

## **Critical Thinking**

Advanced GCE **A2 H450**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H050**

# **Mark Schemes for the Units**

---

**June 2006**

**H050/H450/MS/R/06**

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

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 2006

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annersley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622  
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

**Advanced GCE Critical Thinking (H450)**

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE Critical Thinking (H050)**

### MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
F491	Credibility of Evidence	1
F492	Assessing and Developing Argument	13
F493	Resolution of Dilemmas	31
F494	Critical Reasoning	43
*	Grade Thresholds	59



**Mark Scheme F491  
June 2006**

**SECTION A****Question 1**

Credit any three correct weaknesses.

Do not credit general assessments that could fit any context.

Do not credit answers that assess the specifics of the plane spotters' case.

Forward slashes indicate alternatives.

Candidates may be credited for more than one point in each section.

Examples of correct answers:

In the context of crimes abroad:

**There may be motives/vested interest to misrepresent the truth (interpret favourably/selectively report/falsify reports)**

- |                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| by foreign/British officials - | to protect national customs and interests/national morale/national security.                                  |
| by the accused -               | to avoid having to come to trial in a foreign country.  |
| by the media -                 | to raise awareness of the plight of a fellow citizen abroad.<br>to appeal to national pride/national customs. |

**There may be difficulties in perceiving the truth of the events**

- The barrier of a different language and the use of interpreters could lead to misunderstandings
- Lack of cultural understanding/fear by both sides may lead to misunderstandings
- There may be a fear of foreigners on both sides that restricts the free flow of information

**There may be difficulties in judging the truth of the reports**

- Language, cultural differences and physical distance from the events may limit the possibility of corroboration of information
- There may be increased difficulty resolving conflicting claims/interpretations where cultural perspectives are different

**[AO3 3] 3 x 1 mark**

**[3]**

**Question 2**

Credit one mark each for a correct defence and countering of this, eg

**(a) Defence**

Caption Doc 1 - They could claim that the HAF (Greek Air Force) were being inconsistent in their attitude to photography, as photographs were allowed a year ago.

Caption Doc 3 - They could claim if the information is on the net, it can't be classified and therefore they weren't collecting information that could jeopardise the country.

**(b) Counter**

Caption Doc 1 - The HAF could argue that there had been a change in policy to tighten security (eg in response to world terrorism).

Caption Doc 3 - The HAF could argue that the information is classified and has been spread on the web illegally.

**[AO2 4] 4 x 1 mark [4]**

**Question 3**

Award one mark for each correctly identified criterion of credibility, determine the correctness from the assessment; accept a synonym or equivalent phrase for the criterion;

Award a second mark if this is used to correctly to assess the document, an additional mark if it is correctly supported from the text - *italicised below* – a reference to the text is acceptable; if a claim is used it must relate to the criterion.

Do not credit the assessment of individuals within the document, if the answer does not assess the document.

Examples of correct answers that would gain three marks:

<b>Fair Trials Abroad: notes</b>	Ability to observe/primary info	The lawyer Stephen Jakobi was an eyewitness at the trial.	<i>'At trial the writer was the only foreign lawyer present'</i> .
	Reputation/VI	to represent the events correctly, to maintain their credibility of their cause,	as indicated in their title <i>'Fair Trials Abroad'</i> .
	Bias	they might have a biased perspective on the events influenced by the plight of their clients,	as indicated by their logo <i>'Protecting The Rights Of The Travelling Citizen'</i>
	Neutrality	as a charity to protect their integrity,	<i>'Fair Trials Abroad is a registered charity'</i>
	Vested Interest	to distort the truth to defend their clients to the British public, as	<i>'the only foreign lawyer present'</i>
	Bias	Unbalanced representation of the two cases, as	<i>in this extract the prosecution case is limited to two lines.</i>
	Expertise	Their ability to interpret the central issue correctly, could be high given the nature of the organisation, or low if unfamiliar with a Greek court and if procedures were different.	<i>'the prosecution case; essentially hinged on'</i>
	Expertise	Because the document is written by a lawyer, this might enable a correct interpretation to the reports	<i>'a lawyer' (with Fair Trials Abroad)</i>
	Expertise	If as a charity their resources are limited, this might be limited their role and expertise.	<i>'Fair Trials Abroad is a registered charity'</i>

<b>Kalamata 14 Website</b>	Ability to observe/primary info	An eye witness account is given,	'we were arrested as we attempted to leave the public car park'.
	Vested Interest	Possible vested interest to misrepresent the facts to win support for their case,	<i>as their website claims - 'Spotters NOT Spies'</i>
	Bias	Only one source is given, with no account of the other side,	<i>'a plane spotter's account'</i>
<b>BBC NEWS Greece/ online</b>	Ability to observe/secondary source	No indication as to whether the author was present at the trial, to lend authenticity to the report,	<i>absence of reference to author</i>
	Neutrality	Both sides of the dispute are represented,	<i>The Squadron Leader and the Lieutenant for the Greek prosecution and the Editor, the HAF website and the tour leader for the defence.</i>
	Bias	Because the BBC is a British broadcasting organisation, it may be biased towards the plane spotters	<i>'BBC News'</i>
	Expertise	The article quotes from pertinent expertise, the Greek air force official website,	<i>'Even the Greek Air Force seems to agree'</i>
	Expertise	The article is credited to a legal department of the BBC, which may give relevant expertise to interpret events	<i>'legal minds'</i>
Reputation/vested interest	Possible vested interest of the BBC to represent the events accurately, to maintain the credibility of its website	<i>'news.bbc.co.uk'</i>	

2 x 3 marks as above for each of the 3 documents [AO2 18] [18]

Total Marks for Section A AO2 [22] AO3 [3] [25]

**Question 4**

Credit as follows:

Examples of correct answers:

- (a) **Implication:** - The HAF were being inconsistent.
- (b) **Explanation:** - The HAF relax the prohibition on open days, as the Greek nationals are not seen to jeopardise national security by taking photographs.  
 - These Greek nationals had been given special permission to take photographs.  
 - These Greek nationals may not have been spotted by the HAF
- (c) **Credibility:** - The plane spotter has a vested interest to lie to discredit the prohibition.  
 - As a primary source he would know what happened.

[A01 1, A02 2] **3 x 1 mark [3]**

**Question 5**

Credit one mark for up to **two** correctly identified examples of weak evidence

and a second mark for each if the weakness is correctly explained - Credit the correct terminology with a limited explanation, or a full explanation on its own.

Examples of answers that would gain two marks:

- **They had been previously stopped by HAF who stated there was nothing illegal in what they were doing**

Relevance: If the group were to have changed what they were doing after that point, the relevance of this vetting would be weakened.

Significance: If the HAF had not seen all their possessions, the value of their statement would be decreased.

- **(Ed)'s evidence that they were quite clearly not spies, based on the fact that the scanners they used were harmless**

Sufficient cause: Just because their scanners were not the sort of equipment that spies did not use, does not mean that they were not spies.

- **The HAF website claims that it is the Greek people's democratic right to know about the service**

Relevance: There is no reference here to similar rights for other nations to know the same.

- **The tour leader claims that he had not realised it might be frowned upon to take notes outside an airbase**

Sufficient cause: Just because he did not know, does not mean that it is not illegal.

[AO2 4] **4 x 1 mark [4]**

**Question 6**

Credit **one mark** for a relevant claim - examples *italicised below*

**Plus one mark** for correctly identifying whether this is strengthened or weakened by a relevant criterion

**Plus up to two marks** for stating what is supposed to be true to make this assessment.

Examples of answers that would gain four marks:

<b>(SL) Squadron Leader</b>	Ability to observe	w	His reference to the plane-spotters acting " <i>suspiciously</i> " at another base, would rest upon another's interpretation of the group's behaviour	if (SL) were not present at the other base.
	Bias	w	Squadron Leader's claim that " <i>their actions could have led to them jeopardising the security of the country</i> " could be weakened by a negative bias,	if he felt over anxious about national security
	Expertise	w	Squadron Leader's claim " <i>I concluded the purpose of their presence was to collect classified information</i> " is weakened,	if his lack of experience of plane-spotting gave him an unbalanced view.
	Expertise	s	Squadron Leader's claim " <i>their actions could have led to them jeopardising the security of the country</i> " is strengthened,	if as an SL, he had expert knowledge of security issues.
	Reputation/ vested interest	s	Squadron Leader would have a invested interest to reach a sound conclusion " <i>the purpose of their presence was to collect classified information</i> ". to retain the credibility of his post/national integrity,	if he felt pressured by the international concern surrounding the trial.
	Vested interest	w	However Squadron Leader would equally have a vested interest to misrepresent the events to save his position by claiming " <i>the purpose of their presence was to collect classified information</i> ",	if he had mistaken the groups' intention at the outset and felt the need to cover for this.
<b>Tour Leader</b>	Ability to observe	s	The credibility of Tour Leader's reported claim that " <i>he had not realised it might be frowned upon to take notes outside an airbase</i> ", is strengthened by the only prohibitive signs to be seen being those relating to photography,	if he had not drawn the inference that this referred to any recording of information from the base.
	Vested interest	w	Tour Leader would have a vested interest to lie about his understanding of Greek law, reported as " <i>he had not realised it might be frowned upon to take notes outside an airbase</i> " to avoid imprisonment,	if he had knowingly collected the numbers illegally.

	Reputation /vested interest	<b>w</b>	Tour Leader would have a vested interest to lie about his understanding of Greek law, reported as <i>'he had not realised it might be frowned upon to take notes outside an airbase'</i> to retain the reputation of his tour company as having acted legally,	if he had knowingly collected the numbers illegally.
	Expertise	<b>s</b>	he might be expected to know or have researched the national expectations to ensure the safety of his clients, making his claim, <i>'he had not realised it might be frowned upon to take notes outside an airbase'</i> more credible,	if he was an experienced and professional tour leader.
	Reputation	<b>w</b>	As given by Squadron Leader for having acted suspiciously at another base, would weaken his reported claim that, <i>'he had not realised it might be frowned upon to take notes outside an airbase'</i>	if (SL)'s claim were true.

s = strengthens w = weakens credibility

[AO2 16] 4 x 4 marks [4]

### Question 7

Credit two marks for a comparison which gives an evaluation of both sides, (one mark for one side) eg

Expertise: As a tour operator Tour Leader may have a wider international understanding of what is expected to be publicly available to plane spotters than Squadron Leader who admitted having no idea that plane spotting was allowed in other countries.

[AO2 16] 2 x 1 mark [2]

**Total Marks for Section B AO1 [1] AO2 [24] [25]**

**Question 8****Corroboration****2 x 3 marks**

Credit one mark for a correct but unsupported point.

Credit two marks for a correct point that is accurately supported with one reference to the text.

Credit three marks for a correct point that is accurately supported with two references to the text.

eg Both Stephen Jakobi and the editor make reference to the plane-spotters' equipment being acceptable.

(1 mark)

Stephen Jakobi claimed that the HAF had 'vetted the contents and possessions of the group 48 hours previously'.

(Second mark)

Editor claimed, 'This isn't the sort of equipment people involved in real espionage would use'.

(Third mark)

Other points that could be supported:

Stephen Jakobi plane-spotter and tour leader claim that there was an invitation to attend the events. (implying information not secret).

Both Stephen Jakobi, and BBC News on-line claim that the material would not have been of value to a foreign power.

Both Stephen Jakobi and BBC News on line make reference to European treaties that make this information legal to access.

Both Squadron Leader and the Lieutenant claim that such acts may be detrimental to national security.

Both Squadron Leader and Lieutenant claim that the plane-spotters had been in closed areas or if 'wandering around the base' implying intent.

**Conflict****2 x 3 marks**

Credit one mark for a correct but unsupported point.

Credit two marks for a correct point that is accurately supported with one reference to the text.

Credit three marks for a correct point that is accurately supported with two references to the text.

eg

There is conflict as to whether photographs had been taken

(1 mark)

Plane-spotter claims, 'all camera equipment remained inside the vehicle that day' (second mark)

Squadron Leader claims 'they defied a ban on photography'

(third mark).

(Second mark)

Other conflicting interpretations that could be supported:

A scanner was used (Squadron Leader) implying suspicious v BBC NEWS online - Editor, such scanners are harmless.

Whether national security could have been jeopardised, Squadron Leader, Lieutenant v Stephen Jakobi, and BBC NEWS online.

Whether classified material had been collected Squadron Leader, Lieutenant v Stephen Jakobi, Greek website and BBC NEWS online.

**Balance of evidence****4 marks**

Credit as follows:	A limited assessment with inaccuracies	1 mark
	A thorough and largely accurate assessment	2 marks
	A statement of what each side believes	1 mark
	An explanation of problem sources	1 mark

**Were not/could not have been aware recording information might be illegal v Should have been/were aware**

Fair Trials Abroad lawyer	v	Squadron Leader
Tour leader		Lieutenant
Arrested plane-spotter		
HAF website		
Editor of Greek magazine		
European Conventional Arms inspection treaty		
Military documents		
Document of invitation		

Problem sources: Photographs inconclusive - date plane taken? Cannot read monitor shot.

**Weight of evidence****2 marks**

Numerically the weight of evidence lies with claims - **that plane-spotters could not have been aware** (1 mark)  
 with eight sources leading to this conclusion, two sources directly opposing this, two sources being inconclusive. (1 mark)

**Quality of evidence****2 x 3 marks**

Award one mark for each correct assessment, up to three marks for each side.

eg Understanding of international expectations of what should be publicly available material. (1 mark)	v	appeared to be ignorant of what should be publicly available material according to European treaties and the HAF official website (1 mark)
--	---	--

**Judgement** - greater likelihood that the spotters were not aware that recording of information might be illegal. **1 mark**

Award the judgement mark only if it links with the assessment given.

**Total marks for Section C [25] AO3 [25]**

**Quality of Written Communication**

Credit as follows across all answers

5 marks

Level	Errors in spelling punctuation and grammar	Use of specialist vocabulary	Expression	Marks
1	Errors are intrusive	Little use of specialist vocabulary	Order and expression impede understanding	(1-2)
2	Errors are occasional	Occasional use of specialist vocabulary	Points exhibit some order	(3)
3	Errors are few, if any	Specialist vocabulary used where appropriate	Well ordered and fluent	(4-5)

**TOTAL AO1 [1], AO2 [46], AO3 [33] [80]**



**Mark Scheme F492**  
**June 2006**

**Section A – Multiple choice**

1	A	AO1 [1]
2	D	AO1 [1]
3	C	AO1 [1]
4	D	AO1 [1]
5	D	AO1 [1]
6	A	AO1 [1]
7	C	AO1 [1]
8	discarded item	
9	B	AO1 [1]
10	B	AO1 [1]
11	A	AO1 [1]
12	D	AO1 [1]
13	C	AO1 [1]
14	B	AO1 [1]
15	C	AO1 [1]
16	C	AO1 [1]
17	B	AO1 [1]
18	A	AO1 [1]
19	D	AO1 [1]
20	B	AO1 [1]

1 mark for each correct answer. Mark adjusted as proportion of 40 marks.

**Total marks for Section A [40]  
AO1 [40]**

**Section B**

Where the mark scheme offers two marks, it is for each accurately made relevant point. A comment that has the correct meaning, but lacks precision and/or detail attracts 1 mark. Example comments for 1 mark have been given but are for illustration only.

**21** We should adopt single sex schooling as a strategy for improving our education system  
AO1 [1]

**22** For each precisely identified reason or equivalent paraphrase **2 marks**  
Where individual reasons have been correctly identified but the expression is less specific or includes a minor reference to support evidence **1 mark**

The reasons given to support the conclusion are:

- There is a recognition that there are considerable benefits (from single sex classes) in subjects such as maths and English
- It has been argued that single sex schooling would solve the problem of poor concentration in all our schools
- Single sex schools are evidently successful in raising academic standards
- Single sex schools break down gender barriers
- It is simply not the case that single sex schools are in some way discriminatory (the response to the counter argument)
- Single sex schools are an effective remedy for many of the problems faced by boys.
- Also allow the intermediate conclusion: There is plenty of evidence that suggests single sex schools improve results.

2 marks for any one reason

AO1 [10]

Example of answers that would attract 1 mark would be:

It would be good for maths and English/help some girls in maths and English.

Single sex schools improve concentration/help students concentrate.

Single sex schools improve exam results.

They break down gender barriers because girls pick boys' subjects.

Single sex schools are not biased/discriminatory.

Single sex schools help boys as well/because they behave better.

23 The author would need to assume:

- The school is representative of (similar enough to) other schools offering and benefiting from single sex classes.
- The subjects where the girls were underachieving included maths and English.
- The reason for/effects of the project would not be limited to just year 8.
- The education system used in Wales is similar enough for comparison to be made with schools in England and Scotland and Northern Ireland/rest of UK.
- The effect for the other half of year 8 would have been similar had they taken part in the project.
- The students were taught in single sex classes for maths and English (other subjects in addition possibly).
- There were benefits to these girls having been taught in single sex classes for maths and English.
- Teaching standards were similar (same) in the mixed classes/single sex classes in maths and English.
- Girls' poor performance in maths and English is not related to poor teaching.
- The girls' poor performance/underachievement in the subjects mentioned was **not** related to poor teaching
- The girls' poor performance/ underachievement in the subjects was (partly) caused by the boys in the mixed classes.

Any two assumptions

AO2 [2+ 2]

1 mark answers would lack the precision of the above and would be along the lines of:

The school is like other schools.

Year 8 is a good example/is representative.

You can generalise from Wales to England.

The girls mentioned did do better.

- 24 (a) Lack of interest in subjects  
Poor teaching  
Inappropriate classrooms

Can credit anything reasonable here loosely connected to the school environment.

AO2 [1]

(b)

- The author reaches a general conclusion for all schools based on the problems of a particular age group. Thus, the problems may not be solved for ALL schools (eg primary), although we may solve the problem for a particular age group.
- The problem may not be solved for this age group since it is very likely that there are many other factors affecting the concentration of students (given in part (a)). It is thus difficult that the problem 'would be solved' - a very strong conclusion.
- However, it could be argued that the problems of concentration are most acute at this age which covers important exams. Solving the concentration problem of this particular age group would be a significant advance in our schools.
- There is little evidence of problems in other ages. Solving the problem of the 11-16 year olds would be significant if we assume other age groups do not have such pronounced problems.
- Author reaches a general conclusion on the basis of 'many' which may not be the majority and hence cannot argue that the problem would be solved for all students.

Overall the author's argument is more or less persuasive given the above points.

Any two of the above

AO2 [2 + 2]

Answers that would achieve one mark will lack the above answers but keep the general ideas, eg

The author generalises from only one age group/the author does not consider other age groups.

The author does not give enough information to prove their point/they do not consider other factors.

Exams are a really important time so they make a good point.

We do not know if there are problems with concentration at other ages.

25

- The results only refer to one grade - the picture may be different in the other grades as there may be more girls getting E's than boys
- The results only refer to A levels. There may be a different picture at GCSE level
- The results would clearly include results from mixed schools and cannot be used to determine the relative performance of the two types of school
- The results of one year are not a necessarily reliable guide to other years/future years
- The results may be skewed by marked differences in one or two subjects (as is perhaps suggested in paragraph 5) and therefore may not be representative of overall differences
- The percentage difference is too small to be significant.

Any two of the above

AO2 [2 + 2]

Answers that achieve one mark are likely to refer to a general problem without specifying the exact nature of the limitation in the statistics (for the author's purpose). For example:

The statistics are too restricted.

The author does not give information about other grades.

Not all students take A levels.

The author does not give information about other years.

The difference between the figures is too small.

26 (a)

- The author would need to assume that boys choose traditionally female subjects.
- The author would need to assume that boys pick female subjects such as (accept any reasonable example) psychology and care subjects.
- The author would need to assume that boys' choices are not solely limited to traditional male subjects such as science and maths.

Any one of the above

AO2 [2]

One mark answers will lack the detail and refer only to choices without examples. For instance:

Assumes that boys will pick different subjects like the girls did.

Boys will pick different subjects to those they picked in mixed schools.

- (b) This is either a straw man or a reductio ad absurdum. Students could easily express this as an extreme version without substance or a silly/ridiculous standpoint to take. It could also be seen as a red herring or irrelevant argument.

AO1 [1]

- The flaw comes about because the author's example of equal treatment is so unlikely to represent the view of those wanting equal treatment. No-one is realistically going to suggest shared toilet facilities although they may suggest shared classes. This unrealistic view is used to dismiss the whole argument of those in favour of equal treatment for boys and girls.
- The example chosen is not relevant to the argument about the academic side of school - which is the one the author needs to prove - and is clearly introducing another argument as a way of confusing the issue of the counter argument

Any one that connects with the flaw given

AO2 [2]

One mark could be gained by:

Stating that it would be ridiculous to share toilets/it's a stupid idea.

27 (a)

- The author needs to assume that all-boys schools are likely to have a higher % of male teachers compared to a mixed school
- The author needs to assume that the male teachers in a boys only school are more likely to occupy senior posts/positions of authority that are seen by boys as successful and therefore worth modelling compared to mixed schools
- The author needs to assume that the elder boys in a boys only school are more likely to present a positive role model to younger boys than the equivalent relationship in a mixed school
- Male teachers in all-boys schools are more likely to behave in a 'male role model' way than in a mixed school.

Any one of the above

AO2 [2]

One mark answers are likely to be along the lines of:

Assume that there are more male teachers.

The male teachers were more important/higher up/in positions of power.

- (b) Parents believe that standards of behaviour are worse in boys only schools or in the boys only groups in mixed schools.

AO1 [1]

- (c) It could be that boys only schools produce lower academic standards, as measured by A level results or other exam data, compared to mixed schools.

AO2 [2]

One mark answer would merely refer to 'doing worse' or 'lower standards'

(d)

- By referring only to 'urban' schools the author is being selective since these issues may not apply in rural schools
- By referring only to issues of behaviour and hence ignoring academic success referred to elsewhere in the passage

Any one of the above

AO2 [1]

28

- Having argued that education provision 'must be judged by exam results', it is inconsistent to then go on to use the idea of 'breaking down gender barriers' to support the overall argument
- Students might want to apply the same to the idea of truancy and violence mentioned in the final paragraph
- The link between results and girls only education is made clear, but for boys the author seems to focus on behaviour

Any one of the above

AO2 [2]

This is a more demanding question and weaker students may not get close to the answer. One mark could be achieved by reference to the above but without the accurate detail from the passage/some general sense of the differences in the arguments put forward. For instance:

It is inconsistent to talk about standards and equality.

He talks about behaviour and then standards. This is inconsistent.

29 (a)

- The author wants us to infer that a significant number of other states/areas etc then followed with their own single sex 'experiments'
- That California was a model copied by a significant number of other states/it was a model copied in other areas

Any one of the above

AO3 [1]

- (b) The author would clearly like us to believe that these trials went on to be successful (although they were actually abandoned!)

AO2 [1]

30 Rather than a vote of confidence, the extra money could be politically motivated in order to give the single sex schools an advantage over other mixed schools thereby ensuring their popularity.

- The money is an attempt to 'buy' the positive opinion of people on California. (Starting such schools would be likely to incur extra costs, but money for this purpose would still fit the 'vote of confidence' approach suggested by the author).
- There could have been an increase in funding across the board for all sorts of educational initiatives, making the single sex schooling in no way significant.

One mark answers may refer to some general sense of bias in the allocation of the money, perhaps using a 'vested interest' term from unit 1.

A reference to needing to know about other funding would also attract one mark.

AO3 [2]

**31** It's an appeal to history. (Accept hasty generalisation.)

AO1 [1]

There is no reason to believe that future American leadership (especially on such a different area) will continue to be as successful as it was in the past on the specific topics mentioned. Students may like to illustrate this with suitable counter examples, such as fast food, pollution etc...Simply put, past performance is not always a reliable guide to future performance.

AO2 [2]

One mark could be achieved by a counter example without explanation or a general description that the author is generalising from a limited number of cases.

Students may also point out that none of the topics mentioned would be met with universal approval. This is questioning the evidence rather than explaining a flaw, but would still attract one mark.

**32 (a)** As is the case with all analogies, the comparison is not quite as straightforward as it looks.

- The author compares the suggestion that we should not follow American education policy because of their unacceptable/disliked foreign policy to the idea that we should turn a subject prize down because of a dislike of school policy on uniform. (In reality the author is comparing the pointlessness of one situation to the pointlessness of the other).

- Candidates could still get two marks by stating that:  
Turning down the American educational initiative on single sex schools is compared to turning down a school subject prize  
AND  
The dislike of American foreign policy is compared to a dislike of school uniform policy.

Any one

AO2 [2]

However, most students are likely to identify this comparison at a much simpler level and would gain one mark for the following:

American policies are compared to not liking school uniform/policy on uniform.  
School prizes are compared to educational policy/initiatives/ideas.

**(b)**

- The situations are similar in that in both cases it is possible to form an argument that the policies are similar in that they both (potentially) harm or upset others (stretching it a bit in the case of uniform, but some students do feel strongly that it is wrong to have to wear uniforms/there was the court case about the Muslim student not allowed to wear traditional dress). candidates might illustrate this with examples.
- The situations are similar in that in both cases we would be making a point of a dislike of a regime/policy by refusing to accept something that it does/is an outcome in a very different field - foreign policy to educational policy and uniforms to academic success
- The situations are similar in that the author compares a (potentially) very successful educational policy with a something else of high worth, the school prize.
- 

Any one of the above

AO1 [2]

Student could be awarded one mark for simply stating that both America and school uniform could be seen as bad or that both the things being compared are good.

- The situations are markedly different in that we are comparing giving something up (a school prize) to taking something up (their policy on single sex schools).
- The situations are different in that the school prize would be an individual choice whereas going to school is not/we cannot chose not to go to school in the same way that we can choose not to accept an exam grade
- The situations are different in that the school prize may have very little to do with the school and everything to do with the quality of the individual to whom it is awarded. American policy on single sex schools must be very closely linked to the American Administration.
- The situations are markedly different in that American foreign policy would affect millions whereas a school uniform policy may affect hundreds only – the scale of effect is very different.
- Same reasoning as above for the scale of a single sex schooling and prize.

Any one of the above

AO1 [2]

Students could be awarded one mark for commenting that we already have exam grades, but we do not already have the education policy.

**Total marks for Section B [50]**

**AO1 [20]**

**AO2 [27]**

**AO3**

## Section C

33 (a) The compromise position in mixed schools with single sex classes in some subjects or single sex classes for some year groups. AO1 [1]

(b) It would meet the needs of some of the advocates of single sex schooling and avoid some of the possible criticisms  
 e.g. it would allow girls to pick traditionally boys subjects but not disadvantage boys or it would allow us to promote the success of girls in some subjects where they are currently under performing without being seen to favour girls in total.  
 Opponents of single sex schooling would find it more difficult to argue against since in most ways the boys and girls would be treated equally but would still allow for some of the advantages outlined by the author.  
 There would be many social advantages to some mixed classes whilst retaining the academic benefit of some single sex classes  
 The logistics of running some single sex classes may be easier than building new single sex schools/creating new single sex classes.

One mark for a simple outline and two marks for a developed approach, picking up issues raised in the passage.

AO3 [2]

34 Either one

- It might not be so important if there are currently already more girls picking these subjects than we need for the economy - a lack of jobs in these areas would not suggest a need for more girls to take them.
- It might not be important if the girls who choose these subjects go on to do worse in them than they would have done in traditional girls' subjects.
- It might not be important if the girls who choose these subjects do not go on to take them at a higher level or do not pursue careers that involve these subjects/they revert back to traditional girls' subjects at a later stage.

Any one.

Or reverse of the above points.

AO3 [2]

One mark could be awarded for:

We don't need girls to take those subjects/there are already too many people taking them.  
 Not important if they don't get a related job.

35 Education provision must be judged by the exam results that it produces.

Candidates are likely to achieve two, but one mark could be given for:  
 Education must be judged by exam results

AO3 [2]

**Performance description for questions 36 and 37****Performance description for 7-9 marks**

Candidates present their own relevant further argument with a clear structure that includes at least two reasons supporting an intermediate conclusion. The argument is persuasive and relies only on one or two reasonable assumptions. The argument will also contain a further reason or reasons/examples/evidence/counter-examples that support the argument. The final conclusion is precisely stated.

**Performance description for 4-6 marks:**

Candidates present an argument that contains several reasons and there is an attempt to form an intermediate conclusion. The argument may be persuasive but relies more heavily on assumptions so that the link between reasons and conclusion is less clear. The argument may contain an example/evidence that has less relevance to the overall argument. The main conclusion is clearly stated.

**Performance description for 1-3 marks**

Candidates present an argument that contains one or more reasons of limited relevance to the main conclusion. There is no intermediate conclusion and use of examples is limited. The argument is unlikely to be persuasive without including several assumptions and the use of examples is very limited. Conclusions are imprecise and unclear.

36 There are several possible approaches here:

To argue that the reason for the decline is unrelated to exam results.

To argue that the decline is relatively small/insignificant over the time period.

To argue that social changes during that time are far more significant than the decline.

To argue that the decline is the result of social policy rather than academic/educational merit.

eg

R: The numbers of single sex schools in the past represented the fears of parents about unsupervised contact between the sexes.

EV: society was clearly more restricted 40 years ago/boys and girls generally had less social opportunities to meet.

R: the rise in mixed schools/decline in single sex schools could be as a result of more relaxed social attitudes to the mixing of the sexes.

IC: Therefore the decline is not related to academic, but rather, social reasons.

R: Given that current concerns about our education system are around standards and performance.

C: the decline in single sex schools in the past has little to tell us about the single sex schools of the future.

AO3 [9]

37 There are several arguments left over here that students could tackle.

For the conclusion:

- Separation on religious/moral grounds
- Many work places tend to be single sex
- No need to allow for social opportunities as students have so many social opportunities outside of school - schools should focus on the academic alone.
- Extend breaking down gender barriers into physical and sporting areas - perhaps girls are more likely to pick football or rugby in a girls school.

Against the conclusion:

- Denies students the chance to socialise with the opposite sex
- Behaviour might be worse in single sex classes without the fear of looking foolish in front of (the desired opposite sex). Boys are often believed to have their behaviour modified by the presence of girls
- The world of work involves dealing with the other sex - schools should prepare students for this
- Evidence that single sex schools do better is often believed to be the result of better students picking such schools rather than better schools - question the casual link put forward by the author
- Develop the answer to 34(b) into a whole argument
- The smaller classes of single sex schools may be the result of extra funding or similar/no reason why this shouldn't be a feature of mixed schools - leads to the whole argument that we should be trying to improve our mixed schools rather than give up on them

e.g.

An argument that supports the author's conclusion:

R: society is far more multi-cultural and therefore is a greater range of cultural and religious beliefs.

R: Many of these beliefs involve some separation of the sexes.

EV: Separations that are reflected in religious observances - any example will do here

IC: Therefore single sex schools would appeal more to many religious groups.

R: Education has a role to play in a greater tolerance that allows groups to express their beliefs

C: Therefore, single sex schooling would improve our education system.

AO3 [9]

An argument that challenges the author's conclusion:

R: Most students will end up at university or work where there is a balance of the sexes.

R: Being able to work with the opposite sex promotes a good working environment.

R: These skills are not always easy to learn.

IC: Therefore we need our schools to play an active role in teaching these skills.

R: Opportunities to learn these skills outside of school are limited.

EV: Most youngsters who go out go to noisy clubs/bars etc very unlike a work environment.

C: Therefore we should not adopt single sex schooling as a strategy for improving our education system.

AO3 [9]

**Total marks for Section C [25]**

**AO1 [1] AO3 [24]**

**Quality of Written Communication**

Credit quality of written communication as follows across Section B and C answers.

	<b>Errors in punctuation and grammar</b>	<b>Use of specialist vocabulary</b>	<b>Expression</b>	<b>Marks</b>
Level 1	Errors are intrusive	Little use of specialist vocabulary	Points tersely expressed	1 – 2
Level 2	Errors are occasional	Occasional use of specialist vocabulary	Points exhibit some order	3
Level 3	Errors are few, if any	Specialist vocabulary used where appropriate	Well ordered and fluent	4 - 5

**Section A Total Marks [40]**

**Section B Total Marks [50]**

**Section C Total Marks [25]**

**Quality of written communication [5]**

**Total [120]**

## Assessment objectives breakdown

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
Section A				
<b>1 - 20</b>	40			<b>40</b>
Section B				
21	1			1
22	10			10
23	4			4
24a		4		4
24b		2		2
25		2		2
26a		2		2
26b	1	2		3
27a		2		2
27b	1			1
27c		2		2
27d		1		1
28		2		2
29a			1	1
29b		1		1
30			2	2
31	1	2		3
32a	2			2
32b	4			4
<b>Total for Section B</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>50</b>
Section C				
33			2	2
34a	1	2		1
34b			2	2
35			2	2
36			9	9
37			9	9
<b>Total for Section C</b>				<b>50</b>
Quality of written communication				
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>120</b>
%	51	22	27	

**Mark Scheme F493**  
**June 2006**

**Preamble:**

The Unit 3 Paper sets out to assess the candidate's critical thinking skills in the context of decision-making. To be successful, in general terms candidates need to be able to demonstrate the ability to handle key terms and concepts such as choice, criteria and dilemma and to come to judgements in the context of situations determined by a set of resources. The term dilemma is to be understood here in a broad sense as involving some kind of difficult choice to be made between two different actions. This in turn will lead to a consideration of the consequences of doing X and not doing Y.

**The Assessment Objectives [AOs] and the allocation of marks.**

The total mark for the paper is 80, allocated as follows:

- AO1 - **Analysis** of the use of different kinds of reasoning: 8 marks
- AO2 - **Evaluation** of different kinds of reasoning: 26 marks
- AO3 - **Communication** of developed arguments: 46 marks

This weighting is reflected in the different types of questions asked and in the application of the mark scheme.

**Question 1****[12 marks]**

Involves explanations of problems that might arise in using sources, of definition, and of the implementation of decisions.

**1(a) Problems with using a particular source****[4 marks]**

The candidate -

- **1 mark:** identifies one relevant problem without development
- **2 marks:** identifies two relevant problems/or develops one problem
- **3 marks:** develops one relevant problem and identifies another relevant problem
- **4 marks:** develops two relevant problems.

**Problems with using Document 1:**

- Global figures, so cannot be used to assess damage/threat to particular countries
- Not clear as to what 'international terrorist attack' might include: e.g. does it include Iraq/attacks on military targets, or refer to attacks on civilian targets?
- Gives number of attacks, but no indication of scale or severity of attacks
- No indication of the range of the attacks; are attacks restricted in the main to certain areas/types of targets, e.g. the West?
- Lack of context: attacks might increase/fall due to particular regional problems/conflicts/grievances
- Bias – due to origin of source, information might be selective.

**1(b) Problems of definition****[4 marks]**

The candidate is expected to be able to demonstrate an understanding of the possible ambiguities and different usages involved with certain words/phrases: how meaning and connotation might differ according to situation, individual or group.

- **1 mark:** identifies one relevant problem without development
- **2 marks:** identifies two relevant problems/or develops one problem
- **3 marks:** develops one relevant problem and identifies another relevant problem
- **4 marks:** develops two relevant problems.

**Problems of definition might include:**

- A simple recognition that the term terrorism might mean different things to different people/at different times, or that it might be too broad or general
- Bombing of civilian targets in wartime might generally be seen as acceptable but could be defined as terrorism by victims
- One man's terrorist could be another's freedom fighter
- Document 5 could be used to defend/legitimise attacks on a state that denies fundamental human rights to its subjects
- A higher level response might identify and critically evaluate the assumption, made in Document 3 for instance, that there is a universally acceptable definition of terrorism

**1(c) Problems of implementation arising from problems of definition****[4marks]**

Candidates should be able to recognise that problems might arise concerning the appropriateness and acceptability of policies to different groups and in different contexts.

- **1 mark:** identifies one relevant problem without development
- **2 marks:** identifies two relevant problems/or develops one problem
- **3 marks:** develops one relevant problem and identifies another relevant problem
- **4 marks:** develops two relevant problems.

The candidate should be able to demonstrate some understanding that it is important to develop policies that fit the problem and that problems of defining an action/offence might make this more difficult.

- A one mark response might be one that simply states something like 'the wrong people might be punished as terrorists'; or 'sometimes it is right to commit such acts'; without exemplification or clarification
- Other problems could include: if you get the problem wrong you have less chance of solving it; certain policies based upon a particular definition of terrorism that is too broad or not accepted by certain groups in society/internationally might make the problem worse - by alienating minority groups, for instance.
- The better responses might suggest that certain acts defined as terrorism might be better treated as common criminality, without the need to grant special powers to the security services/judiciary which might have damaging political/social consequences Also that we might usefully distinguish between actions committed by a group seeking merely to inflict indiscriminate harm and damage from one that has clearly defined political objectives.

**Question 2****[10 marks]**

Requires the candidate to identify and to examine the relevance of additional criteria in the context of decision-making.

**2(a) 2 marks:** one for each relevant additional criterion identified.

Examples of criteria include:

- Public acceptability
- Legality
- Impact on community relations
- Effects on international relations
- Fairness
- Economic effects

**2(b) 4 marks per criterion explained:**

- **1 mark:** identifies one point of relevance with no development
- **2 marks:** identifies two points of relevance or develops one point
- **3 marks:** one point of relevance developed and one identified
- **4 marks:** two points of relevance developed.

Example of appropriate points for development -

**Legality:**

- The State, in its wish to maintain security, might itself be in danger of behaving illegally; a government might come into conflict with its own judiciary as well as with international courts/institutions
- Such actions can risk bringing the whole apparatus of the state into disrepute, a factor that could possibly increase support for terrorism within some communities
- If a government chooses to ignore/contravene its own laws then how can it expect its citizens to not to do likewise; to help to combat the threat of terrorism, the state needs to be able to rely upon the citizenry to respect the law
- The boundary between legal and illegal in terms of the actions of the state has to be borne in mind when the government has to argue that it is behaving in a reasonable manner towards its citizens
- On the other hand, there might be circumstances where we might wish to turn a blind eye to actions undertaken by the security forces, such as forcible detention of a suspect in an undisclosed location, where they might be deemed necessary in order to protect the public. Public opinion might countenance 'illegal' acts as being necessary, in which case the issue of legality might safely be disregarded in certain circumstances.

**Question 3****[24 marks]**

The candidate is required to test the two criteria given in the Criteria for Choice against two points from the Continuum of Choice. In doing so, the candidate is required to use and critically assess the material supplied in the Resources booklet.

**Level One [1-8 Marks]**

- The candidate will attempt to apply at least one criteria to one point on the continuum of choice.
- There will be some limited assessment of the material in the resources booklet, with some relevant if limited comments on the utility of the evidence presented in the sources in the context of the appropriate criteria/choices. The candidate should demonstrate that they can recognise and begin to evaluate different types of reasoning, using some limited terminology to identify some questionable/flawed reasoning.
- The appropriateness of the criterion to the choices should be examined, though perhaps in a fairly generalised/simplistic manner.
- Overall, the material/evaluation will not be dealt with in a thorough or sophisticated way.
- Written communication: candidate will employ a style and form which, although generally fit for purpose, may contain significant errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation and lack coherence in places.

**A typical Level One response might:**

- Simply say something like, 'relying upon long-established U.K laws would not be very effective'; or 'effects on civil liberties is not very helpful when having to make decisions about responding to the threat of terrorism'. Where the candidate fails to go much beyond this kind of statement it may be difficult to credit them above level one, even if both criteria and two continuums of choice are considered.
- Refer to the materials, showing some evidence of critical awareness of utility and weaknesses, though in a fairly limited/patchy manner. For instance: merely restate comments made in response to question 1a without specifically applying them to the criteria/choice under consideration; Doc 2 might be questioned merely on the basis of being a newspaper and thus partial/biased. Overall, there will not be evidence of a comprehensive or skilled treatment of the material, little effective use being made, for instance, of the sources to illustrate the problems of demonstrating the effectiveness of particular choices being considered.
- Demonstrate an overall lack of clarity in terms of assessing the relevance, say, of effects on civil liberties in deciding whether or not to give security forces a free hand: the candidate might merely say something like, 'civil rights are not important in an emergency', without much, if any, attempt to discuss such a proposition. Similarly, effectiveness might be viewed as self-evidently paramount.

**Level Two [9-16 Marks]**

- The candidate will need to show evidence of the application of the criteria to the choices [a fuller application of one criteria can give candidates access to marks in level 2]
- The candidate will evaluate critically, and on the whole precisely, the utility of the source material in informing their response: dealing with issues such as authority, relevance, partiality/impartiality, meaning, clarity and completeness; sources will be used more than to illustrate and comments will be evaluative in nature - e.g. *this source can be useful in helping us to assess the importance of this criteria in helping us to make a decision relating to this choice on the continuum because the source/evidence can be relied upon to reflect the large majority of the public/expert opinion etc.*

- In considering the appropriateness/relevance of criteria as applied to choices, the candidate will recognise and evaluate different types of reasoning in a way that is convincing overall, while perhaps not sustained throughout. In doing this, the candidate will demonstrate accurate use of relevant terminology in identifying flawed/questionable reasoning and recognise and evaluate the impact of some assumptions upon arguments presented.
- Written communication will be fit for purpose and demonstrate clarity in the use of relevant terms and in the expression of some complex ideas. There will be relatively few errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation.

**A typical Level Two response will:**

- Demonstrate most, though not necessarily all, of the qualities required for this level.
- Will have critically assessed and used at least 2/3 of the sources with some skill to support a response that is, overall cogent and relevant. For instance: with reference to considering whether to rely upon existing or not, the criterion of effectiveness can be discussed with reference to doc 4 - more people being charged under existing legislation than under the Terrorism Act; half of suspects being released without charge; while doc 3 argues the need for extra powers in the form of control orders in order to protect the public from people who might be suspected of planning terrorist acts; the point that doc 3 comes from the Home Office might usefully be discussed, beyond making the simplistic comment that as such it is biased and therefore of no use to us.
- Demonstrate the ability to use correctly and convincingly relevant terminology in their evaluation of the application of each criterion to different choices. For instance, the candidate might question what assumptions might be being made in the Independent's use of the stop and search figures provided in doc 2; they might also point out that the Minister's view is cited without further comment and is perhaps taken out of context; can we simply infer here that civil liberties of certain groups are under threat, and/or that this is an acceptable price of security. It might be argued that doc 5 could be used to support wide-ranging new powers on the basis that any State has the a duty to effectively protect its citizens; but on the other hand such measures might be rendered less effective if they run the risk of alienating international opinion by overriding acceptable norms of behaviour on the part of the state to its citizens.

**Level Three [17-24 marks]**

- The candidate will demonstrate the qualities described at level two, although generally in a more confident, sophisticated and sustained manner.
- There will be considerable evidence that all the components of the task - two criteria /two choices - have been dealt with thoroughly; and that evaluation of materials and issues of relevance will be sustained and convincing.
- The standard of written communication will be found fit for purpose throughout, being such as to enable the candidate to express/evaluate complex ideas/materials and to deploy terminology relevant to critical thinking accurately and with confidence throughout.

**A typical Level Three response will:**

- Have produced a thorough examination of the two criteria as applied to two choices on the continuum.
- Most, if not all, of the material will have been used when and where relevant with considerable skill to help produce a sustained and cogent piece of work. There will be, for instance, some clear evidence that in using statistical/numerical information -as in docs 1, 4 and 2 - the candidate can interrogate it with confidence and discrimination. There will be little or no evidence of simplistic or uncritical/unbalanced assessment of utility. It may be recognised, for instance, that the figures provided on stop and search in doc 2 could be used in more than one way; and that the Minister's assertion might or might not be taken as the basis for an argument that protecting civil liberties is not always relevant to making decisions about how to respond to the threat of terrorism.
- Demonstrate a clear focus throughout on the application of each criterion to the chosen choices. To achieve the higher marks within this level, the candidate must have demonstrated clarity of thought and expression, consistently and accurately using the appropriate critical thinking skills and terminology. **[Note: there may well be some well-written essay-type responses that do address issues relevant to the issues surrounding actual or potential responses to terrorism but which do not clearly address the requirements of the question and/or clearly demonstrate an understanding of critical thinking terms such as assumption and flaws or engage in a clear process of relevant reasoning - such responses should not be placed in Level Three.]**

**Question Four****[34 Marks]****4(a) [4 Marks]**

The candidate needs to identify two dilemmas: two marks for each relevant dilemma. Only one mark if a dilemma is insufficiently focused or developed so that only an issue is identified - e.g. should we do so and so?

[**Note:** a dilemma is to be defined for our purposes in a broad sense as being a difficult decision to be made in the context of issues raised: should we do X as opposed to Y; should we give consideration A as against B?]

**Examples of such dilemmas might include:**

- Should we permit the security forces to use torture to obtain intelligence about a terrorist threat (or to use intelligence gained through the use of torture in other countries) even though such methods may be seen as denying suspects inalienable/fundamental human rights?
- Should the government follow public opinion even though it might mean the removal of civil liberties from certain minority groups?
- Should those charged with terrorist offences be tried in public like other defendants even though this will pose a threat to the safety and integrity of security operatives and informants?

**4(b)****[30 Marks]****Notes**

- The candidate chooses one dilemma and produces an argument that attempts to resolve it.
- To do this task effectively they need to follow the instructions given in reaching a judgement based upon reasoned argument. Thus, any effective response will involve the identified principles being applied closely to the dilemma and them being assessed in terms of their relative effectiveness in helping to resolve that dilemma. It follows that a consideration of more than one principle will be required to produce a higher level response. Although a set number of principles is not specified, the significance of the plural in the instructions should be recognised. A level three response might be expected to be one that deals with three or maybe four principles, but a very good treatment of two might still result in a level three mark. The quality of critical reasoning on display is what is being assessed.
- **Ethical principles:** candidates will not be required to identify standard authorities such as Bentham or Kant; or even be required to use terms such as utilitarianism, etc. Candidates who do deploy a more specific knowledge of Ethics as such will still only be credited by applying identified principles to the dilemma in order to produce a reasoned argument that attempts to resolve it. The specifications for this Unit, however do provide examples of principles/ethical values that could be applied to this question, including: need, desert, right; deontologies (to do with duties); egalitarianism; consequential ethics; elitism; prudentialism; egoism; altruism; hedonism. Although this list is not meant to be prescriptive, and candidates will not necessarily have to use the more specific terms referred to, it should be expected that a high level response will be one that employs some of the specialised terminology or vocabulary similar to or synonymous with the above.
- **Suppositional reasoning:** it should also be expected that the better candidates will involve themselves in some sort of suppositional reasoning when attempting to apply principles to the resolution of a dilemma.

**Level One [1-10 Marks]**

- The candidate will have at least identified a dilemma that is relevant to the issue, though perhaps one that is over-generalised and lacking in focus [ie that will have only been credited with one mark in question 4a]. The candidate can then be credited if there is evidence, albeit limited, of an attempt to produce reasoning related to the dilemma/problem identified.
- At least one principle should be identified, though perhaps in a fairly loose form such as 'such and such is wrong because...'. The candidate will attempt a fairly basic explanation of the possible relevance of principle(s) to the dilemma/problem. Similarly, the candidate will attempt to show some limited application of the principle(s). There may be few, if any, examples included.
- There may be some limited evidence of the candidate trying to form some sort of a judgement as to the effectiveness of principles identified, although this might well be patchy and not particularly well argued.
- The standard of written communication will be, on the whole, fit for purpose, although there may be significant stylistic weaknesses and errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation. It is likely that there will be little evidence of effective use of specialist vocabulary/terminology relevant to critical thinking.

**A typical Level One response should:**

- Identify a relevant issue/policy related to the problem of dealing with the threat of terrorism but without actually posing it as a dilemma as such, for instance: 'we should allow suspects to be tortured/imprisoned indefinitely without trial'; or 'civil liberties are not as important as protecting the public'. In other words, the decision to be made/the alternative to be considered is not specified.
- Identify specific issues/situations/actions but without defining them in terms of relevant ethical principles: for instance: 'torturing a suspect is wrong'; 'civil liberties should be respected'. In such cases it is likely that the candidate will only be able to fulfil a limited number of the requirements of the question. There may, though, still be some limited attempt to consider issues in terms of right/wrong etc - as in, terrorists have rights too - without any or much development.
- Include some limited argument, such as 'we should/should not do things that will offend minority groups because this might make things worse/or we would not like this to happen to us'. [Where points like this are then developed, the candidate's response might well be lifted into level two.]

**Level Two [11-20 Marks]**

- The candidate will deal with a sufficiently focused dilemma in a generally confident and developed treatment in which at least two relevant principles are identified, explained and applied clearly in the context of the dilemma, using evidence and examples when and where appropriate.
- The candidate will clearly attempt to reach a judgement as to the relative effectiveness of the principles identified in terms of resolving the dilemma in question. This judgment should be based upon the exercise of sound reasoning, well supported by relevant examples and perhaps some suppositional reasoning.
- The form and style of written communication will largely be that appropriate to complex subject matter, with evidence of specialist vocabulary/terminology suited to critical reasoning. Spelling, grammar and punctuation will be a good standard, with relatively few, if any, major errors. Though there may be some minor inaccuracies.

**A typical Level Two response should:**

- Have identified a sufficiently focused dilemma. Relevant principles will be identified and applied to decisions that might have to be made when dealing with the threat of terrorism- for instance: the universality of certain human/ legal rights, based upon principles of fairness/egalitarianism; that individuals should be treated in a manner that respects and preserves essential human decency/dignity; that the 'greater good', needs to be considered when making decisions about how far one should respect the civil liberties of minority groups. [A fuller application of one principle can give candidates access to marks in Level 2]
- Include relevant examples to support reasoning - either from the given materials or otherwise. [However, it must be borne in mind that the candidate is not required to demonstrate any in-depth knowledge/ understanding of the threat of terrorism itself, but rather show reasoning skills in an application of principles to a dilemma. Thus, evidence of some sort of suppositional reasoning is likely to gain more credit than the use of merely illustrative material.]
- Contain clear evidence of the candidate using reasoning in an attempt to resolve the dilemma identified by coming to a judgement as to the relative effectiveness of each principle being applied - for instance: on balance it can be seen that the application of the principle of the greater good to the problem will enable us better to resolve our dilemma than the application of a principle based any universal application of human rights.
- Perhaps be one that does **not** manage to sustain its argument throughout in a wholly convincing manner; that does not demonstrate all of the qualities outlined above; but is one that is on the whole relevant, focused and demonstrates that the candidate is one who understands the importance of critical reasoning and who can use its terminologies fairly confidently in an attempt to come to a decision in the context of what should be done in response to the threat of terrorism.

**Level Three [21-30 Marks]**

- The candidate will produce a strong and well-developed argument that leads to a convincing and confidently expressed judgment. There will be evidence of a high standard of critical reasoning throughout.
- Candidates will have dealt with more than one principle. A very skilful and cogent treatment of two principles could be sufficient to achieve the highest marks.
- Explanations of relevance and the application of principles will have clarity and purpose. Examples/illustrations will be well chosen and effectively applied to support points made. The candidate will demonstrate a keen awareness of context, with principles clearly being applied to the specific dilemma/situation under consideration.

- In coming to a resolution of the dilemma, the candidate will reach to a clear and valid judgement on the relative effectiveness of each of the principles identified. There may well be evidence of some well-developed suppositional reasoning present.
- The standard of written communication will be well suited to the handling of complex subject matter, with relevant material and ideas being very well organised and clearly presented. There should be frequent and effective usage of specialist vocabulary/terminology appropriate to critical reasoning. There will be few errors in spelling grammar and punctuation. Meaning will be clear throughout.

**A typical Level Three response should:**

- Be one that leads to a confidently expressed and convincing judgement based upon the application of the principles it has identified to the clear resolution of a relevant and focused dilemma.
- Have carefully selected from a range of principles, showing discrimination in doing so. The candidate will not have attempted to have considered as many principles they can into a short space of time, rather they will demonstrate sureness of touch in terms of what is relevant and what is not: for instance. Ethical principles/values connected with hedonism or egoism might be expected to play little part in trying to resolve dilemmas involved in dealing with issues of terrorism; while those connected to rights, consequence and egalitarianism might very well do so.
- Be one that meets the most, if not all of the requirements outlined for level two, while managing a more sustained and focused argument throughout. Suppositional reasoning, for instance, is likely to feature more prominently and be more sophisticated, showing clearly that questions of 'what if' might lead us into ever more deeper complexities; that there may well be dilemmas within dilemmas - where, for instance, immediate success in combating terrorism might actually lead to longer term problem when dealing, for example with infringement of the civil liberties/rights of individuals/minority groups.

**Mark Scheme F494**  
**June 2006**

## Section A – Multiple Choice

1	C	
2	C	
3	D	
4	B	
5	D	
6	A	
7	C	
8	B	
9	D	
10	B	
11	D	
12	D	
13	A	
14	C	
15	B	
16	A	
17	C	
18	B	
19	D	
20	B	

## UNIT 4 CRITICAL REASONING June 06 Mark Scheme

## Section B

## Coverage of Assessment Objectives

AO1 – analysis of reasoning:	17
AO2 – evaluation of reasoning:	30
AO3 – development of reasoning:	18

Quality of Language 5

[insert AO grids for whole paper as agreed at mark scheme committee]

**21**

'It ought to be legal to withdraw labour from companies 'closely associated with' firms in dispute with their employees.

Two marks for precise wording. Accept with or without euphemism in brackets.

*There is no one mark version.*

**22**

a) This is a response to a predicted counterargument. (2 marks)

OR

Counter argument. It helps prepare the ground for the main reasoning in paras 4 – 9 (2 marks)

Accept

Counter argument. (one mark)

b) *This is an example (one mark)*  
*which illustrates the more general argument (one mark).*  
*OR It provides topical interest (one mark).*

c) *Intermediate conclusion (one mark). Directly supports main conclusion (one mark).*

Accept

*Reason to support main conclusion (one mark)*

**23 Analyse in detail the structure of the reasoning in paragraph 8.**

Use descriptors grid.

**Analysis of Reasoning AO1**

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.

Candidates should demonstrate understanding of argument structure.

Candidates should identify elements of subtle and complex arguments using appropriate terminology.

	Performance descriptors
Level 4 7 - 9	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.
Level 3 5 - 6	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.
Level 2 3 - 4	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.
Level 1 1 - 2	Candidates demonstrate limited understanding of argument structure. Candidates may provide poor paraphrases of isolated elements of arguments or give overall gist.

Q23 cont.

R1 That [confronting the big companies that manipulate the small] may require union members in 'associated companies' to lose pay and risk jobs.

R2 The sympathy strike requires one worker to make sacrifices for another. These two are very similar: R1 is a specific application of the principle in R2.

IC1 Secondary action is often laudable.

e.g. (context – Heathrow baggage handlers are rarely congratulated on their altruism) but during the Gate Gourmet dispute they supported lower paid workers at considerable personal cost.

Counter claim: Solidarity is no longer fashionable – indeed, in commerce and industry it is illegal

IC2 (which dismisses counter) In a decent society it ought to be encouraged rather than condemned.

(C It ought to be legal to withdraw labour from companies closely associated with ... firms in dispute with their employees)

R1 and R2 support IC1, which is illustrated by e.g. IC1 supports IC2, which dismisses counter claim.

*Candidates should be able to label each structural element accurately. They should take it directly from the text because they are simply showing how Hattersley's words can be broken down into structural elements. However, we will credit elements which are almost there or very good variants.*

*Candidates should use either words or a diagram to show relationships of support. Thus a good answer will show that IC1 gives us a reason to accept IC2 and explain whether reasons operate jointly or independently.*

**24 How effective is Hattersley's response to hostility to secondary action referred to in paragraphs 1 - 3?**

[9]

Use Evaluation of Reasoning descriptors.

**Evaluation of Reasoning AO2**

	Performance Descriptors
Level 4 7 - 9	Candidates demonstrate sound, thorough and perceptive evaluation of strength and weakness in Hattersley's response to hostility to secondary action. They provide with consistent and accomplished evaluation of the impact of this strength and weakness on the overall effectiveness of Hattersley's response to hostility to SA. Candidates select key points to evaluate. Inappropriate forms of evaluation are rare and not serious.
Level 3 5 - 6	Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of weakness in Hattersley's response to hostility in secondary action. They consistently evaluate the impact of this weakness on the overall effectiveness of Hattersley's response to SA. Candidates begin to evaluate strength more clearly. Candidates select points to evaluate, but not always key points. Inappropriate forms of evaluation (disagreement, counterargument, false attribution of weakness) may occur.
Level 2 3 - 4	Candidates demonstrate basic awareness of strength and weakness in Hattersley's response to hostility to secondary action. Valid points may be isolated, but candidates begin to evaluate the impact of weakness on the overall effectiveness of Hattersley's response. Candidates may attribute weakness inappropriately and occasionally disagree with the reasoning or provide counterarguments rather than evaluating it.
Level 1 1 - 2	Candidates demonstrate limited awareness of strength and weakness in Hattersley's response to hostility to secondary action. They make random or isolated valid points, attribute weakness inappropriately and have little awareness of the impact of weakness on the overall effectiveness of Hattersley's response. Candidates tend to disagree with the reasoning rather than evaluate it.

**Indicative content**

Hattersley tends to juxtapose his own viewpoint with a negative portrayal of the reasons to object to secondary action rather than providing good reasons to accept his viewpoint or dismiss the counter view. This weakens his dismissal of counter arguments, but does make the reader consider whether their response is rational or emotional and prepare the ground for his main argument.

*Candidates cannot possibly mention all points in the outline of indicative content below. Good answers will cover all three paragraphs, making pertinent, thoughtful, evaluative comments on the effectiveness of H's response to hostility to SA.*



	<b>Strength</b>	
1	H is right to highlight the emotional nature of our response to picketing.	<p>Makes the reader consider whether they are responding emotionally; makes them either provide rational support for their view or be more prepared to accept H's main line of reasoning.</p> <p>This defuses hostility to SA, rather than responding to counter argument.</p>
2	<p>H concedes that Scargill, and his tactics are not to be supported.</p> <p>Makes the first step in disconnecting Scargill, violence and SA.</p> <p>Although he does not support it, H does provide a plausible explanation of why SA is hated.</p>	<p>Shows that he is not arguing for the extremes of SA.</p> <p>Opens the way for an understanding of SA which might fit our current thinking.</p> <p>This is cynical, perhaps, and rhetorical, but it does work to make the reader wonder whether their emotions are being manipulated, and perhaps be more receptive to the rational support provided in favour of SA.</p>
3	<p>H does show the connection between violence and picketing to be exaggerated.</p> <p>He is right to say that we should not condemn <b>all</b> secondary picketing because <b>some</b> of it is violent.</p>	<p>Weakens the connection by showing that it is not logically necessary. Makes the reader more receptive to his arguments.</p> <p>Does make the point that we should think about the merits of secondary action.</p>

**25 Evaluate the support given to the main conclusion by the reasoning in paragraphs 4 – 9.**

[12]

Use Evaluation of Reasoning grid

**Evaluation of Reasoning AO2**

	Performance Descriptors
Level 4 10 - 12	Candidates demonstrate sound, thorough and perceptive evaluation of strength and weakness in Hattersley's reasoning. They provide a consistent and accomplished evaluation of the impact of this strength and weakness on the overall support for Hattersley's main conclusion, that, 'It ought to be legal to withdraw labour from companies 'closely associated with' firms in dispute with their employees.' Candidates select key points to evaluate. Inappropriate forms of evaluation are rare and not serious.
Level 3 7 - 9	Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of weakness in Hattersley's reasoning and consistently evaluate the impact of weakness on the overall support for Hattersley's main conclusion, that 'It ought to be legal to withdraw labour from companies 'closely associated with' firms in dispute with their employees.' Candidates begin to evaluate strength more clearly. Candidates select points to evaluate, but not always key points. Inappropriate forms of evaluation (disagreement, counterargument, false attribution of weakness) may occur.
Level 2 4 - 6	Candidates demonstrate basic awareness of strength and weakness in Hattersley's reasoning. Valid points may be isolated, but candidates begin to evaluate the impact of weakness on the reasoning in general. Candidates may attribute weakness inappropriately and occasionally disagree with the reasoning or provide counterarguments rather than evaluating it.
Level 1 1 - 3	Candidates demonstrate limited awareness of strength and weakness in Hattersley's reasoning. They make random or isolated valid points, attribute weakness inappropriately and have little awareness of the impact of weakness on the overall reasoning. Candidates tend to disagree with the reasoning rather than evaluate it.

**Q25 Indicative Content - Examples**

Para	Example	Evaluation of effect
4 and 5	The use of Gate Gourmet's dispute with its workers as a result of pressure from BA to cut costs to illustrate a general argument is precise and focussed.	<p>The example illustrates the argument clearly and makes it topical. The argument is clearer and stronger because it is related to a specific case.</p> <p>However, the argument is predominantly theoretical, and the case for SA could stand even if it were shown that it was inappropriate in this particular example</p>
6	Rupert Murdoch and print unions	<p>Secondary action would have helped to defeat Murdoch, just as it may help enforce proper working conditions on subcontractors of big companies. To this extent the example strengthens the case for SA.</p> <p>However, Murdoch did make positive contributions to printing, which the unions were obstructing. GG's use of low paid workers is not similar to Murdoch's introduction of new technology. Seen in this light, the example might weaken the case for SA.</p>
8	Heathrow baggage handlers striking in support of GG workers.	<p>Demonstrating that a group of people felt to be selfish were losing out to help others does strengthen the case for their actions being laudable / praiseworthy.</p> <p>This example may encourage the reader to consider whether their own objections to baggage handlers striking are based on personal inconvenience at disrupted travel plans rather than on the merits of the case.</p> <p>However, if the baggage handlers are seen as militant and inclined to strike, this may weaken the argument that they were supporting those worse off than them. It may be possible to show that they were simply being disruptive with no altruism in mind at all.</p>
7 and 9	Quotations from Adam Smith, economist.	Adam Smith is regarded as the founding father of economics, so he is a reasonable authority to appeal to in this case, as the main opposition to H will be economic. Quoting Smith might defuse economic opposition.

*Candidates do not need to know about Rupert Murdoch or Adam Smith, but if they do, or make relevant related points, they should be credited.*

**Q25 Indicative content - Flaws**

Para	Flaw	Evaluation of Impact
4, 6, 7, 9	Restricting the options	Hattersley repeatedly restricts the options, saying that SA is the only way to redress the balance between master and man, or big company domination and worker. He does not make the case for SA being the only contemporary option, ignoring the possibility of government legislation etc.  This is a minor weakness, as the justification for action against the big companies manipulating the small stands, and secondary action is one part of that.
	Hattersley does not protect himself against economic attack.	If it can be shown that secondary action causes so much disruption that low-paid workers are worse off than if their comrades had not taken action on their behalf, Hattersley will be undermined.

**Q25 Indicative Content - Reasons supporting the conclusion:**

Hattersley's argument is largely well-constructed with reasons which do provide support for his conclusion. He supports his conclusion that, 'it ought to be legal to withdraw labour from companies 'closely associated with' firms in dispute with their employees,' with two main strands of reasoning; that secondary action is often justified, and that it is often laudable.

**Justified:**

Hattersley shows the justification for making companies which determine condition of pay and work responsible for the consequences of their actions. He also shows that there is justification for redressing the balance between master and men, and acting to change the inequity of laws against combining to heighten wages but none against lowering it. These are strong moral arguments. H shows that SA can be justified.

However, SA is only one means of achieving these things.

**Laudable**

The argument that secondary action is praiseworthy rather than blameable is based on the assumption that it is good to make personal sacrifices for another. It rests on the assumption that considering others' needs rather than our own desires is a positive trait and thus should be encouraged. Implicitly, if we should encourage something, then it should be legal.

However, the fact that altruism is generally good, does not mean that each action done with others' needs in mind is a good action.

He has not fully supported his use of 'frequently laudable' although he has certainly demonstrated that it can be praiseworthy.

**Right**

The move from 'secondary action is often justified and frequently laudable' to 'it is right,' is unsupported. Move from qualified position to absolute position. The fact that it is right to consider others does not mean that every action to support others is right – ignores other consequences of those actions.

**Legal**

Even if an action is praiseworthy – or morally right – does not necessarily mean that it should be legal if it breaches another moral principle.

Hattersley is moving from what it is right for an individual to do to in general (consider the needs of others) to an institutionalised right to disrupt the activities of some for the benefit of others – which is different.

Hattersley is arguing for a number of very strong claims. He has shown that secondary action can be justified, can be praiseworthy, and may be the right thing to do. He has a case for SA being legal in these cases. One of these cases may often be ‘withdrawing labour from companies ‘closely associated with’ firms in dispute with their employees.’

However, he has not shown that this is generally the case.

**Q26 How effectively does Gate Gourmet's response counter Hattersley's argument?**

Use Evaluation of Reasoning Descriptors.

**Evaluation of Reasoning AO2**

	Performance Descriptors
Level 4 7 - 9	Candidates demonstrate sound, thorough and perceptive evaluation of strength and weakness in Gate Gourmet's response to Hattersley's argument. They provide a consistent and accomplished evaluation of the extent to which Gate Gourmet have supported their claims, and the extent to which these claims are an effective response to Hattersley's argument. Candidates select key points to evaluate. Inappropriate forms of evaluation are rare and not serious.
Level 3 5 - 6	Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of weakness in Gate Gourmet's reasoning. They evaluate the extent to which Gate Gourmet's claims are an effective response to Hattersley's argument. Candidates may mention strength in Gate Gourmet's response. Candidates select points to evaluate, but not always key points. Inappropriate forms of evaluation (disagreement, counterargument, false attribution of weakness) may occur.
Level 2 3 - 4	Candidates demonstrate basic awareness of strength and weakness Gate Gourmet's response. Valid points may be isolated, but candidates begin to evaluate the impact of weakness on the effectiveness of Gate Gourmet's response to criticism. Candidates may attribute weakness inappropriately and occasionally disagree with the reasoning or provide counterarguments rather than evaluating it.
Level 1 1 - 2	Candidates demonstrate limited awareness of strength and weakness in Gate Gourmet's response to Hattersley. They make random or isolated valid points, attribute weakness inappropriately and have little awareness of the impact of strength or weakness on the overall effectiveness of Gate Gourmet's claims. Candidates tend to disagree with the reasoning rather than evaluate it.

**Q26 Indicative content:**

Comment	Impact on Effectiveness of Response
This letter is concerned with establishing that Gate Gourmet is not unscrupulous.	To the extent that it is successful in this, it only answers Hattersley's use of Gate Gourmet's dispute with its workers, not the overall argument that secondary action should be legal. It does not directly address issues of the legality of any kind of industrial action.
If we accept that Gate Gourmet are not unscrupulous, Hattersley loses his example.	Without the Gate Gourmet example, Hattersley's argument loses topicality and contemporary illustration. It loses nothing of its logical or moral force.
Gate Gourmet do show that they are not unscrupulous.	By showing us the employer's side of the argument, Gate Gourmet show that SA can create economic chaos. They show that it would be wrong to allow action which makes it more difficult to safeguard employees' needs and economic viability.
Gate Gourmet highlight an unfounded assumption made by Hattersley.	Gate Gourmet's image of wildcat strikers highlights H's assumption that workers are rational and acting in others' best interests. This may not be the case.
Gate Gourmet counter Hattersley's idealistic with a realistic appraisal of the actual situation in the workplace.	This makes it seem less justified for workers to strike to support others.
Gate Gourmet use a false image of their workers (straw person) as wildcat, militant, uncaring.  'Unballoted' may be unfair (see notes in background).	This means that their appraisal of the situation is based on unfair and unrealistic ideas about what workers want. So their argument does not weaken the support for SA as strongly as it might seem.
The response does not even show that Gate Gourmet are not unscrupulous.	There is much hidden behind the apparently innocuous phrase 'reducing unnecessary cost and remaining competitive.' This is precisely the kind of exploitation Hattersley is talking about, so this careful comment may actually strengthen Hattersley's case.
Gate Gourmet appeal to the travelling public's self interest.	This is a rhetorical tactic to strengthen our support for GG on the basis of our self interest. It adds no real weight to their response.
Restricting the options: Gate Gourmet imply that the only alternative to their current course of action would be an unscrupulous submission to militant, uncaring workers.	This gives an unrealistic image of what the options are, and excludes any middle ground. It is a redescription of the situation in their own favour rather than a supported response to Hattersley's argument.

**Q27 'Sometimes the right to argue has to be extended to the right to act.'**

Write your own argument to support or challenge this claim.

Use Development of Reasoning Descriptors

**Development of Reasoning AO3**

Communicate arguments using appropriate language.

Anticipate and respond to counter argument.

	Performance Descriptors
Level 4 13 - 18	Candidates produce cogent, sound and perceptive reasoning. Reasons 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.
Level 3 9 - 12	Candidates produce effective and persuasive reasoning. Reasons 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.
Level 2 5 - 8	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. Language simple, clear. Candidates may include a counter argument or counter reason, but respond to it ineffectively if at all.
Level 1 1 - 4	Limited ability to reason. Disjointed, incoherent. Reasons often do not support conclusion. There may not even be a stated conclusion. Language vague.

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.

Candidates may write an argument directly relevant to secondary action.

Candidates may write an argument which addresses secondary action, but uses examples of other instances of persuasion and action.

Candidates may write a theoretical argument which deals with moral principles and abstractions.

Each of these should be credited according to the reasoning skills demonstrated using the descriptors in the grid.

Candidates should not be credited for substantial repetition of either Hattersley's argument or Gate Gourmet's response.

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, e.g. Q 27, L4, 9.

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

**Analysis Questions**

Perhaps the following abbreviations might be put 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.

I'm not sure this is essential. I think it might help to see at a glance. If we do annotate, it should match what we do in Development of Reasoning questions.

**Evaluation Questions:**

In evaluation questions, it might be possible 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

**Advanced GCE (Critical Thinking) (H450/H050)  
June 2006 Assessment Series**

**Unit Threshold Marks**

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
<b>F491</b>	Raw	80	51	43	35	27	20	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>F492</b>	Raw	20	13	11	10	9	0	0
	UMS	180	144	126	108	90	72	0
<b>F493</b>	Raw	80	54	46	38	31	24	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>F494</b>	Raw	20	14	12	10	9	8	0
	UMS	180	144	126	108	90	72	0
	UMS							
	UMS							

**Specification Aggregation Results**

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
<b>H050</b>	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
<b>H450</b>	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
<b>H050</b>	6.05	18.46	38.78	61.22	80.39	100	22,869
<b>H450</b>	10.75	29.57	50.12	70.36	87.67	100	1758

1758 candidates aggregated this series

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;  
[www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp](http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication



**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)  
1 Hills Road  
Cambridge  
CB1 2EU**

**OCR Information Bureau**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [helpdesk@ocr.org.uk](mailto:helpdesk@ocr.org.uk)

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

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity**

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553**

© OCR 2006

