



GCE

Critical Thinking

Unit **F501**: Introduction to Critical Thinking

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2015

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 2015

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Use a ✓ to indicate the separate marks given in 1(a), 1(c), 1(d), 2, 3(a), 3(b), 6, 7 and 8
	Use the following annotations in Q9 to indicate:
C++	the credibility of the claim is assessed with explanation of what else you need to know
C+	the credibility of the claim is assessed e.g. 'We have already seen', 'a key contributor to neighbourhood relations'
C+J	The credibility of the claim is just about assessed (limited reference often to generic words e.g. 'the project')
C	the credibility of the source is assessed
 1	The strengthens/weakens mark
	Use the following annotations in Q10 to indicate:
C+	strong credibility
C	weak credibility
P+	strong plausibility
P	weak plausibility
F	the side 'for' e.g. CF, CF+, PF, PF+
A	the side 'against' e.g. CA, CA+, PA, PA+
J	a judgement
RJ	a relevant judgement
	on pages 10 and 11 that these continuation sheets have been looked at

Subject Specific Marking Instructions

Question 1**Credit full marks**

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.

Partial performance marks

for answers to all parts of question 1, you should refer to the guidance given as to how to credit partial performance marks.

0 marks

for a statement of an incorrect part of the text.

for gist where there is substantial omission or any paraphrase of the correct part of the text.

for no creditworthy material.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)		<p>Credit 2 marks for the following: Conclusion: (But)opening residential streets for play and community events can (also) bring many social benefits</p> <p>Credit 2 marks for the following: Reason: Either credit the whole as one reason (since) neighbours meet (and) get to know one another</p> <p>Or allow separately neighbours meet (one another)</p> <p>Or neighbours get to know one another</p> <p>Or play is a key aspect of child development</p>	2	<p>Use ticks ✓ to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate's answer.</p> <p>Credit 1 mark for the conclusion and/or reason for any addition e.g. <i>"like networking"</i> or <i>"The context of the proposal was reducing obesity"</i> or for any slight omission e.g. <i>"key"</i>, <i>"child"</i></p> <p>Credit 0 marks for significant omission for any paraphrase for the wrong part of the text</p>
			<p>Counter-assertion: (I should say that I accept that) this proposal would not work everywhere</p> <p>Accept <i>'the'</i> proposal in place of <i>'this'</i> proposal</p>	2	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(c)	<p>2 Examples + what they exemplify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> example - (including) USA or Australia or New Zealand <i>accept any or all of these</i> exemplifies - countries that have adopted similar practices example - mass public aerobic classes (caption) exemplifies – activities in Bogotá /Sundays/open streets/to inspire people/ related to stages set up for musicians and instructors example - networking exemplifies - a benefit from opening streets for play and community events <p>Allow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> example - Columbia/Bogotá exemplifies - where Sunday open streets have been successfully introduced 	2 x (1 +1)	<p>* Use ticks ✓ to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate's answer.</p> <p>Credit 1 mark each for up to two correct examples</p> <p>plus a further mark for a correct statement of what this exemplifies. Accept correct paraphrase or explanation of the text. i.e. This mark can only be credited if the example is correct.</p> <p>Credit 0 marks for incorrect parts of the text e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> exercising or training or socialising on foot or bikes or roller skates or wheel chairs
1	(d)	<p>3 different argument indicator words + argument elements for each:</p> <p>Credit 1 mark each, for any three of the following: (credit if they reverse the order eg conclusion - so)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> amongst other things - example so - conclusion (Not intermediate conclusion) because - reason 	3x1	<p>Use ticks ✓ to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate's answer.</p> <p>Credit 0 marks if either the argument element or the indicator word is omitted or is incorrect i.e. both need to be correctly stated for one mark.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>Credit 1 mark for each of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • correct judgement • correct explanation (linked to lack of reason) • relevant reference to the text that supports the explanation <p>Example of a 3 mark answer: This claim is not supported by a reason, as the information that follows about “<i>requiring police services</i>” (reference to text) is simply a claim/statement about a problem that would arise from implementing open streets.(correct explanation) Therefore it is not a conclusion/it is simply an assertion.(correct judgement)</p> <p>Example of a 2 mark answer: This claim is not supported by a reason, as the information that follows about “<i>requiring police services</i>” (reference to text) is simply a claim/statement about a problem that would arise from implementing open streets.(correct explanation).</p> <p>Example of a 1 mark answer This claim is not supported by a reason, as the information that follows is simply a claim/statement about a problem that would arise from implementing open streets.(correct explanation).</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p>	<p>* Use ticks ✓ throughout Q2 to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate’s answer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Lack of persuasion’ is not acceptable as an explanation of why this is not a conclusion – there is an element of persuasion there. • The reference to the text can only be credited for all or part of the sentence “<i>Closing these roads off would also require police services, which are already stretched.</i>” The reference to the text does not have to be in quotation marks and may only be a single word or a paraphrase to indicate the part of the text being discussed. • The reference to the text can only be credited if a correct explanation is given (if no explanation is given, the reference mark cannot be awarded). <p>0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for any answer that attempts to justify that it is a conclusion • for no credit-worthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>Bogotá – 2 ways not representative</p> <p>Credit 2 marks for correct/plausible assessments that explicitly contrast a characteristic in Bogotá with other cities and draw out the different IMPACT that this might make upon public participation.</p> <p>Examples of 2 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bogotá is able to close a continuous network of main roads in the heart of the city which may attract larger entertainment groups and more public than in other cities where they can only close isolated residential roads enabling smaller pockets of activities. • Bogotá has a 40 yr tradition of open streets, so the public has had more time to build up a large response, whereas as a new idea in other cities, the public response there may be initially much smaller. • Bogotá has a warm temperature which might tempt more public onto the streets to enjoy outdoor activities on Sundays, than in colder city streets elsewhere. • In Bogotá the difference between the summers and winters may be less than in cities elsewhere, so they have more of a chance of sustaining public interest in outdoor activities all year round than in other cities where response may drop off in the winter. • Bogotá may be more religious than other cities, so more people might be prepared to keep Sunday special by not working and joining in activities than in other cities, where more of the public may go to work or attend to their home on a Sunday. • The Bogotá population of 6 million may be much larger than in many other cities, so it may not be likely that 2 million people will take part in these. 	2+2	<p>* Use ticks ✓ throughout Q3 to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate's answer.</p> <p>1 mark For either a correct assessment that simply assesses the impact of a factor on one side, without comparison or a comparator e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bogotá is a warm country, so lots of people will want to take part. • This will be a new scheme elsewhere, so not many people here will know about it, which will lessen public support for it. <p>Or a correct assessment that simply identifies a factor using a comparator, without an explanation of the impact that this might make e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is hotter in Bogotá • London has a more diverse transport system. <p>0 marks For no credit-worthy material.</p> <p>NB Candidates may be more speculative in their answers e.g. if they are more religious, if they have better weather....credit these answers where they are plausible</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)	<p>Streetplaylondon- assumption: 3 marks For an accurate statement of an assumption which focus on the creators or designers of the play opportunities e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost is an important factor when <i>creating</i> play opportunities. • Cost is an important factor when <i>developing</i> play opportunities. • Cost is an important factor when <i>considering</i> play opportunities. • Low cost/cheap things can produce adequate quality. <p>Where two or more assumptions are given mark the first.</p>	3	<p>2 marks For an inaccurate statement of the correct assumption e.g.</p> <p>Assumptions which focus on the low cost of use of the facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost is an important consideration for <i>participation</i> in play opportunities. • People would prefer low cost opportunities • People think low cost opportunities are better for their children • People in London prefer low cost opportunities <p>or a generalisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low cost/cheap things can produce high/good quality. • Low cost things are desirable • It is a good thing if things are low cost. <p>1 mark For the essence of an assumption expressed as a challenge e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost shouldn't be of prime importance when creating play opportunities. <p>0 marks For a restatement of the claim e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being cheap means that the play opportunities are desirable. • Low cost play opportunities are desirable. <p>For the statement of an incorrect assumption e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low cost things are good for society. • People in London do not want to pay for their children to play.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b) (i)	<p>Deputy Prime Minister - assumption: 3 marks For an accurate statement of an assumption e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Playing near your home as a child is a good thing/has benefits. • Children need to play near their homes. • It is a bad thing that children have stopped playing near their home. • It was a good thing that adults played near their home. • The adults accurately remembered where they played as a child. • What adults meant by 'near' is the same as what children mean by 'near'. <p>Where two or more assumptions are given mark the first.</p>	3	<p>2 marks For an inaccurate statement of the correct assumption e.g. a generalisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Playing outside is good for children. • People should play near their home. <p>1 mark For the essence of an assumption expressed as a challenge e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not a good thing for children to play outside. <p>Or For an assumption about the quality of the survey e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The same range of children were asked as adults. • The children and adults lived in similar locations. • An appropriate sample size was used. <p>0 marks For a restatement of the claim e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fewer children play near their home nowadays. <p>For the statement of an incorrect assumption e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All change is good. • Things need to change. • Children enjoy being outside. • Children want to play outside. • Playing in the street is a good thing. • Playing in the garden is a good thing.


Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
	(b)	(ii)	<p>One plausible explanation:</p> <p>Credit 2 marks for an explanation related to the change e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children have more opportunity for play inside the home now. The change is exaggerated because older people didn't remember correctly how much they actually played out then. 		<p>1 mark For an answer unrelated to change e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children don't like the cold. Children like to play on their X boxes. <p>0 marks For no creditworthy material.</p>
5			<p>One reason</p> <p>Credit 3 marks for a reason that compares or uses a comparator to indicate the benefits of one area over the other.</p> <p>Examples of 3 mark answers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> There is more opportunity for children to learn the skills of unstructured play in the streets than in the school playground. Children can be more creative in street play without a teacher supervising them. Children can have more extended play in the streets without the restraints of a school playground timetable. Children are freer to express themselves when playing the streets. 	3	<p>2 marks For a reason that does not compare or use a comparator e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children are free to express themselves when playing the streets <p>1 mark For an answer that goes beyond a reason e.g. an argument:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is more opportunity for children to learn the skills of unstructured play in the streets than in the school playground, because there is likely to be no one supervising them. <p>or includes extra argument elements e.g. an example</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is more opportunity for children to learn the skills of unstructured play in the streets than in the school playground, such as riding around together on scooters and bikes. Or which gives additional unrelated factors as if they are one: It will give children a larger and more exciting space to play. <p>0 marks For no credit-worthy material.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	<p>Weakness - links between reasoning and conclusion</p> <p>1 mark for reference to the correct conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That shows the benefits of having “open streets” on Sundays. <p>Plus 1 mark for reference to any part of the reasoning e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While parents sat around drinking to the honour of the happy occasion, the children ran around and were extremely active. <p>Plus either 2 marks for a correct point of assessment that focuses directly upon the link between the reasoning and the conclusion.</p> <p>or 1 mark for a correct point which assesses the reasoning, without any reference to the link between it and the conclusion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reasoning assumes that the children were coming to no harm whilst the street party was going on. The adults may have been concentrating on toasting the royal occasion rather than looking after the children. <i>(this answer does not explicitly link to the benefits of ‘open streets’ so only one mark)</i> <p>Example of a 4 mark answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conclusion about the importance of having “open streets” (✓) is only weakly supported by the reasoning of the positive of children running around and being “extremely active” (✓), because the royal street parties were to celebrate a single occasion and so not direct relevant support for the regular Sunday closing of roads of the “open street” proposal. (✓✓). 	4	<p>* Use ticks ✓ throughout Q6 to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate’s answer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Reference to conclusion and reasoning can be credited even if a candidate discusses strengths. The reference to the text maybe brief. A full quote is not necessary. The reference to the text need not be indicated by speech marks. <p>NB If there is no text reference to the conclusion or the reason but a weak assessment, credit 1 mark</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	<p>Document - Keep Sunday Special</p> <p>Award 2 marks for a correct developed justification e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep Sunday Special might have a vested interest to report the impact of the 1984 act accurately to protect their integrity, as if they misrepresented the information, the public might lose confidence in their campaign. (<i>developed justification ✓✓</i>) <p>Plus 1 mark where a correct developed assessment is supported by a relevant reference to the text e.g. Keep Sunday Special might have a vested interest to report the impact of the 1984 act accurately to protect their integrity as “an alliance of faith groups” (<i>relevant reference ✓</i>), as if they misrepresented the information the public might lose confidence in their campaign. (<i>developed justification ✓✓</i>)</p> <p>or cap at 1 mark for a correct limited justification (i.e. even with a relevant reference) e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep Sunday Special might have a vested interest to report the impact of the 1984 act accurately to protect their integrity. (<i>limited justification ✓</i>) as “an alliance of faith groups”. <p>Continued next page:</p> <p>Continued</p>	6 (2x3)	<p>* Use ticks ✓ throughout Q7 to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate’s answer.</p> <p>* A correct assessment of a source within the document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capped at 1 mark eg the credibility of the Director. 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 the Director because ...” <p>* Credibility criteria</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Credit only assessments related to RAVEN criteria not corroboration (N. includes its opposite, bias.) Assessments that relate to the same 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. If candidates choose both bias and vested interest, they can only be credited if the same material is not used twice. Accept experience as a version of expertise. <p>* Reference to the text</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This needs to be relevant to the assessment made and it needs to justify why credibility is str/weakened by e.g. expertise rather than being an example of it.. This need not be in quotation marks. It need not be a sentence - a relevant phrase or term may be adequate to support an assessment. The name of the publication Keep Sunday Special can be used where relevant to refer to their campaign

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
7			<p>Other answers may be based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • VI to exaggerate to promote their campaign. • Lack of expertise to make informed comments on traffic issues. • Ability to perceive/ experience of the effects of quieter Sundays upon communities. • Bias towards things that enable sharing a Sunday off. • Shopkeepers' vested interest to attract customers to their shops on Sunday. • Shopkeepers' vested interest to close their shops and get a day off on Sunday. 		

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
8			<p>Consistent claim:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Source: Safe Speed (1) <p>Claim: “Closing these roads off would require police services, (which are already stretched).” (1)</p>	1+1	<p>* Use ticks ✓ throughout Q8 to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate’s answer.</p> <p>Credit 1 mark for a correct source, if the correct claim is identified but recorded incorrectly eg through inaccurate paraphrase.</p> <p>Credit 0 marks for a correct source, if the wrong part of the text is stated</p> <p>* There are no other possible answers.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	<p>Examples of possible answers:</p> <p>C++ The credibility of the scheme contributing ‘to neighbourhood relations’ (<i>assessing claim</i>) is reduced by a possible vested interest to exaggerate the effects of the scheme in order to impress the lottery funders (<i>credibility criterion applied</i>), if the continued lottery funding is dependent upon the scheme demonstrating that it is succeeding as it goes along (<i>what else you would need to know</i>).</p> <p>C+ The credibility of the scheme contributing ‘to neighbourhood relations’ (<i>assessing claim</i>) is reduced by a possible vested interest to exaggerate the effects of the scheme in order to impress the lottery funders (<i>credibility criterion applied</i>).</p> <p>C The credibility of streetplaylondon (<i>assessing source</i>) is reduced by their possible vested interest make exaggerated claims in order to make themselves look good (<i>credibility criterion applied</i>).</p> <p>Examples of possible areas for assessment:</p> <p>Ability to see/experience – (strengthens) As organisers of play street events they may have the direct ability to observe street play events and so are likely to know what effects closing roads for play can have upon neighbourhood relations.</p>	12	<p>* Use the following annotation in Q9:</p> <p>C++ The credibility of the claim is assessed with an explanation of what else you need to know.</p> <p>C+ The credibility of the claim is assessed. Ref to claim must include relevant words: children playing locally/going in and out of each other’s homes/key contributor/neighbourhood relations</p> <p>C+J The credibility of the claim is just about assessed using limited reference often using generic words e.g. ‘project’. (NB sole use of ‘the claim’ is not sufficient.)</p> <p>C The credibility of the source is assessed.  1 For the strengthens/weakens mark.</p> <p>Level 3 9-12 marks Clear assessment of claim with an explanation of what else you need to know</p> <p>3 C++ 11 marks 2 C++ 10 marks 1 C++ 9 marks plus one mark strengthens/weakens claim</p> <p>Level 2 5-8 marks Assessment of claim</p> <p>3 C+ or 3 C+J 7 marks 2 C+ or 2 C+J 6 marks 1 C+ or 1 C+J 5 marks plus one mark strengthens/weakens claim N.B. Cap any C+J assessment at Level 2 i.e. an assessment with a limited ref to the claim cannot go on to gain access to the ‘what else you need to know’ marks.</p> <p>Level 1 1- 4 marks Correct assessment of source</p> <p>3C 3 marks 2C 2 marks</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Need to know: How many of the 100 play events they have achieved so far, to be able to judge the degree of what they have been able to witness/experience in this area. continued</p> <p>Vested interest/Reputation – (strengthens) They may have a vested interest to make accurate claims about what effects closing roads for play can have upon neighbourhood relations, as they will need to maintain the public's confidence in what they are doing to be able to persuade them to change their attitudes to how their streets are used. Need to know: How they are perceived by the public to judge to what, if anything, they would be risking by exaggerating the effects upon neighbourhood relations.</p> <p>Expertise – (weakens) As a charity organisation funded by the lottery, they may rely upon many volunteers who have little expertise or time to be able to judge how neighbourhood relations have changed as a result of street play events. Need to know: The qualifications of those making these claims and whether they were familiar with the state of neighbourhood relations before the play street events, to be able to judge any change.</p>		<p>1C plus one mark strengthen/weakens source For no creditworthy material.</p> <p>1 mark 0 marks</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9 (b)	<p>Overall judgement of the claim:</p> <p>Credit 1 mark - Judgement For a clear and explicit judgement about the overall credibility of the claim. NB If there is no claim in 9a, this judgement mark cannot be awarded.</p> <p>Credit 1 mark – Identifying the most important CC For identifying the most important credibility criterion with reference to at least one other credibility criterion used in 9(a). NB Candidates may identify more than one criterion as the most important.</p> <p>Credit 2 marks – Weighing up For a developed explanation that makes comparisons between assessments, i.e. why one credibility criterion is stronger and another is weaker.</p> <p>Or 1 mark 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>Use ticks ✓ throughout Q9 (b) to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate's answer.</p> <p>Example of a 4 mark answer: Overall the credibility of the claim is strong. (<i>judgement ✓</i>) Although streetplaylondon might have a vested interest to exaggerate this to maintain the funding which weakens the credibility of their claim, this might be outweighed (<i>weighing up ✓✓</i>) by a more important consideration i.e. their vested interest to make an accurate claim. The scheme is all about changing people's attitudes, so they have to retain public confidence in what they say. (<i>identifying the most important credibility criterion ✓</i>)</p> <p>Example of a 3 mark answer – no judgement: Although streetplaylondon might have a vested interest to exaggerate this to maintain the funding which weakens the credibility of their claim, this might be outweighed (<i>weighing up ✓✓</i>) by a more important consideration i.e. their vested interest to make an accurate claim. The scheme is all about changing people's attitudes, so they have to retain public confidence in what they say. (<i>identifying the most important credibility criterion ✓</i>)</p> <p>Example of a 2 mark answer – judgement plus attempted justification: Overall the credibility of the claim is strong. (<i>judgement ✓</i>) They have a vested interest to make an accurate claim. The scheme is all about changing people's attitudes, so they have to retain public confidence in what they say. (<i>attempted justification without weighing up ✓</i>)</p> <p>Example of a 1 mark answer – judgement only: Overall the credibility of the claim is strong. (<i>judgement ✓</i>)</p>

Question			Levels Marking	Marks	Guidance				
10			<p>Apply the following levels mark scheme:</p> <p>Level 3 Strong, relative, sustained assessment 11-16 marks 4 areas + 13 marks 3 areas + 11 marks</p> <p>Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• direct points of comparison with effective reference to the text in at least 2 areas• clear and explicit overall judgement (RJ) relating to the beneficial impact, drawn from an assessment of both credibility and plausibility.• coherent reasoning - with effective use of specialist terms and argument indicator words. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are accurate.	16	<p>In this question there are four areas that need to be assessed using the annotations below:</p> <table><tr><th>Credibility for (CF)</th><th>Credibility against (CA)</th></tr><tr><td>-The author of document 1 -UK public health minister -Deputy PM (indirectly) -Director KSS -Keep Sunday Special (any of Trade Unions/faith groups/shopkeepers) -Conservative MP -Streetplaylondon -Department of Health</td><td>AA Head of Road safety Surrey shopkeeper Safe Speed</td></tr></table>	Credibility for (CF)	Credibility against (CA)	-The author of document 1 -UK public health minister -Deputy PM (indirectly) -Director KSS -Keep Sunday Special (any of Trade Unions/faith groups/shopkeepers) -Conservative MP -Streetplaylondon -Department of Health	AA Head of Road safety Surrey shopkeeper Safe Speed
			Credibility for (CF)		Credibility against (CA)				
-The author of document 1 -UK public health minister -Deputy PM (indirectly) -Director KSS -Keep Sunday Special (any of Trade Unions/faith groups/shopkeepers) -Conservative MP -Streetplaylondon -Department of Health	AA Head of Road safety Surrey shopkeeper Safe Speed								
<p>Level 2 Partial or weak assessment 6-10 marks 2 areas + and 2 weak 8 marks 2 areas + 6 marks</p> <p>Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• explicit relevant overall judgement (RJ) relating to the beneficial impact and a reference to the text in at least 2 areas	<table><tr><th>Plausibility(PF) Positive impact e.g</th><th>Plausibility (PA) Negative impact e.g</th></tr><tr><td>healthy exercise, safe play, better neighbour relations</td><td>possible road accidents increased noise/inconvenience/ disputes</td></tr></table> <p>Use the following annotations:</p> <p>CF+, CA+ (strong) Credibility is correctly assessed for at least 2 sources on one side.</p> <p>CF,CA (weak) Only one source's credibility is correctly assessed on one side.</p> <p>PF+, PA+ (strong) Either there is one completely new thought, or one point of the text is developed and discussed, not merely rephrased.</p>	Plausibility(PF) Positive impact e.g	Plausibility (PA) Negative impact e.g	healthy exercise, safe play, better neighbour relations	possible road accidents increased noise/inconvenience/ disputes				
Plausibility(PF) Positive impact e.g	Plausibility (PA) Negative impact e.g								
healthy exercise, safe play, better neighbour relations	possible road accidents increased noise/inconvenience/ disputes								

Question	Levels Marking	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> correct use of specialist terms and grammar spelling & punctuation are adequate. <p>Level1 Basic assessment 1- 5 marks</p> <p>1 area + 3 marks</p> <p>At least 2 weak 1 mark</p> <p>1 or no areas weak 0 marks</p> <p>Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> explicit judgement. (J) Grammar, spelling and punctuation do not impede understanding. <p>N.B. Where no areas weak, award marks for the two bullets only, if present. 0 marks for no creditworthy material.</p> <p>Reasoned case:</p> <p>Answers might include some of the following comparisons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relative credibility of both sides eg using vested interest The side supporting Sunday 'open streets' includes the UK public health minister, the conservative MP, the Director of Keep Sunday Special and Streetplaylondon. Each have a possible vested interest to make exaggerated claims in favour of the proposal such as streetplaylondon's claim that they are a '<i>low cost</i>' and a '<i>valuable play opportunity</i>' as each has something to gain if the proposal goes ahead. The Sunday 'open street' proposal was put forward by the UK public health minister 		<p>or the ideas in the text are synthesized to make a reasoned case. (This should include a coherent comment on, or an assessment of, the ideas in the text, rather than being just a list of stated text or a paraphrase of it.</p> <p>PF, PA (weak) A relevant part of the text is restated specifically in relation to plausibility, but without development. (This should refer to positive or negative impact.)</p> <p>Judgement J for a judgement RJ for a judgement relevant to beneficial impact.</p>

Question	Levels Marking	Marks	Guidance
	<p>so she and the conservative MP in support of this will want to present this in the best light to make it sound attractive. The Director might want to support the proposal to boost their own campaign of making Sunday a special experience and streetplaylondon might want to exaggerate the positives to gain public support for their own lottery funded play street activities. Possible vested interest to exaggerate the benefits therefore weakens the credibility of this side.</p> <p>Those opposing Sunday 'open streets', such as the AA Head of Road Safety and Safe Speed also have a possible vested interest this time to discredit the proposal to maintain road safety by exaggerating the negative impact of the proposal such as needing the support of 'police services' to close off streets. However the opposition of the Surrey shopkeeper may be from a neutral stance. He may not have a vested interest to exaggerate the negative consequences if his own business would not be affected by road closures Therefore the claims on the side of those <u>against the Sunday 'open street' proposal may be very slightly more credible</u> when using the criterion of vested interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The relative plausibility (likelihood) of conflicting outcomes. <p>If the Sunday 'open streets' proposal goes ahead it is likely that <i>'neighbours of all ages get to know each other better'</i> will be a reality, as local activities will help those without transport or who have difficulties with mobility to join in, as these events will be on their doorstep. This should in turn encourage social networks to develop mutual support in the community. Additionally, if the streets can be made secure, children are likely to be attracted by others playing outside and want to join in,</p>		

Question	Levels Marking	Marks	Guidance
	<p>thus extending their opportunities to run around and keep fit. This therefore makes it very likely that Sunday 'open streets' will have a positive impact upon community spirit and the general wellbeing of children.</p> <p>Although there is a possibility of a negative consequences such as neighbours falling out over noise or damage caused by children, or feeling restricted by having to drive through the street very slowly at <i>the 'non bleed speed'</i>, this is likely to be outweighed by the advantages. Most homes have experience of children, so are likely to understand the need for outdoor play and if they value an improved social network, they may be more likely to tolerate any minor inconveniences. This would therefore make the alternative of a <u>positive impact more plausible</u>.</p> <p>Taken as a whole, the plausibility of a positive impact would appear to over-ride the possible vested interest to exaggerate the benefits. <u>Therefore the likelihood of a positive rather than a negative overall impact is more likely</u>.</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

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 2015

