Centre Number			Candidate Number		
Surname					
Other Names					
Candidate Signature					



General Certificate of Education Advanced Subsidiary Examination January 2013

Critical Thinking

CRIT2

Unit 2 Information, Inference and Explanation

Monday 28 January 2013

9.00 am to 10.30 am

For this paper you must have:

a Source Booklet (enclosed).
 You may use a calculator.

Time allowed

• 1 hour 30 minutes

Instructions

- Use black ink or black ball-point pen.
- Fill in the boxes at the top of this page.
- Answer all questions.
- You must answer the questions in the spaces provided. Answers written in margins or on blank pages will not be marked.
- Do all rough work in this book. Cross through any work you do not want to be marked.

Information

- The marks for questions are shown in brackets.
- The maximum mark for this paper is 70 (40 for Section A and 30 for Section B).

You will be marked on your ability to:

- use good English
- organise information clearly
- use specialist vocabulary where appropriate.

Advice

- The recommended time allocation for this examination is as follows:
 - Initial reading: 15 minutesSection A: 35–40 minutesSection B: 35–40 minutes.

For Examiner's Use		
Examine	r's Initials	
Question	Mark	
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
TOTAL		

Section A

Study **Documents A** to **C** before answering **all** the questions in the spaces provided.

There are 40 marks available for this section.

1 (a)	What is the conclusion being argued for?	
		(1 mark)
1 (b)	Would it be fair or unfair to describe this as a slippery slope argument?	(many
	Briefly explain your answer.	
		(3 marks)



Question	2 refers to the main text of Document A
2 (a)	In the main text, the author reports an argument which she opposes.
	Identify and analyse the argument she opposes.
	(5 marks)
2 (b)	Identify the main conclusion of the author's argument.
	(2 marks)
2 (c)	Identify one implicit assumption required to infer the author's main conclusion from the reasoning.
	(2 marks)

Turn over ▶



9

Questi	ons 3 to 10 refer to Document B and Figures 2 to 4
3	In paragraph 3 , the author, Monbiot, claims that 'Nuclear power is potentially dangerous, but it is much safer than its opponents think'.
	Identify one explanation from paragraph 2 or 3 and briefly describe how he uses it to justify this claim.
	(3 marks)
4	In paragraph 4 , Monbiot writes that 'energy is like medicine: if there are no side-effects, the chances are that it doesn't work'.
	How effective is this analogy?
	(4 marks)
	(4 marks)



Questic	on 5 refers to paragraphs 5 and 6	
5	Give one plausible explanation of why 'in places such as the UK renewables do not give year-round, 24 hour reliable supply' of energy.	
	(2 marks)	
		2
Questic	on 6 refers to the table, Figure 2	
6	Assume that the information in the table is accurate.	
	Can the following statement be safely inferred from the information in the table?	
	'Coal-based power should be expected to cause at least 1300 times as many deaths as hydroelectric power.'	
	(3 marks)	
		3

Turn over for the next question



Question	7 refers to Figure 3	
7	Describe the trend in the amount of electricity generated by fossil fuels in the UK from 1980 to 2010.	
	(2 marks)	2
Question	8 refers to Figure 2 and Figure 3	
8	Consider the following claim:	
	'By 2010 Britain's electricity production was causing fewer deaths per year than in 1990.'	
	In what ways is the support for the claim limited?	
	(4 marks)	
		4



9	From the information Monbiot gives in paragraph 11 , he draws the conclusion that 'it makes switching to coal even more wrong'.
	Is his inference justified?
	(3 marks)

3

Turn over for the next question



In response to Document B , a reader comments:
'Monbiot's reasoning is all wrong. After all, you could also think about how may people have been killed by nuclear weapons, and how many have been killed by non-nuclear weapons. For the last sixty-five years, ZERO people have beek killed by nuclear weapons. So by this logic even knives are more lethal than nuclear weapons, which seems to prove that the threat from nuclear weapons just a lie. But it isn't – they could destroy the world.'
Assess whether the response is successful as a counter-argument to Monbiot's artic
(6 m



Section B

Answer this question.

There are **30 marks** available for this question.

Read Do	cument C before answering this question.
11	'The world would be a better place if all energy was produced by nuclear power.'
	Write a reasoned argument for or against the statement above.
	In presenting your case you should:
	• produce a structured argument with a clearly stated conclusion or conclusions
	 draw on relevant information and evidence found in the source documents; you may also draw on your own knowledge and experience if relevant
	consider any general principles that may apply
	consider and respond to possible counter-arguments.









••	
••	
••	





••	
••	
••	



(30 marks)

30

END OF QUESTIONS





