

# **Critical Thinking**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **F501**

Unit 1: Introduction to Critical Thinking

## **Mark Scheme for June 2010**

---

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, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, 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 specifications 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 2010

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

Section A – The language of reasoning					
Question	Syllabus ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale	
1		<p>Brackets indicate words that may or may not be included, ie they do not affect the mark given.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – for precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author. You must only credit the words written. Ellipsis (quoting the first and last word) should not be credited.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – for precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author, but missing out information  <b>or</b> for a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrasing.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – for a less accurate statement of the argument element which has the gist but lacks precision  <b>and/or</b> contains additional information.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – for a statement of an incorrect part of the text.</p>			
	(a)	3.1.1.1 3.1.1.2 3.1.1.5 3.1.1.6	<p><b>State the <u>main conclusion</u> of the argument within paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.</b>            (Despite its advantages,) the e-cigarette should be seen as an unwise choice.</p>	[3]	Unless evidence to contrary, accept 'cigarette' in place of 'e-cigarette' for 2 marks (accepted as careless error).
	(b)	3.1.1.1 3.1.1.5 3.1.1.6	<p><b>State <u>two</u> reasons that are given to support the main conclusion within paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.</b>            Credit any two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (whilst) some consider (that) the e-cigarette is a bit feminine for a man to use</li> <li>• others think (that) the price could put some people off</li> <li>• the medical profession believes (that) it presents potential dangers.</li> </ul>	[2x3]	Do not accept 'no rigorous peer-reviewed studies....' as this is evidence.  If '£50' or 'such as the health risks' is included, 1 mark only as additional material has been included.

Section A – The language of reasoning					
Question		Syllabus ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale
	(c)	3.1.1.1 3.1.1.5 3.1.1.6	<b>State the <u>hypothetical reason</u> within paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.</b> If some reports are to be believed, e-cigarettes do not have harmful effects.	[3]	3 marks for precise answer. 2 marks if both parts there but paraphrased eg 'If reports are to be believed, e-cigarettes are not harmful'. 1 mark if include 'like lung-cancer...' 0 marks if only one part of the reason given.
	(d)	3.1.1.1 3.1.1.5 3.1.1.6	<b>State the <u>counter conclusion</u> within paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.</b> The introduction of the e-cigarette is being seen as providing a modern and acceptable way to smoke indoors.	[3]	2 marks if 'The introduction' is omitted.
2	(a)	3.1.1.6	<b>Consider the <u>third</u> sentence in paragraph 1, 'A student from Ashford, Middlesex, remarked, "I like the e-cigarette. It doesn't make my hands smell like a cigarette does."'</b>  <b>Name the argument element used.</b>  <b>2 marks</b> – example Allow 'counter example'. <b>1 mark</b> – evidence Allow 'counter evidence'. <b>0 marks</b> – for no creditworthy material.	[2]	
	(b)	3.1.1.3	<b>Explain your answer to <u>2(a)</u>.</b> <b>2 marks</b> – it is an instance of something that illustrates the counter reasoning. <b>1 mark</b> – it is something that happened/was said that is used to support to the reasoning/argument. <b>0 marks</b> – for no creditworthy material. Accept answers that use the context to explain the argument element.	[2]	For 2 marks the answer must include a reference to <u>how</u> an example operates, ie words such as 'instance, illustration, shows...' should be included. If only 'support/back up' is used – the answer gets 1 mark. No penalty for referring to wrong reason. Candidates can access all the marks in part (b) even if they have gained no marks in 2(a).

Section A – The language of reasoning					
Question	Syllabus ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale	
3	3.1.1.7	<p>An example is given in <u>paragraph 2</u>, ‘with a bar worker from Bethnal Green commenting, “£50 is a lot of money to pay for a gadget. I wouldn’t pay that much.”’ Explain <u>two</u> ways in which this example might or might not be representative.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – for a clear explanation of why the example might or might not be representative by a <b>comparison between</b> the bar worker and others.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – for an unclear or limited explanation which refers <b>only to</b> the bar worker.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – for no creditworthy material.</p> <p>Examples of possible answers that would gain <b>2 marks</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What a bar worker/worker from Bethnal Green might find expensive might not be representative of smokers, if their salary is significantly less than the average salary.</li> <li>• This person’s disposable income might be similar to that of most smokers, making their claim representative in finding the cost too expensive.</li> <li>• If the bar worker were not a smoker, then not being willing to pay that much might not be representative of the financial priorities of smokers.</li> </ul> <p>Credit answers that explain other relevant points of similarity or difference which affect the representative nature of the example.</p>	[2x2]	<p>No marks for answers which state ‘He is only one person/ lives in Bethnal Green/works in a bar’ etc unless there is some link to smoking or money.</p> <p>No marks for merely commenting on his/her credibility.</p> <p>The majority of correct answers will refer to income, or smoking/non-smoking.</p>	

Section A – The language of reasoning					
Question		Syllabus ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale
4		3.1.1.6	<p>In <b>paragraph 2</b> it says, “... some consider that the e-cigarette is a bit feminine for a man to use.” State the <b>assumption</b> that must be made here in order to support the claim that the e-cigarette is an unwise choice.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> - for an accurate statement of the assumption. eg It is unwise for a man to look feminine.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – for a less precise statement of the assumption. eg Men do not want to look feminine. Men looking feminine is a bad thing.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – for the essence of an assumption expressed as a challenge. eg It is not bad for men to look feminine.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – for the statement of an incorrect assumption.</p>	[3]	<p>For 3 marks ‘unwise’ or a very close synonym must be included so that the answer links to the conclusion.</p> <p>Note: there are many different ways of expressing the 2-mark answer.</p> <p>The point must refer to men and not a general statement about femininity.</p>
5		3.1.1.8	<p><b>Suggest <u>one</u> reason of your own to support a claim that e-cigarettes are not a good way of helping smokers to quit smoking. You must give <u>only</u> a reason and not add other argument elements.</b></p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – for a reason that gives clear support to the claim against e-cigarettes in connection to quitting smoking.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – for a relevant reason against e-cigarettes that is not related to quitting smoking.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – for an answer that goes beyond a reason eg an argument or for quoting from the documents.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – for no creditworthy material.</p> <p>Examples of answers that would gain <b>3 marks</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>E-cigarettes still provide the addictive element of nicotine.</li> <li>E-cigarettes might tempt people to start smoking again.</li> </ul> <p>Credit other relevant reasons.</p>	[3]	<p>If the answer includes a development of how/why, only award 1 mark, because an explanation has been given.</p> <p>Other common argument elements often added which reduce the mark to 1 are: conclusions, examples, second distinctive reason (be alert to ‘so’ ‘thus’ ‘eg’ ‘therefore’)</p> <p>It is acceptable to re-state the original claim without penalty.</p>

Section A – The language of reasoning			Mark	Rationale
Question	Syllabus ref	Expected Answer		
6	3.1.1.8 3.1.1.9	<p><b>Consider the argument presented in paragraphs 2 and 3. Assess how strongly the reasons given support the conclusion. You should include: two <u>developed</u> points; these should refer directly to the <u>links</u> between the reasons and the conclusion.</b></p> <p>Credit as follows for up to <b>two</b> points made:</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – for a correct point of assessment that states the correct conclusion and which focuses directly upon the link.  <b>2 marks</b> – for a correct point of assessment that states the correct conclusion and which assesses a reason without any reference to the link.  <b>1 mark</b> – for a correct point that identifies correctly the reason and conclusion but offers no assessment.  <b>0 marks</b> – for no creditworthy material, eg the conclusion cannot be identified within the answer <b>or</b> evidence/examples are assessed with no attached reason.</p> <p>Examples of assessment points that could be made:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The first reason is relevant to the conclusion in that it may be relevant to the conclusion's claim of being '<i>unwise</i>', if male smokers do not wish to be considered by some as '<i>a bit feminine</i>' by using e-cigarettes.</li> <li>• The second reason states the '<i>price could put some people off</i>'. Whilst this might be a disadvantage, it does not give strong enough support to be able to draw the conclusion of an '<i>unwise</i>' choice, if the price were within the smoker's disposable income.</li> <li>• The second reason states the '<i>price could put some people off</i>'. This might be relevant to the conclusion of an '<i>unwise</i>' choice, if the price were so high that it caused financial difficulties for the smoker.</li> <li>• The conclusion's claim of an '<i>unwise</i>' choice may be directly supported by the third reason of the medical profession, only if</li> </ul>	[2x3]	<p>Provided the reason and conclusion can be clearly identified, they do not have to be quoted in full, eg candidates could mention 'unwise' or 'choosing' or 'choice'.</p> <p>The conclusion is: 'The e-cigarette should be seen as an unwise choice.'</p> <p>Reasons are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the e-cigarette is a bit feminine for a man to use</li> <li>2. the price could put some people off</li> <li>3. the medical profession believes that it presents potential dangers.</li> </ol> <p>For 3 marks to be awarded, there must be an assessment which explains how the reason supports/does not support the <b>unwise choice</b> in the conclusion.</p> <p>Evidence/examples can be used to assess a reason but the reason must be identifiable for marks to be awarded.</p> <p>If two reasons are contained within the same paragraph/bullet point both can be credited if they are correct</p>

Section A – The language of reasoning						
Question			Syllabus ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale
				<p>what it <i>'believes'</i> is well founded.</p> <p>Credit similar answers that address the link between reasons and conclusion.</p>		and the conclusion is correctly identified.
				<b>Section A Total</b>	<b>[35]</b>	

Section B – Credibility			Mark	Rationale						
Question	Syllabus ref	Expected Answer								
7	3.1.2.2 3.1.2.3	<p><b>Assess the credibility of <u>Document 2</u> from e-cigarette-global.com.</b>  <b>You should make <u>two</u> points. Each point should identify and use a relevant credibility criterion to assess the credibility of the document and support this with reference to the text.</b></p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – for a point of assessment that correctly applies a relevant credibility criterion (accept synonyms) to the document with a correct textual reference.  <b>2 marks</b> – for a point of assessment that correctly applies a relevant credibility criterion without any reference to the document.  <b>1 mark</b> – for a point of assessment that demonstrates a correct understanding of the credibility criterion selected.  <b>0 marks</b> – for an irrelevant or inaccurate point/no creditworthy material.</p> <p>Examples of answers that would each gain <b>3 marks</b>.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Vested Interest</td> <td>The authors appear to have a vested interest to promote e-cigarettes as they are a commercial website dependent on the adoption of e-cigarettes, ‘e-cigarette-global.com’. (Also allow the opposite – no vested interest, because they are simply a repository of ‘reviews, news and chat’.)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bias</td> <td>The authors have selected information and views to make a case that supports e-cigarettes as indicated by their title, ‘<i>Electronic cigarettes could be the answer.</i>’ This limits the credibility of their report.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Expertise</td> <td>The document includes an assessment by the ‘<i>CIEH</i>’. As the <i>advisors to the ‘regulatory authorities’</i></td> </tr> </table>	Vested Interest	The authors appear to have a vested interest to promote e-cigarettes as they are a commercial website dependent on the adoption of e-cigarettes, ‘e-cigarette-global.com’. (Also allow the opposite – no vested interest, because they are simply a repository of ‘reviews, news and chat’.)	Bias	The authors have selected information and views to make a case that supports e-cigarettes as indicated by their title, ‘ <i>Electronic cigarettes could be the answer.</i> ’ This limits the credibility of their report.	Expertise	The document includes an assessment by the ‘ <i>CIEH</i> ’. As the <i>advisors to the ‘regulatory authorities’</i>	[2x3]	<p>The reference to the text must clearly support the assessment of the credibility criterion for 3 marks. Merely stating the reference is insufficient to be awarded the text mark, eg if ‘e-cigarette-global.com’ is used as a reference to support expertise there must be a brief explanation as to how/why the reference demonstrates this before the text mark can be awarded. In some instances, the reference can also act as part of the assessment.</p> <p>The candidate does not have to state that the document has high or low credibility to achieve the assessment.</p> <p>For a correct assessment of one source within the document, eg inventors/smoker/representative from CIEH, 1 mark can be awarded if a correct criterion is identified. However, if the individual source is used as an example to assess the credibility of the whole document, it can access all 3 marks.</p> <p>Accept reference to ‘the website’ as a reference to the whole document, not an individual source.</p>
Vested Interest	The authors appear to have a vested interest to promote e-cigarettes as they are a commercial website dependent on the adoption of e-cigarettes, ‘e-cigarette-global.com’. (Also allow the opposite – no vested interest, because they are simply a repository of ‘reviews, news and chat’.)									
Bias	The authors have selected information and views to make a case that supports e-cigarettes as indicated by their title, ‘ <i>Electronic cigarettes could be the answer.</i> ’ This limits the credibility of their report.									
Expertise	The document includes an assessment by the ‘ <i>CIEH</i> ’. As the <i>advisors to the ‘regulatory authorities’</i>									

Section B – Credibility				Mark	Rationale
Question	Syllabus ref	Expected Answer		Mark	Rationale
			<p>it would have the expertise to be able to comment on the issue of e-cigarettes in an informed manner, which lends credibility to the report.</p> <p>Reputation The website has a <i>'global'</i> designation, which may mean that it has a significant reputation to uphold, and as such would have a vested interest to report matters accurately to maintain this. This would strengthen the credibility of its report.</p>		Only accept RAVEN criteria, not corroboration, circumstantial evidence etc. Be careful if candidates choose both bias and vested interest to check that the same point is not being made twice. If both are used, look for distinctions, eg one for financial gain, one due to emotional attachment.
8		<p><b>In Document 3, the Notting Hill bar manager claims, “I think that it would cause problems by blurring the boundaries and creating confusion.”</b></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – for each source correctly identified together with a correct statement of their claim.  <b>1 mark</b> – for a claim without a source.  <b>0 marks</b> – for no creditworthy material.</p>			
(a)	3.1.2.1 3.1.2.2	<p><b>Identify a claim and its source, within Document 2, that is <u>consistent</u> with this claim.</b></p> <p>Answers that would gain two marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Source - The inventors "it looks, tastes and smokes like a conventional cigarette."</li> <li>Source – a smoker/58 year old/from Herne Bay "The barman did initially ask me to stop"</li> <li>Source – CIEH "Our main concern was that officers wouldn't be able to tell the difference"</li> </ul> <p>There are no other claims in Document 2 that are consistent with this claim.</p>		[2]	<p>If the claim includes the consistent element but has additional material, 1 mark can be given for the correct source but no mark for the claim.</p> <p>If the claim does not include the consistent element, no mark can be given for either claim or source.</p> <p>Candidates who give explanations should not be penalised.</p> <p>Where more than one claim is given, mark only the first.</p>

Section B – Credibility				
Question	Syllabus ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale
(b)	3.1.2.1 3.1.2.2	<p><b>Identify a claim and its source, within Document 2, that is <u>inconsistent</u> with this claim.</b></p> <p>Examples of answers that would gain two marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Source – The Chartered Institute of Environmental Health “if you are close to them it’s clear they’re not normal cigarettes.”</li> <li>Source – a smoker/58 years old/from Herne Bay “(but) I showed him the product and he was fine with it.”</li> </ul> <p>There are no other claims in Document 2 that are inconsistent with the above claim.</p>	[2]	<p>If the claim includes the inconsistent element but has additional material, 1 mark can be given for the correct source but no mark for the claim.</p> <p>If the claim does not include the inconsistent element, no mark can be given for either claim or source.</p> <p>Candidates who give explanations should not be penalised.</p> <p>Where more than one claim is given mark only the first.</p>
9	3.1.1.4 3.1.2.2 3.1.2.3	<p><b>Assess the credibility of one reported claim made by the <u>World Health Organisation</u> in Document 3 and one reported claim made by the <u>inventors</u> in Document 2.</b></p> <p><b>Apply <u>two</u> credibility criteria to explain how these may strengthen or weaken the credibility of the selected claim.</b></p> <p>Claim:  <b>1 mark</b> – for an accurate statement of the claim. (Paraphrasing acceptable, allow ellipsis where there is a beginning and an end.)  <b>0 marks</b> – for an inaccurate or incorrect statement of the claim.</p> <p>Assessment of each point: (two points for each source)  <b>3 marks</b> – for a well-explained assessment, that applies a relevant credibility criterion (accept synonyms) indicating how this strengthens or weakens the claim.  <b>2 marks</b> – for a weak explanation that applies a relevant credibility criterion (accept synonyms) indicating how this strengthens or weakens the claim.  <b>1 mark</b> – if there is no explicit indication as to whether the</p>		<p>Only accept RAVEN criteria not corroboration, circumstantial evidence etc. Be careful if candidates choose both bias and vested interest to check that the same point is not being made twice. If both are used, look for distinctions, eg one for financial gain, one due to emotional attachment.</p> <p>Candidates can use the same criterion twice, provided their assessment is different.</p> <p>For ‘strengthen/weaken’ accept synonyms that include comparatives. Do not accept ‘makes strong’/‘makes weak’. If no claim is given/the wrong claim is given, the candidate can still be credited for the rest of the answer.</p>

Section B – Credibility				Mark	Rationale				
Question	Syllabus ref	Expected Answer		Mark	Rationale				
(a)		<p>credibility criterion strengthens or weakens the claim, OR an assessment which demonstrates a correct understanding of a credibility criterion which is not applied to the claim/source.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – for an irrelevant or inaccurate assessment/no creditworthy material.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>World Health Organisation</b></li> </ul> <p>Claim eg "WHO knows of no evidentiary basis for the marketers' claim that the electronic cigarette helps people quit smoking."</p> <p>"Indeed, as far as WHO is aware, no rigorous, peer-reviewed studies have been conducted showing that the electronic cigarette is a safe and effective nicotine replacement therapy."</p> <p>Accept reported claim: "warned that they are concerned that little, if any, testing has been done on the products to prove that they deliver a safe amount of nicotine."</p> <p>Example of assessments that would each gain <b>3 marks</b>:</p> <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reputation/ Vested Interest</td> <td>As an organisation in the worldwide public eye it would have a vested interest to accurately reflect the safety status of the device, in order to protect the professionalism of its organisation. This would strengthen the credibility of its claim.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutrality</td> <td>As an advisory body it would have no motive to distort its findings/no bias in presenting its findings. This neutrality would strengthen the credibility of its claim.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Reputation/ Vested Interest	As an organisation in the worldwide public eye it would have a vested interest to accurately reflect the safety status of the device, in order to protect the professionalism of its organisation. This would strengthen the credibility of its claim.	Neutrality	As an advisory body it would have no motive to distort its findings/no bias in presenting its findings. This neutrality would strengthen the credibility of its claim.	[7]	
Reputation/ Vested Interest	As an organisation in the worldwide public eye it would have a vested interest to accurately reflect the safety status of the device, in order to protect the professionalism of its organisation. This would strengthen the credibility of its claim.								
Neutrality	As an advisory body it would have no motive to distort its findings/no bias in presenting its findings. This neutrality would strengthen the credibility of its claim.								

Section B – Credibility											
Question	Syllabus ref	Expected Answer		Mark	Rationale						
		Expertise/ allow Ability to Observe	As an organisation making decisions about issues that affect world health, it is likely to have at its disposal experts who would know which tests had been carried out on this device. This would strengthen the credibility of its claim.								
(b)	3.1.2.2 3.1.2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>The inventors</b> Claim: “They say it looks, tastes and smokes like a conventional cigarette, but has no detrimental effects upon others and doesn’t cause cancer.”  Credit answers that give other claims made by the inventors or part of the above claim.  Example of assessments that would each gain <b>3 marks</b>:</li> </ul> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Expertise</td> <td>As the inventors, they would have the expertise of being involved in the design to be able to comment accurately on its use and effects. This would strengthen the credibility of their claim.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vested Interest</td> <td>As the inventors, they would have a vested interest to interpret or even exaggerate the benefits of their invention in order to boost its popularity and sales. This would weaken the credibility of their claim.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ability to Observe</td> <td>As the inventors, they would have had ability to observe its effects first hand. This would strengthen the credibility of their claim.</td> </tr> </table>		Expertise	As the inventors, they would have the expertise of being involved in the design to be able to comment accurately on its use and effects. This would strengthen the credibility of their claim.	Vested Interest	As the inventors, they would have a vested interest to interpret or even exaggerate the benefits of their invention in order to boost its popularity and sales. This would weaken the credibility of their claim.	Ability to Observe	As the inventors, they would have had ability to observe its effects first hand. This would strengthen the credibility of their claim.	[7]	
Expertise	As the inventors, they would have the expertise of being involved in the design to be able to comment accurately on its use and effects. This would strengthen the credibility of their claim.										
Vested Interest	As the inventors, they would have a vested interest to interpret or even exaggerate the benefits of their invention in order to boost its popularity and sales. This would weaken the credibility of their claim.										
Ability to Observe	As the inventors, they would have had ability to observe its effects first hand. This would strengthen the credibility of their claim.										

Section B – Credibility																
Question	Syllabus ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale												
10	3.1.2.2 3.1.2.3	<p><b>Write a reasoned case coming to a judgement as to whether smokers are likely to widely convert to e-cigarettes. You should assess:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the relative credibility of the sides promoting and warning against converting to the device.</li> <li>the relative plausibility (likelihood) of smokers widely converting to e-cigarettes.</li> </ul> <p><b>Your answer should include sustained comparisons within each of these tasks and must refer to the material within the documents.</b></p> <p>In this question there are four areas. See the grid below:</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td></td> <td><b>Credibility</b></td> <td></td> <td><b>Plausibility</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Side A</b></td> <td>Strong/weak/not covered</td> <td><b>Outcome A</b></td> <td>Strong/weak/not covered</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Side B</b></td> <td>Strong/weak/not covered</td> <td><b>Outcome B</b></td> <td>Strong/weak/not covered</td> </tr> </table>		<b>Credibility</b>		<b>Plausibility</b>	<b>Side A</b>	Strong/weak/not covered	<b>Outcome A</b>	Strong/weak/not covered	<b>Side B</b>	Strong/weak/not covered	<b>Outcome B</b>	Strong/weak/not covered	[16]	<p><b>Credibility</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not covered: To merely state a group or person as being an expert etc - eg WHO are experts - or to use circular reasoning - eg WHO have expertise because they are experts.</li> <li>Weak coverage: The use of the credibility criterion without developed reference to the issue - eg WHO are experts because they are medical doctors.</li> <li>Strong coverage: The use of the credibility criterion with developed reference to the issue - eg WHO are experts because their medical doctors would have had the experience of treating patients who have been smokers.</li> </ul>
	<b>Credibility</b>		<b>Plausibility</b>													
<b>Side A</b>	Strong/weak/not covered	<b>Outcome A</b>	Strong/weak/not covered													
<b>Side B</b>	Strong/weak/not covered	<b>Outcome B</b>	Strong/weak/not covered													

Section B – Credibility				Mark	Rationale
Question	Syllabus ref	Expected Answer	Mark		
		<p><b>10-16 marks Level 3</b>  <b>Strong, relative and sustained assessment</b>            All 4 areas are covered and at least 3 are strong. <span style="float: right;"><b>11 marks</b></span></p> <p>3 areas are covered and 2 are strong. <span style="float: right;"><b>10 marks</b></span></p> <p>Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct points of comparison are made.</li> <li>• Clear and explicit judgement drawn from their assessment of both credibility and plausibility.</li> <li>• Effective reference is made to the material in the documents.</li> <li>• Effective use is made of specialist terms and argument indicator words.</li> <li>• Grammar, spelling and punctuation are accurate.</li> </ul> <p><b>5-9 marks Level 2</b>  <b>Partial or weak assessment</b>            3 areas are covered and at least 1 is strong. <span style="float: right;"><b>6 marks</b></span>  <b>OR</b> 2 areas covered and 2 are strong <span style="float: right;"><b>6 marks</b></span></p> <p>2 areas covered and 1 strong. <span style="float: right;"><b>5 marks</b></span></p> <p>Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An explicit judgement is made linked to their assessment.</li> <li>• Limited use is made of the material in the documents.</li> <li>• Grammar, spelling, punctuation are adequate with correct use of specialist terms.</li> </ul> <p><b>1-4 marks Level 1</b>  <b>Basic assessment</b>            Some areas covered but none strong OR only one area covered and is strong.            The points are connected. <span style="float: right;"><b>2 marks</b></span></p> <p>The points are disjointed or one area is covered weakly. <span style="float: right;"><b>1 mark</b></span></p> <p>Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to the names of the sources or to the claims is made.</li> <li>• Grammar, spelling and punctuation do not impede understanding.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks – For no creditworthy material.</b>            NB Candidates who <b>exclusively</b> repeat their answers to Q9 without comparison should also be awarded 0 marks.</p>		<p><b>Plausibility</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not covered: No reference to likelihood - eg E-cigarettes cost more.</li> <li>• Weak coverage: Undeveloped points made - eg People would not convert because it costs more.</li> <li>• Strong coverage: Developed points clearly linked to the impact on wide conversion to e-cigarettes - eg If e-cigarettes cost more than ordinary cigarettes, people are less likely to convert to them because they would not want to spend more on smoking (ie some development of the ideas given).</li> </ul>	

Section B – Credibility					
Question	Syllabus ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Rationale	
		<p>Answers might include <b>some</b> of the following comparisons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <p><b>The relative credibility of the sides promoting and warning against converting to the device</b></p> <p>The side that warns smokers to be wary of the product <b>because</b> of the gadget not having been '<i>tested adequately</i>' includes <i>WHO</i> and <i>ASH</i> who would have nothing to gain from misrepresenting facts. <b>However</b> the side supporting the device include the <i>inventors</i> and a <i>Soho club co-founder</i> who have a vested interest to promote its positive aspects, <b>as</b> they stand to gain financially <b>if</b> the device is accepted and used. This <b>consequently</b> makes the side warning against the device more credible, <b>as</b> it appears to have less of a motive to be selective with the facts, which might influence smokers not to convert to the device.</p> </li> <li> <p><b>The relative plausibility (likelihood) of smokers widely converting to e-cigarettes</b></p> <p>The e-cigarette would have to overcome several difficulties for it to become widely used. The '<i>price</i>' putting '<i>some people off</i>' would need to drop for there to be a financial incentive for smokers to switch to it. <b>In addition</b> not knowing '<i>enough about this product</i>' is likely to put many smokers off. <b>Also</b> many who want to quit smoking may feel that the device is too similar to a cigarette to help them break the habit. It is plausible that smokers may choose to use the e-cigarette because it does not produce smoke so they might be able to use it indoors and there is no tar to damage the lungs. <b>However</b> it seems implausible that there will be sufficient smokers changing to the e-cigarette for it to be widely used, <b>unless</b> future tests demonstrate that it is not harmful to the user and its price drops.</p> <p>Overall it <b>thus</b> seems unlikely that smokers will widely convert to e-cigarettes.</p> </li> </ul>			
		<b>Section B Total</b>	<b>40</b>		
		<b>Paper Total</b>	<b>75</b>		

## Assessment Objectives Grid (includes QWC)

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total	Grade A	Grade C	Grade E
1a	3			3	3	3	2
1b	6			6	5	2	2
1c	3			3	3	2	1
1d	3			3	3	2	1
2a	2			2	2	2	1
2b			2	2	2	2	1
3		4		4	4	3	2
4	3			3	2	1	1
5			3	3	3	3	2
6		4	2	6	5	4	3
<b>Section A total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>16</b>
7		6		6	6	4	4
8a	2			2	2	2	1
8b	2			2	2	2	1
9a	1	6		7	6	5	4
9b	1	6		7	6	5	4
10			16	16	13	10	7
<b>Section B total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Unit 1 Total</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Designer grade range</b>					<b>60 - 67</b>	<b>45 - 52</b>	<b>30 - 37</b>

Specification	Assessed in Jan 2009	Question
3.1.1.1 identify argument	*	1
3.1.1.2 identify the conclusion	*	1a
3.1.1.3 explain the purpose of argument elements	*	2b
3.1.1.4 identify and use argument indicators	*	9
3.1.1.5 use argument indicators to analyse structure	*	1a,b,c,d
3.1.1.6 identify argument elements	*	1a,b,c, d, 2a, 4
3.1.1.7 evaluate evidence	*	3
3.1.1.8 identify support given by reasons to conclusions and give reasons to support a given conclusion	*	6 5
3.1.1.9 explain support or lack of support in 3.1.1.8	*	6
3.1.2.1 identify claims that support and undermine	*	8a, 8b
3.1.2.2 use credibility criteria to make judgements	*	7,8,9,10
3.1.2.3 assess credibility of evidence given by sources and identify additional information required by judgement	-	7,9a, 9b
3.1.2.3 assess relative credibility and plausibility	**	10

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@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