



General Certificate of Education (A-level)
June 2012

Critical Thinking

CRIT2

(Specification 2770)

Unit 2: Information, Inference and Explanation.

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.

Unit 2 Information, Inference, Explanation

Section A

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
Questions 1 to 3 refer to Document A					
1	<p>Identify the ‘fundamental flaw at the heart of [Ken Clarke’s] reasoning’ (Paragraph 2).</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p> <p>The flaw is Clarke ‘Dismissing this correlation between the prison population and the crime rate’ [2].</p> <p>Accept paraphrases, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ignores prison population and crime rate relationship [2]• That if the country’s prison population was reduced, then crime rates wouldn’t rise [1]• Ignores link between prison and low crime [1]• Dismisses correlation [1]	2			

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3								
2	<p>This question refers to paragraphs 3 and 4 of Document A.</p> <p>In paragraph 4, Carolina Bracken uses Italy as an example of a link between prison numbers and crime.</p> <p>In doing so, does she commit the <i>post hoc</i> fallacy? Explain your answer.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(4 marks)</p> <p>No marks are available for the (possibly implicit) judgement about whether the fallacy is committed. Award marks for the adequacy and development of the reasons for the judgement.</p> <p>Answers should show clear understanding of the <i>post hoc</i> fallacy.</p> <table><tr><td>GOOD</td><td>The fallacy is understood well. One or more reasons are given for judging that the fallacy is (or is not) present in the reasoning in question and explained, or illustrated with an example.</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>INTERMEDIATE</td><td>The understanding of the fallacy is generally clear. One or more reasons are given for judging that the fallacy is (or is not) present in the reasoning in question.</td><td>2–3</td></tr><tr><td>BASIC</td><td>Understanding of the fallacy is evident but it may be inaccurate or incomplete. A reason for judging that the fallacy is (or is not) present in the reasoning in question may not be clear.</td><td>1</td></tr></table> <p>For example:</p> <p>Bracken does commit the <i>post hoc</i> fallacy because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">She claims that Italy's 'mass pardon of prisoners' caused the crime rate to rise simply because the rise occurred <i>after</i> the change in the prison population. The timing is the only supporting reason given, but it could be a coincidence. The rise might be due to another factor such as policing levels (or any suitable example). <p>Bracken does not commit the <i>post hoc</i> fallacy because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Italy is just an example. The <i>post hoc</i> fallacy is about <i>one</i> event following another but Italy is one of <i>several</i> cases where high crime followed a reduction in the prison population. So, Italy illustrates a <i>trend</i>, including Denmark and Portugal (which is what makes her causal claim plausible).	GOOD	The fallacy is understood well. One or more reasons are given for judging that the fallacy is (or is not) present in the reasoning in question and explained, or illustrated with an example.	4	INTERMEDIATE	The understanding of the fallacy is generally clear. One or more reasons are given for judging that the fallacy is (or is not) present in the reasoning in question.	2–3	BASIC	Understanding of the fallacy is evident but it may be inaccurate or incomplete. A reason for judging that the fallacy is (or is not) present in the reasoning in question may not be clear.	1	2	2	
GOOD	The fallacy is understood well. One or more reasons are given for judging that the fallacy is (or is not) present in the reasoning in question and explained, or illustrated with an example.	4											
INTERMEDIATE	The understanding of the fallacy is generally clear. One or more reasons are given for judging that the fallacy is (or is not) present in the reasoning in question.	2–3											
BASIC	Understanding of the fallacy is evident but it may be inaccurate or incomplete. A reason for judging that the fallacy is (or is not) present in the reasoning in question may not be clear.	1											

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
3	<p>Give <u>two</u> reasons why a high rate of imprisonment could cause the crime rate to fall.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(4 marks)</p> <p>Credit any adequate and non-trivial reason according to detail and development. Allow up to 3 marks for one reason.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Imprisoned offenders cannot commit crime (except against prisoners or prison staff). Increasing the number of criminals in prison (for longer sentences) acts as a deterrent to would be offenders. 		4		
Questions 4 to 7 refer to Document B					
4	<p>This question refers to Graph 1.</p> <p>If you wanted to work out the risk of being a victim of crime, why should you look at the dotted line and not the solid one?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p> <p>Credit any adequate reason according to its accuracy and development.</p> <p>Examples for 1 mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The dotted line shows recorded offences per 100 000 population. The dotted line shows crime linked to number of people but the solid one doesn't. <p>Example for 2 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Because the dotted line shows crimes compared to population, you could work out the percentage chance of being a victim. <p>No credit for mentioning accuracy or specificity – <i>both</i> lines are accurate and specific.</p> <p>Answers which focus on the dashed line at the bottom of the graph showing violent offences against the person should not be credited because it cannot show the risk of being a victim of crime in general.</p>		2		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3								
5	<p>For this question, compare Graph 1 with Graph 2.</p> <p>Can it be inferred from these graphs that an increase in the prison population causes a fall in crime?</p> <p>(4 marks)</p> <p>No marks are available for the (possibly implicit) judgement about whether the inference can be made. Award marks for the adequacy and development of the reasons for the judgement.</p> <table><tr><td>GOOD</td><td>The answer engages critically with the evidence to give a plausible justification for a clear (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>INTERMEDIATE</td><td>The answer engages critically with the evidence to give some justification for a (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.</td><td>2–3</td></tr><tr><td>BASIC</td><td>A minor strength or weakness of the evidence may be identified or answers may assert the strength or weakness of evidence with only very limited justification.</td><td>1</td></tr></table> <p>Examples:</p> <p>It cannot be inferred that an increase in the prison population causes a fall in crime because...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• This could only show correlation, which is not sufficient to establish causation as it could be coincidence or hide a common cause.• There is no clear correlation because crime falls in 1992 to 1993 <i>before</i> prison numbers start to rise between 1993 and 1994 OR crime rose from 1998/9 to 2002/3 yet prison numbers rose (or remained roughly the same) during this time.• Violent crime rises from 1990 to 2004/5 yet the trend for prison population is up over the same period.• Recorded crime may miss out many actual crimes because they are not reported to the police, making a comparison of the <i>real</i> crime rate and prison population impossible.	GOOD	The answer engages critically with the evidence to give a plausible justification for a clear (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.	4	INTERMEDIATE	The answer engages critically with the evidence to give some justification for a (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.	2–3	BASIC	A minor strength or weakness of the evidence may be identified or answers may assert the strength or weakness of evidence with only very limited justification.	1		4	
GOOD	The answer engages critically with the evidence to give a plausible justification for a clear (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.	4											
INTERMEDIATE	The answer engages critically with the evidence to give some justification for a (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.	2–3											
BASIC	A minor strength or weakness of the evidence may be identified or answers may assert the strength or weakness of evidence with only very limited justification.	1											

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3								
6	<p>This question refers to Graph 3 that the police and criminal justice system became less effective at bringing criminals to justice between 1980 and 2010?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(3 marks)</p> <p>No marks are available for the (possibly implicit) judgement about whether we should infer loss of effectiveness. Award marks for the adequacy and development of the reasons for the judgement.</p> <table><tr><td>GOOD</td><td>The answer engages critically with the evidence to give a plausible justification for a clear (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>INTERMEDIATE</td><td>The answer engages critically with the evidence to give some justification for a (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>BASIC</td><td>A minor strength or weakness of the evidence may be identified or answers may assert the strength or weakness of evidence with only very limited justification.</td><td>1</td></tr></table> <p>The answer to this question depends on what is meant by effectiveness. Credit candidates who explicitly discuss its meaning or define it in their answer.</p> <p>For example (answers need not be given in a yes or no format):</p> <p>Yes, we may infer reduced effectiveness because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The effectiveness of the police and criminal justice system is measured by what proportion of known crimes lead to convictions. Whatever the cause of the increase in recorded offences between 1955 and 1993, the police and criminal justice system failed to keep pace with it. <p>No, we may not infer reduced effectiveness because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Although recorded offences rise faster than the number of offenders found guilty or cautioned, that <i>could</i> be due to police successfully recording a higher proportion of actual crimes.	GOOD	The answer engages critically with the evidence to give a plausible justification for a clear (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.	3	INTERMEDIATE	The answer engages critically with the evidence to give some justification for a (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.	2	BASIC	A minor strength or weakness of the evidence may be identified or answers may assert the strength or weakness of evidence with only very limited justification.	1			3
GOOD	The answer engages critically with the evidence to give a plausible justification for a clear (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.	3											
INTERMEDIATE	The answer engages critically with the evidence to give some justification for a (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.	2											
BASIC	A minor strength or weakness of the evidence may be identified or answers may assert the strength or weakness of evidence with only very limited justification.	1											

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3									
7	<p>Consider the following claim: ‘If we want to reduce crime, we should use community punishments, not prison.’</p> <p>To what extent is this claim justified by Graph 4?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(4 marks)</p> <p>No marks are available for the (possibly implicit) judgement about the extent to which the claim is justified. Award marks for the adequacy and development of the reasons for the judgement.</p> <table><tr><td>GOOD</td><td>The answer engages critically with the evidence to give a plausible justification for a clear (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.</td><td>4</td></tr><tr><td>INTERMEDIATE</td><td>The answer engages critically with the evidence to give some justification for a (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.</td><td>2–3</td></tr><tr><td>BASIC</td><td>A minor strength or weakness of the evidence may be identified or answers may assert the strength or weakness of evidence with only very limited justification.</td><td>1</td></tr></table> <p>The judgment is justified (to some extent / slightly) because:</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Although in the early 1990s re-offending was at roughly the same rate for prison and community sentences, by 2006 community sentences led to 10% <i>less</i> re-offending. However, usually more than 50% of offenders still reoffend. <p>The judgment is not justified (at all / with certainty) because:</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">There is no information about the <i>type of offenders</i> punished and if <i>repeat offenders</i> tend to be sent to prison, the higher rate of re-offending would not show that prison is less effective at preventing future crime because <i>repeat offenders</i> would be expected to re-offend more often.	GOOD	The answer engages critically with the evidence to give a plausible justification for a clear (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.	4	INTERMEDIATE	The answer engages critically with the evidence to give some justification for a (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.	2–3	BASIC	A minor strength or weakness of the evidence may be identified or answers may assert the strength or weakness of evidence with only very limited justification.	1			4	
GOOD	The answer engages critically with the evidence to give a plausible justification for a clear (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.	4												
INTERMEDIATE	The answer engages critically with the evidence to give some justification for a (possibly implicit) judgement about the degree of evidential support.	2–3												
BASIC	A minor strength or weakness of the evidence may be identified or answers may assert the strength or weakness of evidence with only very limited justification.	1												

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
Question 8 refers to Document C					
8	<p>Look at Table 1. Assume that the information it contains is entirely accurate.</p> <p>Explain whether or not the following statements may be safely inferred from the information in Table 1.</p>				
8(a)	<p>At least 4 in 10 ex-prisoners will re-offend within one year of being released from prison.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p> <p>No marks are available for the (possibly implicit) judgement about the safety of the inference itself. Award marks for the adequacy and development of the reasons for the judgement (including showing mathematical workings).</p> <p>Judgement: This is a safe inference...</p> <p>Examples for 2 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...because the Reconviction Rate after one year is 43% (which is more than 4 in 10). ...since not all offences end in conviction, the 43% Reconviction Rate suggests that the number who will re-offend may be much higher than 4 in 10. <p>Example for 1 mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...43%. <p>Judgement: This inference is not certain...</p> <p>Examples for 2 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...because data from 2001–10 might not be a good guide to the future if changes were made to prison rehabilitation programmes ...because it is possible that some of the re-convicted ex-prisoners could have suffered miscarriages of justice. <p>Example for 1 mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...because data from 2001–10 might not be a good guide to the future. 	1	1		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3								
8(b)	<p>Ex-prisoners who stay out of jail long enough are no more likely to commit crime than the general population.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(3 marks)</p> <p>No marks are available for the (possibly implicit) judgement about the safety of the inference itself. Award marks for the adequacy and development of the reasons for the judgement (including showing mathematical workings).</p> <table><tr><td>GOOD</td><td>The candidate's (possibly implicit) judgment is clear, accompanied by strong grounds for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference OR a careful discussion of the pros and cons of the inference.</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>INTERMEDIATE</td><td>The candidate gives a (possibly implicit) judgement supported by one or more reasons for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference OR a discussion of the pros and cons, which may be incomplete.</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>BASIC</td><td>The candidate offers one or more reasons for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference which would give only minimal support to a judgment, which may not be given.</td><td>1</td></tr></table> <p>Judgement: This inference is not safe but has limited support because...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Explanation: ...the percentage of ex-prisoners who are re-convicted each year falls and, while the fall slows over nine years (from 12.2% to 1%), it is consistent with a long-term trend of reduced risk of re-offending which would eventually reach the general population's average if continued. <p>Judgement: The inference is unsafe because...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Explanation: ...the Reconviction Rate may not tell us how likely ex-prisoners are to commit crime (ie it could be unrepresentative) since those skilled enough at avoiding detection because of skills that they learned during their prison term avoid being caught....We do not know the general population's risk of criminality, so there is nothing to compare ex-prisoners' risk of re-offending to.	GOOD	The candidate's (possibly implicit) judgment is clear, accompanied by strong grounds for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference OR a careful discussion of the pros and cons of the inference.	3	INTERMEDIATE	The candidate gives a (possibly implicit) judgement supported by one or more reasons for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference OR a discussion of the pros and cons, which may be incomplete.	2	BASIC	The candidate offers one or more reasons for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference which would give only minimal support to a judgment, which may not be given.	1	1	2	
GOOD	The candidate's (possibly implicit) judgment is clear, accompanied by strong grounds for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference OR a careful discussion of the pros and cons of the inference.	3											
INTERMEDIATE	The candidate gives a (possibly implicit) judgement supported by one or more reasons for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference OR a discussion of the pros and cons, which may be incomplete.	2											
BASIC	The candidate offers one or more reasons for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference which would give only minimal support to a judgment, which may not be given.	1											

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3								
8(c)	<p>Ex-prisoners are most likely to commit a serious offence (such as violence against another person) in the third year after being released.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(3 marks)</p> <p>No marks are available for the (possibly implicit) judgement about the safety of the inference itself. Award marks for the adequacy and development of the reasons for the judgement (including showing mathematical workings).</p> <table border="1"><tr><td>GOOD</td><td>The candidate's (possibly implicit) judgment is clear, accompanied by strong grounds for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference OR a careful discussion of the pros and cons of the inference.</td><td>3</td></tr><tr><td>INTERMEDIATE</td><td>The candidate gives a (possibly implicit) judgement supported by one or more reasons for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference OR a discussion of the pros and cons, which may be incomplete.</td><td>2</td></tr><tr><td>BASIC</td><td>The candidate offers one or more reasons for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference which would give only minimal support to a judgment, which may not be given.</td><td>1</td></tr></table> <p>For example:</p> <p>Judgement: This is a safe inference because...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Explanation: ...the re-conviction severity rate for year 3 is 0.9 because the severity rate is cumulative and <u>Year 3</u> less <u>Year 2</u> is 0.9 (ie $2.5 - 1.6 = 0.9$) and the greatest difference between other consecutive years is only 0.8 (or other years are less than 0.9) (eg <u>Year 2</u> less <u>Year 1</u> is 0.8 ($1.6 - 0.8 = 0.8$)). <p>Judgement: This inference is not safe because...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Explanation: ...the data was collected for years 2001–2010, at the latest. Thus all we can infer <i>safely</i> is that ex-prisoners <i>were</i> most likely to commit a serious offence in the third year after being released during 2001–2010.	GOOD	The candidate's (possibly implicit) judgment is clear, accompanied by strong grounds for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference OR a careful discussion of the pros and cons of the inference.	3	INTERMEDIATE	The candidate gives a (possibly implicit) judgement supported by one or more reasons for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference OR a discussion of the pros and cons, which may be incomplete.	2	BASIC	The candidate offers one or more reasons for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference which would give only minimal support to a judgment, which may not be given.	1	1	2	
GOOD	The candidate's (possibly implicit) judgment is clear, accompanied by strong grounds for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference OR a careful discussion of the pros and cons of the inference.	3											
INTERMEDIATE	The candidate gives a (possibly implicit) judgement supported by one or more reasons for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference OR a discussion of the pros and cons, which may be incomplete.	2											
BASIC	The candidate offers one or more reasons for accepting or rejecting the safety of the inference which would give only minimal support to a judgment, which may not be given.	1											

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
Questions 9 and 10 refer to Document D					
9	<p>Identify the argument's main conclusion and one intermediate conclusion.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(4 marks)</p> <p>Accept paraphrases. Award one or two marks for each conclusion, according to accuracy. The conclusions may come in any order and need not be named to be credited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main conclusion: I disagree that increasing the number of prisoners works (ie reduces crime) • Intermediate conclusion: Imprisoning more would actually increase crime, for places that already lock up a lot of people • Intermediate conclusion: Putting a lot of people in prison does not mean automatic security • Intermediate conclusion: A less punitive system would work better 	4			

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3								
10	<p>Consider one reader’s response to Document D:</p> <p>“The article makes a disgusting appeal for us to pity criminals who suffer when punished. But criminals are people who have chosen to hurt innocent victims. Prison is supposed to hurt because it’s a punishment. We should jail criminals because they deserve it, regardless of how well it prevents crime.”</p> <p>Assess how effective this response is as a counter-argument to the main text of Document D.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(5 marks)</p> <p>No marks are available for the (possibly implicit) judgement about how effective the counter-argument is. Award marks for the adequacy and development of the reasons for the judgement.</p> <table><tr><td>GOOD</td><td>Comments engage with the argument critically, concentrating on its most important features. The fallacies, strengths and weaknesses identified strongly support a clear (possibly implicit) judgment. The answer clearly explains why the reasoning in question is strong, weak or fallacious, often using clear illustrations.</td><td>4–5</td></tr><tr><td>INTERMEDIATE</td><td>Comments engage with the argument critically. The fallacies, strengths and weaknesses identified support a (possibly implicit) judgment. Explanation is present but may lack development and some assessment opportunities may be missed.</td><td>2–3</td></tr><tr><td>BASIC</td><td>Comments engage with the argument but evaluation is limited either to identifying a minor flaw or strength, eg an emotive use of a term, or largely to assertion with limited justification, eg that the argument is clear.</td><td>1</td></tr></table> <p>Examples of points for the counter-argument’s effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It (implicitly) reveals a questionable assumption made in Document D that less imprisonment is compatible with justice.• It (implicitly) reveals a value judgement made in the text that the aim of penal policy should be to reduce crime above punishment / everything else.• It highlights what could be interpreted as an appeal to sympathy in the article’s final sentence about the pain punishment inflicts on criminals, their families and community. It could be argued that such an appeal is not reasonable. (This is a weaker point, since the best interpretation of the final paragraph is not as an appeal, and so should be treated as identifying a minor strength of the counter-argument.)	GOOD	Comments engage with the argument critically, concentrating on its most important features. The fallacies, strengths and weaknesses identified strongly support a clear (possibly implicit) judgment. The answer clearly explains why the reasoning in question is strong, weak or fallacious, often using clear illustrations.	4–5	INTERMEDIATE	Comments engage with the argument critically. The fallacies, strengths and weaknesses identified support a (possibly implicit) judgment. Explanation is present but may lack development and some assessment opportunities may be missed.	2–3	BASIC	Comments engage with the argument but evaluation is limited either to identifying a minor flaw or strength, eg an emotive use of a term, or largely to assertion with limited justification, eg that the argument is clear.	1		5	
GOOD	Comments engage with the argument critically, concentrating on its most important features. The fallacies, strengths and weaknesses identified strongly support a clear (possibly implicit) judgment. The answer clearly explains why the reasoning in question is strong, weak or fallacious, often using clear illustrations.	4–5											
INTERMEDIATE	Comments engage with the argument critically. The fallacies, strengths and weaknesses identified support a (possibly implicit) judgment. Explanation is present but may lack development and some assessment opportunities may be missed.	2–3											
BASIC	Comments engage with the argument but evaluation is limited either to identifying a minor flaw or strength, eg an emotive use of a term, or largely to assertion with limited justification, eg that the argument is clear.	1											

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>Examples of points against the counter-argument's effectiveness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It attacks a straw man when it accuses the article of an appeal to pity criminals because the article actually draws attention to the <i>consequences</i> of the criminals' pain for us ('it makes us bad' and increases crime). • It is an over-generalisation to assert that all criminals have chosen to hurt innocent victims because not all crimes are committed by choice, eg those committed under duress or by the mentally disordered and not all victims of crime are themselves innocent, eg in gang warfare. • It confuses punishment with being hurt or causing pain (or it is a questionable assumption that punishment needs to hurt, eg restorative justice where perpetrators meet victims). • It uses provocative / persuasive / emotional language by asserting that an appeal to pity is 'disgusting'. • The counter-argument commits the tu quoque fallacy by reasoning that criminals deserve to be hurt when punished because they hurt their victims. • The counter-argument is based on strong value judgements, which makes it less effective as a counter-<i>argument</i> since it cannot persuade those who start from different values. 				

Section B (See Generic mark-grid Page 14)

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
11	<p>‘Despite its faults, a community sentence is a better way to punish most criminals than a prison sentence.’</p> <p>(30 marks)</p> <p>Reward skilful critical reasoning highly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For example, an answer with some skilful strong reasoning and some weak reasoning may score more highly than an answer with consistent but moderately skilful reasoning. Concise answers may score more highly than longer ones. Answers with skilful reasoning may contain insight, or consider assumptions, or appreciate appropriate standards to use in a fair evaluation of the issues, or use conditional reasoning. <p>Reward answers that use information from the documents skilfully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For example, candidates who draw careful inferences from data, compare and contrast information, consider the credibility of sources, how representative evidence may be, or carefully decide how much support evidence gives, should be credited under both Use of Information and Reasoning criteria on the marking grid. <p>Reward answers that pay careful attention to the wording of the question.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For example, it is significant that the statement is about punishing most criminals rather than all criminals or serious criminals. Answers which take this into account explicitly should be rewarded for doing so. There is no penalty for not doing so. <p>Given the source documents, some answers may concentrate on arguing that prison does not work. They should not be penalised.</p> <p>Some use of principles in arguments will be implicit but may still be rewarded.</p> <p>When marking answers to this question, award marks for the quality of the reasoning, rather than for knowledge about criminal justice.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Credit answers according to how well the ideas are used to build a reasoned argument, rather than whether the ideas are accurate. For example, candidates may have inaccurate ideas about what community sentences typically involve. 				30

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>Possible lines of argument</p> <p>Community sentences are better because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prisons are ‘schools for crime’ that will turn prisoners into more serious criminals, while community sentences have lower re-offending rates • They allow offenders to contribute positively to their community • They challenge the social exclusion that leads to crime • They offer greater opportunities for effective rehabilitation, such as teaching numeracy, literacy, and employment skills • They are cheaper at a time when money is in short supply <p>Prison sentences are better because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are a punishment that reflects the harm criminals cause to victims • Society is protected from criminals while they are in prison • Prisoners could be compelled to undergo intensive rehabilitation work • Prison is a strong deterrent • Punishment is harsher but re-offending rates are only higher because we currently send only the most serious prisoners to jail 				

Generic mark-grid for Section B:

Criteria	Award level		
	Level 3: Good response	Level 2: Reasonable response	Level 1: Basic response
Conclusion	4	2 – 3	1
	A conclusion is clearly stated that is supported by all the reasoning, and directly responds to the question.	A conclusion is clearly stated that is supported by most of the reasoning, and responds to the question.	A conclusion is stated that is supported by some reasoning, and responds to the question in part.
Reasoning	9 – 12	5 – 8	1 – 4
	The conclusion is strongly supported with reasons, contributory arguments, examples, clarification of terms, etc.	The conclusion is supported with reasons, contributory arguments, examples, clarification of terms, etc.	The conclusion is weakly supported with reasons, contributory arguments, examples, clarification of terms, etc which may be imprecise.
Use of information From Source Documents and / or to other relevant information or experience.*	5 – 6	3 – 4	1 – 2
	Information (<i>must</i> include Source Documents) supports reasoning strongly. Information is interpreted carefully and inferences drawn from it are evaluated.	Information supports reasoning. Information is interpreted and inferences drawn may not be evaluated.	Information supports reasoning weakly. Information is not interpreted. Inferences drawn may be implicit and are not evaluated.
Reference to principle	4	2 – 3	1
	One or more general principles are introduced and play a significant role in the argument. Justification of the principle may be given.	One or more general principles are introduced and play a role in the argument.	One general principle is introduced and plays a minor or unclear role in the argument.
Counter-argument	4	2 – 3	1
	One or more challenges and objections are anticipated and answered effectively.	One or more challenges and objections are anticipated and answered.	One or more challenges and objections is anticipated and partially answered.

	Good response	Reasonable response	Basic response
QWC Quality of Written Communication	Consistently communicates clearly and appropriately	Generally communicates clearly and appropriately	Communication may impede understanding.

* NB Candidates are not rewarded for exhibiting additional knowledge per se, but for the use they put it to in their reasoning if they choose to introduce it. Conversely, there is no penalty for not exhibiting additional knowledge: use of the documents alone is sufficient for awarding Level 3 'Good response' (5–6).

Distribution of marks across the questions and assessment objectives for Unit 2

AO Balance	AO1	AO2	AO3
Total Section A	17	23	–
Total Section B	–	–	30
Paper Total: [70] Marks	17	23	30
Paper Total: [70] Percentage	24%	33%	43%

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