452

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H052

Mark Schemes for the Units

January 2009

H052/H452/MS/R/09J

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

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 2009

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE Critical Thinking (H452)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Critical Thinking (H052)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
F501 Introduction to Critical Thinking	1
F502 Assessing and Developing Argument	16
Grade Thresholds	36

F501 Introduction to Critical Thinking

Section A – The Language of reasoning		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<i>For questions 1a, 1b and 1c, see levels based mark scheme after the indicative content.</i>	
1 (a)	<p>State the main conclusion of the argument presented in these paragraphs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (But) those who value the countryside should recommend rejection of this proposal. <p>Accept the proposal defined, either with the statement or as a separate comment.</p>	[3]
(b)	<p>State <u>two</u> reasons that are given to support the main conclusion in these paragraphs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (as) many of the sites are inappropriate (also) local residents may fear that the new developments will damage existing communities (more importantly), local authorities are concerned that these ecotowns will put pressure on services and infrastructure. 	[2 x 3]
NB Allow counter reason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (because) it would be a valuable step towards easing the housing crisis. (This is to credit candidates who understand how reasons support conclusions but who have reversed the conclusion and the counter conclusion.) - If the reasons conflict, only credit marks for the reason that connects to the correct main conclusion - If two reasons are provided as one (i.e. candidate is hedging bets), then maximum 1 mark for this bit. 	
(c)	<p>State the counter argument given in these paragraphs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> counter conclusion (Supporters advise that) the proposal for eco-towns built to the highest environmental standards should be welcomed. counter reason (because) it would be a valuable step towards easing the housing crisis. <p>NB Allow one of the three reasons given in 1 b</p> <p>3 marks For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author. The words in brackets are not required, but candidates should not be penalised if these words are included.</p> <p>2 marks For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author, but missing out any information.</p>	[2 x 3]

	<p>Or for a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrasing. NB Credit only one mark if the candidate also includes another argument element.</p> <p>1 mark For a less accurate statement of the argument element which has the gist but lacks precision eg “they should not build ecotowns” or a correct statement of the argument element but an extra argument element is added.</p> <p>0 marks For a statement of an incorrect part of the text.</p> <p><i>NB Only credit the words actually written. Do not credit words replaced by dots.</i></p>	
--	---	--

Section A – The Language of reasoning		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2	In <u>paragraph 5</u> the Royal Town Planning Institute responded to the proposal by stating ‘...the Government risked creating a "soulless suburbia", if it did not ensure the new settlements were well-linked to existing developments.’	
(a)	<p>Name the argument element used.</p> <p>2 marks Hypothetical reason/hypothetical reasoning.</p> <p>1 mark Reason or hypothetical or hypothetical argument. (this would support the argument rather than counter it).</p> <p>0 marks For no credit-worthy material.</p>	[2]
(b)	<p>Explain your answer to 2(a)</p> <p>2 marks</p> <p>It is a reason that contains a consequence (“soulless suburbia”) which depends upon a condition (not ensuring a good link to existing developments) being fulfilled. Credit answers that refer to conditional/speculative reasoning or similar expression.</p> <p>1 mark It gives support to the conclusion/what the RTPI wants you to accept. Credit answers that explain why it is a reason. Credit one mark as partial performance for the identification of the argument indicator words ‘if’ and ‘then’ (both are required).</p> <p>0 marks For no credit-worthy material.</p>	[2]

Section A – The Language of reasoning		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3	<p>Paragraph 3 gives the views of a tennis player’s father against the plans for an eco-town in Oxfordshire. Explain two ways in which his views might or might not be representative of the local residents.</p> <p>2 marks For a clear explanation of why his views might or might not be representative</p> <p>1 mark For an unclear or limited explanation eg a recognition that he belongs to a particular group, so would know what this group thinks eg elderly, lived in village a long time, “it is just one man’s opinion”.</p> <p>0 marks For no credit-worthy material.</p> <p>Examples of possible answers that would each gain two marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at 67 yrs old his views may not be representative, if there is a greater proportion of younger people in the village and the change impacts less on their lives • as a long term resident his views may not be representative, if there is a greater proportion of people who have lived there for a shorter period of time and they are less attached to the present environment • his views may be representative if the village has a majority of long term/elderly residents. <p>Credit answers that explain other relevant points of similarity or difference which affect the representative nature of his views.</p>	[2 x 2]

Section A – The Language of reasoning		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4 (a)	<p>State the assumption that is needed to support the reasoning about eco-town houses in the caption under the image in <u>paragraph 1</u>.</p> <p>3 marks For an accurate statement of the assumption. Accept the implication that action will take place.</p> <p>2 marks For a less precise statement of the assumption. eg Everyone will always act on this information.</p> <p>1 mark For the essence of an assumption expressed as a challenge. eg Just because the information is monitored doesn't mean that it will be acted upon.</p> <p>0 marks For the statement of an incorrect assumption.</p> <p>Answers that would gain 3 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information given by the computers will be acted upon to reduce energy use • There is a potential to be more energy efficient • The energy involved in monitoring will not be more than the energy that can be saved. • The computer is able to effectively monitor energy use. • The computer in the kitchen can monitor energy used throughout the house. 	[3]

Section A – The Language of reasoning		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4 (b)	<p>Suggest <u>one</u> reason, other than achieving energy efficiency that would make eco-towns a good idea.</p> <p>3 marks For a reason, other than achieving energy efficiency, that gives clear support to eco-towns/eco-houses eg recycling, landscaping, saving money. Allow a reason that uses information from the text or quotes the text.</p> <p>2 marks For a reason, other than achieving energy efficiency, that gives limited support to eco-town houses.</p> <p>1 mark For an answer that goes beyond a reason eg an argument or which is relevant information but is not a reason eg “15,000 new homes”. or for a relevant reason related to achieving energy efficiency. or a relevant point which is not expressed as a reason (eg not a complete sentence such as ‘to make aware of environmental issues’)</p> <p>0 marks For no credit worthy material.</p> <p>Examples of answers that would gain 3 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eco-towns would give the opportunity for town dwellers to live in a less polluted environment. Eco-towns would enable an awareness of the environmental issues. <p>Allow reasons to do with new towns rather than specifically eco-towns eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eco-towns would help to solve the housing problem. <p>Credit other relevant reasons.</p>	[3]
NB allow		
NB allow		

Section A – The Language of reasoning		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
5	<p>Consider the argument presented in <u>paragraph 2</u>. Assess how far the reasons support its conclusion. You should include <u>two</u> developed points that refer directly to the links between the reasons and the conclusion.</p> <p>5 – 6 marks For a detailed, accurate and well-expressed assessment of two points of reasoning. For 6 marks, both points must be detailed, accurate and well-expressed; for 5 marks, one point may be less well expressed or less accurate or detailed. Both focus directly upon the link and use material from the argument. Grammar, spelling, and punctuation are accurate.</p> <p>3 – 4 marks For a reasonably expressed assessment of points of reasoning. 4 marks for two points; 3 marks for one point. The assessment of the link may be inferred Grammar, spelling and punctuation are adequate.</p> <p><i>Partial performance – one detailed, accurate and well-expressed assessment of just one point – maximum four marks.</i></p> <p>1 – 2 marks For two points that include limited reasoning eg demonstrating that there is an argument eg the conclusion [unstated] is supported by recognizing that the sites are not very suitable. or partial performance – one point of correct reasoning with an inferred assessment of the link. Limited use of correct grammar, spelling and punctuation.</p> <p>0 marks For no credit worthy material. eg a critique of a reason rather than the link between a reason and the conclusion.</p> <p>Examples of assessment points that could be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first reason about <i>'inappropriate sites'</i> gives some support to recommend rejection of the proposal, if alternative sites requiring regeneration could be found. • The second reason does not give strong support to the conclusion, because although these <i>'local residents'</i> may <i>'fear'</i> damage, that fear may be unfounded. As such it might not support the recommendation to reject the proposal. • The second reason gives limited support to the conclusion that <i>'those who value the countryside'</i> should recommend rejection of the proposal, as the existing communities being damaged may have little to do with countryside issues if these communities are urban. The reasoning conflates communities and countryside. 	[6]

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The third reason focusing upon the concern of '<i>local authorities</i>' about pressures upon infrastructure would give little support to the recommendation to reject the proposal, if it is intended that they have their own independent services as indicated by Document 2.• The reasons are not strong enough to support the conclusion, as this recommends '<i>rejection of this proposal</i>', whereas with revision of the sites, the proposal might be more acceptable and generate less protest.	
	Section A Total	[30]

Section B – Credibility		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
6	<p>Assess how far the TCPA report in Document 2 is credible. You should make two points. Each point should identify and use a relevant Credibility Criterion to assess the Credibility of the document, supported by reference to the text.</p> <p>Candidates gain three marks in the following way.</p> <p>1 mark For correctly identifying a relevant credibility criterion (accept synonyms) in relation to the document.</p> <p>1 mark For a point of assessment that correctly applies a relevant credibility criterion to the document.</p> <p>1 mark For a relevant reference to the text to support the assessment.</p> <p>0 marks For an irrelevant or inaccurate point/no creditworthy material.</p> <p>Examples of answers that would each gain three marks.</p>	[3 x 3]
	<p>Neutrality</p> <p>Bias</p>	<p>The authors of the report describe their organisation as an '<i>independent charity</i>'. As such they would have no motive to bias their suggestions or findings towards government policy.</p> <p>The authors have selected information and views to make a case that supports eco-towns, as expressed in the title of the report, '<i>a report helping to deliver a change....</i>' Opposing views are not taken into consideration.</p>
	<p>Expertise/ experience</p> <p>Expertise</p>	<p>"Drawing on practical experience the TCPA carried out a review of current good practice". This implies that, as an organisation, they have both expertise and experience in this field.</p> <p>As a Town and Country Planning Association they would have relevant expertise in the development of new urban areas.</p>
	<p>Reputation/ Vested Interest</p>	<p>The TPCA has a reputation to uphold in line with their aims to '<i>create ideas, knowledge, publications, campaigns, independent policies</i>'. If they were found to give distorted information, they would not be seen as trustworthy. They therefore have a vested interest to present their findings accurately.</p>

Section B – Credibility		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7	In <u>paragraph 5</u> of Document 1, the Local Government Association predicts a negative future for eco-towns.	
(a)	<p>Identify a claim and its source, within either Document 1 or 2 that would be <u>consistent</u> with this prediction. NB The source needs to be named – reference to a paragraph or a document is insufficient. “Local authorities” from Doc.1 para 2 is acceptable. Examples of answers that would gain two marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Royal Town Planning Institute warned that ‘<i>the Government risked creating a "soulless suburbia", if it did not ensure the new settlements were well-linked to existing developments</i> The long time residents in Oxfordshire referred to the plans there as a “<i>horrendous site</i>” which he feared would destroy the village.’ <p>Credit other claims and sources that are consistent with the above claim.</p>	[2]
(b)	<p>Identify a claim and its source, within either Document 1 or 2 that would be <u>inconsistent</u> with this prediction. NB The source needs to be named – reference to a paragraph or a document is insufficient. Examples of answers that would gain two marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TCPA report claims that ‘<i>Successful urban development will offer people a decent home of their own.... within easy reach of schools and workplaces.</i> <p>Credit other claims and sources that are inconsistent with the above claim.</p> <p>Accept the following which is advice rather than prediction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The TCPA report advises that ‘<i>sustainable communities should be of a scale...can support a higher order of social and economic activity</i>’. The TCPA report claims that ‘<i>As much employment as possible should be within, or accessible from the community</i>’. <p>2 marks For each source correctly identified together with a correct statement of their claim.</p> <p>1 mark For a claim without a source.</p> <p>0 marks For no credit-worthy material.</p>	[2]

Section B – Credibility		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
8 (a)	<p>Assess the credibility of one claim made by the <u>Housing Minister</u> in Document 1 and one made by the <u>Campaign to Protect Rural England</u>.</p> <p>Apply <u>two</u> credibility criteria to explain how these may strengthen or weaken the credibility of the selected claim.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claim: <p>1 mark For an accurate statement of the claim.</p> <p>0 marks For an inaccurate or incorrect statement of the claim.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment of each point:(two points for each source) <p>Candidates gain up to 3 marks in the following way</p> <p>1 mark Identifies a relevant credibility criterion (accept synonyms)</p> <p>For an accurate point of assessment, that applies a relevant credibility criteria (accept synonyms) in relation to the source’s claim.</p> <p>1 mark For a point of assessment that correctly applies a relevant credibility criterion to this.</p> <p>1 mark For identifying whether this strengthens or weakens the credibility of the claim.</p> <p>0 marks For an irrelevant or inaccurate assessment /no creditworthy material.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing Minister Claim: <i>‘None of them would be sited on green belt land’</i> or <i>‘The eco-town schemes would help tackle the twin challenges of climate change and affordable housing.’ (or one aspect of this claim)</i> <p>NB do not credit the claim for the claim of the Minister of State for Housing in Document 2 (nearly half of our carbon emissions come from buildings. A quarter from our homes. We need substantial changes to the way we heat and power our buildings).</p>	[7]

Section B – Credibility		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<i>For those candidates who have stated the claim of the Minister of State for Housing, or any other wrong claim, credit correct assessment associated with that claim. (i.e. candidates do not need to be doubly penalised).</i>	
8 (a) continued	Example of assessments that would each gain three marks:	
	Reputation /Vested Interest	As the government Housing Minister they would have a vested interest to accurately reflect this aspect of the sitting, to protect both their own professionalism and that of the government. This would strengthen the credibility of this claim.
	Vested Interest	As the government Housing Minister they would have a vested interest to be selective with what they claimed, by failing to mention the effect upon other open countryside in order to set the proposal in a more positive context. This would weaken the credibility of the claim.
	Ability to observe (allow expertise)	As the government Housing Minister they would have access to documentation relating to both green belt land and to the location of the 15 sites, to be able to see that the latter did not involve the former. This would strengthen the credibility of this claim.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Claim: <i>eg 'The majority of proposals appear to be in unsuitable, unsustainable locations and conflict with established plans and strategies.'</i> Example of assessments that would each gain three marks:	[7]
	Reputation /Vested Interest	As a pressure group, they would have a vested interest not to distort their claim about the siting, in order to maintain public confidence in and support for their organisation. This would strengthen the credibility of this claim.
	Bias	As a pressure group with an aim to protect rural England, they would have a natural bias towards interpreting the proposed locations with this in mind. This would weaken the credibility of this claim.
	Expertise	As a pressure group with an aim to protect rural England they may not have the expertise in the plans and strategies of these areas to be able to judge that the locations are unsuitable and unsustainable. This would weaken the credibility of this claim.
	Ability to observe	They would have the ability to see the public documents to be able to judge the suitability of the locations. This would strengthen the credibility of this claim.

Section B – Credibility		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
8 (b)	<p>Explain what other information you would need to know in order to reach one of your points of assessment in 8(a) about the credibility of the Campaign to Protect Rural England’s claim. You should make <u>one</u> precise point.</p> <p>3 marks For information relevant to an assessment made in 8 (a).</p> <p>2 marks For reasoning that is circular.</p> <p>1 mark For a point relevant to the assessment of the claim which however is not related to an assessment made in 8(a) i.e. not linking back to assessment made.</p> <p>0 marks For an irrelevant or inaccurate point/no creditworthy material. (eg assessing the claim not the credibility of CPRE.)</p> <p>Example of answers that would gain 3 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You would need to know whether they had compromised their reputation previously by distorting interpretations in their favour. You would need to know what expertise the CPRE has in order to reach the judgement that these sites are unsuitable and unsustainable. You would need to know that they had properly researched the sites and previous plans to reach this judgement. 	[3]

Section B – Credibility		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
9	<p>Referring to the material within the documents come to a judgement as to whether eco-towns will have a positive <u>or</u> negative future. You should make a reasoned case with a judgement based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the relative credibility of both sides • the relative plausibility (likelihood) of both outcomes. <p>Your answer should include a sustained comparison within each of these tasks.</p> <p>11 – 13 marks For a detailed, accurate and well-expressed reasoned case (assessment) that leads to a judgement. Both the relative credibility of the sides and the relative plausibility of the outcomes are assessed with explicit comparison within both areas of credibility and plausibility. Effective reference to the documents is made. One area (credibility/plausibility) may be weaker than the other, though the answer must still contain a comparison of the two sides within both areas. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are accurate.</p> <p>8 – 10 marks For a reasonably expressed reasoned case (assessment) that leads to a judgement. Both the relative credibility of the sides and the relative plausibility of the outcomes are assessed with some explicit attempt at comparison within the areas (credibility and plausibility). Some reference to the documents is made. Grammar spelling and punctuation are adequate. <i>Partial performance – a detailed, accurate and well-expressed reasoned case that leads to a judgement, but related to just one area (credibility or plausibility)- maximum 8 marks.</i></p> <p>5 – 7 marks Limited reasoned case (assessment) of plausibility and credibility that leads to a judgement (which may be implied rather than explicitly stated). Comparison may be implied or list-like. Expression is limited but adequate. <i>Or partial performance – for a reasonably expressed reasoned case (assessment) that leads to a judgement, but related to just one area (credibility or plausibility) – maximum 5 marks.</i></p> <p>1 – 4 marks Limited and superficial assessments are made without an explicit judgement or the judgement is not supported by a reasoned case. Reference to the documents is absent or weak. Some valid points may be made which are not connected/disjointed. Grammar, spelling and punctuation may impede understanding.</p> <p>0 marks For no creditworthy material. NB Candidates who exclusively repeat their answers to Q8 (a) without comparison should also be awarded 0 marks.</p>	[13]

Section B – Credibility		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
9 continued	<p>Answers might include some of the following comparisons:</p> <p>The relative credibility of both sides eg Relevant expertise</p> <p>The side advocating a positive future in that eco-towns will help in tackling <i>'climate change'</i> and <i>'affordable housing'</i>, includes the Housing Minister who has access to government expertise to be able to judge this outcome in an informed manner. Additionally the TCPA, who advises about eco-town <i>'sustainability'</i>, has practical expertise through their related research, which might accurately inform their prediction of eco-towns as a <i>'successful urban development'</i>.</p> <p>The side that predicts a negative future has more views presented, but less expertise, which weakens the credibility of their claims. It includes a pressure group, the CPRE which claims the locations are <i>'unsuitable'</i> and <i>'unsustainable'</i>, but they may have less access to experts to inform this judgement. A local resident describes one plan as a <i>'horrendous site'</i>. However his expertise to make this judgement is not stated. On the other hand this side includes the RTPI and the LGA who warn of <i>'eco-slums'</i> and <i>'soulless suburbia'</i> if eco-towns are not linked to other developments. This might be well judged and credible, as they deal directly in planning matters and are likely to have both experience and expertise in this area, although possibly not yet with eco-towns.</p> <p>Thus although there is expertise on both sides, that of the Housing Minister and the advisory body TCPA might be more directly relevant to eco-towns, making their claims for a positive future more credible.</p> <p>The relative plausibility (likelihood) of both outcomes The LGA makes the negative prediction of <i>'eco-slums'</i> and the RTPI one of a <i>'soulless suburbia'</i> on the basis of a possible lack of <i>'jobs and training'</i>. However part of the planning structure advised by the TCPA is that the eco-towns will be large enough to support their own <i>'sustainable communities'</i> with <i>social support and economic activity'</i> This would reduce the plausibility of large scale unemployment and eco-slums, as would residents who were able to finance their residence through independent means or a retirement pension and those who could secure jobs within a commuting distance.</p> <p>Thus the plausibility of a negative outcome is weakened by planned sustainability and those who can fund their residence from other means. Therefore it is plausible that eco-towns could provide an ecologically improved outcome for previous town dwellers.</p> <p>Credit other relevant comparisons such as a vested interest to represent the situation accurately to maintain public confidence in the organisations presented. Alternatively, use could be made of neutrality and bias.</p>	
	Section B Total	40
	Paper Total	75

F502 Assessing and Developing Argument

Section A – Multiple Choice Mark Scheme

Question	Key	Text	Type	AO
1	A	skyscrapers	Identify Main Conclusion	AO1
2	D	skyscrapers	Flaws	AO2
3	D	rubbish inspectors	Identify Main Conclusion	AO1
4	A	rubbish inspectors	Identify Principle used	AO1
5	B	rubbish inspectors	Naming argument element	AO1
6	A	hoax calls	Identify Intermediate Conclusion	AO1
7	B	hoax calls	Identify Principle which supports	AO2
8	D	hoax calls	Strengthen	AO2
9	A	stressed parents	Naming argument element	AO1
10	D	stressed parents	Flaws	AO2
11	C	music festivals	Naming argument element	AO1
12	A	music festivals	Weaken	AO2
13	B	shop doors	Identify Counter-Assertion	AO1
14	C	shop doors	Identify Assumption	AO1
15	B	alcohol limit	Strengthen	AO2

Section A Total = [15]

Analysis of Multiple Choice Passages & Answers

Q1 & 2 The first sentence gives the context

- R1 – Dwarfing the other architecture
- R2 – Blocking light and historic views
- R3 – Creating an inhuman landscape of glass and steel
- IC1 – Tall buildings in the wrong place can be a big problem
- IC2 – Since there are problems with building up we will have to look down
- MC – Planners must consider developing underground complexes

Q1 Key – A – see above

Q2 Key – D – There are other solutions, such as building on brown-field sites or away from the city centre, etc. The author falsely gives two choices to support his conclusion.

- A – In no way do any of the reasons depend on the conclusion being true
- B – The Mayor's approval is not a part of the reasoning, so there is no appeal to authority being made which the argument rests on.
- C – There is no argument relying on correlation/causation here.

- Q3, 4 & 5** The first sentence gives the context
- CA – Although the arrival of these inspectors may annoy students
 Ev – In 2007 the council collected 45 tonnes of waste from two student areas, at a cost of £6000 to the taxpayer.
 R1 – It is unfair that local residents have to bear the brunt of student's wastefulness
 MC – It (the arrival of rubbish inspectors) is a good thing
- Q3** Key – D – see above
- Q4** Key – A – This is the only option that gives a guide to action
- Q5** Key – B – This gives a reason why the arrival of inspectors would not be a good thing. It is a claim without reasoning and a conclusion, so is a counter-assertion rather than a counter-argument.
- Q6, 7 & 8**
- R1 These calls waste taxpayers' money.
 R2 Worse, each hoax call draws life-saving services away from people in real need.
 IC Calls about false emergencies such as fires, car crashes and terrorist attacks have serious consequences.
 MC People who make hoax calls to the fire service should face serious Punishment
- Q6** Key – A – see above
- Q7** Key – B – If it is wrong to take actions which could lead to loss of life, it is wrong to make hoax calls to the emergency services. We punish wrong doing, so this principle would support the argument.
- A – This is a judgement about taste rather than a guide to action, therefore not a principle. There is also the question whether hoax calls count as practical jokes.
- C – This is not a principle. It is written as a statement of fact or opinion and there is no guide to action here.
- D – This is an empirically verifiable fact rather than principle.
- Q8** Key – D – This information about cost strengthens the argument by giving evidence to support R1.
- A – This would support the claim that it is possible to identify and catch people who make hoax calls. This makes it practical to punish them, but does not strengthen the theoretical argument that they should be punished. Hoax callers should be punished even if it is difficult to catch them and do so.
- B – This tells us what current legal penalties are, which has no bearing on whether hoax callers should be seriously punished.
- C – This tells us about another consequence felt by hoax callers. It has no bearing on whether they should be punished or not.

- Q9 & 10** Ev Research has found that children with stressed parents have significantly more illnesses than children with relaxed parents.
 R1 As childhood illness affects learning.
 R2 (Hypothetical) If children do not learn the basics they will not progress in their education.
 IC1 Children could leave school without the skills needed by employers.
 IC2 This could lead to serious economic decline.
 MC The government must deal with this problem now

Q9 Key – A – see above

Q10 Key – D – The argument moves from some evidence and a reasonable expression of concern about illness affecting learning to extreme conclusions about children leaving school without necessary skills and economic decline. The logical links of support are tenuous at best. This is characteristic of a slippery slope argument.

- Q11 & 12** CA Many people complain that music festivals are expensive and too muddy.
 R1 (Hypothetical) If people enjoy the music, they should not complain about the price.
 R2 (Explanation) Some people like the mud because it gets them away from the claustrophobic indoors indoor living of city life.
 MC It (fact that music festivals are expensive and too muddy) doesn't matter.

Q11 Key – C – This explains why some people like the mud rather than trying to persuade to accept the conclusion that some people like the mud.

Q12 Key – A – The hypothetical reasoning has a consequence which does not follow from fulfilment of the condition (i.e. enjoying the music does not entail acceptance of too high a price)

B – The argument is not suggesting that the complaints do not matter because they are true. The argument is saying that the mud and expense do not matter because of the enjoyment and getting away from the city.

C & D – These are both disagreements with the premises rather than weaknesses in the reasoning.

Q13 & 14 The first sentence gives the context

Ev – The total annual wastage from heat loss through these open doors is £250 million

CA – Although this strategy makes a shop more welcoming to passers-by

R1 – The average shop could save over 25% of its energy bills by closing its doors

MC – If shops want to increase profit margins and also be more environmentally friendly, they should not leave their doors open.

Q13 Key – B – This is the only option which gives a positive reason for doing the opposite to the conclusion, and opening their doors.

Q14 Key – C – For it to make economic sense, and increase profit margins, it must be that the action of closing doors will save more money in costs than it loses in terms of income. Although this is hard to measure whether it is occurring or not, it is a necessary assumption.

A – This does not need to be true, what matters is actual sales, not necessarily visitors, and even then, a reduction in sales could still be okay if the costs shrink by more, as option C highlights.

B – This is explicitly stated in the passage within the two pieces of evidence

D – The conclusion says “be” more environmentally friendly, not “appear”. The shop doors are being more environmentally friendly regardless of whether customers recognise this or not.

Q15 Ev – Tests show that a driver’s awareness and skill can be affected by as little as 60mg of alcohol per 100 ml of blood

R1 – Therefore a driver can be legally allowed to drive despite being affected by alcohol

R2 (Ev) – Records show that last year more than 6,000 people were hurt in drink-driving accidents

MC – The legal limit for driving with alcohol should be reduced from 80 mg per 100 ml of blood to 50 mg.

Key – B – This strengthens the decision to cut to 50 mg as there are many drivers in this window, so it is targeting a large number who may be causing accidents. If there were a small or non-existent number in this window, the reduction to 50 mg would be pointless.

A – This may increase drinking in general, but there is no mention of drink-driving, To pick this, is to conflate the two.

C – This is not relevant to drink-driving and is a different problem. Mostly binge drinkers will be well over the current limit in any case, so the reduction has no bearing on them.

D – Comparing to other countries is not particularly relevant. There is no information for instance on how successful this has been

Section B – Analysing and Evaluating Argument		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
16 a)	<p>State the main conclusion of the argument presented in paragraphs 1 to 4.</p> <p>3 marks – For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author.</p> <p>2 marks – For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author but adding information or missing out information.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>For a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrase(s)</p> <p>1 mark – For a less accurate statement of the argument element which has the gist but lacks precision and/or contains additional information and/or misses out information.</p> <p>0 marks – For a statement of an incorrect part of the text</p> <p>NB If candidates leave sections out by using ellipses (...) then credit only what is seen without filling in the gaps.</p> <p>3 mark answer The Government should reduce the amount of imprisonment for petty crime by increasing the use of Community Service Orders.</p> <p>Examples for 2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We should reduce the amount of imprisonment for low level crime by giving more Community Service Orders The Government should reduce the amount of imprisonment by increasing the use of Community Service Orders. <p>Examples for 1 mark</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More Community Service Orders should be given instead of prison for crime. The Government should reduce the amount of imprisonment for petty crime. <p>NB If candidates leave sections out by using ellipses (...) then credit only what is seen without filling in the gaps.</p>	[3]

Section B – Analysing and Evaluating Argument		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
16 b)	<p>State an intermediate conclusion in paragraphs 1 to 4.</p> <p>There are five possible options for intermediate conclusions in the paragraphs for 3 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (It is becoming clear that) prison sentencing is not the best response to low-level crime. • The financial burden for tax payers for the current number of prisoners is not sustainable. • (This shows that) Community Service is better than prison at encouraging criminals to change their behaviour. • It would better to send fewer petty criminals to prison. • The only way to break the vicious cycle is to use Community Service Orders. <p><i>“the vicious cycle” may be replaced or explained with context eg “the pattern of criminals learning more about crime” – also for 3 marks</i></p> <p>3 marks – For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author. Any words in brackets are not required but candidates should not be penalised if these words are included.</p> <p>2 marks – For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author but adding information or missing out information.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>For a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrase(s)</p> <p>1 mark – For a less accurate statement of the argument element which has the gist but lacks precision and/or contains additional information and/or misses out information.</p> <p>0 marks – For a statement of an incorrect part of the text</p> <p>NB If candidates leave sections out by using ellipses (...) then credit only what is seen without filling in the gaps.</p>	[3]

Section B – Analysing and Evaluating Argument		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
16 c)	<p>State the principle given by the author in paragraphs 1 to 4.</p> <p>3 marks – For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author.</p> <p>2 marks – For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author but adding information or missing out information.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>For a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrase(s)</p> <p>1 mark – For a less accurate statement of the argument element which has the gist but lacks precision and/or contains additional information and/or misses out information.</p> <p>0 marks – For a statement of an incorrect part of the text</p> <p>NB If candidates leave sections out by using ellipses (...) then credit only what is seen without filling in the gaps.</p> <p>3 mark answer The justice system should aim to rehabilitate rather than punish</p> <p>Examples for 2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The justice system should aim to rehabilitate. • We should aim to rehabilitate rather than punish. <p>Example for 1 mark</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We should aim to rehabilitate. • The justice system should not punish. • The justice system should rehabilitate. <p>Any qualifying comment from the definition provided on the resource booklet on the meaning of the word rehabilitation will not lose credit.</p>	[3]

Section B – Analysing and Evaluating Argument		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
17	<p>In paragraph 2, the author suggests that the significant increase in the number of prisoners has been caused by the longer sentences being given to petty criminals. Give an alternative explanation for this increase.</p> <p>2 marks – Clearly expressed and developed alternative explanation for increase in prisoners.</p> <p>1 mark – Undeveloped or not clear alternative explanation</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy material</p> <p>NB no marks for explanations linked to longer sentencing for petty crimes</p> <p>Examples for 2 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the years in-between a larger number of criminals have been caught • The amount of prisoners being released early has diminished. • In the years in-between, the conviction rates for criminals has increased • The sentencing for serious crimes has increased in length during this time, (which has led to greater numbers being in prison irrespective of petty crime sentence lengths) <p>Examples for 1 mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police have improved during the time • The police force has increased in size during the years in-between • Amount of crime has increased • Population increased/changed • New terrorist detention laws. 	[2]

Section B – Analysing and Evaluating Argument		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
18	<p>In paragraph 2, the author says that the average cost to taxpayers of each prison place is £40,000 per year. Explain <u>one</u> strength <u>or</u> weakness in the use of this evidence to support the argument.</p> <p>2 marks – developed and clear explanation of strength or weakness</p> <p>1 mark – partially stated or undeveloped statement of weakness</p> <p>No credit given for the circling. The explanation must be consistent with the circled strength or weakness. If it is clear that the written answer is opposite to the circling, then no credit for this question can be given.</p> <p>Examples for 2 marks:</p> <p>STRENGTH</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is high compared to average personal income (or “most people’s income”) so will illustrate the high expense. <p>WEAKNESS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is the average figure for prison places. Petty criminals may well be cheaper, so the statistic is not relevant. There is no statistic mentioned for the cost of the alternative, eg community service, so no comparison can be made. We do not know how much money the country can afford, so we don’t know if this is an unsustainable burden or not. No comparisons made to other costs, so we have no reference point to know if it is a high cost. <p>Examples for 1 mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some prisoners will cost less No comparisons made to other costs It is a lot of money. 	[2]

Section B – Analysing and Evaluating Argument		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
19	<p>In paragraph 3, the author claims that “Community Service is better than prison at encouraging criminals to change their behaviour”. Explain <u>one</u> weakness in the way the author has used evidence to support this claim.</p> <p>3 marks – Clear statement of a weakness with a clear explanation why the evidence fails to support the author’s claim</p> <p>2 marks – Clear statement of a weakness and attempted explanation why the evidence fails to support the author’s claim</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Simple statement of a weakness and clear explanation of why the evidence fails to support the author’s claim</p> <p>1 mark – A simple statement of a weakness</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy material</p> <p>Examples for 3 marks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The survey only covers Birmingham and cannot be applied more generally to the rest of the country, so we can’t be sure that CSOs are better everywhere. 2 The survey only covers a 5 year period, it may be that some of those with CSOs, who haven’t yet re-offended, may re-offend after the survey has finished, so it cannot support the claim. 3 The survey only covers 5 years. This is not a long enough period to be a guide to what may happen in the future, (i.e. a 5 year survey in a future decade may yield different results), and so it cannot support the claim. 4 People given prison sentences are more likely to be hardened/persistent criminals and therefore re-offend more than people given CSOs, i.e. the groups being compared are not the same. (It is not necessarily the community service vs. prison that has made them re-offend less), so it cannot support the claim. <p>Examples for 2 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The survey is too short to accurately check re-offending • Other areas of the country may have different re-offending statistics than Birmingham <p>Examples for 1 mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • survey only covers 5 years • survey only covers Birmingham/a small area • survey does not look at just petty crimes 	[3]

Section B – Analysing and Evaluating Argument		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
20	<p>Name a flaw in paragraph 4, and, with reference to the reasoning, explain why it is flawed</p> <p>Name:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> restricting the options/false dichotomy/stating only two options /excluded middle/false dilemma arguing from one thing to another, unrelated conclusion/non sequitur <p>Explain:</p> <p>2 marks – A clear explanation of why the reasoning is flawed clearly related to the passage</p> <p>1 mark – An explanation of why the reasoning is flawed but not clearly related to the passage</p> <p>OR – A statement of what the flaw is, clearly related to the passage, but missing a clear explanation of why the reasoning is flawed</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy material; for instance a further generic description of what the flaw is</p> <p>Examples for 2 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author chooses between sending the criminals to prison, where they can learn more crime, or giving them community service. However there are other options such as isolation or different prisons for different levels of crime. <i>(for 2 marks an example of an alternative option need not be given, but the existence of it needs to be alluded to)</i> The author goes from reasoning that sending petty criminals to prisons can lead to more crime, to concluding that Community Service is the answer. This does not follow, there are other solutions more related to reasoning. <p>Examples for 1 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community Service orders are not the only solution The author gives a conclusion from two choices, but there are other solutions not listed which may be better The author gives only choice between sending petty criminals to prison and giving community service orders Giving Community Service is not related to prison 	<p>[1]</p> <p>[2]</p>

Section B – Analysing and Evaluating Argument		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
21	<p>What does the Reader’s Response imply that the Government should do?</p> <p>2 marks – For a conclusion that relates to the passage and is a clear statement of an action the Government could do to address the concerns in the passage</p> <p>1 mark – For a conclusion relating to the passage that is not clearly expressed, or that is too narrowly focussed, eg “remove sun-filled yards in prison”</p> <p>0 marks – For no creditworthy material.</p> <p>A conclusion which is just a statement of state without associated Government action should not be credited. eg “Britain’s jails are too soft”</p> <p>Examples for 2 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Government should make jails in Britain tougher/unpleasant/uncomfortable • The Government should make prisons less welcoming to criminals • The Government should stop making prisons pleasant/soft. <p>Examples for 1 mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They should stop prisons having gyms or running tracks • They should stop prisoners should not have internet access • Make prisons hard. 	[2]

Section B – Analysing and Evaluating Argument		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
22	<p>Evaluate the reasoning in the Reader’s Response, covered in paragraphs 5 and 6. In your answer you might consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • flaws and appeals • the use of examples • the use of hypothetical reasoning • other evaluation <p>Performance descriptors for question 22:</p> <p>3x3</p> <p>1 mark Identification/Statement Mark A simple statement of the area or argument element to be evaluated with a suitable value judgement. A maximum of 3 marks. Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hypothetical reasoning is wrong. • There is an appeal to emotion. • It commits a slippery slope flaw. <p>1 mark Evaluation Mark A clear, correct and relevant statement of evaluation. A maximum of 3 marks. Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hypothetical reasoning is wrong because the predicted consequences do not always follow. • There is an appeal to emotion which is designed to make people angry and persuade them. • It commits a slippery slope flaw where the final outcome is far-removed from the initial state. <p>1 mark Reference Mark In addition, a clear reference to the passage. A maximum of 3 marks. Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The hypothetical reasoning is wrong because the predicted consequences do not always follow - the “if...then...” reasoning does not follow, it is not obvious that prisoners will re-offend just because prisons are too soft. • There is an appeal to emotion which is designed to make people angry and persuade them when it states “Laze away their afternoons in sun-filled yards”. • It commits a slippery slope flaw where the final outcome is far-removed from the initial state. Living with a better quality of life in prison will not necessarily lead to all people committing crime to get back into prison. <p>It is possible to award each type of identification/statement and/or evaluation marks in isolation, but the reference can only given alongside one of the other two types of marks.</p>	[9]

	<p>Examples of such 2 mark responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hasty generalisation – some prisons may have gyms, sun-filled yards, etc. • Weak Hypothetical reasoning – if prisons are not hard enough, past offenders will commit crimes in order to be sent back inside. <p>Example evaluative points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (para 5) Hasty generalisation – some prisons may have gyms, sun-filled yards, etc. but not all will • (para 5) The list is convincing in that the average person does not have easy access at home to the list of activities that the example has, so the example is a strong one • (para 5) Appeal to Emotion made in two places a) “Laze away their afternoons in sun-filled yards” – this is designed to make people angry and persuade them. Also, b) “this is how the Government punishes the people...” is designed to appeal to us to get angry at a sense of injustice. • (para 6) Slippery Slope – living with a better quality of life in prison will not mean all people will commit crime to get back into prison. There are many other disadvantages linked to being in prison that would outweigh this for most people (family, liberty, social stigma, etc.) • (para 6) Hypothetical Reasoning – the “if...then...” reasoning does not follow, it is not obvious that prisoners will re-offend just because prisons are too soft. • (para 5) Assumption – the author assumes that state of the art gyms, running tracks, etc. are luxuries/comfort, (whereas this may not be true for all prisoners). • (para 5) Assumption - the author assumes that state of the art gyms, running tracks, etc. are accessed by some/most prisoners, (whereas they could only be used by staff). • (para 5) Assumption - the author assumes that lazing away/relaxing is not what prisoners should be doing (whereas this may be good for rehabilitation). • Conclusion – the Reader’s Response reasoning does not support any overall conclusion. It summarises ‘the real problem is that Britain’s prisons are too soft’ without offering recommended action. 	
	Section B Total	[30]

Section C – Developing Your Own Arguments		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
23	<p>In paragraph 1, the author says the Government is releasing nearly 2,000 non-dangerous offenders early as a solution to prison overcrowding. Give <u>two</u> reasons why the Government should not do this.</p> <p>For each reason:</p> <p>3 marks – for a reason that gives clear support that the Government should not release non-dangerous offenders early, (as a solution to prison overcrowding).</p> <p>2 marks – for a reason that gives limited support, perhaps by being undeveloped</p> <p>1 mark – for a statement that shows some awareness of the issue</p> <p>Examples for 3 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The early release makes the general public lose faith in the justice system and government • Crime figures may increase if people are freed before they are ready to return to society or realise the consequence of their actions. • Victims of crime will feel it is not just if criminals have not served their full term • There may not be job opportunities/social structures for such a large number of people leaving prison at one time. • The fact that offenders are being released early will act as less of a deterrent for future crime. • Releasing some prisoners early is not fair to previous ones who have not been. • There may be better solutions to the problem of over-crowding. • Prison guards will have to be made unemployed. • Overcrowding does not need to be solved as it helps to make prison uncomfortable • Released offenders could resume offending, earlier than expected. <p>Examples for 2 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crime may increase • It will increase unemployment • Releasing some prisoners early is not fair • Early release is not the only solution. • Released offenders could resume offending. • It suggests to prisoners that they can get away with crime quite easily. <p>Examples for 1 mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not fair • People will get worried • Overcrowding is a good thing • They carry on being a criminal. • They can get away with it more easily. 	[3]

Section C – Developing Your Own Arguments		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
	<p>Performance descriptors for questions 24 and 25</p> <p>10–12 marks – (level 4) Candidates present their own relevant argument with a clear structure where the conclusion is supported by at least three reasons and at least one properly supported intermediate conclusion. The argument is convincing and may rely on only one or two reasonable assumptions. The argument may also contain other relevant argument elements eg evidence/examples, counter- assertion. The main conclusion is precisely and correctly stated. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are very good: errors are few, if any.</p> <p>7 – 9 marks – (level 3) Candidates present an argument that contains three or more reasons and there is an intermediate conclusion. The argument may be convincing in general but relies on some assumptions, so the link between reasons and conclusions is weakened. The argument may contain other argument elements that have less relevance to the overall argument. The main conclusion is clearly stated, perhaps with minor paraphrase(s). Grammar, spelling and punctuation are good: errors are few.</p> <p>4 – 6 marks – (level 2) Candidates present a basic argument that contains one or more reasons of some relevance to the main conclusion. There is an attempt to form an intermediate conclusion. The argument will rely on several assumptions and is not in general terms convincing. The conclusion is stated but may have a slightly different wording and/or meaning to the conclusion required. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are adequate but with errors which are sometimes intrusive.</p> <p>1 – 3 marks – (level 1) There is a limited attempt at an argument, which is related to that asked for in the question. The conclusion may be unstated, or different to that asked for in the question. At least one reason, is given. There is no attempt to form any intermediate conclusions. Grammar, spelling and punctuation may be poor with errors which are intrusive.</p> <p>0 marks – No creditworthy material. Do not credit arguments simply lifted or paraphrased from the passage.</p>	

Section C – Developing Your Own Arguments		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
24	<p>Write your own argument to challenge the following conclusion:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">“Prison sentences should be short and unpleasant”</p> <p>Marks will be given for a well-structured and developed argument. You should include at least 3 reasons, an intermediate conclusion and an overall conclusion. Your argument should also contain examples and/or evidence.</p> <p>You may use information and ideas from the passage, but you must use them to form a new argument. No credit will be given for repeating the arguments in the passage.</p> <p>Acceptable conclusions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prison sentences should <u>not</u> be short and unpleasant • Prison sentences should be long and pleasant/comfortable. <p>Examples of points challenging the conclusion that prisoners should be given short sentencing in unpleasant conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tough conditions may incite prisoners to revolt and riot • A consequence of tough conditions is that prisoners may resent authority • Comfortable conditions, such as watching TV, can give prisoners new interests away from crime • Watching TV can help educate for a return to new work • Longer sentences are needed so people can be rehabilitated and retrained • Taking away all modern conditions is a breach of human rights and is illegal • Prison is punishment enough, the prisoners do not need to be uncomfortable in addition to this. • Society is protected for a longer period of time, if prisoners get long sentences. • Longer prison sentences give the appearance of justice to society/victims. 	[12]

Section C – Developing Your Own Arguments		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
24	<p>Example of a 12 mark answer</p> <p>It is incorrect that prison sentences should be short and unpleasant. This is because short prison sentences fail to give prisoners time to think about the consequences of their actions. Short sentences also mean that when offenders go back into normal life, they have more time to re-offend. Short sentences are not effect in punishing prisoners. Although they have committed crimes, prisoners should not be treated too inhumanely, as they are still people. So prison sentences should not be too unpleasant. However, they should not get the luxuries of normal life. Currently, prisoners have to do chores around the prison, such as cooking, cleaning, etc. This should be maintained, though not increased, as being away from your family and segregated from normal life is punishment enough. Prison sentences should be longer, which the government should enforce strongly.</p>	[12]

Section C – Developing Your Own Arguments		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
25	<p>Write your own argument to <u>challenge or support</u> the following conclusion:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">“We should aim to rehabilitate offenders rather than punish them”</p> <p>Marks will be given for a well-structured and developed argument. You should include at least 3 reasons, an intermediate conclusion and an overall conclusion. Your argument should also contain examples and/or evidence.</p> <p>You may use information and ideas from the passage, but you must use them to form a new argument. No credit will be given for repeating the arguments in the passage.</p> <p><u>Acceptable conclusions</u></p> <p><u>Support</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We should aim to rehabilitate offenders rather than punish them <p><u>Challenge</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We should <u>not</u> aim to rehabilitate offenders, instead we should punish them. • We should aim to punish offenders and not rehabilitate it. <p>Examples of points which <u>support</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehabilitation cuts crime in the long term with changed behaviour, which is cheaper for society. • It is a more humane way to treat people, and fits more with human rights legislation. • Being a convicted criminal is punishment enough. • Rehabilitated offenders should offer more to society in terms of employment and service – eg they could have learned trades. • There will probably be less strain on the emergency services with less crime occurring. • Public confidence is increased if less crime occurs. • A consequence of rehabilitation is that prisoners feel valued and invested in. <p>Examples of points which <u>challenge</u>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Punishment is more of a deterrent against crime (for others/for the future). • Victims of crime may feel more that justice has been seen to be done if punishment occurs • Keeping criminals in prisons will keep the streets safer (in the short term) • Rehabilitation is more expensive in the short term than punishment • Criminals in the past have been punished, so amending it to rehabilitation is unfair and inconsistent to them. 	[12]

Section C – Developing Your Own Arguments		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
25	<p>Example of a 12 mark answer</p> <p>The Government's prisons are currently overflowing with prisoners, who are not being taught how to live in society and therefore end up re-offending. Rehabilitation may be the answer. Rehabilitating prisoners allows them to learn new skills which they can use to find a job when they leave prison, for example, English and Maths lessons. Drug addicts could reform and get clean, thanks to rehabilitating them and showing them what effects their drug taking has on others. Learning a new trade, such as mechanics, could help offenders forget crime and start afresh, rather than punishing them, so they will never forget what they have done. Punishing a person will make them bitter and end up resenting authority, looking for revenge when they are released. Rehabilitating prisoners will do more good than punishing them, so therefore we should aim to rehabilitate offenders rather than punish them.</p>	
	Section C Total	[30]
	Paper Total	[75]

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE Critical Thinking (H052/H452)
January 2009 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
F501	Raw	75	55	48	41	35	29	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F502	Raw	75	56	49	42	35	29	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0

No candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:
http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums_results.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

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@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 2009

