



GCE

Critical Thinking

Unit **F501**: Introduction to Critical Thinking

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2017

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 2017

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
✓	Use a ✓ to indicate the separate marks given in all parts of questions 1 - 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
C+JU	the credibility of the claim is just about assessed(limited reference often to generic words e.g. <i>risk</i>)
C	the credibility of the source is assessed
✓+	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+
JU	a judgement
RJU	a relevant judgement
BP	to indicate that any blank pages have been looked at
SEEN	on pages 13 and 14 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	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>argument:</p> <p>Credit 2 marks: Our material could revolutionize the electronics industry, since it could be used for a number of applications.</p>	2	<p>1 mark for: significant omissions, only either the first or second part of the argument is given.</p> <p>0 marks for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> any paraphrase any addition no creditworthy material.
1	(b)	<p>counter-assertion:</p> <p>(As with the smartphone) wearable devices come with a risk of making confidential data available to hackers.</p>	2	<p>1 mark for: slight omissions e.g. <i>confidential</i> or <i>to hackers</i>.</p> <p>0 marks for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> any paraphrase any addition counterargument – <i>The concern is now....on our wrist</i> no creditworthy material.
1	(c)	<p>3 argument indicator words and what they indicate:</p> <p>despite - response to counter assertion /response to counter reasoning /response to counter conclusion) NB must include response to</p> <p>since - reason consequently - conclusion</p> <p>also accept - additional reason</p>	3x1	<p>Credit if the order is reversed e.g. conclusion – thus.</p> <p>0 marks for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • • • <p>Despite - As - 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> no creditworthy material.

1	(d)	<p>3 examples and what they exemplify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apple smartwatch • or Nike+ (sportwatch) • or Samsung Gear Smartwatch example of a <i>wearable</i> computer • Filip, / a colourful plastic band embedded with a tiny SIM card example of first wearables that can make calls (aimed at children) • solar panels or 'smart' T shirts example of a range of applications/products / of GraphExeter in the electronics industry 	3x1	<p>1 mark each for up to three correct examples linked to a correct statement</p> <p>Allow a correct statement of what this exemplifies even if followed by further description of the device.</p> <p>Accept close paraphrases of the text here. i.e. This mark can only be credited if the example is correct.</p> <p>0 marks for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for incorrect parts of the text e.g. <i>walking down streets, waiting for transport, or even hanging out with friends</i> • Just a description of the device rather than a statement of what it exemplifies e.g. <i>Apple smart watch is a fancy electronic device that allows.....</i> • no creditworthy material. • The use of Graph Exeter as an example (it can be credited as part of the explanation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Filip is example of technology aimed at children</i> –not acceptable • <i>Smartphone</i>- not used as an example here 	
1	(e)	<p>evidence:</p> <p>(A 2011 survey found that) a quarter of Britons are never more than a metre away from their smartphone, which is often only centimetres from their bed during the night.</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 mark for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • slight omissions • or for either half of the evidence. <p>0 marks for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any paraphrase • any addition • no creditworthy material. 	

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
2	(a)	<p>argument element:</p> <p>Credit 1 mark for counter assertion</p>	1	<p>0 marks for: no creditworthy material.</p> <p>N.B. Both terms are necessary for 1 mark.</p>
2	(b)	<p>explanation of argument element:</p> <p>Credit 1 mark each for versions of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is a unsupported statement • goes against/counts the analyst's argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • with reference to the text. <p><i>Example of a 3 mark answer</i> It is an unsupported statement✓ and this goes against✓ the analyst's conclusion that 'there is definitely scope for wearables.'✓</p>	1+1+1	<p>2(a) and 2(b) should be marked independently i.e. if 2(a) is incorrect, marks can be awarded for a correct answer to 2(b).</p> <p>The points can be made in any order.</p> <p>Marks for the first two points (see left) are independent of each other, but no credit should be given for a reference to the text if it does not illustrate one of the first two points.</p> <p>0 marks for no creditworthy material.</p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
3	(a)	<p>Representative weakness:</p> <p>2 marks for: a correct assessment where a characteristic is stated and the impact is explained e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Both MIS university students and other student smartphone users have the same opportunity available on their smartphones for social media, so it is likely that both will make equal use of this for social ease. Both MIS university students and other student smartphone users are likely to know people who are on social media, so it is likely that using an account will be equally of interest to both. <p>Other acceptable characteristics : similar age so similar interests</p> <p>(ii)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MIS university students have more expertise in Information Sciences and so might be more confident in social media use increasing their use of these sites, whereas other student smartphone users may not have the expertise to use the social media aspects of the smartphone, thus making less use of it. MIS university students are from the US which is the home of Facebook, which may mean that their use of social media sites is more pronounced than other students who may not have been subject to 	2+2	<p>1 mark</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Either for a correct assessment that only explains one side of the IMPACT e.g. Other student smartphone users have access on their smartphones to have a social media account. Other student smartphone users may not have expertise to use the social media functions of the smartphone. Or for a correct assessment that simply identifies a characteristic using a comparator without an explanation of the IMPACT e.g. Other student smartphone users are likely to be equally interested in social media sites. 0 marks for: no creditworthy material.

		<p>marketing about social media for so long.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MIS university students are from the USA where use of the internet is unrestricted whereas students from other countries such as China have restricted access <p>Credit second mark if words like restricted/increased imply that the impact on their use of internet may be different</p>		
3	(b)	<p>weaknesses of findings in table: 2 marks for a correct developed explanation e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The students may not have accurately perceived their dependence on their smartphones when they made their ratings, making the evidence less accurate. The students may have been influenced by what they think is a 'cool' response when they made their ratings, making the evidence skewed to the image they want to present rather than an accurate reflection of their smartphone use. The survey table is unbalanced as it only has two negative statements to which to respond, which may lead students to be more positive about their use of mobile phones, which will skew the evidence giving a 	2	<p>1 mark for: a correct simple statement where the IMPACT on the findings/results is not explained e.g. The students may have been deluded. The students may have wanted to look cool. They are leading statements which may subconsciously bias the students to a certain viewpoint</p> <p>0 marks for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a correct statement of the impact without explaining the CAUSE e.g. The evidence is skewed positively. The evidence is unrepresentative. The evidence is only an average. • no creditworthy material.

		<p>more positive slant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The survey was conducted by MIS staff and as champions of Information Science they may have had a vested interest to skew the evidence towards a positive view of technology by asking leading questions and surveying students who are more likely to have an interest in this. The survey, by only asking for a yes/no response could distort the responses that the students give as it does not allow for no graduated responses. The survey asks questions that concentrate primarily on the traditional use of phones to keep in touch with others but claims to assess how students use their smart phones. This could include a wider variety of activities like taking photographs and watching videos so the survey is only a partial assessment of the use of smart phones. 		
--	--	--	--	--

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
4	(a)	<p>Assumption – Filip band</p> <p>Examples of 3 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children are able to operate the band/know how to use it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parents have loaded numbers to be stored. Children will know which stored number to press. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Someone will answer the phone. It is the mechanism of the watch which allows for quick and easy call up of the numbers. Fewer stored numbers makes it easier to operate. 	3	<p>2 marks for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an inaccurate statement of the assumption <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e.g. Parents will have loaded all the numbers to be stored. (overdrawn) e.g. It's quick and easy (for children) to use it/ call the numbers e.g. That the child is old enough to be capable of using such technology <p>1 mark for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an assumption expressed as a challenge e.g. The children won't be able to operate the band. <p>0 marks for:</p>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the statement of an incorrect assumption e.g. Children won't think about using it in an emergency no creditworthy material.
4	(b)		<p>Assumption - In class usage</p> <p>Examples of 3 mark answers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The students' opinion about multitasking is correct That one of the multi tasks relates to work in the classroom Professors should be guided by student opinion. Professors might become offended by students using smartphones in the classroom 	3	<p>2 marks for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an inaccurate statement of the assumption e.g. Professors should always be guided by student opinion. (overdrawn) <p>1 mark for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an assumption expressed as a challenge e.g. The students might be wrong or multi-tasking will not affect students' ability to learn. <p>0 marks for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the statement of an incorrect assumption e.g. Professors are intolerant or students are capable of multi-tasking no creditworthy material.

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
5	<p>One reason: 3 marks for: a reason that relates specifically to wearable technology and children/children's clothing.</p> <p>Example of 3 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wearable technology introduces a risk of cybercriminals getting in touch with children. It (wearable technology) will make children's clothing more expensive. It might distract children's attention. 	3	<p>2 marks for: a reason that does not refer to the precise details i.e. of wearable technology and children/children's clothing e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Children will become distracted. Things will be more expensive. <p>1 mark for: an answer that goes beyond a reason (e.g. an argument):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It (wearable technology) will make children's

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">It (children's wearable clothing) could become very expensive for some parents to afford.		<p>clothing more expensive, because of the cost of the technology involved.</p> <p>or includes extra argument elements (e.g. an example):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">It might distract children's attention, such as when they are crossing a road or doing their homework.
--	--	---	--	--

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
6		<p>Weakness - links between reasoning and conclusion:</p> <p>Conclusion 1 mark for reference to the correct overall conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (So), only when the law changes will wearables become safe. <p>Plus Either 3 marks for an assessment of the link.</p> <p>Or 2 marks for an assessment of the reasoning.</p> <p>Or 1 mark for a challenge.</p> <p>0 marks for no creditworthy material.</p> <p>Possible weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generalisation from smartwatches to wearables. • Assumption that drivers will not recognise the dangers of using their smartwatches whilst driving. • Assumption that when the law changes, people will change their behaviour/stop using these devices whilst driving. 	4	<p>The reference to the text: may be brief. A full quote is not necessary.</p> <p>- need not be indicated by speech marks.</p> <p>Example of 4 mark answer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reasoning is specifically about smartwatches and traffic accidents which gives weak support to the wider conclusion about <i>wearables</i> in general and safety in general. The conclusion therefore generalises beyond the reasoning, weakening the link between the two. <p>Example of 3 mark answer (no ref to conclusion)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reasoning is specifically about smartwatches and traffic accidents which gives weak support to the wider conclusion. The conclusion therefore generalises beyond the reasoning, weakening the link between the two. <p>Examples of 2 mark answers (assessment of the reasoning)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contributor assumes that the law is required for understanding and does not allow for a driver's common sense to influence action. • The contributor assumes that the two situations of mobile phones and smartwatches are sufficiently similar to produce the same public reaction. <p>Example of 1 mark answer (a challenge with no ref to conclusion)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Smartwatches are safer than mobile phones, because you don't have to hold them whilst driving.

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drivers will not make the same mistake twice about using technology whilst driving (mobile phones and smartwatches)
Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance	
7	<p>Document – Students and Smartphones Credit 2 marks for: a correct developed justification of the credibility of the document or its authors e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the MIS staff research team might have a vested interest to draw conclusions that would favour the use of smartphones in lessons, as this use might bring interest to their particular area of technology in the university curriculum (developed justification ✓✓). <p>Plus 1 mark Where a correct developed justification is supported by a relevant reference to the text. e.g. Being in the area of '<i>Management Information Sciences</i>' (relevant reference ✓), the MIS staff research team might have a vested interest to draw conclusions that would favour the use of smartphones in lessons, as this use might bring interest to their particular area of technology in the university curriculum (developed justification ✓✓). 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"> Being in the area of '<i>Management Information Sciences</i>' (relevant reference ✓), The MIS staff research team might have a vested interest to draw conclusions that would favour the use of smartphones in lessons (<i>limited justification</i>✓). <p>Other answers may be based on e.g. Reputation/VI to be accurate to maintain professionalism</p>	2x3	<p>A correct assessment of a source within the document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> is capped at 1 mark e.g. the credibility of the Head of Research. 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 3 is increased by its use of the Head of Research because of their expertise in.... <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 e.g. strengthened by expertise rather than being an example of expertise. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 Document 3 – <i>Journal of Academic Articles</i> can be used as a relevant reference to 	

		Expertise in MIS to assess the context accurately Ability to see the data collected – primary data		support e.g. expertise. • As can <i>MIS Staff Research team/Alabama State university</i>
--	--	---	--	---

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
8		<p>2 inconsistent claims:</p> <p>'you don't have to take a device out of your pocket to check on the traffic conditions whilst driving, which makes it safer.'</p> <p>Accept either or both parts of the statement below: 'Drivers will only realise the dangers of using smartwatches whilst driving once the law has caught up with this new technology. / Until then they'll cause more accidents.'</p>	2x1	<p>1 mark for: each correct claim. Accept correct paraphrase</p> <p>0 marks for: • an inaccurate or missing claim • no creditworthy material.</p> <p>There are no other possible answers.</p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
9	(a)	<p>Assessing credibility of claim.</p> <p>C++ The credibility of the claim about <i>cybercriminals</i> is assessed with an explanation of what else you need to know.</p> <p>C+ The credibility of the claim about <i>cybercriminals</i> is assessed.</p> <p>C+J The credibility of part of the claim is assessed without reference to <i>cybercriminals</i>, but with reference to risk/danger</p> <p>C The credibility of the source is assessed.</p> <p>Examples of possible answers:</p> <p>C++ The credibility of their claim 'smart fitness bands devices, will provide an even richer source of data for cybercriminals to exploit' is strengthened by their expertise as a strategist in security technology to know about these risks. (<i>Assessing the claim</i>). I would need to know that as a strategist working in security technology that they have been working in this field for a reasonable length of time to have gained the expertise to assess the risk involved in small fitness bands (<i>what else you would need to know</i>).</p> <p>C+ The credibility of their claim 'smart fitness bands devices, will provide an even richer source of data for cybercriminals to exploit' is strengthened by their expertise as a strategist in security technology to know about these risks. (<i>Assessing the claim</i>).</p> <p>C+J The credibility of their claim about the risks is strengthened by their expertise as a strategist in security technology. (<i>Assessing part of the claim without reference to the process</i>).</p> <p>C The credibility of the security strategist (assessing source) is strengthened by their experience in this field with the technology company. (<i>Do not accept just 'experience as a</i></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 ref to <i>cybercriminals</i>, 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 ref to <i>cybercriminals</i>. 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 ref to <i>cybercriminals</i> 3 C+J 6 marks 2 C+J 5 marks 1 C+J 4 marks plus one mark for strengthen/weaken in 1 assessment * Cap at Level 2 i.e. if 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 For no creditworthy material 0 marks</p>

		<p><i>security strategist' without justification).</i></p> <p>Synonyms of strengthen or weaken should be credited e.g. <i>increases credibility</i>. Accept <i>positive/negative credibility</i> <i>strong/weak</i>. <i>Credible/not credible</i>.</p> <p>Other possible assessments might include: As a security strategist working for a leading technology company the will have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• direct ability to see how the processes work to recognise risk• a vested interest to point out the claim that there is a cybercriminal risk, as this could promote the products of their company• a vested interest to maintain their public standing by accurately presenting the risk• bias towards seeing the risk because of their work in security.		Accept synonyms for cybercriminals e.g. internet crime
--	--	---	--	--

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
9	(b)	<p>Weighing up the credibility criteria</p> <p>Identifying the most important CC</p> <p>1 mark for: identifying the most important credibility criterion with reference to at least one other credibility criterion used in 9(a). (Credit if more than one criterion is identified as the most important.)</p> <p>Weighing up</p> <p>2 marks for: a developed explanation that makes comparisons between assessments of at least 2 criteria, making it clear why one credibility criterion is the strongest.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>1 mark for: an attempted justification of one credibility criterion, without weighing up/comparison.</p> <p>NB Where 9b gives limited explanation, candidates who have scored C++ or C+ against a particular credibility criterion in 9a should be able to carry over this reasoning into 9b without being expected to write it out in full again.</p>	3	<p>Example of a 3 mark answer: Although the security strategist might have a vested interest to exaggerate the risk of cybercriminal exploitation to promote his field of work with Symantec which weakens the credibility of his claim, this might be outweighed by a more important consideration i.e. his expertise (<i>identify the most important credibility criterion ✓</i>) working in the field of security technology that would make him unlikely to want misrepresent the risk because this might tarnish his professionalism. (<i>weighing up ✓✓</i>).</p> <p>Example of a 2 mark answer: Although the security strategist might have a vested interest to exaggerate the risk of cybercriminal exploitation to promote his field of work with Symantec which weakens the credibility of his claim, this might be outweighed by a more important consideration i.e. his expertise (<i>identify the most important credibility criterion ✓</i>) working in the field of security technology. (<i>Attempted justification ✓</i>).</p> <p>Example of a 1 mark answer: Expertise is more important than vested interest (<i>identifying the most important credibility criterion ✓</i>).</p> <p>Or The security strategist might have a vested interest to exaggerate the risk of cybercriminal exploitation to promote his field of work with Symantec which weakens the credibility of his claim. (<i>attempted justification without weighing up/comparison. ✓</i>).</p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance				
10		<p>Apply the following levels mark scheme:</p> <p>Level 3 Strong, relative, sustained assessment 11-16 marks</p> <p>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 whether or not wearables will benefit modern living drawn from an assessment of both credibility and plausibility. These judgements can be stated separately. • 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> <p>2 areas + and 1 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 whether or not wearables will benefit modern living drawn from either credibility or plausibility. Plus 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> <p>1 area + 3 marks</p>	16	<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 border="1"> <tr> <td>Credibility for wearables Fitbit (employee) smartphone research analyst MIS research team Head of MIS Research GraphExeter(lead researcher/Exeter University)</td> <td>Credibility against wearables smartphone research analyst security strategist/Symantec forum contributor</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Plausibility likely to benefit informed decision-making accessible, practical popular, immediacy</td> <td>Plausibility not likely to benefit class divide, crime bullying, distraction isolation</td> </tr> </table> <p>Use the following annotations in Q10:</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, or one or more points of the text are developed and discussed (NB PF+ few original benefits so expect developed points from text).</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 whether or not wearables will benefit modern living).</p> <p>Judgement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • J for a judgement. • RJ for a judgement relevant to whether or not 	Credibility for wearables Fitbit (employee) smartphone research analyst MIS research team Head of MIS Research GraphExeter(lead researcher/Exeter University)	Credibility against wearables smartphone research analyst security strategist/Symantec forum contributor	Plausibility likely to benefit informed decision-making accessible, practical popular, immediacy	Plausibility not likely to benefit class divide, crime bullying, distraction isolation
Credibility for wearables Fitbit (employee) smartphone research analyst MIS research team Head of MIS Research GraphExeter(lead researcher/Exeter University)	Credibility against wearables smartphone research analyst security strategist/Symantec forum contributor							
Plausibility likely to benefit informed decision-making accessible, practical popular, immediacy	Plausibility not likely to benefit class divide, crime bullying, distraction isolation							

	<p>At least 2 weak 1 or no areas weak</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.</p> <p>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 <p>e.g. using expertise</p> <p>The side that points out the positive features of <i>wearables</i> includes the Fitbit employee and the smartphone research analyst. They have experience of working in the field, the former in health tracking bracelets and the latter in smartphones. So they are likely to have expertise in the specific area to be able to speak in an informed manner to predict positive outcomes for <i>wearables</i> – that '<i>personal health insurance payments</i> will benefit and that these devices '<i>can immediately see what you need on your wrist</i>'. This expertise therefore considerably strengthens the credibility of this side with regard to having the right information to make informed judgements.</p> <p>Those on the side that points out the negative features of <i>wearables</i> include a Symantec security strategist who warns that '<i>smart fitness bands devices will provide an even richer source for cybercriminals to exploit</i>' and a road safety forum contributor who warns points out the dangers of using smartwatches whilst driving. The first is speaking from experience in cyber security which increases the credibility of their warning whereas the forum contributor is simply expressing their opinion as a member of the public with no known specialised expertise about the effects of using smartwatches whilst driving.</p> <p>Therefore, using the criterion of expertise, it would seem that</p>	<p>1 mark 0 marks</p> <p><i>wearables</i> will benefit modern living.</p> <p>Continued from left column</p> <p>This would mean that people could navigate a route quickly with Google maps whilst walking and have their hands free at the same time, making it safer and more convenient if carrying things or holding onto children. Whilst driving, the passenger might take on the role of providing the information from a smartwatch. Most people already wear a watch, so this could easily be replaced by a wearable without added inconvenience. It is therefore plausible that <i>wearables</i> could benefit modern living through the sheer convenience that they bring.</p> <p>Although problems are also plausible, as with other items of technology, these could be overcome making it still plausible that <i>wearables</i> could benefit modern living. '<i>Cybercriminals</i>' could be deterred with the use of technology protection such as firewalls and shields. Also a potential class divide could be lessened by offering affordable ranges and similar methods of controlling distraction could be used as with mobile phones. Therefore being mindful of the possible drawbacks and having plans to combat these would make it more likely that <i>wearables</i> would indeed bring benefits to modern living.</p> <p>Taken as a whole, the credibility criterion of expertise makes it clear that the benefits are credible and that the likelihood of <i>wearables</i> bringing benefits is strong, if the problems are foreseen and tackled.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>the claims from those pointing out the positive features have more credibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The relative plausibility (likelihood) of benefits <p>It is feasible that <i>wearables</i> will be able to help people make decisions and act more quickly, with the added convenience of having the information within sight '<i>on your wrist</i>'.</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 2017

