



General Certificate of Education (A-level)
June 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 to 4 refer to Document A.					
1	<p>The author claims in paragraph 3 that ‘the temptation for athletes to tamper with genes is obvious’.</p> <p>Identify <u>one</u> of the reasons given to support this claim.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p> <p>The main reasons are due to the physical benefits it can bring [2] and that (compared to eg drugs) it’s harder to police [2]. Candidates can cite the effect on muscle growth and injury time as separate reasons.</p> <p>Candidates can copy selected sentences if appropriate eg the sentence on mice (quoting from “Experiments...” to “from injury” gets [2] marks) however, partial copying such as the following will merit [1] mark.</p> <p>Example of [1] mark = Mice get more muscle OR It’s good for you.</p> <p>Example of [2] mark = Experiments on mice support it.</p> <p>NB If candidates copy from “moreover”...to either...”harder to police” or...”can be detected” this merits 2 marks, but if they just quote from “the changes” to “can be detected” this gets 1 mark.</p>		2		
2	<p>Paragraph 5 contains <u>three</u> short arguments given by Professor Pearson.</p> <p>Identify the conclusion of each.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(3 marks)</p> <p>There is nothing inherently wrong with the practice of gene transfer, or ‘doping’. [1]</p> <p>[In fact] it will probably be a good thing for sport [1]</p> <p>People need not be worried about the risks [1]</p> <p>Very imprecise quotations or paraphrasing such as ‘Good thing’ will not merit a mark.</p> <p>Slightly imprecise quote or paraphrase gets 1 mark BOD.</p>		3		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
3	<p>Explain <u>two</u> ways in which Pearson’s reasoning as presented in Paragraph 5 could be seen as weak or flawed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(6 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a <i>tu quoque</i> in the first of Pearson’s arguments. To argue that there is nothing wrong with ‘gene doping’ simply because athletes are already doing similar kinds of thing ‘pushing themselves in any way they can’, and that it is consistent with the moral code of sport as it exists is to trade on the assumption that two wrongs can make a right. [up to 3 marks] NB Candidates need to explain <i>tu quoque</i> correctly. A bare correct guess at the <i>tu quoque</i> label gets 0 marks. It also begs the question / argues in a circle, by assuming that the existing moral code at the top of sport is unobjectionable, when in fact this is part of the very thing that is being objected to. [up to 3 marks] Only 1 mark if candidates say this is an appeal to history [“already”], or an appeal to popularity [“Athletes”], or as an over-generalisation. The second argument makes a dubious assumption – that the occurrence of ‘more extraordinary performances’ in sport is (necessarily) a good thing. Candidates could challenge this assumption, for example by arguing that sport is about the competition between contestants, and the enjoyment for participants or spectators does not necessarily increase if the individual achievements are ‘more extraordinary’ – a match between two low-league teams could be more exciting than one between two top clubs. [up to 3 marks]. The flaw in Pearson’s third argument is an appeal to ignorance. It uses the lack of evidence of a risk to draw the conclusion that there is therefore no risk. Candidates could develop this with reference to the text, for example ‘so far no reported examples’ of gene doping risks. [Up to 3 marks for this.] Also in the third argument Pearson dismisses the risks of gene doping on the grounds that it is no more dangerous than the use of performance enhancing drugs such as steroids. The weakness here lies in the dubious assumption that using steroids is not dangerous, and that it involves hardly any risks to health. [up to 3 marks.] <p>NB If students try commenting on all 3 of Pearson’s arguments but do each poorly then mark the first two only. No extra credit should be given for not adhering to the specifics of the question. It asks for two ways, not three. NB If candidates spot both flaws in the third argument they can still get all 6 marks. Similarly, if they see the <i>tu quoque</i> and the appeal to history or popularity they can get up to 4 marks if they don’t mention other flaws. But if they see the <i>tu quoque</i> and the appeal to history and popularity, then still only 4 marks max because this is 3 flaws not 2.</p>	2	4		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	Level	Description			
	Good [5 – 6 marks]	Explanation of flaws is clear and accurate. Will likely include correct names of flaws along with reference to the text.			
	Intermediate [3 – 4 marks]	Explanation of flaws is reasonably good but may contain errors or omissions, or one flaw very well explained.			
	Basic [1 – 2 marks]	Explanation of flaws is likely to be brief or vague, or only covers a minor flaw, eg appeal to popularity.			

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
4	<p>Explain a possible flaw in Nick Jones’s reasoning (Paragraph 6) (3 marks)</p> <p>Slippery slope – candidates need to express the thought that gene doping does not necessarily mean the end of competitive sport as we know it. Eg What makes Jones so sure? How does he know? Also, if the ‘old wave’ of cheats did not destroy sport, this should presumably reduce fear of the new! Must be some reference to the text for the full 3 marks. [up to 3 marks]</p> <p>1 mark for labelling the flaw ‘slippery slope’.</p> <p>There is also a case for begging the question (obviously a change will mean the end of something ‘as we know it’ – this is true by definition!) [Max 2 marks for just this].</p> <p>There is an assumption that it is a bad thing to destroy the very nature of competitive sport as we know it. (But maybe it needs to be destroyed.) This on its own could get 2 marks. If added to the question-begging flaw as an explanation of it, then it will change the 2 marks to 3.</p>			3	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
Questions 5 to 8 refer to Document B.					
5	<p>After disagreeing about whether or not Professor Nigel Pearson is right to say that gene doping is a good thing, the following exchange occurs.</p> <p>Alesha But it's not natural.</p> <p>Frank Oh come on. You're not going to use the 'everything natural is good' argument, are you? Besides, neither is taking protein supplements 'natural'. Or are you saying that athletes have to eat berries they've found from foraging in the woods, train by running up mountains...?</p> <p>Comment critically on what <u>Frank</u> has said.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>(5 marks)</i></p>			5	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3	
	Level	Description				
	Good [4 – 5 marks]	Critical comments are convincing and effective. Strengths and weaknesses are identified and an appropriate judgment is reached. Candidates engage critically with the most important features of the argument and specific flaws cited are clearly explained and / or likely to be labelled accurately.				
	Intermediate [2 – 3 marks]	Evaluation is largely correct and focused on relevant flaws and strengths. Explanation is largely present but some assessment opportunities are missed.				
	Basic [0 – 1 marks]	Evaluation is likely to be limited to merely asserting agreement or disagreement with argument, or to identifying merely a minor flaw or strength, eg an emotive use of a term or a commonsense claim that's obviously true, or some vague comment eg that the argument is stated clearly.				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>Alesha has used the claim that it's not natural as a reason for arguing against gene doping being a good thing in sport / as a counter-argument to Pearson.</p> <p>(Since he shows that being 'natural' is not a good reason / is implausible) Frank makes a good point; his argument / counter-example shows that Alesha's comment alone is a weak (insufficient) reason / argument, and requires further support.</p> <p>However the overall effectiveness is weakened by his use of a straw man; his example of what Alesha might mean by 'natural' is fairly extreme / a little ridiculous; instead of asking Alesha to clarify what she means by natural, he assumes Alesha has used it in a particularly naive way eg by limiting the options to extremes (there are more charitable interpretations of what Alesha has said; natural and unnatural are not black and white, but are (arguably) of degrees; Alesha would probably admit this; Alesha probably means that it is 'more' unnatural than eg eating, even if the food is artificially synthesised).</p> <p>Frank could be credited for drawing attention to a problem with the use of the word natural – and for revealing a potential vagueness with the way Alesha has used the word.</p> <p>However, he is guilty of applying too arbitrary and specific (and perhaps extreme / ridiculous) a meaning to it (hence the straw man).</p> <p>Frank assumes taking protein supplements is good / acceptable, but Alesha could challenge this. What if she responded that people shouldn't take protein supplements either? [2]</p> <p>NB He does sort of ask her "Or are you saying....?", and some candidates may use this as evidence that Frank is not guilty of a straw man, because he is searching for what Alesha means (Principle of Charity). If they do, then credit this with only 1 mark, because the way he asks her, and the whole tone and context strongly suggest it isn't an innocent query.</p> <p>If candidates comment on Frank's tone / attitude / language, eg "Oh come on", is slightly intimidating, as is also the next question, which is mildly ridiculing her, as being emotive / unfair, then 1 mark for this as it is not focused on a logical flaw.</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
6	<p>Consider the following exchange.</p> <p>Alesha You say there's no difference between gene doping and an athlete who takes protein supplements but the person who's taken the protein supplements still has to work to turn that into muscle. It's not fair for someone else to get there just by messing with their genes.</p> <p>Frank Some people are born with more natural ability to run fast than others. That's not fair, either. Some people's coaching team might be better. Their training facilities might be better. Some people's bikes are better than others. Or their cars are faster. Is that fair?</p> <p>How effective is <u>Frank's</u> response to what <u>Alesha</u> has said? (6 marks)</p>				
			2	4	

No.	Question			AO:	1	2	3
	Level	Description	Question specific points				
	Basic [5 – 6 marks]	Critical comments are convincing and effective. Strengths and weaknesses are identified and an appropriate judgment is reached. Candidates engage critically with the most important features of the argument and specific flaws cited are clearly explained and / or likely to be labelled accurately.	Analytical (AO1) comments concerning the meaning / implication of Frank's comments are relevant as part of the candidates' evaluation.				
	Intermediate [3 – 4 marks]	Evaluation is largely correct and focused on relevant flaws and strengths. Explanation is largely present but some assessment opportunities are missed.					
	Basic [0 – 2 marks]	Evaluation is likely to be limited to merely asserting agreement or disagreement with argument, or to identifying merely a minor flaw or strength, eg an emotive use of a term or a commonsense claim that's obviously true, or some vague comment eg that the argument is stated clearly.					

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Frank's response consists of arguing that other (legal) things that might advantage competitors are also unfair when compared to gene doping. He is implying that (therefore) Alesha's objection that gene doping is wrong because it unfairly advantages competitors is not a good one. [2 marks for correct understanding of Frank's point / argument]. NB This analysis may be implicit as part of the candidate's assessment of Frank, but that's ok. Candidates could argue that Frank's response is not very effective because some of the comparisons Frank makes are not (as he implies) equally unfair; for example in Formula 1, part of the competition is in the engineering; But some of Frank's points may be effective. Eg If Alesha thinks protein supplements are ok because at least you still have to work to turn this into muscle, but not so with gene doping, then Frank's point about people who are born with natural ability to run faster, has some bite because presumably they don't have to work for this advantage. Frank's point seems to be that Alesha won't want to ban naturally gifted runners from sport just because they are lucky inheritors of 'fast' genes. Perhaps Alesha is being inconsistent. Frank may be guilty of a tu quoque flaw. Just because other current practices in sport aren't fair doesn't mean we should allow new forms of unfairness such as gene doping. The fact that it is impossible to find a perfectly level playing field in sport does not mean that the attempt should be abandoned. <p>If candidate cites Frank's use of lots of examples / 'evidence' (5 in all) to back up his point, as a strength, then [1 mark] for this. NB If this is all they do, then maximum is Basic level in the grid.</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
7	<p>Consider the following exchange:</p> <p>Frank (...) Surely it's fairer to give everyone a chance to build their genes up to the same level.</p> <p>Alesha But that's not going to happen.</p> <p>Frank I agree with you. That's why gene doping needs to be legalised. It's only unfair if one person has access to the procedure and not the other.</p> <p>Explain <u>Frank's</u> reasoning by identifying</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • his conclusion • the grounds on which he bases his conclusion • one implicit assumption that he makes <p style="text-align: right;">(7 marks)</p> <p>No marks for reason mistaken for a conclusion and vice versa.</p> <p>Frank's conclusion: "Gene doping needs to be legalised" [2]</p> <p>Reasons: It's fairer to give everyone a chance to build their genes up to the same level [1].</p> <p>As Alesha states [Frank agrees] – "That's not going to happen" [1] It's only unfair if one person has access to the procedure and not the other [1].</p> <p>If the argument is paraphrased but gives the gist of it then award up to 4 marks depending on how many parts are covered.</p> <p>eg If candidate paraphrases Frank's last reason as "Athletes won't get fair access to gene therapy while it's illegal." = [1 mark].</p> <p>Implicit assumption: that it's more likely that people will have access to the drugs if they are legal. [2]</p> <p>Award 1 mark for a partial or exaggerated identification of implicit assumption eg ALL athletes would/will gene dope = [1 mark] (Exaggerated)</p> <p>"All athletes will have the ability to gene dope" [1], athletes will jump at the chance to use gene doping [1], most athletes will use them [1].</p>		7		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
8	<p>Later in the dialogue, when <u>Alesha</u> raises doubts about the ethical implications of gene doping, the following exchange occurs:</p> <p>Alesha Like, are we saying that people who are strong are better than those who are weak, that being weak is an imperfection, something that needs to be eliminated...? Not even weak, necessarily. Just – different.</p> <p>Frank What's so bad about us getting better? Don't you like the idea of us becoming healthier, not dying of nasty illnesses...? You're in favour of medicine, I presume?</p> <p>Explain why <u>Frank's</u> response could be considered to be guilty of equivocation</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p> <p>2 marks for <u>either</u> of the points below</p> <p>'Getting better' could mean in a physical or an ethical sense. Alesha's point is more about the ethics of the situation, whereas Frank twists it into a purely physical sense.</p> <p>Frank also equivocates by using 'getting better' in a health / disease-free sense, whereas Alesha's point is more about physical <u>fitness</u> rather than health. People can be fitter but less healthy than others and vice versa.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying "better" as the source of equivocation even if the explanation is wrong / vague etc.</p>		1	1	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
Questions 9 and 10 refer to Document C.					
9	<p>In paragraphs 3 and 4 the author compares the use of ‘artificial enhancements’ within sport to their use outside sport.</p> <p>He claims there is a ‘fundamental ethical difference’ between them.</p> <p>Explain what this difference is, and whether or not you agree that it is, in fact, an ethical one.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(5 marks)</p> <p>Explain what the difference is [2 marks]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The difference is that using gene therapy in sport is all about the individual / the Self versus all others, and trying to gain an advantage, by denying them access to gene therapy, whereas outside sport, in everyday life, the use of gene therapy is not about the individual / Self versus all others, but instead is about the individual and all others being on the same human ‘team’. It is not competitive and the individual is not disadvantaged by others having access to gene therapy on health grounds. Candidates do not need to say anything as long and involved as the above. NB Credit candidates with up to 2 marks if they state the gist of the difference more or less clearly. <p>Eg In sport, others getting gene therapy harms me by spoiling my winning chances. But in life, I am not harmed by others using gene therapy</p> <p>OR</p> <p>in sport, if everyone uses gene therapy, no one benefits, whereas in life, if everyone uses gene therapy, everyone benefits.</p> <p>[Reasoning for] whether you agree that it is...an ethical difference</p> <p>[3 marks for any of the following]</p> <p>FOR it being ethical</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Being ethical is about benefiting everyone, so using gene therapy in life is ethical, whereas in sport it is not because it only benefits some at the expense of others. In sport, wanting to win is only of benefit to oneself, so this may be seen as selfish or self-interested, as opposed to wanting others to be healthier which is more altruistic. Altruism is moral, but selfishness is not. 		2	3	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Paragraph 3 rightly claims that gene therapy is “inherently valuable” because health is inherently valuable ie worthwhile for its own sake, and gene therapy causes that. <p>But, in sport, gene therapy is only instrumentally valuable because it is only useful for the other things it produces, ie victory.</p> <p>Ethics is about what is inherently valuable, not what is merely instrumentally valuable, so gene therapy is ethical in life, but not in sport.</p> <p>AGAINST it being ethical</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">In life, health is inherently valuable and gene therapy is merely useful in causing it, so it itself is not inherently valuable either in life or in sport, so there is no ethical distinction.Life itself is a competition so it may harm you if others are healthier than they would otherwise be without gene therapy because, eg<ul style="list-style-type: none">They may get promotion over you partly due to their good attendance as a result of gene induced better health.They will live longer and use more state benefits when older and drain away public money (your money) on the NHS and extra gene therapy costs. <p>So it is not an ethical distinction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">There is such a thing as an ethic of self-improvement which does not involve wanting everyone to improve. A perfectionist ethic may feel right at home in a sporting context as the pursuit of excellence. So the distinction is not ethical because both sport and life, are ethical.People may use gene therapy outside sport for selfish or vain reasons eg to look better. These aren’t moral motives, and are on a par with self-seeking in sport.				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3											
10(a)	<p>Look at paragraph 5, in which the author gives a summary of his argument.</p> <p>Give an analysis of the reasoning in paragraph 5, identifying its conclusion(s) and the reasons offered.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(6 marks)</p>	6														
	<table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th></th></tr><tr><td>Good [5 – 6 marks]</td><td>Analysis of the reasoning into its main components (reasons and conclusions) is accurate. Distinctive features of the author's reasoning (eg use of evidence, examples) and its structure (eg intermediate conclusions) are likely to be correctly identified.</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Intermediate [3 – 4 marks]</td><td>Analysis of the main components is reasonably accurate but may contain errors or omissions. Candidates may recognise some additional features of the author's reasoning (eg two or more reasons are not identified at all or incorrectly).</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Basic [1 – 2 marks]</td><td>Analysis of the main components is largely correct but may contain errors or omissions. Candidates may recognise some additional features of the author's reasoning.</td><td></td></tr></table>	Level	Description		Good [5 – 6 marks]	Analysis of the reasoning into its main components (reasons and conclusions) is accurate. Distinctive features of the author's reasoning (eg use of evidence, examples) and its structure (eg intermediate conclusions) are likely to be correctly identified.		Intermediate [3 – 4 marks]	Analysis of the main components is reasonably accurate but may contain errors or omissions. Candidates may recognise some additional features of the author's reasoning (eg two or more reasons are not identified at all or incorrectly).		Basic [1 – 2 marks]	Analysis of the main components is largely correct but may contain errors or omissions. Candidates may recognise some additional features of the author's reasoning.				
Level	Description															
Good [5 – 6 marks]	Analysis of the reasoning into its main components (reasons and conclusions) is accurate. Distinctive features of the author's reasoning (eg use of evidence, examples) and its structure (eg intermediate conclusions) are likely to be correctly identified.															
Intermediate [3 – 4 marks]	Analysis of the main components is reasonably accurate but may contain errors or omissions. Candidates may recognise some additional features of the author's reasoning (eg two or more reasons are not identified at all or incorrectly).															
Basic [1 – 2 marks]	Analysis of the main components is largely correct but may contain errors or omissions. Candidates may recognise some additional features of the author's reasoning.															

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>(MAIN) Conclusion: the reasons we have to legalise enhancements beyond sport are infinitely more powerful than the reasons we have to legalise enhancements within sport. [1]</p> <p>BECAUSE:</p> <p>R1 Athletes want enhancements so that they can gain an advantage over opponents. [1]</p> <p>R2 However, in sport, an enhancement that is available to all is, practically speaking, equivalent to an enhancement that is available to none. [1]</p> <p>IC1 (Based on R2): The net benefit to each and all is zero. [1]</p> <p>(HOWEVER) IC2 Safe enhancements beyond sport are far more rewarding: [1]</p> <p>(BECAUSE) R3 they can make everybody's life better simultaneously. [1]</p> <p>A simpler, though no less accurate, way to analyse the structure is to identify the main conclusion and then explain that this is based on two sub-arguments: [1]</p> <p>(Sub-argument 1)</p> <p>Athletes want enhancements so that they can gain an advantage over opponents. [1]</p> <p>(AND CONSEQUENTLY/ HOWEVER)</p> <p>The net benefit is zero. [1]</p> <p>(Sub-argument 2)</p> <p>Safe enhancements beyond sport are far more rewarding [1]</p> <p>(BECAUSE): they can make everybody's life better simultaneously. [1]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If main conclusion is identified as a reason = 0 marks • If reason is identified as the main conclusion = 0 marks • If IC identified as a reason = 1 mark BOD • If IC identified as main conclusion = 1 mark BOD <p>NB Paraphrasing risks losing the whole mark or reducing the mark to ½ (chevron) depending on how accurate it is. NB A single chevron gets rounded down to zero. Need 2 chevrons for 1 mark.</p> <p>NB If candidate summarises or paraphrases the whole argument without explicitly identifying any of its parts as reasons or conclusions then max 2 marks.</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
10(b)	<p>Briefly assess the quality of the reasoning in paragraph 5, explaining why you do or do not accept the author's conclusion (or conclusions).</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(5 marks)</p> <p>Candidates can judge either way, but their judgements need to be supported by their analysis / evaluation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author has made a very good case for arguing that enhancements outside sport are more valuable than those within and that there are better arguments for allowing gene therapy outside sport than within. Indeed, if we accept the reasons as stated – that the net benefit of enhancements within sport is zero; and that safe enhancements beyond sport are far more rewarding / can make everybody's life better simultaneously – then the conclusion seems to be undeniable. However, a lot rests on this last premise (that safe enhancements beyond sport are far more rewarding / can make everybody's life better simultaneously). Candidates may want to question the truth of this assertion, for example by questioning the extent to which our lives would be 'better' or 'more rewarding' through gene therapy (or indeed what these terms might mean). They may also want to point out that there is a degree of circularity / question-begging in 'safe enhancements' – of course 'safe' enhancements are likely to make our lives better, but what about <i>unsafe</i> ones? (Since the conclusion is a general one: that enhancements outside are inherently more valuable than those within; and since the reasoning only works for 'safe enhancements', there is a case for saying the conclusion doesn't (fully) follow.) As against the author, there is a case for allowing gene therapy in sport even if it reduces to a net benefit of zero, since it makes everything fair (therefore to some extent undermining the author's conclusion). The author's phrase that the reasons we have to legalise gene therapy beyond sport are 'infinitely more powerful', could plausibly be seen as exaggerated / hyperbole and unfairly persuasive. This looks like leading language. [max 2 marks for this] <p>They may also want to target some of the assumptions the argument makes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> eg That besting your own personal best is not important, never mind whether you win or not OR that improving the general health of people as a good consequence of legalising gene therapy beyond sport, is enough to make this morally ok. Might it be intrinsically wrong to mess with the very essence of what makes us human (DNA)? 			5	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3											
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">NB If a candidate's judgment is entirely positive and finds nothing to question or criticise then maximum is INTERMEDIATE (2–3 marks) if they give relevant reasons. But if it is a vague or broad endorsement of the argument, then award just 1 mark.Also candidates could point out that the argument only works on condition all athletes do indeed make use of gene enhancement. If they don't all use them then they won't cancel each other out to nothing; as long as some athletes have access to techniques that others do not then the net benefit will not be zero. This is a dubious assumption; what if, despite having access to the drugs, some athletes refuse to use them for moral or health reasons.The argument also needs to assume that all athletes will benefit equally if they use gene enhancement, but this isn't necessarily true. Surely some athletes' gene will 'take to it' more readily than others'. So there will still be unfairness because the net benefit will not be zero. <p>NB Credit any well-made points about the quality of reasoning, even if their analysis of the reasoning in 10(a) is wrong. This will prevent candidates being penalised twice for the same mistake.</p> <table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Description</th><th>Question Specific Points</th></tr><tr><td>Good [4 – 5 marks]</td><td>Critical comments are convincing and effective. Strengths and weaknesses are identified and an appropriate judgment is reached. Candidates engage critically with the most important features of the argument and specific flaws cited are clearly explained and / or likely to be labelled accurately.</td><td>Candidates will need to give a clear judgement which is well-supported by their critical comments.</td></tr><tr><td>Intermediate [2 -3 marks]</td><td>Evaluation is largely correct and focused on relevant flaws and strengths. Explanation is largely present but some assessment opportunities are missed.</td><td>Candidates may give a clear judgement but not one that is fully / convincingly supported by their critical comments.</td></tr><tr><td>Basic [0 – 1 mark]</td><td>Evaluation is likely to be limited to merely asserting agreement or disagreement with argument, or to identifying merely a minor flaw or strength, eg an emotive use of a term or a commonsense claim that's obviously true, or some vague comment eg that the argument is stated clearly.</td><td>Candidates' judgements, if present, are likely to be mostly assertive; there may be no clear judgement present.</td></tr></table>	Level	Description	Question Specific Points	Good [4 – 5 marks]	Critical comments are convincing and effective. Strengths and weaknesses are identified and an appropriate judgment is reached. Candidates engage critically with the most important features of the argument and specific flaws cited are clearly explained and / or likely to be labelled accurately.	Candidates will need to give a clear judgement which is well-supported by their critical comments.	Intermediate [2 -3 marks]	Evaluation is largely correct and focused on relevant flaws and strengths. Explanation is largely present but some assessment opportunities are missed.	Candidates may give a clear judgement but not one that is fully / convincingly supported by their critical comments.	Basic [0 – 1 mark]	Evaluation is likely to be limited to merely asserting agreement or disagreement with argument, or to identifying merely a minor flaw or strength, eg an emotive use of a term or a commonsense claim that's obviously true, or some vague comment eg that the argument is stated clearly.	Candidates' judgements, if present, are likely to be mostly assertive; there may be no clear judgement present.			
Level	Description	Question Specific Points														
Good [4 – 5 marks]	Critical comments are convincing and effective. Strengths and weaknesses are identified and an appropriate judgment is reached. Candidates engage critically with the most important features of the argument and specific flaws cited are clearly explained and / or likely to be labelled accurately.	Candidates will need to give a clear judgement which is well-supported by their critical comments.														
Intermediate [2 -3 marks]	Evaluation is largely correct and focused on relevant flaws and strengths. Explanation is largely present but some assessment opportunities are missed.	Candidates may give a clear judgement but not one that is fully / convincingly supported by their critical comments.														
Basic [0 – 1 mark]	Evaluation is likely to be limited to merely asserting agreement or disagreement with argument, or to identifying merely a minor flaw or strength, eg an emotive use of a term or a commonsense claim that's obviously true, or some vague comment eg that the argument is stated clearly.	Candidates' judgements, if present, are likely to be mostly assertive; there may be no clear judgement present.														

SECTION B (see Generic Mark Grid) page 24

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
11	<p>‘We should be allowed to change our bodies in any way we wish, whether through use of medicinal drugs or through medical technology.’</p> <p>Give a reasoned argument in response to the above claim.</p> <p>In your 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 <u>Documents A–C</u>. <p style="text-align: right;">(20 marks)</p> <p>NB If counter-argument included but not replied to then credit 1 mark for this, but if replied to, then 2 marks (3 if really well done).</p> <p>Candidates can take a strong position, arguing for or against the above claim, or adopt a modified, softened stance, such as ‘We should be free to change our bodies in any way we wish, as long as this is through treatments that are available to everyone through the NHS’.</p> <p>Candidates who agree or disagree ‘partially’ or ‘to an extent’ will need to make it clear precisely where they do or do not agree with the claim as it stands. Candidates do not need to restrict their answers to questions of sport / the debate surrounding gene doping. In fact, unless they give good reasons for doing so, they need to tackle the more general claim that has been proposed (perhaps referring to issues to do with sport and gene doping if relevant).</p> <p>Some suggested lines of argument are as follows:</p> <p>Candidates can argue that what we do with our bodies is our own choice; we have a right to do as we please and this right should be respected, and reflected in eg law / social attitudes. Candidates could point to the medical benefits / general physical benefits cited in Document A, or refer to the everyone-is-a-winner argument in Document C.</p> <p>Alternatively, candidates could offer lines of argument which challenge the ethics of such self-improvement, perhaps by considering the implications on our humanity / human identity, or by extending lines of argument raised by Alesha in Document A.</p> <p>Candidates could question other implications, such as turning medical advancements into a commercial industry, and the economic implications to do with funding (who will pay? Taxes? Or, if private, just those that can afford it?)</p> <p>Candidates could explore the importance of health on human happiness / well-being.</p>				20

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>For example, candidates agreeing with the position could argue that it is all-important. Candidates taking a more critical stance could argue that perhaps too much importance is placed on health / physical well-being; that we are obsessed with eg longevity at the expense of eg more spiritual / psychological achievements.</p> <p>These are just example responses and do not include an exhaustive list.</p> <p>Candidates can discuss non medical changes. Candidates may challenge the title claim by arguing that it possibly contradicts itself by at first asserting that any way of changing should be allowed, and restricting the options to either medicinal drugs or medical technology. They could then go on to argue for tattoos and piercings (does make-up count as a change of body?) which are hardly 'medical' changes.</p>				

Generic mark-grid for Section B:

Descriptor	Award Level		
	Good response	Reasonable response	Limited response
	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	25	25	–
Total Section B	–	–	20
Paper Total: [70] Marks	25	25	20
Paper Total: [70] Percentage	36%	36%	29%

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