

## Critical Thinking

Advanced Extension Award **AEA 9913**

# Mark Schemes for the Component

---

**June 2006**

9913/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 Extension Award Critical Thinking (9913)

#### MARK SCHEMES FOR THE COMPONENT

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
9913	AEA Critical Thinking	1
*	Grade Thresholds	9



**Mark Scheme 9913  
June 2006**

**Section A****Multiple Choice**

**One mark for each correct answer.**

1. C
2. (a) E (b) B
3. (a) D (b) C
4. D
5. A
6. (a) B (b) A
7. D
8. B
9. E
10. B
11. C
12. A

**Section B**

- 1 (a) The association is 'funded by solid fuel producers and distributors'.  
As such their expertise in the market might **strengthen** the quality of their advice.  
Alternatively a vested interest to sell their products might **weaken** this. **2 x 1 mark**
- (b) The first photograph and heading – '21 century lifestyle' with a modern enclosed fire could be used to challenge
- the claim that rural communities who heat their rooms are backward looking
  - the claim that fires are uncontrolled. **2 x 1 mark**
- 2 (a) **Intermediate conclusion**  
Burning fires simply involves too many dangers. **1 mark**
- Additional factors**  
(Paragraph 5 and 6) discusses efficiency and conservation.  
(Paragraph 7) criticises out moded practice.  
Accept relevant quotations.
- (b) **Assumptions** **2 x 1 mark**  
Award 1 mark each for up to two of the following:  
In relation to open fires central heating
- is less dangerous in the home
  - requires a fuel whose extraction is less dangerous/does not use solid fuels
  - causes less pollution/less harmful to the environment
  - is more efficient
  - is more modern. **2 x 1 mark**
- (c) **Further evidence**  
Award 1 mark each for any of the following that would weaken the claim:
- if the fuel that had been used in fires had been smokeless.
  - if the fires had been in the countryside where the fumes had been diluted.
  - if the deaths had been caused by other reasons exacerbated by pollution from fires.
- Award 1 mark each for any of the following that would weaken the case:
- if the boiler uses a fuel derived from coal/fossil fuel e.g. gas from a coal fired generator.
  - if the boiler consumes more energy because it heats more rooms or is easier to use and therefore is used more often/wastefully.
  - If the boiler consumes fuel that costs more energy to extract or transport.
- Credit other valid further evidence **2 x 1 mark**
- (d) **Stated and countered claim**  
The open fire is a symbol of 'warmth, light and security' **1 mark**
- Weakness**
- Conflation of open fires with coal fires.
  - 'Appeal to Modernity' where practices may not necessarily be better than the past.
  - Reference to sentimentality attacks the characteristic of the opponent rather than their reasoning.
  - Assume sentimentality is a bad thing. **1 mark**

**(e) Analogy**

That mining should be banned as barbaric, being similar to banning sending children up chimneys for the same reason.

**1 mark****Weakness**

- Children had no choice, whereas miners choose their job.
- The conditions for children were not monitored whereas miners are protected by health and safety measures

**1 mark**

- (f)** Candidates might give reasons such as why renewable energy (in general or specific forms such as wind or solar energy) should be the way forward, pointing out that these fuels are unsuitable - as the supplies of oil are uncertain, or because British supplies of natural gas are running out.

**3 marks****[18 marks]****3****(a) Key dilemma**

For a **correctly phrased dilemma**

**1 mark**

and a further 2 marks if the **harm caused by each option is correctly stated** **plus 2 marks**

Either the wind farm should go ahead - causing possible harm to wildlife, peat lands and tourism or it should be refused - resulting in a lost opportunity for the local economy and renewable energy.

**3 marks**

For simply identifying **conflicting options** e.g.

The duty to provide jobs	v	the duty to protect tourism
The need to promote renewable energy	v	the need to protect landscape and wild life

**2 marks**

For simply **raising an issue** e.g.

What should we define as environmentally friendly?

Should the economy come first?

Should human welfare take priority over that of birds?

**1 mark****(b) Principles**

For a relevant principle **supporting** the proposal

**2 marks**

For two of these

e.g. The governing body has a duty to adopt those measures that would benefit the greater number of people even if it causes harm to some communities.

The governing body has a duty to ensure a sustainable economy.

It is right to conserve the earth's natural resources.

It is right to replace polluting fossil fuels with renewable energy sources.

**3 marks**

Award one mark for an expression that embeds a principle but does not explicitly express it.

N.B. Award no marks for a principle that would lead to the proposal being rejected

e.g. It is right to protect endangered species/areas of outstanding beauty.

Local inhabitants have the right to reject plans that would harm their environment.

**(c) Counter reasoning**

Candidates need to counter the stance made by **the opposition** e.g.

Although the protection of rare birds is important, this needs to be seen in the

context of the survival of the planet as a whole through the reduction of carbon emissions.

Although the windfarm might impact on the unspoilt image, tourism might in fact benefit from such a plan, as it might be advertised as a technological attraction as nuclear power stations do at present.

Sometimes governments have a conflict of duties. Although there is a duty to protect biodiversity there is also a duty to ensure that there is sufficient employment.

**3 x 1 mark**

**(d) Weakness in reasoning**

Candidates need to evaluate the claims made by **the opposition** e.g.

**Significance** If the claim that the building on peat lands releasing carbon into the atmosphere is seen as a single event and set against the long term production of power by wind farms which reduces carbon emissions significantly, then the criticism of releasing carbon is weakened.

**False parallel** If the wind farms in Lewis are predominantly on flat moorland, then the parallel with the wind farm in Ireland is not so relevant.

**Ambiguity** Does the 9% mean that 9% of the breeding population of all the red throat divers is in the Lewis peatlands? Or do these constitute 9% of the breeding population of all birds breeding in GB?

**Significance** There is no indication of how much Lewis contributes to the £33 million per year. If the amount is a small percentage, the reasoning about the loss to tourism would be weak.

**Bias** The findings of the poll might be biased, as those conducting it were concerned residents and as such might have a vested interest to influence the responses. This might weaken the result.

**Appeal to popularity** A majority does not necessarily justify the correctness of an argument. The inhabitants of Lewis may be wrong in their opposition.

**Appeal to fear Uses** emotive language 'catastrophic bog slides' as a method of persuasion rather than reasoning.

**3 x 1 mark**

**Section B A01 [5], A02 [10], A03 [10], A04 [5]**

**Total: [30]**

## Section C

Specific points to supplement the Generic Performance Descriptors:

### **Clarify parameters of the question e.g.**

The **minimum age** is not specified: the lower the limit, the greater the restrictions that would need to be introduced in any licence.

No indication is given as to the **time span** of the provisional licence: the longer the period of time it applies to the young person, the greater the infringement upon freedom.

**Select relevant issues, combine conflicting views, support with relevant examples, develop further reasoning on both sides of the argument e.g.**

### **ISSUE 1**

**To prevent the law being broken**

*Conflict*

**ought v can**

**The government has a duty to ensure that laws preventing underage drinking can be upheld.**

*Document 5*

The Home Office recognises the need to deal with the problems of underage drinking, 'The new licensing structure will give police and local authorities greater powers to deal with the minority who abuse the licensing laws'.

**However the present increased powers alone might not control this, pointing to the need for additional/alternative measures.**

*Document 7*

'In spite of noble intentions and the expenditure of massive amounts of time, energy and money, the best evidence shows that our current abstinence-orientated alcohol education is ineffective'.

*Document 6*

Inspector Barnes pinpoints the problem with the present system, '...fake ID is easy to get - landlords can't always tell who hits the mark'.

*Further reasoning*

Other measures could include the promotion of clubs for under 21s where alcohol is not served at all, or where there are restrictions upon the licensed premises in line with those proposed for the under 21s.

*Counter reasoning*

However those under 21 might not wish to frequent such venues.

### **ISSUE 2**

**To prevent harm**

*Conflict*

**protection of society v restriction of freedom of the individual**

**A provisional licence could be used to help protect society from the excesses of underage drinking.**

*Document 7*

Those suggesting the provisional licence claim, 'clandestine overindulgence could give way to public self-regulation, with the penalty for abuse being revocation of the privilege'.

*Document 4*

Examples of harm:

Maxine Frith, 'Doctors are now seeing girls as young as 17 with cirrhosis of the liver due to excessive drinking. The Government estimates that alcohol related harm costs the country £20bn a year'.

**However this would limit the present personal freedom of 18 to 21 year olds, the majority of whom, from the figures, comply with the law.**

*Document 5* The Home Office statistics for December evidenced an average of four fixed penalty notices for troublemakers per licensed premise. The figures do not identify what percentage of these are under 21, but this is a small percentage of the drinking clientele.

*Further reasoning*

A provisional licence to include those under 18 could bring drinking in line with the minimum age for smoking, thus dealing with what teenagers see as an inconsistency in legislation.

*Counter reasoning*

However it could be argued that the social effects of excessive drinking are greater than those of excessive smoking. These are also more immediate than the more long term effects of passive smoking.

**ISSUE 3 When youth self-regulation is not an option**

*Conflict* **Paternalism v self control**  
**Underage drinkers do not always have the self control to protect themselves from harm.**

*Document 4* According to the European School Survey Project on Alcohol, 'One in three girls and one in five boys aged 15 to 16 admitted to binge drinking three or more times in the previous month', perhaps indicating the need for the greater supervision that a provisional drinking licence might afford.

**However the youth in other societies have self regulated without the need for such measures.**

*Document 7* 'Many groups around the world have learned to consume alcohol widely with almost no problems'.

*Further reasoning*

There are restrictions in other areas where young people are considered to be at risk from their own actions. A provisional drinking licence could be seen as being in line with other levels of restriction e.g. via censorship in viewing films of an adult nature.

*Counter reasoning*

However, learning from experience is often seen as valuable to encourage an autonomous adult.

**Assess the credibility of documents/sources within them e.g.**

**Document 4 Expertise**

of Martin Plant in addiction studies as a professor in that field, to be able to present reliable information relating to the trend in alcohol related liver disease being evidenced in those in their twenties and thirties.

**Vested interest**

by the British teenagers to exaggerate their 'binge' drinking as being at three or more times in the previous month, if they wanted to fit in with this image.

**Document 5 Vested interest**

by the Home Office to present the figures accurately to protect public confidence in their role, but at the same time a motive to selectively present the figures relating to abuse, to justify the need for increasing measures to combat underage and 'binge' drinking.

**Document 6 Neutrality**

of Alcohol Concern, who claim that raising the age limit would have little impact, as it would be in their interest to support such measures if they thought that they would be effective.

**Document 7 Experienced insight**

of Hanson and Heath into the drinking habits of students on campus, to suggest that a provisional drinking licence might be of help.

**Evaluate the reasoning and data offered e.g.****Document 4 Significance**

The increase in alcohol-related deaths rising by 20% and cirrhosis of the liver by 50% might represent only a few cases if the initial rate of increase was small, as indicated by the graph.

**Document 5 Significance**

The figures from the Christmas campaign period may be unrepresentative of alcohol abuse incidents in other parts of the year: less than usual if the cold weather limits people spilling out onto the streets or more than usual as it is a festive time of the year.

**Document 6 Significance**

The implication is that 48% of 15 year old girls having a drink each week is a problem, however no context is given. This could be a glass of wine at a family dinner, something which is argued to be successful in avoiding alcohol abuse in continental practice.

**Document 7 Weak parallel**

Successful avoidance of alcohol abuse in Italy and Greece may be due to factors not relevant in the UK or US, such as the nature of the wine in the area, or its cost.

## Section C – Generic Performance Descriptions

		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	
<b>AO2</b> <b>1 mark</b>	<b>Clarify</b> the question		The question is clarified successfully to direct the answer. [0-1]	As in Level 2.	
<b>AO3</b> <b>1 mark</b>	<b>Present</b> a clear, logical and coherent argument.	The argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• may not be well formulated</li> <li>• has little or no sign posting</li> <li>• may not be easy to follow</li> <li>• may lack consistency [0-1]</li> </ul>	The argument – evidences Level 3 characteristics in parts but these are not maintained throughout i.e. is generally ... or evidences Level 3 characteristics but tends to be superficial/unambitious. [2]	The argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• is well formulated</li> <li>• is clearly signposted</li> <li>• is easy to follow</li> <li>• is consistent</li> <li>• is complex. [3]</li> </ul>	
<b>AO4</b> <b>2 marks</b>	Organised in an identifiable framework.				
<b>Marks should not be awarded for the quality of English (spelling, punctuation, grammar) or the quality of the persuasiveness/rhetoric, or the quality of description or summary – but rather for the strength of the composition of the argument.</b>					
<b>AO4</b> <b>6 marks</b>	<b>Select</b> relevant issues to direct the argument.  <b>Combine</b> different points of view to construct the argument.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>1 central issue</b> selected with <i>inappropriate</i> attention paid to peripheral or irrelevant points.</li> <li>• the conflicting perspectives of <b>1 issue</b> are broadly identified with some supported example from text and there is some attempt at integration.</li> <li>• The conclusions are presented without strong argument or no conclusion is drawn. [0-2]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>2 central issues</b> are selected with <i>some</i> attention paid in parts to peripheral or irrelevant points.</li> <li>• The conflicting perspectives of <b>2 issues</b> are identified with supporting examples from texts and <i>are</i> integrated.</li> </ul> <p>The conclusions are presented tentatively within the outline of possible alternatives. [3-4]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3 central issues</b> selected with <i>little</i> attention to peripheral or irrelevant points.</li> <li>• The conflicting perspectives of <b>3 issues</b> are clearly identified with forceful examples from texts and successfully integrated.</li> <li>• The conclusions <i>are reached through strong argument.</i> [5-6]</li> </ul>	
<b>AO2</b> <b>7 marks</b>	<b>Evaluate</b> the credibility of the documents.  <b>Evaluate</b> the strength and relevance of the claims.	An attempt is made to evaluate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the credibility of 1 document [0-1]</li> <li>• 1 point of reasoning/evidence. [0-1]</li> </ul>	<i>An attempt</i> is made to evaluate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the credibility of 2 documents [2]</li> <li>• 2 points of reasoning/evidence [2]</li> </ul>	The following are successfully assessed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the credibility of 3 documents [3]</li> <li>• 3-4 points of reasoning/evidence [3-4]</li> </ul>	
<b>AO3</b> <b>3 marks</b>	<b>Develop</b> the reasoning with additional examples to support and challenge the argument.	An attempt is made to support the reasoning of one side of the argument with little or no additional evidence/examples. [0-1]	Additional relevant reasoning is given to present one side of the argument with relevant evidence/examples. [2]	Additional relevant reasoning is successfully given to both present one side of the argument and assess the counter argument with relevant evidence for at least one side. [3]	
<b>AO2</b> <b>AO3</b> <b>AO4</b>	evaluate develop and present synthesize	overall 16 [8] 8 [4] 16 [8]	0-6 marks	7-13 marks	14-20 marks

**Advanced Extension Award Critical Thinking (9913)  
June 2006 Assessment Series**

**Component Threshold Marks**

Component	Max Mark	Distinction	Merit	Ungraded
<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>

**Overall**

	Distinction	Merit	Ungraded
<b>Percentage in Grade</b>	<b>23.23</b>	<b>51.18</b>	<b>25.59</b>
<b>Cumulative Percentage in Grade</b>	<b>23.23</b>	<b>74.41</b>	<b>100.00</b>

The total entry for the examination was 297.

**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

