



GCE

## Critical Thinking

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit F502/01-02: Assessing and Developing Argument

### Mark Scheme for January 2013

---

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2013

## Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	To mark each of the additional lined pages and additional objects pages to indicate that these have been seen and taken into account.

## Section A – Multiple Choice

Question	Key	Text	Type	AO
1	D	School uniform	Name argument element (Expl)	AO1
2	C	School uniform	Name argument element (IC)	AO1
3	D	School uniform	Strengthen	AO2
4	B	Relationship advice	Main conclusion	AO1
5	C	Relationship advice	Assumption	AO1
6	A	Relationship advice	Flaw (conflation)	AO2
7	C	Let teenagers have a lie-in	Intermediate conclusion	AO1
8	B	Let teenagers have a lie-in	Name argument element (Expl)	AO1
9	C	Let teenagers have a lie-in	Flaw (hasty generalisation)	AO2
10	B	Let teenagers have a lie-in	Strengthen	AO2
11	D	Older drivers	Main conclusion	AO1
12	D	Older drivers	Flaw (generalisation)	AO2
13	D	Handwriting vs keyboarding	Name argument element (Reason)	AO1
14	C	Handwriting vs keyboarding	Assumption	AO1
15	C	Handwriting vs keyboarding	Strengthen	AO2
			Section A Total	15

Question	Topic/Answer	Marks	Guidance
1–3	<b>School uniform</b>		<p><b>Analysis</b></p> <p>MC School uniforms should be abandoned      IC because they do not succeed in preventing bullying      Expl No matter what students wear to go to school, some people will always find a way to judge others      Ex such as criticising their hairstyle, hair colour and accessories      IC In addition, school uniforms cost families extra money      R Not only do families have to pay for leisurewear, they also have to pay for the uniform too      R Children will still ask their parents for designer clothes to wear outside of school.</p>
1	<b>D</b>	1	see analysis above
2	<b>C</b>	1	see analysis above
3	<b>D</b>	1	<p>(a) This statement acts as a weak counter assertion to the last reason, so would weaken the argument, not strengthen it</p> <p>(b) This statement acts as a response to the second IC, so would weaken the argument, not strengthen it</p> <p>(c) This neither strengthens or weakens the argument. It refers to the explanation in the argument, but a limited number of variations does not mean that abandoning uniforms will prevent bullying</p> <p>(d) This strengthens the MC, by illustrating and giving evidence for why school uniforms should be abandoned.</p>
4–6	<b>Relationship advice</b>		<p><b>Analysis</b></p> <p>R The relationship advice offered by women's magazines is increasingly focused on casual relationships rather than long-term commitment      Ev In 1965, the most popular women's magazine had 32 articles giving relationship advice. Of those, almost 90% focused on marriage. In 2010, only 5% of the articles giving relationship advice mentioned marriage      MC The relationship advice in women's magazines is damaging      R True happiness in a relationship comes from long-term commitment.</p>

Question		Topic/Answer	Marks	Guidance
4		B	1	see analysis on previous page
5		C	1	<p><b>Rationale</b></p> <p>(a) The author of the argument does not need to believe that casual relationships are (morally) wrong. It could be that casual relationships are morally acceptable but do not lead to true happiness, in which case relationship advice which encourages casual relationships at the expense of long-term commitment could be harmful</p> <p>(b) The argument works even if the articles about marriage in 2010 were not critical of marriage. The author provides evidence that marriage is mentioned only rarely in the context of relationship advice and it is possible that readers are less likely to form long-lasting relationships as a result of this</p> <p>(c) The author has to think that the relationship advice in women's magazines affects readers' relationships. Otherwise people would not be less likely to form long-term relationships just because of the advice in women's magazines</p> <p>(d) The argument works even if women's magazines do not all have the same attitude to marriage. It could be that most women's magazines are opposed to marriage and a few think marriage and casual relationships are equally acceptable. In that case, the magazines would have different attitudes but their relationship advice could all be harmful. It is also possible that other magazines have different attitudes to marriage but still focus overwhelmingly on other kinds of relationship, which could be harmful.</p>

Question	Topic/Answer	Marks	Guidance
6	A	1	<p><b>Rationale</b></p> <p>(a) The argument conflates long-term commitment with marriage because the evidence is about a lack of focus on marriage but we are not told that true happiness comes from marriage; we are told that it comes from long-term commitment. It could be that a high proportion of the articles deal with long-term relationships and in that case there is no reason to think that they are harmful</p> <p>(b) A straw man argument misrepresents an opponent's argument but this passage does not refer to an argument put forward by women's magazines</p> <p>(c) The argument does not generalise from women's magazines to all magazines because it never considers all magazines together. The conclusion is specifically about women's magazines</p> <p>(d) A slippery slope argument describes a sequence of steps from an initial action to a sequence of increasingly unlikely outcomes. This argument does not describe a sequence of steps from publishing articles about casual relationships to a sequence of unlikely outcomes, the last of which is unhappiness.</p>
7 -10	Let teenagers have a lie-in		<p><b>Analysis</b></p> <p>IC Teenagers could achieve more if they were allowed to stay in bed longer and start their classes later</p> <p>R Teenagers reach full alertness later in the morning than other age groups.</p> <p>Exp A hormone which helps to make us sleepy continues to be produced in teenage brains until much later in the day</p> <p>Ev A school on Tyneside has tested the idea, changing its start-time from 9 am to 10 am, and exam results improved dramatically: the number of pupils achieving at least five GCSEs at grades A*-C rose by 19%</p> <p>MC It is clear that other UK schools should do the same and start later.</p>

Question		Topic/Answer	Marks	Guidance
7		C	1	see analysis on previous page
8		B	1	<p><b>Rationale</b></p> <p>(a) An example gives a particular instance to illustrate a general statement. The quoted claim does not do that</p> <p>(b) The continued production of the sleep-promoting hormone causes teenagers to reach full alertness later in the morning. It says why this happens, so it is an explanation</p> <p>(c) This is not supported by any other statement in the passage. The main conclusion is "It is clear that other UK schools should do the same and start later"</p> <p>(d) The author does not talk about the continued production of the sleep-producing hormone in order to persuade us that teenagers reach full alertness later. In fact, it is easier to accept the fact that teenagers reach full alertness later (as most people know this from their own experience) than it is to accept the fact that a hormone stops being produced at a certain time (which we have to take on trust from specialised scientists).</p>
9		C	1	<p><b>Rationale</b></p> <p>(a) A circular argument uses as a reason a statement that is equivalent to its conclusion. This argument does not do that</p> <p>(b) It seems that delaying the start-time is a sufficient condition for achieving more but the argument does not assume or state that it is a necessary condition. The author can accept that higher achievement can be obtained without delaying start-times but still maintain that delaying start-times is the right thing to do. Delaying start-times could be the best way of raising achievement. Even if it is not the best, it could be that delaying start-times in combination with other measures would raise achievement even more than those other measures by themselves</p> <p>(c) The author assumes that the effect observed in one school on Tyneside would be replicated elsewhere. Therefore, the author is generalising hastily from the school on Tyneside to all UK schools</p> <p>(d) A slippery slope argument predicts a sequence of increasingly undesirable outcomes if an initial step is taken. This argument does not predict a sequence of undesirable outcomes.</p>

Question	Topic/Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	B	1	<p><b>Rationale</b></p> <p>(a) The timetable in American schools makes no difference to the argument. The American study did not refer to schools but is only explaining, in terms of their brain chemistry, why teenagers reach full alertness later in the morning than adults</p> <p>(b) The fact that there were no other changes in the Tyneside school strongly suggests that it was because of the delayed start-time that exam results there improved, and not because of some other factor</p> <p>(c) The fact that teachers find it harder to control a class of teenagers that are fully awake weakens the argument; it does not strengthen it. It suggests that lessons will be more disorderly if start-times are delayed and this is a reason not to delay start-times</p> <p>(d) The fact that teachers will be more tired by the end of the school day if it finishes later weakens the argument. If teachers are more tired, then a delayed start-time is bad for them and may be bad for the quality of their lessons.</p>
11–12	Older drivers		<p><b>Analysis</b></p> <p>R Driving represents freedom and independence for older people</p> <p>Ex For example, it gives them the ability to visit friends and go to the shops, without relying on anyone else</p> <p>MC It is a good thing that there is no legal age at which you must stop driving in the UK</p> <p>R For the most part, older drivers are safe</p> <p>Ev The graph proves that those above the age of 60 are the safest drivers.</p>
11	D	1	see analysis above

Question	Topic/Answer	Marks	Guidance
12	D	1	<p><b>Rationale</b></p> <p>(a) The author does not confuse necessary and sufficient conditions - the author does not consider the issue of preventing accidents being necessary or sufficient for safety.</p> <p>(b) The author does not make this non-sequitur.</p> <p>(c) The author does not conflate freedom with visiting friends and going to the shops, these are given as examples of freedom.</p> <p>(d) The author does generalise from the 60–64 age group to all drivers over the age of 60 – whilst the 60–64 age group has the lowest number of insurance claims after causing accidents, the graph shows that those above the 60–64 age group are not necessarily the safest drivers.</p>
13–15	<b>Handwriting vs keyboarding</b>		<p><b>Analysis</b></p> <p>MC (Dropping the requirement to teach handwriting) is a mistake.</p> <p>R Handwriting is essential to a child's development</p> <p>Ev Researchers took two groups of pre-school children. One group spent four weeks practising writing the letters of the alphabet; the other children practised only seeing and saying the letters. Afterwards, the researchers did brain scans. They found that only the children who practised writing developed a particular type of brain activity that is found in adults</p> <p>R Good handwriting can also mean better grades</p> <p>Ev Undergraduate essays are given better marks if the handwriting is neat.</p>
13	D	1	see analysis above

Question	Topic/Answer	Marks	Guidance
14	C	1	<p><b>Rationale</b></p> <p>(a) The author of the argument does not need to believe that children cannot learn to handwrite at home. Even if it is possible for children to learn handwriting at home, it could be that the vast majority of them will not learn to do so without lessons at school. It could be that most parents do not have the patience, or the skills, to teach their children handwriting at home. In that case, dropping the requirement to teach handwriting in schools could have the negative impact on a child's development that the passage mentions</p> <p>(b) The author certainly does not need to believe that keyboarding skills are more useful today than they were in the past. If anything, this belief would weaken the argument that it is a mistake to replace the handwriting with keyboarding</p> <p>(c) The argument does not work unless the particular type of brain activity that is developed by practising handwriting is useful. If it is not useful, then the evidence about the two groups of pre-school children does not support the claim that handwriting is essential to a child's development. You cannot say that something is essential to a child's development because it develops a useless type of brain activity</p> <p>(d) It does not matter to the argument whether the two groups of pre-school children were approximately the same size. The groups could contain completely unequal numbers of children but could both be large enough for a statistically significant difference to be observed in the proportion of children developing the particular type of brain activity.</p>

Question	Topic/Answer	Marks	Guidance
15	C	1	<p><b>Rationale</b></p> <p>(a) It would not strengthen the argument very much if most American parents want primary schools to teach handwriting. This would not help to show that handwriting was essential to a child's development or that dropping the requirement to teach handwriting was a mistake. The majority of parents could simply be wrong in thinking that learning to handwrite, rather than keyboard, is better for children</p> <p>(b) The fact that computers may soon be able to recognise handwriting with a high degree of accuracy does not help to show that replacing handwriting with keyboarding is a mistake. It does not give an advantage of handwriting over keyboarding. After all, computers are never likely to recognise handwriting as accurately as they do typed input</p> <p>(c) The statement that keyboarding does not develop the type of brain activity developed by handwriting would strengthen the argument considerably. It is needed if we are to think that replacing handwriting with keyboarding will stop children from developing this type of brain activity and have a harmful effect on children</p> <p>(d) The fact that making a list of things helps you to remember them has no relevance in a discussion about the relative merits of handwriting and keyboarding, because you can make a list of things either by handwriting it or by keyboarding it.</p>
	<b>Section A Total</b>	<b>15</b>	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
16	(a)	<p><b>MAIN CONCLUSION</b>  <b>2 marks:</b>  Monarchy is good for the UK.</p> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monarchy is good. (<i>missing out information</i>)</li> <li>Monarchy is a good thing for the UK (<i>approximate</i>)</li> <li>Monarchy is beneficial for the UK (<i>approximate</i>)</li> <li>It is good that the UK has a monarch. (<i>approximate</i>).</li> <li>Monarchy is good for all (<i>approximate</i>).</li> <li>The monarchy is good for the UK. (<i>subtlety different concept</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 0 marks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The monarchy is good value for money. (<i>IC</i>)</li> <li>The monarch is good for the UK. (<i>quite a different concept</i>)</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>Principle of discrimination for all parts of question 16</b>  This question discriminates between candidates who can demonstrate a secure understanding of the overall structure of the argument, from those who can only recognise the gist of the argument.</p> <p><b>2 marks – PRECISION</b>  For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author.</p> <p><b>1 mark – APPROXIMATE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For imprecisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author, but adding or missing out information</li> <li><b>OR</b> For a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrases.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b>  For a statement of an incorrect part of the text.</p> <p>NB Only credit the words actually written. Do not credit words replaced by dots.</p> <p>NB Any words in brackets are not required but candidates should not be penalised if these words are included.</p>
	(b)	<p><b>PRINCIPLE</b>  <b>Examples for 2 marks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We should be prepared to pay a small price for anything that benefits the country. (<i>para 2</i>)</li> <li>In a democracy we should be able to choose the Head of State. (<i>para 4</i>).</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We should pay a small price for things that benefit the country. (<i>approximate</i>)</li> <li>Unity is a good thing. (<i>para 5</i>) (<i>partial performance – this not a guide to action</i>).</li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 0 marks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The monarchy is good value for money. (<i>IC</i>).</li> <li>We should do what is best for the country (<i>principle which does support but not in passage</i>)</li> </ul>	2	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	(i)	<p><b>COUNTER-REASON</b>  <b>2 marks</b>            (Because) change brings progress</p> <p><b>Example for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Opponents of monarchy argue that) in a democracy we should be able to choose the Head of State, (not have the eldest child of the previous reigning monarch imposed on us) (<i>counter-assertion, but not part of the counter argument</i>).</li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• continuity is not necessarily a good thing (<i>counter-conclusion</i>).</li> </ul>	2	<p>The counter-argument is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Counter-reason: (Because) change brings progress</li> <li>• Counter-conclusion: (Some have argued that) continuity is not necessarily a good thing</li> </ul> <p>There is also a counter-assertion in the passage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Opponents of monarchy argue that) in a democracy we should be able to choose the Head of State, (not have the eldest child of the previous reigning monarch imposed on us) (<i>counter-assertion, but not part of the counter argument</i>).</li> </ul>
	(ii)	<p><b>COUNTER-CONCLUSION</b>  <b>2 marks</b>            (Some have argued that) continuity is not necessarily a good thing</p> <p><b>Example for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• continuity is not a good thing (<i>approximate</i>)</li> <li>• (Opponents of monarchy argue that) in a democracy we should be able to choose the Head of State, (not have the eldest child of the previous reigning monarch imposed on us) (<i>counter-assertion, but not part of the counter argument</i>).</li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 0 marks</b>            (Because) change brings progress (<i>counter-reason</i>)</p>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where a candidate has given the counter-reason and counter-conclusion together in one part (either 16ci OR 16cii), credit 1 mark. Do not credit the whole counter-argument twice (i.e. for 16ci AND 16cii).</li> <li>• Where a candidate has put the counter-assertion for EITHER 16ci OR 16cii, credit 1 mark. Do not credit the counter-assertion twice (i.e. for 16ci AND 16cii)</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where a candidate has put the counter-conclusion for the counter-reason in 16ci, credit 0 marks</li> <li>• Where candidate has put the counter-reason for the counter-conclusion in 16cii, credit 0 marks</li> </ul>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
(d)		<p><b>INTERMEDIATE CONCLUSION</b></p> <p><b>Examples for 2 marks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The monarchy is good value for money. (para 2)</li> <li>• A monarch will have more expertise than any elected president. (para 4).</li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 1 mark:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The monarch is good value for money. (<i>slightly different concept</i>)</li> <li>• Monarchy is good value for money (<i>approximate – monarchy in general is different to THE monarchy we have</i>)</li> <li>• The monarch has more expertise than any elected president. (<i>approximate</i>).</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The monarchy generates income for the country by attracting tourists to the UK. (<i>not supported by reasons, just evidence</i>)</li> <li>• The monarchy is one of the few things that unites the United Kingdom. (<i>IC, but from para 5, not paras 2-4</i>).</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b></p> <p>This question discriminates between candidates who can demonstrate a secure understanding of the overall structure of the argument, from those who can only recognise the gist of the argument.</p> <p><b>2 marks – PRECISION</b></p> <p>For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author.</p> <p><b>1 mark – APPROXIMATE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For imprecisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author, but adding or missing out information.</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> For a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrases.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>For a statement of an incorrect part of the text.</p> <p>NB Only credit the words actually written. Do not credit words replaced by dots.</p> <p>NB Any words in brackets are not required but candidates should not be penalised if these words are included.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
17	(a) (b)	<p><b>EVALUATION OF ANALOGY</b></p> <p><b>Examples of evaluative points</b></p> <p><b>Strengths</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both lead people / institutions</li> <li>• Both have people who report to / work for them</li> <li>• Both look after the welfare of others</li> <li>• Both require training</li> <li>• Both are symbolic leaders</li> <li>• Both use the length of service / reign to illustrate consistency</li> </ul> <p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One is run as a business, the other not</li> <li>• One is a symbolic leader, the other is not</li> <li>• One makes decisions, the other does not</li> <li>• The effect of weakness is not comparable</li> <li>• The timespans are different</li> <li>• The scale of leadership cannot be compared</li> <li>• It implies that the monarch is weak</li> <li>• The implied comparison should be between a monarch and a president</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 3 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through comparing the monarchy with a weak headteacher, it implies that the monarch may not be effective, which goes against the MC that the monarch is good for the country (w)</li> <li>• The comparison shows a long-standing weak headteacher is better than a new one each term, whereas the implied comparison would be between a monarch and a president, which are very different roles, so it is not a clear comparison. (w)</li> </ul>	3+3	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b></p> <p>This question discriminates between candidates who recognise and give a clear justification for the presence of a strength or weakness in a specific area in relation to the overall argument, with those who can give partial justification(s) for their evaluation of the relative strength or weakness in specific parts of the argument.</p> <p><b>Three marks are independently available:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correct identification of <b>WHAT</b> a weakness or strength is in the analogy <b>(1 mark)</b></li> <li>• An explanation of <b>WHY</b> this is a weakness or strength <b>(1 mark)</b></li> <li>• An assessment of <b>HOW</b> this weakness or strength impacts on the argument/claim. <b>(1 mark)</b></li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> For no credit-worthy material.</p> <p>Candidates may give either a strength or a weakness and do not need to identify whether their evaluation is a strength or a weakness.</p> <p>Do not credit responses that merely state that the claim is a strength or a weakness.</p> <p><b>NB:</b> <b>Do not give credit to the second answer if it is essentially a repetition of the same point.</b></p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p><b>Examples for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both headteachers and monarchs are trained for the post, so it is a clear comparison (s)</li> <li>The author implies that the monarchy is weak, which would argue against their own argument (w)</li> <li>Implementing new ideas takes time and the comparison shows this (s)</li> <li>Both headteachers and monarchs have a leadership role and look after the welfare of those they lead (s)</li> <li>A country is not a business, whereas schools are (w)</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It implies that the monarch is weak (w)</li> <li>The scale of leadership is not comparable (w)</li> <li>The monarch is a symbolic leader. (w)</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is a weakness/strength</li> <li>The monarchy is not weak</li> <li>Not every monarch is long reigning</li> <li>This is not necessarily true, lots of headteachers may be useful. (<i>counter, not evaluation</i>)</li> <li>It makes a hasty generalisation / conflation of headteachers to monarchs.</li> </ul>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
18	<p><b>EVALUATION OF THE USE OF EVIDENCE PARA 2</b></p> <p><b>Examples for 3 marks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cost refers to the Queen, not the buildings, security and other royals, so it is significantly different to the cost of the monarchy (w)</li> <li>• The cost is compared to crisps, making it easy to understand the amount necessary, so the evidence helps to support the claim that the monarchy does not cost a lot (s)</li> <li>• The evidence has been presented in a misleading way; by referring to 'per person per year' it disguises the considerable total cost, which undermines the IC that the 'monarchy is good value for money'.</li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 2 marks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The cost refers to the Queen, who has the greatest cost of all the royals, so it does not represent the whole of the monarchy quite accurately (s)</li> <li>• Tax payers can choose whether or not to buy a packet of crisps, but this is not the case with a monarch. (w)</li> <li>• 69p is so little that it strongly supports the claim that the monarchy does not cost us very much (s)</li> <li>• To know that 69p is a little amount, we need to know what else costs us 69p on tax. (s)</li> <li>• It will be a greater burden on taxpayers, because not every person pays tax. (s)</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tax payers can choose whether or not to buy a packet of crisps. (w)</li> <li>• The author has not established that 69p is a tiny amount to each person per year.</li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We don't know where this evidence comes from</li> <li>• It strengthens the argument as it uses statistics.</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b></p> <p>This question discriminates on candidates' ability to assess evidence used in the argument, by commenting on its relevance, and/or by assessing the degree to which the evidence helps the author to make the point.</p> <p><b>Three marks are independently available:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correct identification of <b>WHAT</b> a weakness or strength is in the <u>use of the evidence</u> (<b>1 mark</b>)</li> <li>• An explanation of <b>WHY</b> this is a weakness or strength (<b>1 mark</b>)</li> <li>• An assessment of <b>HOW</b> this weakness or strength impacts on the argument/claim. (<b>1 mark</b>)</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>For no credit-worthy material.</p> <p>Candidates may give either a strength or a weakness and do not need to identify whether their evaluation is a strength or a weakness.</p> <p>Do not credit responses that merely state that the claim is a strength or a weakness.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
19	<p><b>EVALUATION OF EXAMPLE PARAGRAPH 3</b></p> <p><b>Examples of evaluative points</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thousands are willing to spend time by being outside demonstrates attracting tourists</li> <li>Those waiting / being outside may not be tourists</li> <li>Those waiting / being outside may not generate any (tourist) income for the UK</li> <li>The people waiting / being might not be from overseas</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 3 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The author assumes that the people waiting / being outside are overseas tourists and this assumption weakens the link between the example and the claim it illustrates 'the monarchy generates income for the country by attracting tourists to the UK' (w)</li> <li>The use of the evidence is weak as it is unlikely that people waiting / being outside the palace are spending any tourist money and therefore contributing to the economy. (w)</li> <li>The people outside BP may not be tourists from outside of the country so they may not be contributing to the economy (w)</li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 2 marks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Just because people are outside, does not mean that it is good for tourism (w)</li> <li>The people outside BP may not tourists, so they may not be generating income (w)</li> <li>The author assumes that the people waiting outside are overseas tourists (w)</li> <li>It has not been shown how the place itself is good for tourism. (w)</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b></p> <p>This question discriminates on candidates' ability to assess an example used in the argument, by commenting on its relevance, and/or by assessing the degree to which the example helps the author to make the point.</p> <p><b>Three marks are independently available:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Correct identification of <b>WHAT</b> a weakness or strength is in the <u>use of the example</u> (<b>1 mark</b>)</li> <li>An explanation of <b>WHY</b> this is a weakness or strength (<b>1 mark</b>).</li> <li>An assessment of <b>HOW</b> this weakness or strength impacts on the argument/claim (<b>1 mark</b>).</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>For no credit-worthy material.</p> <p>Candidates may give either a strength or a weakness and do not need to identify whether their evaluation is a strength or a weakness.</p> <p>Do not credit responses that merely state that the claim is a strength or a weakness.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p><b>Examples for 1 mark:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waiting outside may not be positive tourism. (w)</li> <li>Standing outside is free (s/w)</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We don't know where this evidence comes from and if it is still true</li> <li>They may never see a royal just by waiting outside</li> <li>The Queen is not there all of the time.</li> <li>It is only one example.</li> <li>A weakness of the example is that it presumes that the thousands of people waiting outside BP are waiting to see the royal family (<i>most of this is stated and merely states that it is a weakness, without explaining why it is a weakness</i>).</li> </ul>		

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
20	(a)	<p><b>FLAW (NAME)</b></p> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ad hominem</li> <li>• Attacking the arguer.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Straw man / person</li> <li>• Necessary and sufficient conditions</li> <li>• Attacking the argument</li> <li>• Undermining the opposing view (this is a partial response on what a straw man is, rather than ad hominem)</li> </ul>	1	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b></p> <p>This question discriminates between candidates who can identify flaws in reasoning, from candidates who identify obvious weaknesses in reasoning without accurate identification.</p> <p><b>1 mark – PRECISION</b></p> <p>For precisely naming the flaw in the exact words required in the specification.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For naming an unrelated/incorrect flaw, or other key term used in the specification.</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> for a scattergun approach (correct answer along with others)</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> For no credit-worthy material.</li> </ul>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)		<p><b>FLAW (EXPLANATION)</b></p> <p><b>Examples for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The author calls the opponents disrespectful rather than attacking their argument (the Head of State should not be imposed on us)</li> <li>The author attacks opponents of monarchy, as being disrespectful and ungrateful people. This is a problem with the reasoning, as their view has not been properly dismissed, just them as people.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It attacks the opponents, not their view (<i>generic</i>)</li> <li>Their view is not considered (<i>limited</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>They may not be disrespectful people (<i>counter</i>)</li> <li>This view should be dismissed as the rantings of disrespectful people. (<i>just reference to the text</i>)</li> <li>The statement is not backed up with evidence and so creates a bad argument (<i>use of evidence is not necessary to make a good argument – this does not identify what occurs in an ad hominem flaw nor why this is wrong</i>)</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b></p> <p>This question discriminates between candidates who can identify flaws in reasoning, explaining accurately what is weak about their use, from candidates who identify obvious weaknesses in reasoning with some understanding of what is wrong.</p> <p><b>2 marks – CLEAR JUSTIFICATION</b></p> <p>A clear explanation, with reference to the context, of why the flaw weakens the reasoning.</p> <p><b>1 mark – LIMITED JUSTIFICATION</b></p> <p>For a generic justification that the flaw is a weakness. <b>OR</b> a limited justification that the flaw is weak, perhaps phrased as a counter.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>For just reference to the text, or no credit-worthy material.</p> <p><b>NB:</b>  <b>There are 2 elements to the ad hominem flaw</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Attacking the opponents</b></li> <li><b>Disregarding their argument.</b></li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
21	<p><b>ASSUMPTION</b></p> <p><b>Examples for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training leads to greater expertise</li> <li>• The monarch has learnt from / implements / has benefitted from their training</li> <li>• The training is better than any a prospective president could have had</li> <li>• Presidents are <b>not</b> trained from birth</li> <li>• Presidents have not received the same type / degree of training.</li> <li>• The training is effective.</li> <li>• Expertise relies on training.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training does not necessarily lead to better experience (<i>worded as a counter</i>)</li> <li>• Presidents may have more experience in leadership (<i>counter</i>).</li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training is good (<i>this assumption is not necessary for the argument to work</i>)</li> <li>• A monarch will have more expertise than any president. (<i>reference to the text</i>)</li> <li>• A monarch is trained from birth and a president is not (<i>the first part is a quote, the second is an assumption that could be awarded 1 mark, but the fact that both are presented together as assumptions which are necessary for the argument means that this achieves no credit</i>)</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b></p> <p>This question discriminates between candidates who recognise the unstated assumption causing the argument not to function without it, from candidates who can show a slight recognition of missing reasons in the argument area, but who may lack clear understanding of whether the assumption is necessary.</p> <p><b>2 marks – CLEAR</b></p> <p>Identification of an assumption which is necessary for the argument and which would support the author's argument.</p> <p><b>1 mark – LIMITED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification of an assumption which lends minimal support to the author's argument</li> <li>• Identification of an assumption which lends strong support to the author's argument, but lacks clarity in expression.</li> <li>• For the essence of an assumption expressed as a challenge.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>For just reference to the text, or no credit-worthy material.</p> <p><b>NB:</b> <b>Where 2 assumptions are given, BOTH have to be a necessary step in the argument for it to gain credit.</b></p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
22	(a)	<p><b>APPEAL (NAME)</b></p> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tradition</li> <li>• Appeal to tradition.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appeal to history</li> <li>• Appeal to tradition / history</li> <li>• It is a weakness.</li> </ul>	1	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b></p> <p>This question discriminates between candidates who can identify appeals in reasoning, from candidates who identify obvious weaknesses in reasoning without accurate identification.</p> <p><b>1 mark – PRECISION</b></p> <p>For precisely naming the appeal in the exact words required in the specification.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For naming an unrelated/incorrect appeal, or other key term used in the specification</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> for a scattergun approach (correct answer along with others)</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> For no credit-worthy material.</li> </ul>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)		<p><b>APPEAL (EXPLANATION)</b></p> <p><b>Example for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Just because the monarchy has survived throughout history does not mean that it is therefore the best form of government, further reasoning is needed.</li> <li>Although the monarchy has survived so long, this does not mean it is correct/right/good</li> <li>Just because the monarchy is traditional does not give any reasons for it being a good idea.</li> <li>Just because it has happened for 'so long' does not mean that it is right.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Just because it is a tradition doesn't mean to say it is right (<i>generic</i>)</li> <li>The argument has no reasons for the conclusion other than the sense of tradition. (<i>generic</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our monarchy would not have survived for as long as it has if it were not the best form of government. (<i>just reference to the text</i>)</li> <li>The author argues that the fact it has happened in the past means that it will continue to happen in the future (<i>explanation of an appeal to history</i>)</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b></p> <p>This question discriminates between candidates who can identify appeals in reasoning, explaining accurately what is weak about their use, from candidates who identify obvious weaknesses in reasoning with some understanding of what is wrong.</p> <p><b>2 marks – CLEAR JUSTIFICATION</b></p> <p>A clear explanation, with reference to the context, of why the appeal does not give strong support.</p> <p><b>1 mark – LIMITED JUSTIFICATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For a generic justification that the appeal is weak.</li> <li><b>OR</b> a limited justification that the appeal is weak, perhaps phrased as a counter.</li> <li><b>OR</b> a description, in context, of what the appeal is, without justifying why its presence may not give strong support to the argument.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>For just reference to the text, or no credit-worthy material.</p> <p><b>NB:</b></p> <p><b>An appeal to history</b> is where evidence of past performance is used to predict future performance – '<i>it happened then so will happen in the future</i>'</p> <p><b>An appeal to tradition</b> occurs when someone argues that we should continue to do something because it is traditional to do it or that longevity suggests correctness or rightness - '<i>this has always happened, so we should continue with it</i>'</p>
		<b>Section B Total</b>	<b>30</b>	

## Section C – Developing your arguments

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
23	<p><b>OWN ARGUMENT</b></p> <p><b>Examples of points that may be raised:</b></p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allow future generations to experience/enjoy them</li> <li>It is our link to the past</li> <li>To prevent them from being lost/demolished</li> <li>Attracts tourists</li> <li>It gives us a sense of pride</li> <li>It is aesthetically pleasing.</li> </ul> <p>Challenge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It has a heavy cost</li> <li>It prevents change</li> <li>It is anachronistic</li> <li>The past may be accompanied by painful memories</li> <li>It alienates others</li> <li>The past (and its buildings) isn't necessarily right.</li> </ul> <p>In this question, there are 4 requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>well-structured, sustained and developed argument</li> <li>at least two reasons</li> <li>a counter-argument and response</li> <li>a main conclusion.</li> </ul> <p>The candidates may also include other argument elements.</p> <p>For each of the four areas, the assessment could be strong, weak or not covered / absent / missing.</p>	12	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b></p> <p>This question discriminates on the whether a candidate can demonstrate the ability to select and use components of reasoning including sustained response to counter-argument, and synthesise them, to create well-structured arguments.</p> <p><b>Level 4 12 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4 areas are strong <b>12 marks</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Level 3 Cogent and sustained response</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 areas are strong, 2 are weak <b>9 marks</b></li> </ul> <p>Plus credit 1 mark for one of the following: <b>(MAX +2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other argument elements, if present, effectively support the argument.</li> <li>Argument as a whole can be considered as concise, not verbose.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2 Fair response</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3 areas are strong <b>7 marks</b></li> <li>2 areas are strong, 2 weak <b>6 marks</b></li> <li>2 areas are strong, 1 weak <b>5 marks</b></li> </ul> <p>Plus credit 1 mark <b>each</b> bullet point: <b>(MAX +2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other argument elements, if present, effectively support the argument.</li> <li>Argument as a whole can be considered as concise, not verbose.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1 Limited / Basic Response</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2 strong <b>4 marks</b></li> <li>1 strong, 2-3 weak <b>3 marks</b></li> <li>1 strong, 1 weak <b>2 marks</b></li> <li>At least 2 areas covered weakly <b>2 marks</b></li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Main Conclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Strong</b> MC is stated and precisely responds to the question</li> <li>• <b>Weak</b> MC present but significantly different to that required</li> </ul> <p><b>Reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Strong</b> 2 reasons giving support the MC, without intrusive assumptions and/or flaws</li> <li>• <b>Weak</b> 1 or more relevant reasons</li> </ul> <p><b>Counter and response</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Strong</b> Relevant and valid counter which is responded to effectively</li> <li>• <b>Weak</b> A counter and a response are offered</li> </ul> <p><b>Structure and development</b></p> <p><b>Strong</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustained, organised, easy to follow.</li> <li>• Effective development (e.g. through connecting the reasons, supporting / illustrating / clarifying reasons through explanations / examples)</li> </ul> <p><b>Weak</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• GSP may impede understanding.</li> <li>• May be characterised as a rant / emotive / rhetorical reasoning / undeveloped</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 area covered weakly <b>1 mark</b> Plus credit 1 mark for the following: <b>(MAX +1)</b></li> <li>• Other argument elements, if present, give some useful support to the argument.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of strong conclusions</b></p> <p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We should preserve our historic buildings</li> <li>• Our historic buildings should / must be preserved</li> </ul> <p><b>Challenge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We should not preserve our historic buildings</li> <li>• Our historic buildings do not need to be preserved.</li> </ul> <p><b>Example of weak conclusions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is / is not important to preserve our historic buildings (<i>being important does not mean that we should</i>)</li> <li>• We should preserve our historical buildings</li> <li>• We need / do not need to preserve our historic buildings (<i>need does not mean should</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Example of weak counters and responses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although they have been a part of the landscape for years, there is no longer a need for them.</li> <li>• Some people say that we should not preserve our historic buildings, however they are wrong</li> <li>• Some people say that it costs too much, however we do need them.</li> </ul> <p><b>NB:</b> The response to the counter cannot be 'doubled marked' as a response to CA and as a reason. Candidates were required to give 2 reasons, as well as a response to their counter.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
24	(a)	<p><b>OWN REASON TO SUPPORT CLAIM</b></p> <p><b>Examples of points which may be raised</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finance</li> <li>• Business opportunities</li> <li>• Raises a sense of pride</li> <li>• Encourages inter-country dialogue</li> <li>• Shares our heritage.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 3 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tourism is a vital part of our economy</li> <li>• It / they will bring money into the economy</li> <li>• It helps acceptance of other cultures.</li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because it will bring money into the economy, such as for hotels (<i>adding argument element</i>).</li> <li>• The UK offers attractions not seen anywhere else (<i>supports why tourists should come, rather than why we should encourage them to come to the UK</i>).</li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be a nice holiday location. (<i>superficial support</i>).</li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The monarchy generates by attracting tourists to the UK. (<i>quote</i>)</li> <li>• It is more important to encourage people in the UK to have stay-cations. (<i>reason, but one which challenges the claim, not supports it</i>).</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b></p> <p>This question discriminates between candidates who select and utilise argument elements effectively and clearly, accurately and coherently using appropriate language, with those who convey a basic point.</p> <p><b>3 marks – PRECISE</b></p> <p>For a relevant and precise reason that gives clear support to the claim.</p> <p><b>2 marks – LIMITED</b></p> <p>For a reason that gives limited support to the claim.</p> <p><b>OR</b> For a reason that includes other argument elements.</p> <p><b>1 mark – SUPERFICIAL</b></p> <p>For a reason that gives slight support to the claim</p> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>For something unrelated so it does not give support, or a statement that is too lacking in plausibility to offer recognisable support.</p> <p>For no credit-worthy material.</p> <p><b>NB:</b></p> <p>Phrases which give clarification, such as temporal / geographical reference, should not be seen as additional argument elements. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For the country ...</li> <li>• In the current climate ...</li> </ul> <p>If the candidate has included the claim from the question 'We should encourage tourists to visit the UK' in addition to their response, then they have included another argument element.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b>HYPOTHETICAL REASON TO CHALLENGE</b></p> <p><b>Examples for 3 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more tourists visited the UK, then the infrastructure could be damaged</li> <li>• If more tourists visited the UK, then there could well be disruption for UK residents.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If more tourists visit the UK, then the infra-structure could be damaged, because of litter (<i>adding argument element</i>).</li> <li>• If more tourists visit the UK, then they will litter. (<i>limited challenge as the statement is too strong</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If tourists are encouraged to visit the UK, then the airports would be fuller (<i>could give support or challenge to the statement</i>)</li> <li>• There would be more litter (<i>not HR, but some relevance</i>).</li> <li>• There would be lots of over-crowding, because there would be so many people in the country (<i>not HR and includes additional argument elements</i>)</li> <li>• It would increase disease and infection, such as SARS. (<i>not HR and includes additional elements</i>)</li> <li>• If people do not like our way of life, then they could be offended. (<i>offers superficial challenge to claim</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If tourists are encouraged to visit the UK, they may get to see a member of the royal family. (<i>unrelated</i>)</li> <li>• If we had more tourists, then we would have more illegal immigrants (<i>unrelated so it does not give challenge to the claim</i>).</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b></p> <p>This question discriminates between candidates who select and utilise argument elements effectively and clearly, accurately and coherently using appropriate language, with those who convey a basic point.</p> <p><b>3 marks – PRECISE</b></p> <p>For a relevant and precise hypothetical reason that gives a clear challenge to the claim.</p> <p><b>2 marks – LIMITED</b></p> <p>For a hypothetical reason that gives a limited challenge to the claim.</p> <p><b>OR</b> For a hypothetical reason that includes other argument elements.</p> <p><b>1 mark – SUPERFICIAL</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a reason that challenges the claim, but is not a hypothetical reason.</li> <li>• For a statement which <b>includes</b> a reason that challenges the claim, but is not a hypothetical reason.</li> <li>• For a hypothetical reason which offers superficial challenge.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>For something unrelated so it does not give a significant challenge, or a statement that is too lacking in plausibility to offer recognisable challenge.</p> <p>For no credit-worthy material.</p>	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
25	<p><b>OWN ARGUMENT</b></p> <p><b>Examples of points that may be raised:</b></p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It allows an international focus on us</li> <li>• It inculcates community spirit</li> <li>• They are celebrations that go beyond religion and politics</li> <li>• It raises people's spirits</li> <li>• It benefits the economy</li> <li>• It is a good conversation topic.</li> </ul> <p>Challenge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It causes unnecessary expense</li> <li>• It causes unnecessary security risks</li> <li>• Not everyone is a fan of the monarchy</li> <li>• It can make some people feel lonely</li> <li>• Monarchy may emphasise disunity in the UK</li> <li>• Days off reduce the country's productivity.</li> </ul> <p>In this question, there are 4 requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• well-structured, sustained and developed argument</li> <li>• at least two reasons</li> <li>• an intermediate conclusion</li> <li>• a main conclusion.</li> </ul> <p>The candidates may also include other argument elements.</p> <p>For each of the four areas, the assessment could be strong, weak or not covered / absent / missing.</p>	12	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b></p> <p>This question discriminates on the whether a candidate can demonstrate the ability to select and use components of reasoning including an intermediate conclusion, and synthesise them, to create well-structured, sustained arguments.</p> <p><b>Level 4 12 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4 areas are strong <b>12 marks</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Level 3 Cogent and sustained response</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 areas are strong, 1 is weak <b>9 marks</b></li> </ul> <p>Plus credit 1 mark for one of the following: <b>(MAX +2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other argument elements, if present, effectively support the argument.</li> <li>• Argument as a whole can be considered as concise, not verbose.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2 Fair response</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3 areas strong <b>7 marks</b></li> <li>• 2 areas are strong, 2 weak <b>6 marks</b></li> <li>• 2 areas are strong, 1 weak <b>5 marks</b></li> </ul> <p>Plus credit 1 mark <b>each</b> bullet point: <b>(MAX +2)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other argument elements, if present, effectively support the argument.</li> <li>• Argument as a whole can be considered as concise, not verbose.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1 Limited / Basic Response</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2 strong <b>4 marks</b></li> <li>• 1 strong, 2-3 weak <b>3 marks</b></li> <li>• 1 strong, 1 weak <b>2 marks</b></li> <li>• At least 2 areas covered weakly <b>2 marks</b></li> <li>• 1 area covered weakly <b>1 mark</b></li> </ul> <p>Plus credit 1 mark for the following: <b>(MAX +1)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other argument elements, if present, give some useful support to the argument.</li> </ul>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p><b>Main Conclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Strong</b> MC is stated and precisely responds to the question</li> <li>• <b>Weak</b> MC present but significantly different to that required</li> </ul> <p><b>Reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Strong</b> - 3 reasons giving support to the MC/IC, without intrusive assumptions and/or flaws</li> <li>• <b>Weak</b> - 1 or more relevant reasons</li> </ul> <p><b>Intermediate conclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Strong</b> - Progressive IC – it is fully supported by one or more reasons and gives support to the MC</li> <li>• <b>Weak</b> - Simplistic summary statement or a statement of the MC reworked</li> </ul> <p><b>Structure and development</b></p> <p><b>Strong</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustained, organised, easy to follow.</li> <li>• Effective development (e.g. through connecting the reasons, supporting / illustrating / clarifying reasons through explanations / examples)</li> </ul> <p><b>Weak</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• GSP may impede understanding.</li> <li>• May be characterised as a rant / emotive / rhetorical reasoning / undeveloped</li> </ul>		<p><b>Examples of strong conclusions</b> Support: Royal celebrations are good for the UK Challenge: Royal celebrations are not good for UK</p> <p><b>Example of weak conclusions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Royal celebrations are good (good in general is different to good for the UK)</li> <li>• The UK benefits from royal celebrations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Example of weak intermediate conclusions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For these reasons, royal celebrations are good for the UK.</li> <li>• There are many reasons for this.</li> <li>• There are many benefits from royal celebrations.</li> </ul> <p><b>NB:</b> The response to the intermediate conclusion cannot be 'doubled marked' as an intermediate conclusion and as a reason. Candidates were required to give 3 reasons, as well as an intermediate conclusion.</p>
		<b>Section C Total</b>	<b>30</b>	
		<b>Paper Total</b>	<b>75</b>	

**APPENDIX 1**  
**Marking Grid for Question 23**

<b>Main Conclusion</b>		<b>Reasons</b>	
Strong	MC is stated and precisely responds to the question	Strong	2 reasons giving support to the MC, without intrusive assumptions and/or flaws
Weak	MC present but significantly different to that required	Weak	1 or more relevant reasons
<b>Counter and response</b>		<b>Structure and development</b>	
Strong	Relevant and valid counter which is responded to effectively	Strong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustained, organised, easy to follow.</li> <li>• Effective development (e.g. through connecting the reasons, supporting / illustrating / clarifying reasons through explanations / examples)</li> </ul>
Weak	A counter and a response are offered	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• GSP may impede understanding.</li> <li>• May be characterised as a rant / emotive / rhetorical reasoning / undeveloped</li> </ul>

4 areas are strong **12 marks**

3 areas are strong **7 marks**

2 areas are strong **4 marks**

At least 2 areas covered weakly **2 marks**

3 areas are strong, 1 is weak **9 marks**

2 areas are strong, 2 weak **6 marks**

1 strong, 2-3 weak **3 marks**

1 area covered weakly **1 mark**

2 areas are strong, 1 weak **5 marks**

1 strong, 1 weak **2 marks**

## Marking Grid for Question 25

Main Conclusion		Reasons	
Strong	MC is stated and precisely responds to the question	Strong	3 reasons giving support to the MC/IC, without intrusive assumptions and/or flaws
Weak	MC present but significantly different to that required	Weak	1 or more relevant reasons
Intermediate conclusion		Structure and development	
Strong	Progressive IC – it is fully supported by one or more reasons and gives support to the MC	Strong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sustained, organised, easy to follow.</li> <li>• Effective development (e.g. through connecting the reasons, supporting / illustrating / clarifying reasons through explanations / examples)</li> </ul>
Weak	Simplistic summary statement or a statement of the MC reworked	Weak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• GSP may impede understanding.</li> <li>• May be characterised as a rant / emotive / rhetorical reasoning / undeveloped</li> </ul>

4 areas are strong **12 marks**3 areas are strong **7 marks**2 areas are strong **4 marks**At least 2 areas covered weakly **2 marks**3 areas are strong, 1 is weak **9 marks**2 areas are strong, 2 weak **6 marks**1 strong, 2-3 weak **3 marks**1 area covered weakly **1 mark**2 areas are strong, 1 weak **5 marks**1 strong, 1 weak **2 marks**

## Assessment Objectives Grid

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total	Timing	Specification Reference
1	1			1	1–2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (Expl)
2	1			1	1–2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (IC)
3		1		1	1–2	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments
4	1			1	1–2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (MC)
5	1			1	1–2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (Assumption)
6		1		1	1–2	3.2.1.6 recognise, identify and explain flaws within arguments (Conf)
7	1			1	1–2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (IC)
8	1			1	1–2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (Expl)
9		1		1	1–2	3.2.1.6 recognise, identify and explain flaws within arguments (HG)
10		1		1	1–2	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments
11	1			1	1–2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (MC)
12		1		1	1–2	3.2.1.6 recognise, identify and explain flaws within arguments (G)
13	1			1	1–2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (R)
14	1			1	1–2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (Assumption)
15		1		1	1–2	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments
Section A Totals	9	6		15	20	
16a	2			2	2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (MC)
16b	2			2	2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (P)
16ci	2			2	1	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (CA)
16cii	2			2	1	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (CA)
16d	2			2	2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (IC)
17i		3		3	2–3	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments (analogy)
17ii		3		3	2–3	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments (analogy)
18		3		3	2–3	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments (use of evidence)
19		3		3	2–3	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments (use of example)
20a		1		1	1	3.2.1.6 recognise, identify and explain flaws within arguments (AH)
20b		2		2	2	3.2.1.6 recognise, identify and explain flaws within arguments
21	2			2	2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (Assu)
22a		1		1	1	3.2.1.6 recognise, identify and explain appeals within arguments (AT)
22b		2		2	2	3.2.1.6 recognise, identify and explain appeals within arguments
Section B Totals	12	18	0	30	30	
23			12	12	10–12	3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments
24a			3	3	2–3	3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total	Timing	Specification Reference
24b			3	3	2–3	3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments
25			12	12	10–12	3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments
Section C Totals			30	30	30	
Paper Totals	21	24	30	75	90	

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
1 Hills Road  
Cambridge  
CB1 2EU

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998  
Facsimile: 01223 552627  
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

**www.ocr.org.uk**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office: 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2013

