



**GCE**

**Critical Thinking**

Unit **F501**: Introduction to Critical Thinking

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2014**

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.






All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2014

## Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Blank Page – this annotation must be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.
	Use a ✓ to indicate the separate marks given in <b>1(a), 1(c), 1(d), 2(a), 2(b), 3(a), 3(b), 3(c), 4(a), (4b), Q6, Q7, Q8, Q9(a) and 9(b)</b>
	<b>Use the following annotations in Q10:</b>
<b>C+</b>	to indicate strong credibility
<b>C</b>	to indicate weak credibility
<b>P+</b>	to indicate strong plausibility
<b>P</b>	to indicate weak plausibility
	to indicate credibility against the TEA , plausibility negative/against the TEA
	to indicate credibility for the TEA, plausibility positive/for the TEA
	on pages 10 and 11 to indicate that these continuation sheets have been looked at

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
			<p><b>For Questions 1(a) to (d):</b></p> <p><b>Credit 3 marks</b> for precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author. You must only credit the words written; ellipses (...) should not be credited. The words in brackets are not required, but candidates should not be penalised if these words are included.</p>		<p><b>Credit 2 marks and 1 mark</b> for answers to all parts of question 1, you should refer to the guidance given as to how to credit partial performance marks.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> for a statement of an incorrect part of the text.</p>
1	(a)		<p><b>Conclusion:</b> we should recognise the difficulty of increasing capacity here is undeniably obvious.</p>	3	<p><b>Credit 2 marks for a slight omission</b> e.g. leaving out “undeniably” or ‘We should recognise’</p> <p><b>Credit 1 mark for any addition or a significant omission</b> e.g. leaving out “of increasing capacity is undeniably obvious”</p> <p><b>Credit 0 marks for</b> ‘We should still consider this expansion’ as this supports the additional runways.</p>
	(b)		<p><b>Hypothetical reason:</b> You can't go on expecting Britain to compete with European countries if we simply can't supply the flights to destinations that are growing in importance.</p>	3	<p><b>Credit 2 marks for omission</b> e.g. leaving out “European countries” or “simply” or “to destinations that are growing in importance”</p> <p>or for rearranging the text putting the ‘if’ first.</p> <p><b>Credit 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>for addition</b> e.g. including “like China and Latin America”</li> <li><b>or for the hypothetical conclusion</b> “(As a result) London will become an international backwater if we don't address this.” (This is correctly identified as hypothetical, but is not a reason, therefore partial credit.)</li> </ul>

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
	(c)		<p><b>3 examples:</b></p> <p>Credit 1 mark each, for any three of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• conference facilities</li> <li>• hotel</li> <li>• marine research facilities</li> <li>• sailing schools</li> <li>• China</li> <li>• Latin America</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>* Use ticks ✓ to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate's answer.</b></p> <p><b>Credit 1 mark</b> if multiple examples are given for a single bullet point e.g. '<i>China and Latin America</i>'.</p> <p><b>Credit 0 marks</b> For incomplete wording e.g. "<i>conference</i>", "<i>research</i>", "<i>sailing</i>", "<i>America</i>"</p> <p>For the list of attractions '<i>parks, promenades and beach</i>'.</p> <p>For answers that copy out extra material e.g. '<i>Flights to destinations that are growing in importance like China and Latin America</i>'</p>
	(d)		<p><b>3 different indicator words and argument elements for each:</b></p> <p>Credit 1 mark each, for any three of the following: (credit if they reverse the order e.g. conclusion - so)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• so - conclusion</li> <li>• (allow 'should' – conclusion <b>or</b> counter conclusion)</li> <li>• as - reason</li> <li>• despite (this) -(response to) counter reasoning /counter argument/ counter reason</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>Use ticks ✓ to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate's answer.</b></p> <p><b>Credit 0 marks</b></p> <p>if either the argument element or the indicator word is omitted or is incorrect</p> <p>i.e. both need to be correctly stated for one mark.</p> <p>For 'counter assertion, counter, counter claim'</p>

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(a)		<p><b>Argument element:</b> <b>2 marks</b></p> <p>conclusion</p> <p>(Accept 'main conclusion')</p>	2	<p><b>* Use ticks ✓ throughout Q2 to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate's answer.</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b></p> <p>For 'intermediate <b>conclusion</b>'</p> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>For no credit-worthy material.</p>
	(b)		<p><b>Element explanation:</b> <b>2 marks</b></p> <p><b>Credit 1 mark</b> for correct versions of each of the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is what the writer wants you to accept (persuasion)</li> <li>It is based on the reason(ing) given. (or It is supported by/ based on "As they would have to destroy bird habitat to create the airport")</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>1 mark</b></p> <p>For one of the bulleted answers</p> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>For no credit-worthy material e.g. examples</p> <p>do not accept '<i>sums up</i>'</p> <p><b>* 2(a) and 2(b) should be marked independently</b> i.e. if 2(a) is incorrect, marks can be awarded for a correct answer to 2(b).</p> <p><b>* A definition is all that is required. However if a candidate explains the element correctly via the text, this should be credited 2 marks.</b></p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	(a)	<p>The exact key terms below do not have to be given for 2 marks. Synonyms or phrases can be used to express the concept.</p> <p><b>Evidence TEA attractions – weakness</b>  <b>2 marks</b>  For a correct assessment that focuses upon both cause (TEA) and consequence (its impact on visitors)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Plausibility</b> - It is unlikely that people will go there just to experience these attractions (<b>consequence</b>), when they can enjoy the same things elsewhere without the noise of aircraft taking off and landing nearby (<b>cause</b>).</li> <li>• The airport (<b>cause</b>) will make parks and beaches less pleasant (<b>consequence</b>)</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>Use ticks ✓ to identify cause and consequence</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b>  For an assessment of only a consequence or a cause e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>These</b> beaches will be unattractive (consequence)</li> <li>• The airport will be noisy. (cause)</li> <li>• Visitors may not want to make use of <b>these</b> facilities (consequence)</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b>  For no credit-worthy material such as answers that merely assert that the claim might not be true or restate the claim e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We can't know that this will happen</li> <li>- People don't like going to the beach</li> <li>- Beaches are unattractive.</li> </ul>
	(b)	<p><b>Evidence TEA benefits - weakness</b>  <b>2 marks</b>  For a correct assessment which is <b>explained</b> e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Prediction</b> - The benefits are a belief based on a prediction, rather than firm evidence. If circumstances change or they have miscalculated, the benefits may be less than this.</li> <li>• <b>Ambiguity</b> – The context of the benefits is not clear i.e. whether these benefits will be over and above what is taken from elsewhere e.g. from Heathrow or in addition to what is taken from elsewhere.</li> <li>• Allow <b>credibility</b> – Norman Foster would have a possible vested interest to exaggerate the benefits in order to attract support for the proposal.</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>1 mark</b>  For a challenge to the benefits without explanation of weakness e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is only what they think will happen.</li> <li>• They haven't considered the negatives.</li> <li>• It won't benefit everyone.</li> <li>• There will be noise and disruption.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b>  For no credit-worthy material e.g.</p> <p>It is only a possibility.  We can't know that this will happen.</p> <p><b>N.B. Answers can refer to any part of Document 2</b></p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
	(c)	<p><b>Evidence 2003 bird strike report - weakness</b>  <b>2 marks</b>  For identifying a weakness and <b>explaining</b> it e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Representative</b> - The evidence may be weak if the sample of 10 studied is not representative of the risk of bird strike at the largest airports i.e. if those selected for study had less of a risk than other large airports not studied.</li> <li>• <b>Relevance</b> – The 2003 report may not be relevant to the TEA proposal, as the bird population may differ in different parts of the Thames estuary.</li> <li>• <b>Relevance</b> – If the bird population on the Thames estuary has changed since 2003 / the technology dealing with bird strikes / avoiding them has improved there may not now be such a difference between the sets of risk figures.</li> <li>• <b>Prediction</b> - The bird population might change in the future, therefore the risks of aircraft loss might change.</li> <li>• <b>Prediction</b> - Planes have not been around long enough to test the statistics about aircraft loss through bird strikes.</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>1 mark</b></p> <p>For identifying a weakness or a challenge to the 2003 report/ prediction <b>without explanation</b> e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The evidence given is not a great risk.</li> <li>• The 2003 report is not recent evidence.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b>  For no credit-worthy material. No marks for merely re-stating the claim.</p>



Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	(a)		<p><b>Assumption:</b>  <b>3 marks</b>            For an accurate statement of an assumption e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The conditions faced on the island airport in Hong Kong are similar to those that will be faced at the TEA.</li> <li>The expertise acquired by British engineers in Hong Kong will be available to engineers on the TEA project.</li> <li>The project in Hong Kong was successful</li> <li>British engineers are enough to make it successful</li> <li>Building in Hong Kong is <b>similar</b> to building in London.</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>2 marks</b>            For an inaccurate statement of the assumption e.g. overdrawn e.g. <i>same</i> or too general.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hong Kong and London are similar.</li> <li>The building techniques required are exactly the same for both projects.</li> <li>Only/the same British engineers will be used on the TEA project.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b>            For the essence of an assumption expressed as a challenge e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Just because the engineers were successful in Hong Kong doesn't mean that they will be successful on the TEA as the conditions may be different.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b>            For the statement of an incorrect assumption e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The building of both airports will be equally as easy.</li> </ul> <p>For a restatement of the claim e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If British engineers have already done this in Hong Kong, we can achieve this.</li> </ul>
	(b)		<p><b>Assumption:</b>  <b>3 marks</b>            For an accurate statement of an assumption e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The natural environment created by the TEA would not have a net benefit over the bird habitat it destroyed.</li> <li>The destruction of bird habitat is not beneficial to the natural environment/will not help the environment.</li> <li>The TEA would not benefit the environment in other ways.</li> <li>They would not build a better habitat to improve on the habitat they had destroy</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>2 marks</b>            For an inaccurate statement of the assumption e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The environment created by the TEA would not be good.</li> <li>They will not respect <i>other</i> habitats.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b>            For the essence of an assumption expressed as a challenge e.g. The TEA might create a <b>better</b> environment with the reclamation of land.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b>            For the statement of an incorrect assumption e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Airports are detrimental to the environment.</li> <li>The construction work wouldn't respect the natural environment.</li> </ul>

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
			NB <i>'add to the natural environment' can be interpreted as either producing a net benefit or compensating for the damage.</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The construction work wouldn't recreate the natural environment.</li> </ul>
5			<p>One reason <b>against</b>:</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> For a reason that relates specifically to</p> <p><b>size</b> e.g. "largest"/large capacity/everyone/most people or  <b>location</b> e.g. London/capital/benefits of having an airport hub elsewhere</p> <p><b>Examples of 3 mark answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>London's already congested transport links would be made worse by a large new transport hub.</li> <li>Other parts of the country are more in need of the business development that a large transport hub would bring.</li> <li>Elsewhere in the country would benefit more from a large airport.</li> <li>The North of England requires more air travel infrastructure.</li> <li>It will worsen the already existing pollution issues. ("It" refers back to the claim)</li> </ul> <p><b>N.B.</b> Do not penalise for repeating the words of the claim if a valid reason is given.</p>	3	<p><b>2 marks</b></p> <p>For a reason that does not refer to the precise details:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other parts of the country are poorer.</li> <li>People need jobs elsewhere</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> For an answer that goes beyond a reason (e.g. an argument):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>London's already congested transport links would be made worse by a large new transport hub, so the development should be made elsewhere.</li> </ul> <p>or includes extra argument elements (e.g. an example).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>London's already congested transport links such as the underground network would be made worse by a large new transport hub.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> For no credit-worthy material.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	<p><b>Links between reasoning and conclusion</b>  <b>1 mark</b>  for <b>reference</b> to the correct conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>London will become an international backwater if we don't address this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Plus 1 mark</b>  for <b>reference</b> to any part of the reasoning</p> <p>Our main hub airport at Heathrow has only 2 runways, which cannot operate 24 hours a day, for social and environmental reasons. Frankfurt airport (Germany) has 3, Charles de Gaulle airport (France) has 4 and Schiphol airport (Amsterdam) has 7, and they are all 24 hour airports</p> <p><b>Plus either 2 marks</b>  for a correct point of assessment that focuses directly upon the link between the reasoning and the conclusion</p> <p><b>or 1 mark</b>  for a correct point which assesses the reasoning, without any reference to the link between it and the conclusion.  e.g.  The reasoning assumes that having fewer runways open fewer hours makes a significant difference.</p> <p>Example of a 4 mark answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The conclusion about "London becoming a backwater." (✓) is linked purely to the functioning of the Heathrow airport hub in comparison with airport hubs in Europe. (✓). The conclusion is therefore overdrawn, as although these other countries will have more people passing through them, other forms of international communication could prevent London from being left out of things. (✓✓)</li> </ul>	4	<p><b>* Use ticks ✓ throughout Q6 to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate's answer.</b></p> <p>* These marks should be credited independently of each other, i.e. it is not necessary to gain the first before the others can be credited.</p> <p>* The reference to the text may be brief. A full quote is not necessary.</p> <p>* The reference to the text need not be indicated by speech marks.</p> <p><b>NB</b> If there is no reference to the conclusion or the reason but a weak assessment, credit 1 mark</p> <p><b>NB</b> no marks for assessing the conclusion with no reference to the reasoning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>London is not a backwater because it has a lot of talented and clever people'</li> </ul> <p>Do not credit '<i>The TEA is in an ideal location</i>'.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	<p><b>Credibility of Document</b> Award up to <b>3 marks</b> for each correct answer:</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> for a <b>correct developed justification</b> e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Architects' Journal might have a vested interest to report the proposals accurately to protect their professionalism, <b>as if they misrepresented the information the public and architectural firms might lose confidence in their reports.</b> (<i>developed justification ✓✓</i>).</li> </ul> <p>or</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> for a <b>correct relevant generic justification</b> e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Architects' Journal might have a vested interest to report the proposals accurately <b>to protect their professionalism.</b> (<i>generic justification ✓</i>).</li> </ul> <p><b>Plus 1 mark</b> Additional mark where the correct assessment is supported by a <b>relevant reference to the text e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Architects' Journal might have a vested interest to report the proposals accurately to protect their professionalism, as if they misrepresented the information the public and architectural firms might lose confidence in their reports, (<i>developed justification ✓✓</i>) which they claim are important because <b>"We sit at the heart of the debate about British architecture and British cities,"</b> (<i>relevant reference ✓</i>).</li> </ul> <p>Other answers may be based on: Vested interest to promote architectural schemes Neutrality with regard to specific schemes Expertise to make informed comment</p>	6	<p><b>* Use ticks ✓ throughout Q7 to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate's answer.</b></p> <p><b>* A correct assessment of a source within the document</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capped at 1 mark for a developed/not generic assessment of the credibility of Norman Foster.</li> <li>However if the individual source is used as an example to assess the credibility of the whole document, it can access all 3 marks e.g. "The credibility of Document 2 is increased by its use of the expertise of Norman Foster because ..."</li> </ul> <p><b>* Credibility criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Credit only assessments related to <b>RAVEN</b> criteria not corroboration (N. includes its opposite, bias.)</li> <li>Assessments that relate to the <b>same</b> credibility criterion can only be credited if a different assessment is made e.g. vested interest that weakens and a different assessment of VI that strengthens credibility</li> <li>If candidates choose <b>both bias and vested interest</b>, they can only be credited if the same material is not used twice.</li> <li>Accept experience as a version of <b>expertise</b>.</li> </ul> <p><b>* Reference to the text</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This need not be in quotation marks.</li> <li>It need not be a sentence - a relevant phrase may be adequate to support an assessment. <b>NB 'Architect' is not sufficient</b></li> <li>This needs to be relevant to the assessment made.</li> <li>It needs to justify why credibility is strengthened/weakened by expertise rather than being an example of expertise.</li> <li>The name of the publication – The Architects' Journal or the website, <a href="http://www.architectsjournal.co.uk">www.architectsjournal.co.uk</a> can be used where relevant.</li> </ul>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
8		<p><b>Consistent claims by sources on opposing sides:</b></p> <p><b>Side For</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Source:</b> Boris Johnson (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Claim:</b> “You can’t go on expecting Britain to compete with European countries if we simply can’t supply the flights (to destinations that are growing in importance like China and Latin America.)</p> <p>We are being left badly behind. ” (1)</p> <p>(Either or both parts of his claim)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Also accept : Source: MP for North East Essex</b>  (“As a result,) London will become an international backwater (if we don’t address this.”)</li> </ul> <p><b>Side Against</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Source:</b> GMB Trade Union’s National Officer for airport workers (1)</li> </ul> <p><b>Claim:</b> “New runways at many European hub airports are already taking Heathrow business.</p> <p>This is already having a detrimental effect on jobs, skills and the economy of London and the UK.” (1)</p> <p>Either or both parts of their claim</p>	4	<p><b>* Use ticks ✓ throughout Q8 to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate’s answer.</b></p> <p><b>Credit 1 mark</b> for an inaccurate paraphrase i.e. for a correct source, if the whole of the correct claim is identified but recorded incorrectly .</p> <p><b>Cap at one mark in total</b> if only one of the claims is correct</p> <p><b>Credit 0 marks</b> for a correct source with the wrong claim. i.e. someone else’s claim or inconsistent part of claim.</p> <p><b>* There are no other possible answers.</b></p>

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	(a)		<p><b>Boris Johnson</b></p> <p><b>Claim:</b> <b>1 mark</b> For an accurate statement of the claim.</p> <p>“You can't go on expecting <i>Britain</i> to compete with European countries if we simply can't supply the <i>flights</i> to destinations that are growing in importance like China and Latin America,</p> <p>so the <i>government</i> is absolutely right to start looking at a more imaginative <i>solution</i>.</p> <p><i>We are being left badly behind.</i>”</p> <p><b>Accept any part of these claims</b> so long as they make sense as independent statements.</p>	1	<p><b>* Use ticks ✓ throughout Q9(a) and 9(b) to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate's answer.</b></p> <p><b>0 marks</b> For an inaccurate or incorrect statement of the claim.</p> <p><b>For 9(a) (ii) reference to the claim</b> Accept generic words, where relevant to the claim, to refer back to the specific parts of the claim.</p> <p>i.e. for ‘Britain’ any reference to the UK, London or the city,</p> <p>for ‘flights’ any reference to airports, TEA, runways.</p> <p>for ‘government’ any reference to government or MP (accept that the mayor of London is related to the government)</p> <p>for ‘solution’ any reference to project, scheme, plan, policy ideas</p> <p>for ‘we’ reference to the UK, London or the city or British/ Britain where relevant to the claim e.g. ‘that Britain is economically weak’</p>

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
		(ii)	<p><b>Assessment of each point:</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> For an accurate assessment using a <b>relevant credibility criterion</b> <i>'The Mayor of London may have a vested interest to point out the <b>negative effects</b> to support his own proposal.'</i></p> <p><b>plus 1 mark</b> if this assesses the <b>person in relation to part of the claim selected in 9 (a)</b> <i>'As the mayor of London, he might have a vested interest to preserve his public standing by making an accurate claim 'We are being left badly behind'</i></p> <p>only if the two marks above have been gained, then <b>plus 1 mark</b> if the assessment explicitly indicates whether this strengthens or weakens the claim e.g. <i>This would strengthen the credibility of this claim.</i></p> <p><b>Synonyms</b> of strengthen or weaken should be credited e.g. increases credibility. Accept positive/negative credibility, strong/weak, credible/not credible</p> <p>Other possible assessments might include: As London mayor he might have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>access to expertise to suggest a more imaginative solution is needed</li> <li>lack of expertise on what affects Britain in general as a mayor with expertise in London</li> <li>direct ability to see the effects of competition upon London business.</li> </ul>	9	<p><b>* Credibility criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Credit only assessments related to <b>RAVEN</b> criteria not corroboration (N. includes its opposite, bias.)</li> <li>Assessments that relate to the <b>same</b> credibility criterion can only be credited, if a different assessment is made in e.g. vested interest that weakens and a different assessment of VI that strengthens credibility.</li> <li>If candidates choose <b>both bias and vested interest</b>, they can only be credited if the same material is not used twice.</li> </ul> <p><b>* Reference to the claim</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>does not have to be in speech marks</li> <li>may be only one word</li> <li>may be a generic word not found in the claim (see previous page.) However this needs to relate to the specific claim, rather than just the role of the source as mayor.</li> </ul> <p><b>* Cap at 1 mark for</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>correct assessment of an <b>incorrect claim</b></li> <li>correct assessment of <b>missing claim</b></li> <li>(However credit according to the 3 marks available, if the candidate refers to the correct claim in a correct assessment.)</li> <li>Accurate point that <b>assesses the person rather than in relation to their claim</b>, <i>"As the mayor of London, he might have a vested interest to preserve his public standing by making an accurate claim."</i></li> <li>correct assessment where the claim itself is not assessed.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks for no creditworthy material e.g.</b> an irrelevant or inaccurate assessment or a definition of a credibility criterion with no context.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	(b)	<p><b>Overall judgement of the claim:</b></p> <p><b>Credit 1 mark - Judgement</b> For a clear and explicit judgement about the overall credibility of the claim.</p> <p>If there is no claim in 9a, this judgement mark cannot be awarded.</p> <p><b>Credit 1 mark – Identifying the most important CC</b> For identifying the most important credibility criterion with reference to <b>at least one other credibility criterion</b> used in 9(a). Candidates may identify more than one criterion as the most important.</p> <p><b>Credit 2 marks – Weighing up</b> For a developed explanation that makes comparisons between assessments, i.e. <b>why</b> one credibility criterion is stronger and another is weaker.</p> <p><b>Or 1 mark</b> for an attempted justification of one credibility criterion or the judgement, without weighing up /comparison.</p> <p>These marks should be credited in any combination in which they appear e.g. it is not necessary to have a judgement before the other marks can be credited. See guidance adjacent.</p> <p>If the reference and explanation are contrary to the judgement, do not credit the judgement mark.</p>	4	<p><b>Use ticks ✓ throughout Q9 (b) to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate's answer.</b></p> <p><b>Example of a 4 mark answer:</b> Overall the credibility of Boris Johnson's claim about being left badly behind is strong. (<i>judgement</i> ✓) Although he might have a vested interest to say this to support his own proposal which weakens the credibility of his claim, this might be outweighed (<i>weighing up</i> ✓✓) by his possible access to expertise to recognise the problem and the most important of the credibility criteria - his direct ability to see the negative effects of competition upon London business (<i>identifying the most important credibility criterion</i> ✓).</p> <p><b>Example of a 3 mark answer – no judgement:</b> Although he might have a vested interest to say this to support his own proposal which weakens the credibility of his claim, this might be outweighed (<i>weighing up</i> ✓✓) by his possible access to expertise to recognise the problem and the most important criterion - his direct ability to see the negative effects of competition upon London business (<i>identifying the most important credibility criterion</i> ✓).</p> <p><b>Example of a 2 mark answer – judgement plus attempted justification:</b> Overall the credibility of his claim about being left badly behind is strong. (<i>judgement</i> ✓) He has a possible access to expertise to recognise the problem and a direct ability to see the negative effects of competition upon London business (<i>attempted justification without weighing up</i> ✓).</p> <p><b>Example of a 1 mark answer – judgement only:</b> Overall the credibility of Boris Johnson's claim about being left badly behind is strong. (<i>judgement</i> ✓)</p>



Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance						
10		<p>In this question there are four areas and for each area the assessment could be strong, weak or not covered. See below:</p> <table><tr><td><b>Credibility for TEA (CF)</b></td><td><b>Credibility against TEA (CA)</b></td></tr><tr><td>Boris Johnson, Deputy L Mayor Norman Foster, MP NE Essex, UK CAA</td><td>RSPB GMB national officer,  E Green party co-ordinator, use of 2003 report</td></tr><tr><td><b>Plausibility positive economic effects (PF)</b></td><td><b>Plausibility negative economic effects (PA)</b></td></tr></table> <p><b>Reasoned case:</b> Answers might include <b>some</b> of the following comparisons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><b>The relative credibility of both sides</b> e.g. using vested interest The side that claims that the TEA would have positive effects if it went ahead <b>includes</b> the mayor and deputy mayor of London and the Foster team. They both have a possible vested interest to exaggerate the need for an <i>‘imaginative solution’</i> and the <i>‘benefits’</i> that this will bring in order to make it go ahead, <b>as</b> the TEA proposal was forged by both Boris Johnson and the Foster architects. This weakens the credibility of this side.</li></ul> <p>Those on the side that point out the possible negative effects <b>such as</b> the RSPB and the eastern region Green party co-ordinator would <b>also</b> have a possible vested interest, this time to exaggerate the negative consequences of the proposal in order to prevent the environmental effects <b>like</b> the destruction of <i>‘habitat’</i>. <b>However</b> on this side there is also the use of the 2003 report which might be considered to be neutral, <b>as</b> its authors may not have had anything to gain from prejudicing their research. <b>Therefore</b> the claims on the side of those <u>against the TEA proposal may be very slightly more credible</u> when using the criterion of vested interest.</p>	<b>Credibility for TEA (CF)</b>	<b>Credibility against TEA (CA)</b>	Boris Johnson, Deputy L Mayor Norman Foster, MP NE Essex, UK CAA	RSPB GMB national officer,  E Green party co-ordinator, use of 2003 report	<b>Plausibility positive economic effects (PF)</b>	<b>Plausibility negative economic effects (PA)</b>	16	<p><b>Use the following annotations in Q10:</b> Use the annotations F and A as in the table opposite</p> <p><b>Credibility Strong</b> <b>Use the annotation C+</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>More than one correct source is identified for the side</li><li><b>and</b> credibility is correctly assessed for <b>at least two</b> sources.</li></ul> <p><b>Credibility Weak</b> <b>Use the annotation C</b> <b>Only one</b> source’s credibility is correctly assessed with at least one criterion No credit is given if a source is merely named with a criterion i.e. not assessed. No credit is given if a document is assessed without assessing a named source.</p> <p><b>Plausibility Strong</b> <b>Use the annotation P+</b> Either there is <b>one</b> completely new thought or <b>one</b> point of the text is developed and discussed.</p> <p>This must relate to positive or negative ECONOMIC effects, giving explanation for either position.</p> <p><b>Plausibility Weak</b> <b>Use the annotation P</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A relevant part of the text is restated without development.</li><li>Several points from the text are listed without development.</li><li>Correct assessment of the plausibility of the environmental effects without reference to the ECONOMIC effects.</li></ul> <p>Apply the levels mark scheme on the next page:</p>
<b>Credibility for TEA (CF)</b>	<b>Credibility against TEA (CA)</b>									
Boris Johnson, Deputy L Mayor Norman Foster, MP NE Essex, UK CAA	RSPB GMB national officer,  E Green party co-ordinator, use of 2003 report									
<b>Plausibility positive economic effects (PF)</b>	<b>Plausibility negative economic effects (PA)</b>									

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>• <b>The relative plausibility (likelihood) of conflicting outcomes.</b></p> <p>If the TEA proposal goes ahead it is likely that there will be economic 'growth in the area' <b>as</b> the island will attract businesses to service the airport and the other 'facilities' that are planned around it. When people travel they use restaurants, shopping outlets and trains or road transport to reach the airport, all of which are likely to add to the economy of the area. <b>Additionally, if</b> there are connections in the UK to '<i>Latin America and China</i>', this will attract passengers who have previously had to travel into Europe to catch their flight to these places. This is bound to bring more money into the UK <b>because</b> of the convenience to UK passengers. This <b>therefore</b> makes it very likely that there will be a positive economic effect which will help both the local area and the UK economy as a whole.</p> <p>The likelihood of the claimed negative economic effect impacting on 'Heathrow' and '<i>the economy of London and the UK</i>' <b>however</b> may not be so certain, <b>as</b> many of the passengers will be poached from the competition in European hub airports and the business for London and the UK may only be re-distributed from the west to the east of London, <b>thus</b> having no net loss.</p> <p>This would <b>therefore</b> make the alternative of <u>positive economic effect more plausible</u> <b>because</b> there is likely to be increased economic activity and at worst only a redistribution of business.</p> <p>Taken as a whole, the plausibility of a positive economic effect would over-ride the possible motive to exaggerate this positive effect, as the sources may actually be being accurate in what they claim. <u>Therefore the likelihood of positive rather than negative overall effect is more likely.</u></p>		<p><b>Level 3</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>11-16 marks</b></span></p> <p><b>Strong, relative, sustained assessment</b></p> <p><b>4</b> areas are strong. <span style="float: right;"><b>13 marks</b></span>  <b>3</b> areas are strong <span style="float: right;"><b>11 marks</b></span>  Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• direct <b>points of comparison</b> with <b>effective</b> reference to the text in <b>at least 2</b> areas</li> <li>• clear and explicit <b>overall</b> judgement <b>relating to the economic effects</b>, drawn from an assessment of <b>both</b> credibility and plausibility.</li> <li>• <b>coherent reasoning</b> - with effective use of specialist terms and argument indicator words. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are sustained and accurate.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>6-10 marks</b></span></p> <p><b>Partial or weak assessment</b></p> <p>At least <b>3</b> areas covered and <b>2</b> are strong <span style="float: right;"><b>8 marks</b></span>  <b>2</b> areas covered and <b>2</b> are strong <span style="float: right;"><b>6 marks</b></span>  Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>explicit relevant overall</b> judgement <b>relating to the effects</b> and a reference to the text in <b>at least 2</b> areas</li> <li>• <b>correct</b> use of specialist terms and grammar spelling &amp; punctuation are sustained and adequate</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>1- 5 marks</b></span></p> <p><b>Basic assessment</b></p> <p><b>1</b> area covered is strong <span style="float: right;"><b>3 marks</b></span>  <b>At least 2</b> areas covered weakly <span style="float: right;"><b>1 mark</b></span>  <b>1 or no</b> areas covered weakly <span style="float: right;"><b>0 marks</b></span>  Plus credit 1 mark each for either of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explicit judgement <b>relating to the effects.</b></li> <li>• grammar, spelling and punctuation do not impede understanding and are sustained. (more than half a side)</li> </ul> <p><b>N.B.</b> Where areas are covered but not strongly, award marks for the two bullets only, where present.</p> <p><b>The judgement must follow from the reasoning to be credited in L1-3</b>  <b>0 marks</b> For no creditworthy material.</p>

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2014

