



GCE

Critical Thinking

Unit **F501**: Introduction to Critical Thinking

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2016

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 2016

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
✓	Use a ✓ to indicate the separate marks given in all questions apart from Q9(a) and Q10
Use the following annotations in Q9(a) to indicate:	
C++	The credibility of the claim is assessed with reference to cost /cheaper or what venues choose + explanation of what else you need to know
C+	The credibility of the claim is assessed with reference to cost /cheaper or what venues choose
C+J	The credibility of the claim is just about assessed (limited reference) with reference to competition, live screenings, sales, profits etc.
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
SEEN	To indicate that answers without annotation have been looked at
BP	To indicate that any blank pages have been looked at

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>Two Conclusions: Credit 2 marks for each of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> they simply did not capture the full experience of watching the plays in person (allow expansion of <i>they</i> e.g. television director and vision mixer/TV broadcasts). it will be a long time before cinema can capture anything more than a pale reflection of theatre performance. 	2 x 2	<p>1 mark for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> slight addition slight omission e.g. <i>simply, full, in person, pale</i>. <p>0 marks for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> significant omission e.g. <i>of watching the plays in person</i> significant addition e.g. <i>although its potentially exciting</i> any paraphrase the wrong part of the text e.g. <i>My fears are that...</i>
1	(b)	<p>Hypothetical reasoning: Credit 2 marks for:</p> <p>audiences will only have a second-hand live performance, if they haven't been there in London.</p>	2	<p>1 mark for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> slight addition slight omission e.g. <i>only, live, in London</i>. <p>Allow one mark for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>either half of the reasoning</i> <p>0 marks for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> significant addition e.g. <i>they'll....centres of excellence</i> any paraphrase the wrong part of the text e.g. <i>if equally intense time in the cinema</i>. <p>N.B. Accept answers which reverse the two clauses.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(c)	<p>Two counter assertions Credit 2 marks for each of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (and) these may be groundless (allow expansion of <i>these</i> e.g. my fears) • (although) it's potentially exciting. <p>allow expansion of 'it' eg 'screening films live'</p>	2 x 2	<p>1 mark for: slight omission e.g. <i>potentially</i>.</p> <p>0 marks for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • addition of an extra argument element <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - e.g. <i>are that eventually local theatres</i> - e.g. <i>it will be a long time</i> • any paraphrase • the wrong part of the text.
1	(d)	<p>Exemplifies</p> <p>Credit 1 mark for each correct exemplification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (catch) every nuance of the performance • bringing us right in there • close-ups and film will enhance that experience • pale reflection of theatre performance. • not in a million years the same as being in the theatre 	1 + 1	<p>N.B. Accept paraphrases of the text here.(do not penalise for elaboration)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • see every detail • appreciate the subtlety of... • having the best view through film close-ups • not nearly the same • not even close to it • theatre experience is better/ film experience is worse <p>0 marks for: incorrect exemplification e.g. NTL broadcasts.</p>
1	(e)	<p>Four different argument indicator words + argument elements for each</p> <p>Credit 1 mark each, for any four of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • one/one such /such - example • if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - hypothetical conclusion or hypothetical reasoning (accept hypothetical reason) hypothetical claim hypothetical assertion 	4 x 1	<p>Credit if the order is reversed e.g. conclusion - so</p> <p>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
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • since - reason • but - counter-assertion/counter claim 		
2	(a)	<p>Credit 1 mark for each of the following:</p> <p>Argument element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • counter • reason* 	1 + 1	<p>*accept counter-argument reason</p> <p>0 marks for: no creditworthy material. do not accept 'reasoning'</p>
2	(b)	<p>Credit 1 mark for each of the following:</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it supports a conclusion * • which goes against the main argument. 	1 + 1	<p>Accept single sentences including both elements e.g. 'it is a reason that supports the counter-conclusion'</p> <p>0 marks for: no creditworthy material.</p> <p>An explanation that is clearly not about a reason should not be credited.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	(a)	<p>Alternative Explanation</p> <p>Credit 2 marks for stating that there are plausible alternative explanations for the 6.4% <i>increase</i>.</p> <p>NB. Answers must refer to <u>change</u> in order to get 2 marks.</p> <p>Examples of 2 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • perhaps <i>more</i> well-known headline actors attracted more people that year • <i>better</i> productions may have increased attendance • <i>improved</i> publicity may have attracted more people • <i>reduced</i> seat prices may have increased audiences. • people <i>now</i> have <i>more</i> money to spend on tickets. • <i>new plays</i> may have attracted other people • <i>at the end of</i> the recession people could afford tickets 	2	<p>Credit 1 mark for:</p> <p>a relevant statement without reference to <i>change</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • well-known actors were used • good productions were put on • publicity was good • seat prices were cheap <p>comparative/change factor with unstated relevance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • people have more money • people have more time <p>0 marks for: no creditworthy material.</p>

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	(b)	(i)	<p>Representative</p> <p>Credit 2 marks for answers that identify an attractive characteristic of live gigs that is applied to live entertainment in general.</p> <p>Examples of 2 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • live gigs are more spontaneous and unpredictable, things that attract people to other live entertainment. • both theatre musicals and live gigs involve live music so people go to both for the same reason because they want to listen to live music • people go to live gigs to follow a particular band just as people go to the theatre/cinema because they follow a particular actor. 	2	<p>1 mark for:</p> <p>a statement about going to live gigs or going to other forms of entertainment without a comparison i.e. either only addresses the live gigs or other forms of entertainment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • people go to live gigs because they want to listen to music • people go to the theatre to see a particular actor. <p>0 marks for:</p> <p>no creditworthy material.</p>
3	(b)	(ii)	<p>Not representative</p> <p>Credit 2 marks for answers that identify a characteristic that attracts people to live gigs in contrast to reasons for attending other forms of live entertainment. (Both must be justified)</p> <p>Examples of 2 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People often go to live gigs because they want to participate in the performance, whereas in other forms of live entertainment, to make a noise disturbs the performance. • People often go to live gigs because they feel a bond with the band members, whereas in other forms of live entertainment, within the theatre you more often feel a bond with the story of the characters. • People often go to live gigs for social reasons to be part of the festival, whereas going to the theatre is a more individual experience, with less focus on the interaction with the rest of the audience. 	2	<p>1 mark for:</p> <p>a statement about going to live gigs or going to other forms of entertainment without a comparison i.e. only addresses the live gigs or other forms of entertainment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • people go to live gigs because they want to join in • people go to the theatre only to watch a performance. <p>0 marks for:</p> <p>no creditworthy material.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
4		<p>Assumption</p> <p>Credit 2 marks for an accurate statement of an assumption e.g.</p> <p><i>Whole claim:</i></p> <p>(Cinema goers at NTL screenings are a captive audience for live theatres in London so regional venues will be able to convert these into greater ticket sales.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audiences that attend cinema screenings <i>in London</i> are interested in attending live theatre <i>elsewhere</i>. • Audiences that attend cinema screenings <i>elsewhere</i> are interested in attending live theatre at all. • Audiences who attend NTL screenings in the regions will behave in the same way as those who attend NTL screenings in London. • Regional venues offer similar attraction and quality of play as those in London. <p><i>First part of claim:</i></p> <p>(Cinema goers at NTL screenings are a captive audience for live theatres in London)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cinema goers at NTL screenings also attend live theatres in London. • Captive audiences in London will buy theatre tickets. <p><i>Second part of claim:</i></p> <p>(regional venues will be able to convert these into greater ticket sales)</p>	2	<p>1 mark for:</p> <p>an inaccurate statement of the assumption e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People who go to the cinema also go to the theatre. • People in the regions will be as interested in theatre as people in London (NB This generalises the audiences who attend NTL screenings in the regions and in London.). • Cinema-goers don't go to theatres already. • A captive audience can be successfully persuaded to buy tickets. • Viewers at screenings will want to go to the theatre performance as well. <p>0 marks for:</p> <p>the statement of an incorrect assumption e.g. 'people should go to the theatre', or a rephrasing of the statement.</p> <p>Do not allow: 'Regional venues want greater ticket sales.'</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cinema-goers don't go to regional theatres already. • People in the regions will attend NTL screenings. 		
5		<p>One reason</p> <p>Credit 3 marks for: a reason that relates specifically to regional productions/ live screenings.</p> <p>Examples of 3 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this would enable an exchange of regional culture across the UK • it would bring extra revenue to the less prosperous regions. <p>Do not penalise answers that repeat the question followed by 'because'</p>	3	<p>2 marks for: a more general reason that does not refer to the regions e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it would bring in extra revenue. <p>1 mark for: an answer that goes beyond a reason (eg an argument):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this would enable an exchange of regional culture across the UK, because art forms often reflect local culture. <p>or includes extra argument elements (eg an example).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it would bring extra revenue to the less prosperous regions, like the North of England. <p>0 marks for: no credit worthy material.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
6		<p>Weakness - links between reasoning and conclusion</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>1 mark for reference to the correct conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> theatre performance can now be distributed worldwide with astonishing accuracy. <p>Plus either 3 marks for an assessment of the link.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>2 marks for an assessment of the reasoning.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>1 mark for a challenge.</p>	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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>3 marks for: a correct point of assessment that focuses directly upon the link between the reasoning and the conclusion e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reasoning is about <i>Ghosts</i> but the conclusion refers to all theatre performances. (generalisation/representativeness). The reasoning refers to best view whereas the conclusion is about accuracy and these are not necessarily the same. (Conflation/assumption). The reasoning focuses upon “close ups” which would not be available to theatre audiences, so this does not support his conclusion about theatre performance being distributed with “astonishing accuracy”. <p>2 marks for: assessment of the reasoning rather than the link e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author assumes that the “best view” is about “close-ups”. The author assumes that “to catch every nuance of the performance”, “will enhance” the “experience”. <p>1 mark for: a challenge to the argument e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The theatre performance cannot be “distributed worldwide” because some areas do not have cinemas. Even in close up, <i>Ghosts</i> was not a good experience.

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
7		<p>Document - Nesta Award up to 3 marks for each correct answer:</p> <p>2 marks for: a correct developed justification e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nesta might have a vested interest to report the impact of NTL screenings accurately to protect their integrity, as if they misrepresented the information, their funders might lose confidence in their work. (<i>developed justification ✓✓</i>). <p>Plus 1 mark where a correct developed assessment is supported by a relevant reference to the text e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They are “funded by the National Lottery” (<i>relevant reference✓</i>). <p>Or cap at 1 mark in total for a correct limited justification (i.e. even with a relevant reference) e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nesta might have a vested interest to report the impact of NTL screenings accurately to protect their integrity, (<i>limited justification ✓</i>) They are “funded by the National Lottery” <p>Other answers may be based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Experience/Expertise in research. Neutrality – as an “independent charity” to support rather than to influence. Ability to perceive – their own findings “Nesta research” to draw conclusions. 	2 x 3	<p>A correct assessment of a source within the document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cap at 1 mark e.g. the credibility of Bakhshi. 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 Bakhshi 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 <i>relevant</i> to the assessment made and it needs to justify why credibility is strengthened/ weakened by e.g. expertise rather than being an example of expertise. 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 <i>Nesta</i> cannot be used as relevant reference to text to support an assessment.

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
8		<p>Consistent claim</p> <p>Credit 1 mark for each of the following:</p> <p>Claim: (my fears, and these may be groundless, are that) eventually local theatres will stop doing plays; (they'll all be streamed from these centres of excellence)</p> <p>Source: Sir Alan Ayckbourn.</p>	1 + 1	<p>Credit 1 mark for: a correct source, if the correct claim is identified but recorded incorrectly eg through inaccurate paraphrase or incorrect addition.</p> <p>Credit 0 marks for: a correct source, if the wrong part of the text is stated.</p> <p>NB. There are no other possible answers.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	(a)	<p>Assessing credibility of claim.</p> <p>C++ The credibility of the claim determined by cost/cheaper and/or what venues choose assessed with an explanation of what else you need to know</p> <p>C+ The credibility of the claim determined by cost /cheaper and/or what venues choose is assessed.</p> <p>C+J The credibility of part of the claim is assessed without reference to cost/cheaper or what venues choose, but with reference to venues, competition or live screenings.</p> <p>C The credibility of the source is assessed.</p> <p>Examples of possible answers:</p> <p>C++ The credibility of her claim that “venues will always choose screenings” on the basis of cost (<i>assessing claim</i>) is strengthened by her experience as a director of a touring/theatre company to know the difficulties of financing live performances. I would need to know that as director she knew about the company’s finances. (<i>What else you would need to know</i>).</p> <p>C+ The credibility of her claim that “venues will always choose screenings” on the basis of cost (<i>assessing claim</i>) is strengthened by her experience as a director of a touring/theatre company to know the difficulties of financing live performances.</p> <p>C+J The credibility of her claim about ‘live screenings’/venues/’competition’(<i>assessing part of the claim</i>) is strengthened by her experience as a director of a touring/theatre company to know about the threat from live screenings.</p> <p>C The credibility of the artistic director (<i>assessing source</i>) is strengthened by her experience producing plays because she runs a small touring theatre company.</p> <p>NB Candidates may specify venues as ‘rural areas’ ‘village halls’ ‘fields’ ‘colleges’ ‘pubs’. Accept these.</p>	13	<p>Use the following annotation in Q9:</p> <p>C++, C+, C+J, C see left hand side</p> <p>Level 4 10-13 marks Clear assessment of the claim with reference to cost/cheaper and/or what venues choose, with an explanation of what else you need to know. 3 C++ 12 marks 2 C++ 11 marks 1 C++ 10 marks plus one mark for strengthen/weaken in 1 assessment</p> <p>Level 3 7-10 marks Clear assessment of the claim with reference to cost/cheaper and/or what venues choose. 3 C+ 9 marks 2 C+ 8 marks 1 C+ 7 marks plus one mark for strengthen/weaken in 1 assessment</p> <p>Level 2 * 4-7 marks Assessment of part of the claim without direct reference to cost/ cheaper or what venues choose.(e.g. venues, competition, live screenings, sales) 3 C+J 6 marks 2 C+J 5 marks 1 C+J 4 marks plus one mark for strengthen/weaken in 1 assessment</p> <p>* Cap at Level 2 i.e. an assessment of part of the claim cannot access the marks for ‘what else you need to know’</p> <p>Level 1 1- 3 marks Assessment of the source 3 C 3 marks 2 C 2 marks 1 C 1 mark</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p>Other answers may be based on:</p> <p>Ability to see/know what happens first hand – as a director she has the ability to see what decisions are made when there is a pricing issue - if there have been a number of these to demonstrate a trend (strengthens).</p> <p>Vested interest/reputation – as a director she has a vested interest to report clashes concerning costs accurately to retain public confidence and professionalism – if her company depends on reputation and public opinion to attract audiences (strengthens).</p> <p>Vested interest – as a director she has a vested interest to ensure her company gets bookings so they have work, so she may have exaggerated the way the costing's at the various venues to gain publicity so that communities will still book her – if they don't have other sources of income (weakens).</p> <p>Bias – as a director of a touring company she is biased in favour of venues running live theatre which is more expensive than live screenings and so would claim that venues shouldn't focus just on cost – if she believes in live theatre (weakens).</p>		<p>For no creditworthy material</p> <p>0 marks</p>

Question		Levels Marking	Marks	Guidance
9	(b)	<p>Weighing up the credibility criteria</p> <p>Identifying the most important CC 1 mark for: identifying the most important credibility criterion with reference to <i>at least one other credibility criterion</i> used in 9(a). (Credit if more than one criterion is identified as the most important.)</p> <p>Plus:</p> <p>Weighing up</p> <p>2 marks for: an explanation of at least two credibility criteria, one of which is the most important.</p> <p>Or 1 mark for: an attempted justification of one credibility criterion.</p>	3	<p>Example of a 3 mark answer:</p> <p>Her experience as director of a small theatre company means she knows how venues choose shows. (<i>credibility criterion explained</i>✓) However her experience is outweighed by her vested interest. (<i>weighing up and most important credibility criterion identified</i>✓) She has a vested interest in live performance being chosen as this is how she gains income. (<i>most important explained</i>)</p> <p>Example of a 2 mark answer:</p> <p>Vested interest is more important than expertise (<i>identifying the most important credibility criterion</i> ✓). She has a vested interest to make an accurate claim. Audience participation will depend in part on public opinion of her company, so she needs to retain public confidence in what she says (<i>attempted justification without weighing up/comparison</i>. ✓).</p> <p>Example of a 1 mark answer:</p> <p>Vested interest is more important than expertise (<i>identifying the most important credibility criterion</i> ✓).</p> <p>Or</p> <p>She has a vested interest to make an accurate claim. Audience participation will depend in part on public opinion of her company, so she needs to retain public confidence in what she says (<i>attempted justification without weighing up/comparison</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</p> <table> <tr> <td>4 areas strong</td> <td>13 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3 areas strong</td> <td>11 marks</td> </tr> </table> <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 impact on attendance, 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. <p>Level 2 Partial or weak assessment 6-10 marks</p> <table> <tr> <td>2 areas strong + 1 weak</td> <td>8 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 areas strong</td> <td>6 marks</td> </tr> </table> <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 impact on attendance and a reference to the text in at least 2 areas correct use of specialist terms and grammar spelling & punctuation are adequate. <p>Level 1 Basic assessment 1- 5 marks</p> <table> <tr> <td>1 area strong</td> <td>3 marks</td> </tr> <tr> <td>At least 2 weak</td> <td>1 mark</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1 or no areas weak</td> <td>0 marks</td> </tr> </table> <p>Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> explicit judgement (J) 	4 areas strong	13 marks	3 areas strong	11 marks	2 areas strong + 1 weak	8 marks	2 areas strong	6 marks	1 area strong	3 marks	At least 2 weak	1 mark	1 or no areas weak	0 marks	16	<p>In this question there are four areas that need to be assessed using the annotations below:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Credibility for (CF) successfully captured National Theatre Live Michael Billington allow Kaiser, Freestone Sir Alan Ayckbourn Hasan Bakhshi Nesta</td> <td>Credibility against (CA) not successfully captured Michael Boyd Sir Alan Ayckbourn points from Billington Lyn Gardner allow Hasan Bakhshi Nesta</td> </tr> </table> <hr/> <table> <tr> <td>Plausibility (PA) increase/not decrease</td> <td>Plausibility (PF) decrease</td> </tr> </table> <p>engender interest in arts, seen as old fashioned media want to see the real thing screenings better view, theatre more expensive, easier to help schools</p> <p>Use the following annotations:</p> <p>CF+, CA+ (strong) Credibility is correctly assessed for two 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,</p>	Credibility for (CF) successfully captured National Theatre Live Michael Billington allow Kaiser, Freestone Sir Alan Ayckbourn Hasan Bakhshi Nesta	Credibility against (CA) not successfully captured Michael Boyd Sir Alan Ayckbourn points from Billington Lyn Gardner allow Hasan Bakhshi Nesta	Plausibility (PA) increase/not decrease	Plausibility (PF) decrease
4 areas strong	13 marks																					
3 areas strong	11 marks																					
2 areas strong + 1 weak	8 marks																					
2 areas strong	6 marks																					
1 area strong	3 marks																					
At least 2 weak	1 mark																					
1 or no areas weak	0 marks																					
Credibility for (CF) successfully captured National Theatre Live Michael Billington allow Kaiser, Freestone Sir Alan Ayckbourn Hasan Bakhshi Nesta	Credibility against (CA) not successfully captured Michael Boyd Sir Alan Ayckbourn points from Billington Lyn Gardner allow Hasan Bakhshi Nesta																					
Plausibility (PA) increase/not decrease	Plausibility (PF) decrease																					

Question		Levels Marking	Marks	Guidance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> grammar, spelling and punctuation do not impede understanding. <p>N.B. Where no areas weak, award marks for the two bullets only, if present.</p> <p>0 marks for: no creditworthy material.</p> <p>Reasoned case: Answers might include some of the following comparisons:</p> <p>The relative credibility of both sides e.g. using vested interest</p> <p>The side supporting live theatre being able to be successfully captured on the screen includes the NTL and Michael Billington. NTL, as the company making the broadcasts, has a possible vested interest to make exaggerated claims in favour of the screenings such as giving "<i>the best view of each production</i>" to make them sound attractive to possible audiences. However Billington, as a theatre critic, has a vested interest to be accurate in his appraisal "<i>that everyone now has the best view</i>" in order to maintain the integrity of his position as a critic within a leading newspaper. Thus there is both weakness and strength in the credibility on this side when considering vested interest.</p> <p>Those opposing live theatre being able to be successfully captured on the screen are Michael Boyd and Sir Alan Ayckbourn, as well as Michael Billington giving a counter position. Michael Boyd, as the artistic director of the RSC which provides live theatre productions, and Sir Alan Ayckbourn, as a playwright writing for live theatre, have a possible vested interest to highlight the shortcomings of live screenings as a "<i>pale reflection</i>" and not capturing the "<i>full</i></p>		<p>or one or more points of the text are developed and discussed.</p> <p>PF, PA (weak) A relevant part of the text is re-stated specifically in relation to plausibility, but without development (this should refer to decrease or increase of theatre attendance).</p> <p>Judgement</p> <p>J for a judgement.</p> <p>RJ for a judgement relevant to the impact on attendance.</p> <p>The relative plausibility (likelihood) of conflicting outcomes.</p> <p>It is plausible that the present trends highlighted by Bakhshi '<i>of increased audiences for local theatres in London</i>' will continue, as once cinema audiences have seen a screened production, they may be curious about live theatre and so be tempted to want to go to a theatre to see a performance live. Live screenings may act as an introduction to the theatre to the younger generations who may not otherwise have had contact with this art form. This therefore increases the possibility of audiences in local theatres rising.</p> <p>Although there is a possibility of this rise in theatre audiences, it may be limited if the younger generation feel that theatre productions are an outdated art form which lacks the impact of special effects, sound and cgi. Although they may be tempted by a live screening with the advantage of close ups, they may not relate to the distant viewing and lack of cinematography in the theatre. This would therefore make the alternative of not increasing live-theatre performance more plausible, although it</p>

Question		Levels Marking	Marks	Guidance
		<p><i>experience</i>", as they may wish to promote their livelihood and belief in live theatre. However when Michael Billington identifies the limitations of live screenings, it is within his argument in defence of live theatre being captured on the screen, which may make his observations more credible.</p> <p>Therefore, as there is possible vested interest to be selective and exaggerate on both sides, it comes down to the stronger credibility of the claims of Billington who has nothing to gain either way and argues in a balanced argument for live theatre being accurately captured.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>continued adjacent</i></p>		<p>would not necessarily decrease theatre audiences, as this younger generation watching live screenings would not be being poached from theatres. Therefore a "no impact on theatre going" is more plausible.</p> <p>Thus, taken as a whole, the plausibility of a slightly beneficial impact of introducing younger audiences to live theatre, irrespective of live theatre audiences, allied with the neutrality of the theatre critic claiming that live screenings improve theatre performance with close ups <u>would appear to make a negative impact less 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 2016

