

Critical Thinking

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F501**: Introduction to Critical Thinking

Mark Scheme for January 2011

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 2011

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: publication s@ocr.org.uk

Section A – The Language of reasoning				Mark	Guidance
Question	Specification ref	Expected Answer			
<p>For answers 1 (a) and 1 (b) and 1 (c) credit answers as follows:</p> <p>3 marks For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author. You must only credit the words written; ellipsis (...) should not be credited. 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 information or for a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrasing.</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.</p> <p>0 marks For a statement of an incorrect part of the text.</p>					
1	(a)	3.1.1.1 3.1.1.2 3.1.1.5 3.1.1.6	<p>State the <u>conclusion</u> of the government’s argument in paragraph 1 of Document 1.</p> <p>(and so) it should help them to find jobs in a reduced graduate job market when they returned to Britain</p>	[3]	<p>* Allow the insertion of ‘the 2009 gap year award scheme’, or similar, to replace ‘it’.</p> <p>* Popular omissions ‘when they returned to Britain.’ ‘in a reduced graduate job market’ Credit 2 marks.</p> <p>* ‘It should help them.’ (gist) Credit 1 mark.</p>
	(b)	3.1.1.1 3.1.1.5 3.1.1.6	<p>State the <u>reason</u> given to support the conclusion of the government’s argument in paragraph 1 of Document 1.</p> <p>(the government claimed that) this scheme/it would help graduates develop the soft skills that their CV might lack</p>	[3]	<p>* If candidates omit ‘that their CV might lack’, credit 2 marks.</p> <p>* If candidates include the examples, ‘like teamwork’ etc, credit 1 mark.</p>

Section A – The Language of reasoning					
Question	Specification ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance	
(c)	3.1.1.5 3.1.1.6	<p>State the <u>evidence</u> given in paragraph 1 of Document 1.</p> <p>In 2009, one in ten new graduates was not in a job or further study.</p>	[3]	<p>* Popular omission ‘In 2009.’ Credit 2 marks.</p> <p>* Popular addition ‘The number of graduates who are unemployed six months after leaving university has reached a worrying level.’ Credit 1 mark.</p> <p>* Popular error ‘The number of graduates who are unemployed six months after leaving university has reached a worrying level.’ Credit 0 marks.</p>	
(d)	3.1.1.5	<p>State <u>three argument indicator words</u> that are used in any of paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of Document 1. You must give three different words.</p> <p>Credit 1 mark each for any of the following, up to 3 marks: if; since; as; and; despite; so; also.</p> <p>0 marks For no credit-worthy material.</p>	[3x1]	<p>* Popular error Additionally – this is in paragraph 5. Credit 0 marks.</p>	
(e)	3.1.1.5 3.1.1.6	<p>State the <u>examples</u> that are given to support the reasoning in paragraph 5 of Document 1.</p> <p>3 marks All 5 examples. accommodation, transport, safety equipment, food, medical care</p> <p>2 marks Incomplete list, ie of two or more examples.</p> <p>1 mark Including additional material to a correct or incomplete list, ie of two or more examples..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • expenses • fund-raising, marketing (and) office costs. <p>0 marks For no credit-worthy material.</p>	[3]	<p>* Disregard indicator words ‘such as’ and ‘and’.</p> <p>* Popular errors ‘expenses’ ‘fund-raising, marketing (and) office costs’ reference to ‘Prince William’ If these are not in conjunction with correct answers, credit 0 marks.</p>	

Question		Specification ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
2	(a)	3.1.1.6	<p>Consider the advertisement's claim in <u>paragraph 2</u> of Document 1 that "an expedition would boost your employability skills."</p> <p>Name the argument element used.</p> <p>2 marks Reason</p> <p>1 mark Accept 'reason' as part of 'hypothetical reason'.</p> <p>0 marks For no credit-worthy material.</p>	[2]	Do not credit 'hypothetical reasoning'
	(b)	3.1.1.3	<p>Explain your answer to <u>2(a)</u>.</p> <p>2 marks It gives support to the (hypothetical) conclusion.</p> <p>Accept to give support to "It could be just the thing you need if you have recently graduated and feel like everything is all gloom and doom."</p> <p>1 mark Accept it gives support to the hypothetical reasoning/argument. (However, if the candidate goes on to quote the conclusion from the text, this becomes 2 marks).</p> <p>0 marks For no credit-worthy material.</p>	[2]	<p>* 2 (a) and (b) should be marked independently, ie if 2 (a) is incorrect, marks can be awarded for 2 (b).</p> <p>Cannot credit 'it gives support to the hypothetical reason'.</p>

Question	Specification ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
3 (a) (b)	3.1.1.7	<p>Explain <u>two</u> ways in which the Beach Lifeguard Training Programme in <u>Document 3</u> might not be representative of most gap year work opportunities.</p> <p>2 marks For each point that explicitly assesses the earning capacity or job opportunity related to this programme, with those of other gap year work. Some element of comparison should be present eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amount capable of being earned through this programme/£500 a week might not be typical of most gap year work opportunities which might pay considerably less/more. • The possibility of gaining jobs all over the world might not be typical of most gap year opportunities where opportunities might be more limited/extensive. <p>1 mark For each correct assessment that is either simply a statement of the characteristic of one side, or an implied comparison without specifically commenting on both sides eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The amount that can be earned on this programme is very high. • Many schemes do not train you in specific skills. • Other schemes pay less money. <p>0 marks For no credit-worthy material. eg Not everywhere in the world has a beach.</p>	[2 x 2]	* Reference alone to the programme is not enough. Candidates need to explain why this might not be typical of other gap year work opportunities or training opportunities.

Question	Specification ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
4	3.1.1.6	<p>State an <u>assumption</u> that is needed to support the reasoning in the photograph caption: “The award scheme is endorsed by leading employers and government departments, so you don’t have to feel guilty about having the time of your life!”</p> <p>3 marks For an accurate statement of the assumption eg</p> <p>Government department/leading employer endorsement makes the experience legitimate. Accept</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enjoying yourself on an award scheme may make you feel guilty. • Going on an award scheme will give you the time of your life. Accept ‘Going on a gap year will give you the time of your life’. • Having the time of your life may make you feel guilty. <p>2 marks For a less precise statement of the assumption. eg Everything that the government endorses is legitimate. eg Having the time of your life makes/will make/would make you feel guilty.</p> <p>1 mark For the essence of an assumption expressed as a challenge. eg Just because the government says it is OK, doesn’t mean that it is.</p> <p>0 marks For the statement of an incorrect assumption. eg Having the time of your life is a good thing.</p>	[3]	<p>* Candidates may use other words to express endorsement and legitimacy, eg OK.</p> <p>Candidates may express the assumption in a very basic way, such as ‘If the government says the experience is OK, then it is’. Credit similarly expressed answers.</p> <p>NB ‘Having the time of your life’ is assumed to be a definite consequence of the award scheme, so candidates need to use such words as ‘will’ and ‘would’ in their answer.</p> <p>Making you ‘feel guilty’ is not assumed to be a definite consequence of the award scheme, so candidates should use words like ‘may’ or ‘might’.</p>

Question	Specification ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
5	3.1.1.9	<p>Suggest <u>one</u> reason of your own to support a possible claim that graduate gap years worsen job prospects. You must give <u>only</u> a reason and not add other argument elements.</p> <p>3 marks For a reason that relates specifically to gap years and job prospects. eg Gap year graduates might lose touch with the job market.</p> <p>2 marks For a reason that focuses upon gap years or that is unrelated to job prospects. eg Gap year graduates might come back owing a lot of money.</p> <p>1 mark For an answer that goes beyond a reason eg an argument, or includes extra argument elements (eg an example or another reason). eg Gap year graduates might lose touch with the developments in their specialist subject that are needed for the job market, like developments in technology.</p> <p>0 marks For no credit-worthy material, eg a completely unrelated reason, or a reason taken from the text.</p>	[3]	<p>* “Graduate gap years worsen job prospects because...” or “because” can lead into a reason worth 3 marks and should not be penalised.</p> <p>Credit part of a line of reasoning that would lead to the conclusion.</p>

Question	Specification ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
6 (a) (b)	3.1.1.8 3.1.1.9	<p>Consider the author's argument presented in <u>paragraph 5</u> of Document 1. Assess how strongly the reasoning gives support to the conclusion, "Criticisms that the financial awards are a complete waste of public money are unjustified." You should make <u>two</u> developed points that refer directly to the links between the reasoning and the conclusion.</p> <p>Circle which you have chosen: Strong link Weak link</p> <p>No credit given for the circling.</p> <p>Credit as follows for up to two points made:</p> <p>3 marks For a correct point of assessment that focuses directly upon the link between the reasoning and the conclusion, eg Weak <i>Using 75% of the money to support the volunteers for things such as accommodation may be a good thing but if expeditions do not increase their job prospects, this is irrelevant.</i> Strong <i>Because the graduates had to raise £1000 of their own, they are likely to be motivated to take the scheme seriously and so gain skills which will increase their job prospects.</i></p> <p>2 marks A weak attempt at assessing the reasoning and/or the link between it and the conclusion about a waste of (public) money.</p> <p>1 mark An attempt which, in essence, merely correctly repeats the text, possibly amidst other uncreditable material.</p> <p>0 marks For no credit-worthy material.</p>	[2x3]	<p>NB Candidates may use any part of the text in paragraph 5 as reasoning to assess how far it supports the conclusion.</p> <p>NB Candidates do not need to make reference to the exact wording of the conclusion.</p> <p>* Popular error 'Prince William says that the money is used efficiently.' Incorrect. Credit 0 marks.</p> <p>3 mark answer: clear and needs no interpretation.</p> <p>2 mark answer: gaps need to be filled by examiner.</p> <p>Look out for and credit synonyms for 'public waste of money'.</p> <p>NB Credit marks for a correct assessment that focuses upon credibility.</p>
Section A Total			[35]	

Section B – Credibility				
Question	Specification ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
7	(a) (b)	<p>3.1.2.2 3.1.2.3</p> <p>Assess the credibility of <u>Document 2</u> from www.gapwork.com. 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.</p> <p>Award up to 3 marks for each correct answer:</p> <p>1 mark For correct understanding of the credibility criterion selected, even if the assessment is incorrect or inadequately justified eg Gapwork.com has a good reputation (<i>credibility criterion ✓</i>) because people trust it enough to use it (<i>weak attempt to justify relevance</i>).</p> <p>1 mark Additional mark for a correct assessment with adequate justification. Gapwork.com has a good reputation (<i>credibility criterion ✓</i>) which may mean that its information about the expeditions will be accurately set out to maintain this standard (<i>justified assessment ✓</i>).</p> <p>1 mark Additional mark where the correct assessment is supported by a relevant reference to the text. Gapwork.com has a reputation (<i>credibility criterion ✓</i>) as 'an award winning company' (<i>relevant reference ✓</i>) which may mean that its information about the expeditions will be accurately set out to maintain this standard (<i>justified assessment ✓</i>).</p> <p>0 marks For an irrelevant or inaccurate point/no credit-worthy material.</p>	[2 x 3]	<p>* Use ticks ✓ to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate's answer.</p> <p>* An assessment of a source within the document can only gain 1 mark for a correct criterion identified. However if the individual source is used as an example to assess the credibility of the whole document, it can access all three marks eg "The credibility of Document X is increased by its use of the expertise of XX because"</p> <p>* Credit only RAVEN criteria, not corroboration.</p> <p>* Repetition of a credibility criterion can only be credited if a different assessment is made in relation to the criterion, eg vested interest that weakens and a different assessment of VI that strengthens credibility, eg to protect their public image.</p> <p>* Use of bias and vested interest If candidates choose both, they can only be credited once if the same material is used twice.</p>

Question	Specification ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
		<p>Examples of answers that would each gain 3 marks:</p> <p>Bias/selective <i>gapwork.com</i> describes the positive aspects of the <i>'Raleigh expeditions'</i>, without any wider context to enable the reader to assess the negative aspects such as risks or personal costs.</p> <p>Vested Interest <i>'gapwork.com'</i> may have a vested interest to present the expeditions in a positive light in order to attract readers, as the UK's biggest gap year information provider.</p> <p>Neutrality <i>'gapwork.com'</i> might have a vested interest to present the information about the expeditions accurately without exaggeration, as it needs to maintain public confidence in its website.</p> <p>Reputation <i>gapwork.com</i> has a reputation as <i>'an award winning company'</i> which may mean that its information about the expeditions may be accurately set out to maintain this standard.</p> <p>Expertise <i>gapwork.com</i> should have the necessary expertise to be able to select and present worthwhile expeditions, as they work with <i>'industry leaders'</i>.</p> <p>or <i>gapwork.com</i> should have the necessary expertise to be able to select and present safe expeditions, as they are partners in the <i>'Know Before You Go campaign'</i>.</p>		<p>* The name of gapwork.com can only be credited as a reference to the text if it directly relates to the assessment, eg Neutrality <i>"'gapwork.com' might have a vested interest to present the information about the expeditions accurately without exaggeration, as it needs to maintain public confidence in its website."</i></p> <p>* Reference to the text</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This need not be in quotation marks. • It does not need to be a sentence - a relevant phrase or term may be adequate to support an assessment. • This needs to be relevant to the assessment made.

Question	Specification ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
8 (a) (b)	3.1.2.1 3.1.2.2	<p>In <u>paragraph 4</u> of Document 1, a taxpayers' campaign group claimed, "This kind of charity, paid out of the taxpayer's pocket, is unfair."</p> <p>Identify <u>two</u> claims and their sources that are <u>consistent</u> with this claim.</p> <p>2 marks For each source correctly identified together with a correct statement of their claim.</p> <p>1 mark For an acceptable claim with inaccurate or no source.</p> <p>0 marks For no credit-worthy material. Do not credit an unacceptable claim even with a correct source.</p> <p>Source – Founding director of Xtreme Gap.</p> <p>Only credit this quote from the director: "We actually feel that this is a questionable use of taxpayers' money, as the award is based on two incorrect assumptions that (volunteering directly improves your job prospects) that without financial help only the privileged can take a gap year."</p> <p>Source – critics</p> <p>"The awards were a complete waste of money."</p> <p>There are no other acceptable answers.</p>	[2x2]	<p>* Do not award any marks for giving a correct source without their claim.</p> <p>* However, do award the mark for the correct source if their claim is stated inaccurately.</p> <p>* Paraphrase which does not distort the author's meaning can be credited.</p> <p>* The words in brackets do not need to be quoted.</p> <p>* Credit Document 3 or Xtreme Gap as the source as the views given constitute the whole document.</p> <p>* Credit any part of the quote that makes stand alone sense.</p> <p>NB The Director only makes one claim that is supported so can only be credited once.</p>

Question	Specification ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
9	(a) (i) 3.1.2.1 (ii) 3.1.2.2 (iii) 3.1.2.3 (b) (i) (ii) (iii)	<p>Assess the credibility of one claim made by the <u>Higher Education government minister</u> in the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills in paragraph 3 of Document 1 and one claim made by a <u>founding director of Xtreme Gap</u> in Document 3.</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: 1 mark For an accurate statement of the claim. 0 marks For an inaccurate or incorrect statement of the claim. Assessment of each point: (two points for each source) 2 marks For an accurate point that assesses the person in relation to an aspect of their claim by applying a relevant credibility criterion. <i>“As the government minister in the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills they would have an ability to know about how volunteering would help new graduates acquire these skills. This would strengthen the credibility of their claim.”</i> Or 1 mark For an accurate point that assesses the person without reference to an aspect of their claim by applying a relevant credibility criterion. <i>“As the government minister in the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills they would have a vested interest to preserve their professionalism by making an accurate claim. This would strengthen the credibility of their claim.”</i> 	[2 x 7]	<p>* Use ticks ✓ throughout assessments in Q9 to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate’s answer.</p> <p>* Following an inaccurate claim Assessment marks can still be given if the gist of the claim is correct.</p> <p>* Following an incorrect claim Credit a maximum of 1 mark, if a correct understanding of the credibility criterion has been demonstrated.</p> <p>* Following a missing claim <i>Either</i> credit a maximum of 1 mark, if a correct understanding of the credibility criterion has been demonstrated <i>Or</i> credit according to the 3 marks available, if the candidate refers to the correct claim in a correct answer.</p> <p>* Credit only RAVEN criteria, not corroboration.</p> <p>NB No mark can be credited in this question for the understanding of the credibility criterion.</p> <p>* Repetition of a credibility criterion can only be credited if a different assessment is made in relation to the criterion, eg vested interest that weakens, and an alternate assessment of VI that strengthens credibility.</p>

Question	Specification ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
		<p>Expertise/Experience/Ability to Perceive As a founding director in the gap year industry, they should have the expertise to understand how those on gap years fund their year and what benefits they are likely to receive. This would strengthen the credibility of their claim.</p>		

Question	Specification ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance									
10	3.1.1.4 3.1.2.1 3.1.2.2 3.1.2.3 3.1.2.4	<p>Write a reasoned case coming to a judgement as to whether the graduate bursary award scheme is likely to boost the employability skills of those taking part. You should assess:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the relative credibility of both sides giving their views about this; • the relative plausibility (likelihood) that the scheme will boost the employability skills of those taking part. <p>Your answer should include sustained comparisons within each of these tasks and must refer to the material within the documents.</p> <p>In this question there are four areas: credibility and plausibility to support one side; and credibility and plausibility to support the other side.</p> <p>For each of the four areas, the assessment could be strong, weak or not covered.</p> <p>See the grid below:</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Credibility</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Plausibility</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Side A</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Strong/Weak/ Not covered</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Strong/Weak/ Not covered</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Side B</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Strong/Weak/ Not covered</td> <td style="text-align: center;">Strong/Weak/ Not covered</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Credibility	Plausibility	Side A	Strong/Weak/ Not covered	Strong/Weak/ Not covered	Side B	Strong/Weak/ Not covered	Strong/Weak/ Not covered	[16]	* Candidates who exclusively repeat their answers to Q9 without comparison should also be awarded 0 marks.
	Credibility	Plausibility											
Side A	Strong/Weak/ Not covered	Strong/Weak/ Not covered											
Side B	Strong/Weak/ Not covered	Strong/Weak/ Not covered											

Question	Specification ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
		<p>Level 3 11-16 marks Strong, relative, sustained assessment All 4 areas are covered and at least 3 are strong. 12 marks 3 areas are covered and all 3 are strong. 11 marks Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct points of comparison are made. • Clear and explicit judgement is drawn from an assessment of both credibility and plausibility. • Effective reference is made to the material in the documents in all areas covered. • Effective use is made of specialist terms and argument indicator words. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are accurate. <p>Level 2 6-10 marks Partial or weak assessment 3 or more areas are covered and 2 are strong. 7 marks 2 areas are covered and 2 are strong. 6 marks Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explicit judgement that relates to a partial assessment. • Limited use is made of the material in the documents. • Grammar, spelling and punctuation are adequate with correct use of specialist terms. <p>Level 1 1-5 marks Basic assessment 1 or more areas are covered but only 1 is strong. 1 mark No areas are strong. 0 marks Where areas are covered but not strongly award marks for the four bullets only, where present. Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The points are connected. • A judgement is implied. • Reference to the names of the sources is made. • Grammar, spelling and punctuation do not impede understanding. <p>0 marks For no credit-worthy material.</p>		

Question	Specification ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
		<p>Answers might include some of the following comparisons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relative credibility of the claims on both sides eg Vested interest The side that claims that the programme will be effective in developing ‘<i>skills that are so highly valued</i>’ includes claims from those who are directly involved with the expedition, <i>Raleigh</i> and the <i>HE government minister in the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills</i>, so they would both have a possible vested interest to predict the effectiveness of the scheme. They are supported by <i>gapwork.com</i> that is involved as a publisher of gap year work and may therefore have a financial incentive to present a positive picture; and the <i>NUS secretary</i>, who appears keen to grasp at any opportunity that might help the graduates. <p>However the other side also appears to have a vested interest, this time to discredit the scheme. The <i>founding director of Xtreme Gap</i> may see schemes that promote volunteering as competition to his work based programmes, and the <i>taxpayers’ campaign group</i> may have a vested interest to challenge the less essential uses of taxes to promote accountability and reduce the tax burden.</p> <p>It thus appears that there is a high degree of possible vested interest that might be influencing the claims expressed by both sides which in turn reduces their credibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relative plausibility If the graduates were sufficiently challenged by the expedition offered, it might make them become more resourceful and develop the ‘<i>problem solving skills</i>’ advertised. They might find it difficult to experience this extreme type of challenge otherwise and facing this challenge could effectively set them ‘<i>apart from the crowd</i>’. 		<p>Strong credibility eg “<i>The side that claims that the programme will be effective in developing ‘skills that are so highly valued’ includes claims from those who are directly involved with the expedition, Raleigh and the HE government minister in the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills, so they would both have a possible vested interest to predict the effectiveness of the scheme.</i>”</p> <p>Characteristics of ‘strong’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sources within the sides are identified. Credibility is explained for at least one source and there is at least reference to a second source. <p>Weak credibility eg “<i>The side that claims that the programme will be effective in developing ‘skills that are so highly valued’ includes Raleigh and the government minister who might both have a possible vested interest to predict the effectiveness of the scheme.</i>”</p> <p>Characteristics of ‘weak’:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One source is identified instead of sources on a side. Credibility is identified but not explained. <p>Strong Plausibility Reference to the text with developed original thought, ie: Completely new thoughts or a development of thoughts prompted</p>

Question	Specification ref	Expected Answer	Mark	Guidance
		<p>Also if the graduates were given experiences of working together with others and overseeing a project, they might develop the skills of '<i>global awareness</i>', '<i>teamwork</i>' and '<i>project management</i>' as advertised.</p> <p>However, this may not '<i>set them apart</i>', as these are skills that could have been developed within the UK. Also, as the expedition is only for '<i>ten weeks</i>', prospective employers might not view this as a sustained period of time to be able to develop these skills sufficiently. Additionally, as the whole experience is organised for the graduates, employers might feel that this is not as strong a test of their initiative as if the gap year had been planned and organised by the graduates themselves.</p> <p>Thus, the success of the expedition to build these skills might be very limited both in terms of time and evidencing independence, reducing the plausibility of the claims that employability skills will be boosted.</p> <p>Section B Total</p> <p>Paper Total</p>	<p>[40]</p> <p>[75]</p>	<p>by the text or a synthesis of different parts of the text, using these to make a reasoned argument.</p> <p>Weak Plausibility Merely restating parts of the text.</p>

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