



**General Certificate of Education (A-level)
January 2012**

Critical Thinking

CRIT1

(Specification 2770)

Unit 1: Foundation Unit

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Critical Thinking Mark Scheme

INTRODUCTION

The nationally agreed assessment objectives in the QCA Subject Criteria for Critical Thinking are:

- A01** Analyse critically the use of different kinds of reasoning in a wide range of contexts.
- A02** Evaluate critically the use of different kinds of reasoning in a wide range of contexts.
- A03** Develop and communicate relevant and coherent arguments clearly and accurately in a concise and logical manner.

- Marks are allocated to the assessment objectives according to the nature of each question and what it is intended to test.
- For Section A, Examiners need only provide a total mark for each of the candidates' answers. They do not need to provide a breakdown by Assessment Objective.
- For Section B, marks should be awarded according to the generic marking grid.
- Candidates should be able to achieve the highest marks with a selection of relevant points, not necessarily the complete range.
- **Indicative content is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and other valid points must be credited.**

Unit 1 Critical Thinking Foundation Unit

Section A

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3											
Questions 1 and 2 refer to Document A.																
1	How good is the support provided in the document for each of the following?															
1(a)	<p>It is still quicker to read the print version of a book (paragraph 1). (4 marks)</p> <p>Award as follows:</p> <table><tr><th>Levels</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptors</th></tr><tr><td>Level 3</td><td>4</td><td>Clear judgement (explicitly made or very obviously implied), well-supported with reference to the text, and strengths and weaknesses of the justification clearly identified and articulated.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 2</td><td>2 – 3</td><td>Clear judgement with adequate to good support; or: reasonable analysis of strengths and weaknesses but overall judgement unclear.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 1</td><td>1</td><td>Limited attempt to comment critically and / or answer the question.</td></tr></table> <p>Bare judgment gets 0 marks.</p> <p>Candidates ought to recognise that this claim is at best partly justified (candidates could determine this as being partially or poorly or not at all justified, or label the claim too strong).</p> <p>While there is some evidence in support of this claim, the claim goes further than the evidence warrants / there are numerous problems in the justification for the claim as it stands.</p> <p>Why there are problems with justification / why the justification is insufficient.</p> <p>There is a problem with generalisation.</p> <p>There is a lack of clarity about what is meant by ‘the same story’ and moreover there are presumably problems with reading the same story a number of times (will it make you speed up / slow down?).</p>	Levels	Marks	Descriptors	Level 3	4	Clear judgement (explicitly made or very obviously implied), well-supported with reference to the text, and strengths and weaknesses of the justification clearly identified and articulated.	Level 2	2 – 3	Clear judgement with adequate to good support; or: reasonable analysis of strengths and weaknesses but overall judgement unclear.	Level 1	1	Limited attempt to comment critically and / or answer the question.		4	
Levels	Marks	Descriptors														
Level 3	4	Clear judgement (explicitly made or very obviously implied), well-supported with reference to the text, and strengths and weaknesses of the justification clearly identified and articulated.														
Level 2	2 – 3	Clear judgement with adequate to good support; or: reasonable analysis of strengths and weaknesses but overall judgement unclear.														
Level 1	1	Limited attempt to comment critically and / or answer the question.														

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3											
	<p>It could be that users' IT skills / lack of expertise at handling the electronic readers warped the data (i.e. with some further practice it would cease to be slower).</p> <p>Candidates could point out that in a sense the claim is justified if it is seen merely as an indirect quote from/ summary of the report itself. However, whether the conclusion was drawn by the journalist or by those who wrote the report, there are still problems given the support provided in the article. Therefore this line of discussion, if comprising the whole response, should be restricted to [2] marks maximum.</p>															
1(b)	<p>iPads & Kindles were 'more satisfying' (paragraph 3).</p> <p>(4 marks)</p> <p>Award as follows:</p> <table><tr><th>Levels</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptors</th></tr><tr><td>Level 3</td><td>4</td><td>Clear judgement (explicitly made or very obviously implied), well-supported with reference to the text, and strengths and weaknesses of the justification clearly identified and articulated.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 2</td><td>2 – 3</td><td>Clear judgement with adequate to good support; or: reasonable analysis of strengths and weaknesses but overall judgement unclear.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 1</td><td>1</td><td>Limited attempt to comment critically and / or answer the question.</td></tr></table> <p>Candidates could judge this as (fairly) well supported, since the claim can be taken to be a simple summary of what was found.</p> <p>However, there is still a possible problem with generalisation, and there are also possible problems to do with the subjectivity and / or vagueness of satisfying – also with the closeness of the results.</p> <p>Therefore also accept 'not well justified' / 'not justified' (or the claim is 'too strong') if candidates provide a satisfactory case.</p> <p>Candidates could raise the possible generalisation problem. It is unclear whether or not the claim is supposed to apply generally; or whether only to the people surveyed – if the former, then a problem; if the latter, then not.</p>	Levels	Marks	Descriptors	Level 3	4	Clear judgement (explicitly made or very obviously implied), well-supported with reference to the text, and strengths and weaknesses of the justification clearly identified and articulated.	Level 2	2 – 3	Clear judgement with adequate to good support; or: reasonable analysis of strengths and weaknesses but overall judgement unclear.	Level 1	1	Limited attempt to comment critically and / or answer the question.		4	
Levels	Marks	Descriptors														
Level 3	4	Clear judgement (explicitly made or very obviously implied), well-supported with reference to the text, and strengths and weaknesses of the justification clearly identified and articulated.														
Level 2	2 – 3	Clear judgement with adequate to good support; or: reasonable analysis of strengths and weaknesses but overall judgement unclear.														
Level 1	1	Limited attempt to comment critically and / or answer the question.														

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>Candidates could point to the subjectivity of ‘satisfying’, and the consequent problems of making any firm judgment.</p> <p>On the other hand, candidates could argue that it is not unreasonable (and indeed common practice) to ask consumers about their degree of satisfaction – and this is as good a way as any / all such attempts will necessarily be subjective.</p> <p>Candidates could ask whether the average difference (0.1 out of 7) is sufficient given the size of the overall sample (24) to warrant any sort of definitive claim – i.e. even as a judgement applying only to the people surveyed, the claim is still too strong.</p> <p>As above, candidates could point out that the journalist could simply be reporting the report’s conclusion – award as above.</p>				
2	<p>Given the evidence in paragraphs 2 and 3, identify one implicit assumption upon which the title of the article depends. (2 marks)</p> <p>N.B. If a candidate offers two or more implicit assumptions, only mark the first one. If it is wrong the candidate gets zero, even if their second attempt is correct.</p> <p>Speed is more important than satisfaction when it comes to winning / Speed is important for something to be the future of literature; if something is to be the future of literature it cannot be slower to read.</p> <p>For a clear / precise articulation of an implicit assumption [2]</p> <p>For an unclear / imprecise expression (e.g. over-/ under-statement) [1]</p> <p>Speed and satisfaction are important when judging what medium for reading is best [1]</p>		2		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3											
Questions 3 to 6 refer to Document B.																
3	<p>Antonio I think a lot of people in the art world are frightened of new technologies because they threaten the power and status of the so-called creative industries. Anyone can make a film now; anyone can take the great picture; anyone can publish their writing on the internet. And this is a great thing.</p> <p>Sue But surely that cheapens it. If anyone can do these things, then they are no longer special.</p> <p>Nigel That’s a stupid argument. It’s like saying that water or food has become less valuable because it is more available to people.</p> <p>Comment critically on the analogy Nigel gives.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(4 marks)</p> <table><tr><th>Levels</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptors</th></tr><tr><td>Level 3</td><td>4</td><td>Accurate and convincing critical comment on the analogy.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 2</td><td>2 – 3</td><td>Reasonable and plausible critical comment on the analogy with explanation that it is relevant.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 1</td><td>1</td><td>Candidate shows some understanding of how to assess the analogy OR limited but reasonable critical comment on terms of this analogy.</td></tr></table> <p>Candidates can be credited with a mark if their answer shows some understanding of how to go about assessing an analogy – even if their assessment is weak or unconvincing.</p> <p>N.B. Do not credit <u>mere</u> explanation of what analogy <u>is</u>.</p> <p>Similarly, candidates can be awarded a mark for effective critical comment even if they do not tackle the analogy.</p> <p>N.B. Do not credit critical comments on Nigel’s claim “That’s a stupid argument”.</p>	Levels	Marks	Descriptors	Level 3	4	Accurate and convincing critical comment on the analogy.	Level 2	2 – 3	Reasonable and plausible critical comment on the analogy with explanation that it is relevant.	Level 1	1	Candidate shows some understanding of how to assess the analogy OR limited but reasonable critical comment on terms of this analogy.	1	3	
Levels	Marks	Descriptors														
Level 3	4	Accurate and convincing critical comment on the analogy.														
Level 2	2 – 3	Reasonable and plausible critical comment on the analogy with explanation that it is relevant.														
Level 1	1	Candidate shows some understanding of how to assess the analogy OR limited but reasonable critical comment on terms of this analogy.														

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>Relevant lines of assessment could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – In a sense his analogy is good, in that water does not become less valuable in the (biological) sense of sustaining life just because it is easily available [1–2] – However, in another (economic) sense, water, just like any resource, does become more valuable when it is scarce (e.g. threat of water wars etc) [1–2] – Could point out that more food / water is wasted now as a result of its increased availability – therefore it's not a 'stupid argument, and his analogy supports / does not weaken Sue's point [1–2] – Relies on an equivocation / ambiguity of word 'valuable' (and / or 'cheapens?') [1] (ie 'value' in the sense of economic cost and 'value' in the sense of aesthetic value or 'needed for life') – Candidates could earn [1] for questioning the truth of water becoming more valuable (although not really a problem with the analogy, since he's only saying it's 'like saying that') – Weak analogy in the sense that water and food are essentials of life / survival but music, art and literature are not; water and food will retain their value for this always, but art won't, because of their very different qualities. Hence analogy could be seen as unfair – Any reasonable critical comment on terms of analogy [1] – Can award and extra mark if accompanied with a relevant explanation <p>Award up to maximum [4] marks.</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3											
4	<p>Consider the following contribution from <u>Antonio</u>:</p> <p>‘And it’s just snobbishness to say that what they make is no good, to say that digital pictures, for example, are less valuable because they are easier to take.’</p> <p>Does <u>Antonio’s</u> response to <u>Sue</u> commit <u>either</u> of the following flaws?</p> <p>4(a) Ad Hominem</p> <p>4(b) Straw Man</p> <p>Give reasons for your judgements.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(8 marks)</p> <p>For each part:</p> <table><tr><th>Levels</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptors</th></tr><tr><td>Level 3</td><td>4</td><td>A convincing case either way; OR: a reasonable case put forward for both interpretations with clear and precise reference to the text.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 2</td><td>2–3</td><td>A partly convincing case, but with some simplicity / reference to text.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 1</td><td>1</td><td>For knowledge of what the terms straw man / ad hominem mean, but with no link to context.</td></tr></table> <p>There is a case either way for both.</p> <p>(a) Ad hominem</p> <p>a case either way: someone (here Sue) is entitled to make a value judgement (!); dismissing the fact someone has done this as ‘snobbishness’ is arguably dismissing it on grounds of their personality, which makes it ad hominem; on the other hand, what Sue is saying is almost a self-evident truism because of an equivocation on “special”. ‘Special’ can mean individual / different or it can mean ‘higher quality’ eg special guest – what she describes is a clear-cut case of snobbishness – IF people have the view she describes it is fair to label it as ‘snobbishness’; looked at in this way there is nothing necessarily ad hominem about Antonio’s comment.</p>	Levels	Marks	Descriptors	Level 3	4	A convincing case either way; OR: a reasonable case put forward for both interpretations with clear and precise reference to the text.	Level 2	2–3	A partly convincing case, but with some simplicity / reference to text.	Level 1	1	For knowledge of what the terms straw man / ad hominem mean, but with no link to context.			
Levels	Marks	Descriptors														
Level 3	4	A convincing case either way; OR: a reasonable case put forward for both interpretations with clear and precise reference to the text.														
Level 2	2–3	A partly convincing case, but with some simplicity / reference to text.														
Level 1	1	For knowledge of what the terms straw man / ad hominem mean, but with no link to context.														
			4	4												

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>(i) Students could argue it is ad hominem if they think the accusation of <u>in itself</u> is the <u>basis</u> of Antonio's point.</p> <p>(ii) Students could argue that it is not ad hominem because the claim that Sue's view <u>is</u> snobbish is <u>justified</u> and so Antonio's point is reasonable – if candidates argue that it <u>is</u> ad hominem for this reason, then this part of their answer gets zero marks.</p> <p>(b) Straw Man</p> <p>a case for yes, as certainly some sense that Sue's point has been exaggerated: there is a difference between no longer special and no good. Also his saying it is <u>just</u> snobbishness may distort or limit the plurality of interpretations of 'special'.</p> <p>Also, going by Antonio's original comment, saying anyone can do it did not necessarily mean it meant easier – could have just been accessibility his point was describing.</p> <p>However, Sue does say something along these lines (If anyone can do it, it becomes less special etc); therefore it's arguably not a great exaggeration, more just spelling out the possible implications of her viewpoint – therefore a case for 'No' also.</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3												
5	<p>Consider the following exchanges between Steve and Nigel:</p> <p>Steve Personally I feel that if I have paid for something then I want to actually own something physical – not just the data, a series of 1s and 0s – but some tangible object I can touch, pick up and look at, put on my shelves.</p> <p>Nigel But you don't <i>listen</i> to the object either. You listen to the song. All a CD is, is an imprint of the digital transcription of the music; it is a record of 1s and 0s. It already <i>is</i> in digital form.</p> <p>Steve I think that if you just buy the download, not the physical thing, then you are not a fan.</p> <p>Nigel What gives you the right to say that?</p> <p>Steve Ask any true music fan, they will agree with me.</p> <p>Comment critically on what Steve says in the exchange above. (6 marks)</p> <p>This is an open question and candidates can apply their critical thinking skills as they deem appropriate, and should be credited according to the quality of their response as per the following bandings:</p> <table><tr><th>Levels</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptors</th></tr><tr><td>Level 3</td><td>5 – 6</td><td>Analytical comments (e.g. where reasoning is or is not taking place) are accurate and deploy correct terminology (e.g. claim, assumption); evaluative comments are clear and convincing.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 2</td><td>3 – 4</td><td>Analytical comments contain slight inaccuracies (e.g. terminology is misapplied); evaluative comments are present but less well supported.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 1</td><td>1 – 2</td><td>An attempt is made to engage critically with the materials but analytical comments are mostly inaccurate and evaluative comments unclear or poorly supported.</td></tr></table>	Levels	Marks	Descriptors	Level 3	5 – 6	Analytical comments (e.g. where reasoning is or is not taking place) are accurate and deploy correct terminology (e.g. claim, assumption); evaluative comments are clear and convincing.	Level 2	3 – 4	Analytical comments contain slight inaccuracies (e.g. terminology is misapplied); evaluative comments are present but less well supported.	Level 1	1 – 2	An attempt is made to engage critically with the materials but analytical comments are mostly inaccurate and evaluative comments unclear or poorly supported.				
Levels	Marks	Descriptors															
Level 3	5 – 6	Analytical comments (e.g. where reasoning is or is not taking place) are accurate and deploy correct terminology (e.g. claim, assumption); evaluative comments are clear and convincing.															
Level 2	3 – 4	Analytical comments contain slight inaccuracies (e.g. terminology is misapplied); evaluative comments are present but less well supported.															
Level 1	1 – 2	An attempt is made to engage critically with the materials but analytical comments are mostly inaccurate and evaluative comments unclear or poorly supported.															
			2	4													

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>NB although candidates can be credited for both analytical and evaluative comments, there is no need for candidates to offer analytical comments to gain full marks – if the evaluation is clear and convincing then that will suffice; similarly, there is no need for candidates to comment on all contributions Steve makes, they can focus their response on what they see as the problematic parts.</p> <p>The following provide examples of relevant lines of discussion:</p> <p>Steve’s first comment is largely an expression of personal opinion / where he stands on the issue, and he is perfectly entitled to offer this.</p> <p>(Saying e.g. that it is ‘<i>just</i> an opinion and therefore not valid’ should not be credited).</p> <p>Steve’s claim: ‘I think that if you just buy the download, not the physical thing, then you are not a fan’ however, is more deserving of critical comment.</p> <p>Questionable underlying assumptions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – It’s just an expression of (quite snobbish? Antiquated?) opinion (his, personal, subjective and perhaps leading) definition of a fan – Alternatively, candidates could perhaps make the case for this being a reasonable extension / addition to his viewpoint / line of argumentation – Or: an ad hoc amendment in the light of an intelligent counter-argument / objection from Nigel – Possible limiting options (either buy a CD <u>or</u> not a true fan) <p>Steve’s final comment is the least reasonable (and could fairly be labelled flawed)</p> <p>Candidates may point to an unfair appeal to popularity and / or authority; an unfair use of leading language / a persuasive definition of ‘fan’ that arguably begs the question.</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
6	<p>Consider the contribution by Sue:</p> <p>Sue There's a deeper point here. There is a real danger that the rush to digitalise music and literature is actually impoverishing rather than enriching our lives. When something is just a package of data, you lose respect for it. Consequently it becomes disposable; something that you just download, then erase. It also encourages people to go for things that are a quick fix. Your relationship with a book or a song; it should be something lasting, perhaps difficult to get on with initially, but then you grow to love it.</p>				
6(a)	<p>Identify <u>Sue's</u> conclusion or conclusions and the reasons she offers. (5 marks)</p> <p>Main conclusion, introduced with: 'There's a deeper point here', is:</p> <p>There is a real danger that the rush to digitalise music and literature is actually impoverishing rather than enriching our lives.</p> <p>[NB you could accept this as a final intermediate conclusion, and the first sentence: 'There is (therefore) a deeper point here' as the main conclusion]</p> <p>This is based on two problems that she identifies with turning something into 'just a package of data':</p> <p>R1 When something is just a package of data, you lose respect for it</p> <p>R2/ IC (Consequently) it becomes disposable, something you just download then erase</p> <p>And</p> <p>R2/ R3 Turning something into just a package of data / It (also) encourages you to go for things which are a quick fix</p> <p>R3/ R4 (Whereas) Your relationship with a book or a song, it should be something lasting, perhaps difficult to get on with initially, then you grow to love it.</p>	5			

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3											
	<table><tr><th>Levels</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptors</th></tr><tr><td>Level 3</td><td>5</td><td>Analysis of the argument into reasons and conclusions is full and accurate.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 2</td><td>3 – 4</td><td>Candidate’s analysis is largely correct but contains errors or omissions.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 1</td><td>1 – 2</td><td>Candidates either offer a full analysis but one that is largely incorrect, or a very incomplete analysis (e.g. one reason and one conclusion)</td></tr></table> <p>N.B. Max 2 marks for answers which merely list or paraphrase relevant parts of the argument without any indication that they are reasons or conclusions.</p>	Levels	Marks	Descriptors	Level 3	5	Analysis of the argument into reasons and conclusions is full and accurate.	Level 2	3 – 4	Candidate’s analysis is largely correct but contains errors or omissions.	Level 1	1 – 2	Candidates either offer a full analysis but one that is largely incorrect, or a very incomplete analysis (e.g. one reason and one conclusion)			
Levels	Marks	Descriptors														
Level 3	5	Analysis of the argument into reasons and conclusions is full and accurate.														
Level 2	3 – 4	Candidate’s analysis is largely correct but contains errors or omissions.														
Level 1	1 – 2	Candidates either offer a full analysis but one that is largely incorrect, or a very incomplete analysis (e.g. one reason and one conclusion)														
6(b)	<p>Identify <u>one</u> implicit assumption that is necessary for her argument. (2 marks)</p> <p>N.B. No credit for anything explicit or that is an implied conclusion.</p> <p>Implicit assumption clearly stated [2] / unclear or over / understated [1] eg quick fixes are the worst thing you can have</p> <p>N.B. Do not credit: “We should stop digitalising music / literature”, (this is an implied conclusion).</p> <p>There is a major assumption about the importance of music / literature in our lives – that it has a direct impact on our quality or richness of life</p> <p>Other major assumptions include: (credit 2 marks for each of the following unless only 1 mark is indicated)</p> <p>Non digital / physical versions of music / literature enrich our lives</p> <p>Losing respect is bad / Respect is a good thing</p> <p>Being impoverished is worse than being enriched</p> <p>Quick fixes are bad</p> <p>What lasts is better</p> <p>Perseverance is good / valuable</p> <p>A lasting relationship, rather than a quick fix, enriches our lives</p> <p>Losing respect is impoverishing</p> <p>You can have respect for inanimate objects [1]</p>	2														

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
6(c)	<p>Explain one possible flaw or weakness in Sue's reasoning. (3 marks)</p> <p>Don't credit mere claims that Sue makes assumptions or that Sue does not use examples or rely on other evidence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – This begs the question: obviously if someone has this attitude, then it is no surprise to say they have lost respect for art! – Questionable assumptions e.g. about significance of art in our lives / Assumption that a 'quick fix' cannot be long lasting...? eg digitalisation automatically leads to people losing respect for it (music etc) – Relies on her own opinion / slightly dubious principle about the value / worth of the reading / listening experience – Candidates could examine the analogy given / implied, and ask whether it holds – Candidates could argue that Sue has made a false dichotomy between the old forms of ... and the new in that only digital is a package of data [NB could be interpreted as a Straw Man, albeit as one of a view not expressed] – Possible slippery slope from digital media to encouraging quick fixes in general ONLY credit 1 mark maximum if student refers to and explains Sue's use of slippery slope – Limiting options to download and erase; could download and share etc [2] <p>Clear and plausible explanation of flaw with accurate reference to the text [3]</p> <p>Correct flaw partially explained and reference to text is vague [2]</p> <p>Flaw seems correct but is not clearly enough explained and only vague reference to the text [1]</p> <p>Simply mentioning name of flaw [0]</p>		1	2	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3											
Questions 7 and 8 refer to Document C.																
7	<p>Critically assess the following claim which is implied by the author as a reason for ‘going back to film’</p> <p>Images taken by digital cameras are more fragile or vulnerable to being lost than images on a film camera.</p> <p>How justified is the claim; and are the assumptions that it makes warranted?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(6 marks)</p> <p>Levels mark scheme</p> <p>For each claim:</p> <table><tr><th>Levels</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptors</th></tr><tr><td>Level 3</td><td>5 – 6</td><td>Candidates’ assessment shows that they have understood the grounds the author has given for their implied claim, and they support their implied claim, and they support their evaluative judgments with relevant and effective critical comment.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 2</td><td>3 – 4</td><td>Candidates’ assessment shows that they have understood the grounds the author has given for their implied claim, and they support their evaluative judgements with relevant critical comment.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 1</td><td>1 – 2</td><td>Candidates make critical comment but their criticisms lack relevance or bite. There may be confusion regarding the actual grounds for the implied claims.</td></tr></table> <p>N.B. Max Level 2 for answers which <u>confine</u> themselves to merely the factual, technical differences between digital cameras and film cameras.</p>	Levels	Marks	Descriptors	Level 3	5 – 6	Candidates’ assessment shows that they have understood the grounds the author has given for their implied claim, and they support their implied claim, and they support their evaluative judgments with relevant and effective critical comment.	Level 2	3 – 4	Candidates’ assessment shows that they have understood the grounds the author has given for their implied claim, and they support their evaluative judgements with relevant critical comment.	Level 1	1 – 2	Candidates make critical comment but their criticisms lack relevance or bite. There may be confusion regarding the actual grounds for the implied claims.	2	4	
Levels	Marks	Descriptors														
Level 3	5 – 6	Candidates’ assessment shows that they have understood the grounds the author has given for their implied claim, and they support their implied claim, and they support their evaluative judgments with relevant and effective critical comment.														
Level 2	3 – 4	Candidates’ assessment shows that they have understood the grounds the author has given for their implied claim, and they support their evaluative judgements with relevant critical comment.														
Level 1	1 – 2	Candidates make critical comment but their criticisms lack relevance or bite. There may be confusion regarding the actual grounds for the implied claims.														

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>Suggested answers</p> <p>Reasons for the implied claim:</p> <p>the story about her finding an old negative and being able to develop it; and the claim, implied through rhetorical question, that people would not be able to do the same thing with their current digitally stored images (presumably since they are now so prevalent as to be not deemed worth looking after / because people don't care about them or value them enough to do so).</p> <p>Candidates could point out that the claim being implied is a general one, and the use of a single personal anecdote is poor / insufficient support.</p> <p>Candidates may also want to target some of the problematic implicit assumptions here.</p> <p>For example, that when something is more abundant/likely to break / fragile it (immediately) becomes less valuable. Or that people will automatically value their images less due to the way they are stored. Candidates could question these, e.g. the second assumption could be challenged by arguing that the medium is hardly relevant to the interest value or likelihood of loss – a digital photo of something interesting must surely be greater than that of a boring paper photograph.</p> <p>There is also a hint of circularity: people will not allocate their current digital images with the same sense of worth because they think they are less valuable.</p> <p>On the other hand, candidates could argue e.g. that there is a plausibility in the notion that when something is abundant it becomes less valuable (support this with suitable examples or analogies).</p> <p>Candidates could decide that the overall comparison is unfair: obviously an old film from long ago will have an inherent value that is nothing to do with the medium.</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3												
8	<p>Comment critically on the author's claims in the next to last paragraph about the beauty and poetry of photography. How successfully do they support her reasoning in favour of sticking with film?</p> <p>(6 marks)</p>		2	4													
<table><tr><th>Levels</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptors</th></tr><tr><td>Level 3</td><td>5 – 6</td><td>Candidates' assessment shows that they have understood the grounds the author has given for claims, and candidates support their case, and their evaluative judgments with relevant and effective critical comment.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 2</td><td>3 – 4</td><td>Candidates' assessment shows that they have understood the grounds the author has given for claims, and candidates support their evaluative judgements with relevant critical comment.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 1</td><td>1 – 2</td><td>Candidates make critical comment but their criticisms lack relevance or bite. There may be confusion regarding the actual grounds for the author's claims.</td></tr></table>						Levels	Marks	Descriptors	Level 3	5 – 6	Candidates' assessment shows that they have understood the grounds the author has given for claims, and candidates support their case, and their evaluative judgments with relevant and effective critical comment.	Level 2	3 – 4	Candidates' assessment shows that they have understood the grounds the author has given for claims, and candidates support their evaluative judgements with relevant critical comment.	Level 1	1 – 2	Candidates make critical comment but their criticisms lack relevance or bite. There may be confusion regarding the actual grounds for the author's claims.
Levels	Marks	Descriptors															
Level 3	5 – 6	Candidates' assessment shows that they have understood the grounds the author has given for claims, and candidates support their case, and their evaluative judgments with relevant and effective critical comment.															
Level 2	3 – 4	Candidates' assessment shows that they have understood the grounds the author has given for claims, and candidates support their evaluative judgements with relevant critical comment.															
Level 1	1 – 2	Candidates make critical comment but their criticisms lack relevance or bite. There may be confusion regarding the actual grounds for the author's claims.															
<p>Reasons for the claim</p> <p>The judgement that the film-based photo (in contrast to digital) 'really was a moment frozen in time; the actual light waves caught on the piece of film – a record of the actual light waves that had reflected off this now long-dead person's face.'</p> <p>Candidates could judge the reasons here to be fairly flimsy, and relying heavily on personal opinion / interpretation, and even use of language: it is used to emphasis what are merely assumptions / assertions 'really'; 'actual'. Candidates might usefully ask what is meant by 'the actual light waves'?</p> <p>In point of fact, the physics is much the same – light waves being captured. Also 'a long dead person's face' could still be the subject matter whatever the technology. Whether captured on screen or film is really neither here nor there. Therefore the comparison is unconvincing and / or the implied claim poorly supported.</p>																	

SECTION B (see Generic Mark Grid) page 19

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
9	<p>To what extent do you agree with the claim below?</p> <p>‘In the digital age, libraries, galleries and museums are a waste of money and space.’</p> <p>Write a reasoned argument for your position.</p> <p>In answering this question you should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> state your conclusion (or conclusions) clearly offer effective reasoning to support your conclusions use the information, and respond to issues or arguments, in Documents A – C. <p>(20 marks)</p> <p>There are several positions candidates could adopt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidates could take a strong position on this, agreeing largely or completely with the assertion. To do so effectively, since it is a controversial stance, they would really need to consider some of the counter-arguments – at least consider some of the things that public spaces such as these offer. Candidates could take a modified position, such that they agree that e.g. libraries could be, but not museums / galleries. Candidates could similarly take a modified position whereby they admit that perhaps <i>less</i> money could be spent etc, there is <i>less</i> need for these things, but it would be wrong / a crime to get rid of them completely. Candidates could argue strongly against this position. They could argue, for example, that in the digital age, where people are increasingly connected via electronic media, such public spaces as these are of increased importance. Any argument on either side of the question of whether or not something should be abolished will presumably need to consider the strengths of the thing that is being abolished. Therefore candidates will need to consider what kind of things libraries etc provide; how important (or obsolete) this is; and whether or not this can usefully be provided elsewhere. Candidates could consider the case for the need for the physical spaces themselves and / or for the importance of the physical artefacts. Candidates could consider those who are disadvantaged by the proposal – such as those people who would lose most from the cuts. 				20

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Candidates could weigh these (and similar) points against e.g. economic arguments; they could take the line that, in the economic climate, cuts need to be made somewhere, and maybe this is something that could go! (Room for some discussion of the inherent value of protecting arts / culture in such a climate). <p>Candidates could also explore the implications of the alternatives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are issues of access. Candidates could argue that anyone can walk into a library. Whereas accessing digital records will take IT facilities and perhaps passwords, logins etc. On the other hand, candidates could argue that the physical space advantages the physically able bodied – that there is something even more open and accessible about the digital world. (Candidates could do something here about the democratic nature of the internet compared to e.g. galleries etc which are all owned / curated.) There is the issue of security. Candidates could usefully talk up the dangers of electronic storage – in terms of piracy, theft – and also technical failures; contrasts with the perishability (or otherwise) of physical storage e.g. books could be made. <p>There is the related issue of ownership. It is clear that a library has a (certain kind of) ownership of the objects it holds. But who owns the means of digital storage / the ISP? Is this contracted with a third party? What if the third party prove rogue?</p>				

GENERIC MARKING GUIDE for Question 9

	Award Level		
	Good response	Reasonable response	Limited response
Descriptor	Criteria well met. Communication is clear and appropriate.	Criteria partially met. Communication is mostly clear and appropriate.	Criteria barely met. Communication errors may impede understanding.
Conclusion A conclusion is clearly stated that is consistent with the reasoning, and directly responds to the question.	3	2	1
Reasons / Lines of Reasoning The above conclusion is well supported with reasons, contributory arguments, examples, clarification of terms. Counter-arguments considered and replied to.	9 – 11	5 – 8	1 – 4
Use of source documents Candidate has engaged critically with source material.	5 – 6	3 – 4	1 – 2

Distribution of marks across the questions and assessment objectives for Unit 1

AO Balance	AO1	AO2	AO3
Total Section A	21	29	–
Total Section B	–	–	20
Paper Total: [70] Marks	21	29	20
Paper Total: [70] Percentage	30%	41%	29%

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion