

Advanced GCE
GCE CRITICAL THINKING

Unit F504: *Critical Reasoning*

Specimen Paper

F504 QP

Morning/Afternoon

Time: 1 hour 30 minutes

Additional Materials: Answer booklet
Resource Booklet



INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

- Answer **all** the questions.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

- The number of marks for each question is given in brackets [] at the end of each question or part question.
- The total number of marks for this paper is **60**.

ADVICE TO CANDIDATES

- You are advised to spend about 15 minutes reading through the Resource Booklet and Question Paper before attempting to answer the questions.

This document consists of **2** printed pages and 2 blank pages.

Answer **all** questions.

Read the article, 'Street Policy', and answer questions 1 to 5.

Analyse

- 1 Identify and briefly explain the function of the following elements in the structure of Purves's argument
- (a) '*The streets must be seen to be safe whatever the cost and however many sensitivities are bruised to make them so.*' (Paragraph 3) [2]
- (b) '*Evils flow from unsafe public areas*' (Paragraph 6) [2]
- (c) '*You can argue that tolerating a certain amount of lawlessness and disruptive scruffiness is the price we traditionally pay for freedom and privacy.*' (Paragraph 7) [2]
- (d) '*The present combination of skimpy street policing with intrusion and pompous tellings-off is the worst of both worlds.*' (Paragraph 8) [2]
- 2 Analyse in detail the structure of the reasoning in paragraph 4 by identifying elements such as reasons, intermediate conclusions etc. [12]

Evaluate

- 3 In paragraph 3 Purves claims that '*The streets must be seen to be safe whatever the cost and however many sensitivities are bruised to make them so.*'
- Evaluate the support given to this claim by Purves' reasoning in paragraphs 2 to 5. You should consider how specific strengths and weaknesses in the reasoning impact upon the support given to this claim. [10]
- 4 Evaluate Purves's move in paragraphs 7-8, from justifying the need for safe streets to the claim that, '*The present combination of skimpy street policing with intrusion and pompous tellings off is the worst of both worlds.*' [10]

Develop your own reasoning

- 5 'Freedom is meaningless without safety.'
- Write your own argument to support or challenge this claim. [20]

Paper Total [60]

BLANK PAGE

SPECIMEN

BLANK PAGE

SPECIMEN

The maximum mark for this paper is 60.

SPECIMEN

Coverage of Assessment Objectives

AO1 – analysis of reasoning:	20
A02 – evaluation of reasoning:	20
A03 – development of reasoning:	20

In all cases performance descriptors refer to candidates performing at the top of the band. Any candidate performing above the descriptor enters the bottom of the next band.

Annotations.

The marks for each part of a question should be written in the margin. The marks for a whole question should be written in the margin and circled.

Where levels of response descriptors are used, the level should be written in the margin by the mark, eg Q5, L4, 17.

Ticks should be avoided, especially where they do not add up to the number of marks given.

Analysis Questions

It is helpful to put the following abbreviations in the left hand margin:

R	where reason is precisely and accurately identified.
IC	where intermediate conclusion is precisely and accurately identified.
Ev	where evidence is precisely and accurately identified.
Ex	where example is precisely and accurately identified.
CA	where counter claim or counter argument is precisely and accurately identified.
St	where accurate indication of structure is given.
G	where gist is given.

Evaluation Questions:

In evaluation questions, it is helpful to put the following abbreviations in the left hand margin:

S	where strength is identified
W	where weakness is identified
E	where evaluative comment is made
I	where the impact of strength or weakness is considered.

Development of Reasoning Questions:

R	Reason
SR	Strand of Reasoning
A	Argument depends on (glaring) assumption
IC	Intermediate Conclusion
Ex	Example
Ev	Evidence
CC	Counter claim presented
CA	Counter argument presented
RCA	Response to counter argument or counter claim.
P	Use of argument based on principle
Ag	Use of argument based on analogy
HR	Use of Hypothetical Reasoning

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1	<p>Identify and briefly explain the function of the following elements in the structure of Purves's argument.</p>	
1(a)	<p>'The streets must be seen to be safe whatever the cost and however many sensitivities are bruised to make them so.' (Paragraph 3)</p> <p>This is an intermediate conclusion supported by much of the reasoning (esp paras 4, 5, 6) and giving support to the main conclusion.</p> <p>2 marks – Intermediate conclusion supported by the reasoning in paras 4, 5, 6</p> <p>2 marks – Intermediate conclusion supporting main conclusion</p> <p>1 mark – Intermediate conclusion</p> <p>1 mark – Reason to support main conclusion</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy material</p>	[2]
1(b)	<p>'Evils flow from unsafe public areas' (Paragraph 6)</p> <p><i>This is a reason to support the claim that streets, parks and alleys must be safe. It is supported by examples of evils caused by unsafe public areas.</i></p> <p>2 marks – Reason to support the claim that streets parks and alleys must be safe</p> <p>2 marks – Reason supported by examples of evils caused by unsafe public areas</p> <p>1 mark – Reason</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy material</p>	[2]
1(c)	<p>'You can argue that tolerating a certain amount of lawlessness and disruptive scruffiness is the price we traditionally pay for freedom and privacy.' (Paragraph 7)</p> <p>2 marks – Introduces the second strand of reasoning about the government chipping away at the freedom which makes us tolerate lax street policing.</p> <p>1 mark – Begins different strand of reasoning about freedom and policing.</p> <p>Add 1 mark answers at standardisation.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy material</p>	[2]
1(d)	<p>'The present combination of skimpy street policing with intrusion and pompous tellings-off is the worst of both worlds.' (Paragraph 9)</p> <p>2 marks – Main conclusion. Supported by the bulk of the reasoning</p> <p>1 mark – Main conclusion.</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy material</p>	[2]

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2	<p>Analyse in detail the structure of the reasoning in paragraph 4 by identifying elements such as reasons, intermediate conclusions etc.</p> <p>Performance descriptors refer to candidates performing at the top of the band. Any candidate performing above the descriptor enters the bottom of the next band.</p> <p>Level 4 10 – 12</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate thorough understanding of argument structure, including some complexity. Candidates are able to identify elements of complex reasoning accurately using appropriate terminology. Mistakes are rare and not serious.</p> <p>Level 3 7 – 9</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of argument structure. Candidates are able to identify most elements of reasoning accurately using appropriate terminology. They may make mistakes, occasionally serious ones.</p> <p>Level 2 4 – 6</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate basic understanding of argument structure. Candidates are able to identify some elements of reasoning accurately using appropriate terminology. They may mix this with gist and misunderstanding.</p> <p>Level 1 1 – 3</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate weak, limited understanding of argument structure. Candidates may provide poor paraphrases of isolated elements of arguments or give overall gist.</p> <p>0 marks</p> <p>No creditworthy material</p> <p>R1 Children are not interviewed for government surveys R2 Many of them do not report the moment when their mobile or gadget is taken, with menaces and insult and bruises. IC1 [so] street robberies from children under 16 are not recorded Ev When the Home Office did a separate survey, in 2003, it found that more than a third of 10-15 year olds had been victims of a “personal” crime of this sort; one in five had been hit. A1 So the real figures are probably even worse than the published figures (unstated IC) A2 The poorest, the oldest and the youngest can afford hi-tech gadgets, but cannot afford to protect them. IC2 In a world where safety depends on the self-financed insulation of the car or the fortress home the victims are the poorest, the youngest and the oldest. IC3 Apart from anything else, the streets being safe is a matter of social justice.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
2 cont'd	Accept IC3 labelled as C. R1 and R2 independently support IC1. IC1 and Ev support A (unstated IC), which together with A2 supports IC2, which supports IC3. Only top band answers are likely to identify A1 or A2. Good and excellent answers will show some or all of these relationships of support using words or a diagram.	[12]
3	<p>Evaluate the support given by the reasoning in paragraphs 2-5 to Purves's claim that, 'The streets must be seen to be safe whatever the cost and however many sensitivities are bruised to make them so.'</p> <p>Performance descriptors refer to candidates performing at the top of the band. Any candidate performing above the descriptor enters the bottom of the next band.</p> <p>Level 3 7 – 10</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate sound, thorough and perceptive evaluation of strength and weakness of Purves's reasoning with consistent and accomplished evaluation of their impact on the support for the claim. Candidates select key points to evaluate. Inappropriate forms of evaluation are rare and not serious. Candidates have evaluated the support for Purves's claim, making some relevant points to support their evaluation.</p> <p>Level 2 4-6</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of weakness in Purves's reasoning and evaluate the impact of weakness on the support for the claim. Candidates show some clarity in evaluation of strength. Candidates select points to evaluate, but not always key points. Inappropriate forms of evaluation (disagreement, counterargument, false attribution of weakness) may occur. Candidates have made a mixture of relevant evaluation and inappropriate or irrelevant points in an attempt to evaluate the support for Purves's claim.</p> <p>Level 1 1-3</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate basic or limited awareness of strength and weakness in Purves's reasoning. Valid points may be isolated, and candidates have little awareness of the impact on the overall reasoning. Candidates make the odd relevant evaluative point amidst description and irrelevance.</p> <p>0 marks</p> <p>No creditworthy material.</p>	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark						
3 cont'd	<p>Overall evaluation:</p> <p>Key point:</p> <p>Reasonable support is provided for the claim that the streets must be seen to be safe (as a matter of social justice, shared areas, social cohesiveness, risk of vigilantes) but very little is provided for the second part of the claim 'whatever the cost and however many sensitivities are bruised to make them so.'</p> <p>Evaluation should be supported by comments which might include:</p> <p>Flaws in the reasoning and their impact on the strength of the reasoning.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 819 1225 1865"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="320 819 517 853">Para</th> <th data-bbox="517 819 895 853">Flaw</th> <th data-bbox="895 819 1225 853">Impact</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 853 517 1865">2</td> <td data-bbox="517 853 895 1865">Causal flaw: No evidence given that the cause of being safer at home is self-financed alarm systems, or that lax policing is the cause of increase in street robberies.</td> <td data-bbox="895 853 1225 1865">This flaw underlies the whole argument. It is because of this supposed causal relationship that responsibility for safe streets is passed to the police and is not a matter of individual responsibility. If this causal relationship does not hold, then the rise in street robberies etc is less of an issue in terms of social justice. The police might be doing a fine job of protecting the old and vulnerable at home. Police efforts may mean that the young are safer than they would otherwise have been on the streets. Thus, without this causal relationship, safe streets are less an issue of social justice.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Para	Flaw	Impact	2	Causal flaw: No evidence given that the cause of being safer at home is self-financed alarm systems, or that lax policing is the cause of increase in street robberies.	This flaw underlies the whole argument. It is because of this supposed causal relationship that responsibility for safe streets is passed to the police and is not a matter of individual responsibility. If this causal relationship does not hold, then the rise in street robberies etc is less of an issue in terms of social justice. The police might be doing a fine job of protecting the old and vulnerable at home. Police efforts may mean that the young are safer than they would otherwise have been on the streets. Thus, without this causal relationship, safe streets are less an issue of social justice.	
Para	Flaw	Impact						
2	Causal flaw: No evidence given that the cause of being safer at home is self-financed alarm systems, or that lax policing is the cause of increase in street robberies.	This flaw underlies the whole argument. It is because of this supposed causal relationship that responsibility for safe streets is passed to the police and is not a matter of individual responsibility. If this causal relationship does not hold, then the rise in street robberies etc is less of an issue in terms of social justice. The police might be doing a fine job of protecting the old and vulnerable at home. Police efforts may mean that the young are safer than they would otherwise have been on the streets. Thus, without this causal relationship, safe streets are less an issue of social justice.						

Question Number	Answer		Max Mark	
3 cont'd			<p>However, even if this causal relationship does not hold up, other reasons for having safe streets (shared areas, social cohesiveness, risk of vigilantes) do provide support.</p> <p>So, at this point, the causal flaw weakens but does not deny support to the claim that 'the streets must be seen to be safe.'</p>	
	2	<p>Straw Person: parody of opposing argument (fortress, scrapping ideals of safety which may never have existed and have little relevance anyway)</p>	<p>Purves is arguing against an attitude which is at best exaggerated. This does not mean that her claim that the streets must be seen to be safe is not supported.</p>	
	5	<p>Generalises that, because the police haven't stamped out one particular kind of crime, that they have not been successful.</p>	<p>This is largely rhetorical and answers the straw person rather than the real problem. Although this reasoning does not support her argument does not damage the argument; we only need to accept that there is a problem with street safety for her argument. We don't need to accept the flourish saying the police having nothing to be smug about.</p>	

Question Number	Answer			Max Mark
3 cont'd	Assumptions which must be made and their impact on the reasoning.			
	Para 2	Assumption 'less serious' assaults are rising because the police are not doing their job / skimpy street policing.	Impact If we do not accept this assumption, we do not have to accept that it is the police's job to make the streets safe. But we may still agree that the streets do have to be seen to be safe, so this claim is still supported.	
	2	It is unreasonable to expect us to take reasonable precautions against theft and robbery. A failure to reduce street crime equates to a lack of desire to do so.	Again, if we don't accept this, the responsibility for the crime figures lies less with the police and more with us as members of a society. Little impact.	
	4	The youngest and the oldest can afford portable high-tech goods but cannot afford to protect their property. So the real figures are probably even worse than the published figures.	This can be challenged. Perhaps it is a case of choices people make rather than vulnerability and social justice. Fine. Supports conclusion.	
	5	Assumes that if something is nasty and frightening it can't be a normal part of growing up.	Can easily be challenged. But something can be a normal part of growing up and still be something we wish to improve. So, although this is a weak response to a counter argument, it does not really weaken support for the claim.	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark									
3 cont'd	<p>How well the claim is supported by reasons and intermediate conclusions.</p> <p>The claim that the streets must be seen to be safe is well supported, mostly by the brief reasons in paragraph 6. The implication that it is the police (and government) who must see to this, rather than a matter for individual social responsibility is not well supported. There is no support at all for the idea that this must happen, 'whatever the cost and however many sensitivities are bruised to make them so.' This claim is entirely rhetorical and unsupported. It ignores a good many reasons which would suggest that bruising sensitivities can lead to less safe streets and may contradict the reasoning relating to vigilantes.</p> <p>The effectiveness of the use of evidence and examples.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="320 824 1225 1908"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="320 824 477 860">Para</th> <th data-bbox="477 824 895 860">Evidence/example</th> <th data-bbox="895 824 1225 860">Effectiveness</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 860 477 1128">2</td> <td data-bbox="477 860 895 1128">Rise of 10% in assaults and unspecified rise in street robbery with no context used to show we are less safe on the streets.</td> <td data-bbox="895 860 1225 1128">Need more information to draw such a strong conclusion. There are other crimes which may affect us on the streets which are not mentioned.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="320 1128 477 1908">4</td> <td data-bbox="477 1128 895 1908">Notes lack of evidence from under sixteens (good). Uses separate survey from 2003</td> <td data-bbox="895 1128 1225 1908">Assumes that more of them are victims, not fully supported. It is Home Office, therefore probably fairly reliable, although may wish to record figures in such a way as to minimise the problem or serve other interests. However, we cannot compare this with the 2005 figures – we know only that there has been a rise in overall street robbery, not actual figures. So it does not demonstrate that the problem is worse now, or that the young are more vulnerable.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Para	Evidence/example	Effectiveness	2	Rise of 10% in assaults and unspecified rise in street robbery with no context used to show we are less safe on the streets.	Need more information to draw such a strong conclusion. There are other crimes which may affect us on the streets which are not mentioned.	4	Notes lack of evidence from under sixteens (good). Uses separate survey from 2003	Assumes that more of them are victims, not fully supported. It is Home Office, therefore probably fairly reliable, although may wish to record figures in such a way as to minimise the problem or serve other interests. However, we cannot compare this with the 2005 figures – we know only that there has been a rise in overall street robbery, not actual figures. So it does not demonstrate that the problem is worse now, or that the young are more vulnerable.	
Para	Evidence/example	Effectiveness									
2	Rise of 10% in assaults and unspecified rise in street robbery with no context used to show we are less safe on the streets.	Need more information to draw such a strong conclusion. There are other crimes which may affect us on the streets which are not mentioned.									
4	Notes lack of evidence from under sixteens (good). Uses separate survey from 2003	Assumes that more of them are victims, not fully supported. It is Home Office, therefore probably fairly reliable, although may wish to record figures in such a way as to minimise the problem or serve other interests. However, we cannot compare this with the 2005 figures – we know only that there has been a rise in overall street robbery, not actual figures. So it does not demonstrate that the problem is worse now, or that the young are more vulnerable.									

Question Number	Answer			Max Mark
3 cont'd	5	16 – 25 figure	Not clear whether figures are from HO survey or 2005 crime figures.	[10]
	5	Example of lad in hoody and evidence from further survey indicate that the young are robbing the young.	This indicates a failure of policy – does not show that the police have 'nothing' to be smug about.	

Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
4	<p>Evaluate Purves’s move in paragraphs 7-8, from justifying the need for safe streets to the claim that, ‘The present combination of skimpy street policing with intrusion and pompous tellings off is the worst of both worlds.</p> <p>Level 3 7 – 10</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate sound, thorough and perceptive evaluation of strength and weakness in Purves’s reasoning in her move from the need for safe streets to the claim above. Candidates select key points to evaluate. Inappropriate forms of evaluation are rare and not serious. Candidates have evaluated Purves’s move from one claim to another, making some relevant points to support their evaluation.</p> <p>Level 2 4-6</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of weakness in Purves’s reasoning in her move from the need for safe streets to the claim above. Candidates show some clarity in evaluation of strength. Candidates select points to evaluate, but not always key points. Inappropriate forms of evaluation (disagreement, counterargument, false attribution of weakness) may occur. Candidates have made a mixture of relevant evaluation and inappropriate or irrelevant points in an attempt to evaluate the support for Purves’s conclusion.</p> <p>Level 1 1-3</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate basic or limited awareness of strength and weakness in reasoning. Valid points may be isolated, and candidates have little awareness of the impact on the overall reasoning. Candidates make the odd relevant point amidst description and irrelevance.</p> <p>0 marks</p> <p>No creditworthy material.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Key points</p> <p>This move depends on the assumption that it is lax or skimpy street policing which have caused our lack of safety on the streets. If this cannot be said to be the case then we do not have the worst of both worlds; it is not the government which is not ensuring our safety. The example of Singapore confuses rather than clarifying the argument. Furthermore, Purves’s examples do not really show that the government is invading our private lives. With the exception of the example of the police acting outside the law, these are better examples of pompous tellings off than of government chipping away at our freedom. Purves’s examples do not really show that the government is reducing our liberty, so whilst we might agree with her conclusion, her reasoning does not fully support it.</p>	

Question Number	Answer		Max Mark
4 cont'd	<p>Examples</p> <p>Para 7</p>	<p>Example</p> <p>Singapore</p>	<p>Impact</p> <p>Sustained example with complex impact on argument. The harsh penalties for mugging and dropping litter are implied to be counter to a prevailing idea of how we should be. It is implied that they are too harsh. Such social control is also said to make the streets in Singapore safe. We are led to question the wider cost of making the streets safe, thus introducing the dichotomy of safety and liberty. Our priorities and ideas of what is important to us as British citizens (safety or liberty) is also raised. The image of a woman walking around alone at night is contrasted with 'scrapping' of similar medieval hopes. As Purves is in both cases talking about street robbery and fighting, not quite appropriate.</p> <p>Singapore's social control is juxtaposed with our desire for freedom. It is implied that it is an either or situation. This is used to show that liking freedom and privacy underlies our toleration of lax policing. It is not strictly rational.</p> <p>Overall, this example confuses more than it clarifies. Singapore is an extreme example, and we cannot be sure that it is the harsh social control which leads to safety – or even lack of crime reporting. It distracts from the aim of creating a level of freedom which is compatible with safety. It also undermines Purves' earlier claim that the streets must be made safe whatever it costs.</p>
	8	Singapore	

Question Number	Answer			Max Mark
4 cont'd	8	CCTV	Does not restrict our freedom to act, or appear to have any consequences on our freedom. We cannot be sure there wouldn't be more muggings without it. Much of it is not state-run.	
	8	DNA	Worrying implications – police acting outside the law. However, the existence of DNA database does not affect anyone's freedom to act freely within the law.	
	8	DVLA	Stupid and likely to lead to increase in burglary rather than invasive or restrictive of our actions.	
	8	Identity cards	It's the database (rather than the cards) that is invasive of privacy, and the compulsory cost. Useless and annoying rather than restrictive, perhaps.	
Assumptions				
	Para	Assumption	Impact	
	7	Singaporean punishments are the cause of safe streets.	If they are not, the example and the argument do not work well.	
	7	Low crime figures and safety of women at night implies low street robbery figures	This may well not be the case – British overall and serious crime figures have fallen, despite a rise in street crime.	
	8	Un-skimpy (or strict or tough) street policing would sort out street crime.	If this is not the case, Purves's conclusion does not hold.	

Question Number	Answer			Max Mark
4 cont'd	<p>Flaws</p> <p>Para</p>	<p>Flaw</p>	<p>Impact</p>	
	7	Causal flaw: assumes that strict punishments for litter louts etc are the reason for street safety.	See above.	
	8	Straw Person: misrepresents the government's aims and actions,	By being rude about the government and knocking down an easier target than actually exists, Purves fails to provide support for her conclusion. If the government are genuinely trying to find the best solution for the British, Purves's claims that the government is not making us safe is weakened. However, the use of the straw person does not undermine the point that feeling unsafe and nagged is a bad combination.	
	8	Conflation of dignity and freedom	Slightly weakens reasoning but not significantly.	
	8	Ignores the possibility that these measures might actually improve our security. 'Intrusion' might be the form of policing that is necessary.		
	3 / 8	Contradiction	The streets must be seen to be safe whatever it costs and however many sensitivities are bruised to make them so is contradicted by the argument that the government 'reduces our dignity daily, generally in the name of security,' and that we must not sacrifice freedom or privacy for safety.	[10]
Question	Answer			Max

Number		Mark
5	<p>‘Freedom is meaningless without safety.’ Write your own argument to support or challenge this claim.</p> <p>Level 4 16 – 20</p> <p>Candidates produce cogent, sound and perceptive reasoning using clear strands of reasoning. Reasons and intermediate conclusions give strong support to conclusion and argument structure is accomplished, possibly complex. Blips rare. Language clear, precise and capable of dealing with complexity. Candidates anticipate and respond effectively to key counter arguments. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are very good. Errors are few, if any.</p> <p>Level 3 11 – 15</p> <p>Candidates produce effective and persuasive reasoning. Reasons and intermediate conclusions mostly support the conclusion well with occasional irrelevance or reliance on dubious assumptions. Arguments may be simple, clear and precise, or may demonstrate increased complexity with some blips. Language clear and developing complexity. Candidates may anticipate and respond to counterargument. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are good. Errors are few.</p> <p>Level 2 6 – 10</p> <p>Ability to produce basic reasoning with reasons which give some support to a conclusion but may rely on a number of dubious assumptions. Clear, straightforward, perhaps simplistic. Occasionally disjointed. Candidates may include a counter argument or counter reason, but respond to it ineffectively if at all. Language generally simple though clear. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are adequate. Errors are sometimes intrusive.</p> <p>Level 1 1 – 5</p> <p>Limited ability to reason. Disjointed, incoherent. Reasons often do not support conclusion. There may not even be a stated conclusion. Language vague. Grammar, spelling and punctuation may be poor. Errors are intrusive.</p> <p>Candidates will not have time to produce thorough arguments covering all possible strands of reasoning and responding to all counter arguments. We should reward candidates who have demonstrated the ability to argue cogently, coherently and concisely. We are looking for an intelligent, thoughtful, structured response.</p>	<p>[20]</p>
Paper Total		[60]

Assessment Objectives Grid (includes QWC)

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
1a	2			2
1b	2			2
1c	2			2
1d	2			2
2	12			12
3		10		10
4		10		10
5			20	20
Total	20	20	20	60

SPECIMEN