

# **Critical Thinking**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F502/01-02**: Assessing and Developing Argument

## **Mark Scheme for June 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

## 1. Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
<b>SEEN</b>	To mark each of the additional lined pages and additional objects pages to indicate that these have been seen and taken into account. (only necessary if no other annotations shown on that page)
<b>E</b>	Weak main conclusion Q22 & 24
<b>E</b> +	Strong main conclusion Q22 & 24
<b>R</b>	Weak reasons Q22 & 24
<b>R</b> +	Strong reasons Q22 & 24
<b>I</b>	Weak intermediate conclusion Q24 only
<b>I</b> +	Strong intermediate conclusion Q24 only
<b>J</b>	Weak Counter argument and response to CA Q22 only
<b>J</b> +	Strong Counter argument and response to CA Q22 only
<b>S</b>	Weak structure and development
<b>S</b> +	Strong structure and development

## CONVENTIONS USED IN THIS MARK SCHEME

- Any words in (brackets) in the examples of candidates' answers that follow are not required; but candidates should neither be penalised nor given extra credit if these words are included.
- "Quotation marks" are used to identify direct quotes from the Resource Booklet. Whilst candidates are encouraged to identify quotations in this way, they should not be penalised if they do not use quotation marks.
- Words in (*brackets in italics*) after a sample answer are explanations of the category into which this answer falls.
- Elsewhere, *italics* and CAPITALS are used for emphasis

## Section A – Multiple Choice

Question	Key	Text	Type	AO
1	B	Museum funding	Intermediate conclusion	AO1
2	C	Museum funding	Principle that supports	AO2
3	B	Museum funding	Weaken	AO2
4	B	Bottled water	Name argument element (IC)	AO1
5	D	Bottled water	Assumption	AO1
6	A	Bottled water	Strengthen	AO2
7	B	Falling behind in computer science	Name argument element (Evidence)	AO1
8	A	Falling behind in computer science	Appeal (AA)	AO2
9	C	Falling behind in computer science	Strengthen	AO2
10	B	Magazines	Intermediate conclusion	AO1
11	D	Magazines	Name argument element (Reason)	AO1
12	A	Magazines	Assumption	AO1
13	D	Tattoo removal	Main conclusion	AO1
14	D	Tattoo removal	Name argument element (Reason)	AO1
15	C	Tattoo removal	Principle that supports	AO2
			<b>Section A Total</b>	<b>15</b>

## Analysis of Multiple choice Passages and Answers

Qu.	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1–3	Museum funding		<b>Analysis</b> R The present Government will only fund museums that it considers to be of national importance. MC The Government should reinstate funding for smaller museums. IC The current policy is unfair on people who do not live near London. R Almost all the museums considered to be of national importance are in the capital city.
1	B	1	see analysis above
2	C	1	<b>Rationale</b> (a) This is too specific to be a principle. It refers specifically to free museum admission and is not a general rule about how the Government or any other organisation should behave (b) This does not support the argument very strongly. The passage already contains a convincing argument that the cut in museum funding is unfair, and so this statement does not add anything new (c) This is clearly a principle as it expresses a general rule about what the Government should do. Moreover, it gives strong support to the argument, because it works as a joint reason with the claim that cutting funding to smaller museums is unfair. Together, they imply that the Government should not have cut funding to smaller museums (d) This may be general enough to be a principle but it does not give strong support to the argument because it does not imply that the Government has acted wrongly. Even after the funding cuts, the Government is continuing to support museums. We would need a reason to think that the level of support is inadequate.
3	B	1	<b>Rationale</b> (a) The fact that museums are a major tourist attraction tells us nothing about smaller museums outside of London. The popularity of different museums has little to do with the argument. The argument is based on the unfairness of people in one part of the country having free access to nearby museums whilst those in other parts of the country do not (b) The fact that people who live in or near London pay more tax than those who live elsewhere suggests that it is not unfair that they should benefit from free museum entry whilst people in the rest of the country do not. They are paying more so it seems reasonable that they should get more in return (c) The fact that some museums get funding from the private sector does not show that small museums can succeed without funding from the government. It is possible that only the big national museums can get funding from the private sector (d) The Government's behaviour in cutting funding to other arts organisations tells us nothing about whether it is right to cut funding to small museums. Even if the Government is right to cut funding to other organisations, it may be wrong to cut funding to small museums. It is also possible that all these funding cuts are a mistake.

Qu.	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4-6	<b>Bottled Water</b>		<b>Analysis</b> MC People should not buy bottled water IC It is environmentally unfriendly R To manufacture one litre of bottled water requires a wasteful six litres of water R Additionally, although the bottles can be recycled, most are not, and the waste just clutters up the environment R Also, tap water must be tested for parasites and toxic chemicals before it is released for public use, whereas there is no such requirement for bottled water.
4	<b>B</b>	1	see analysis above
5	<b>D</b>	1	(a) This, if true, would <i>weaken</i> the argument by making tap water even more environmentally unfriendly than bottled water. If anything, the argument is assuming that it takes <i>less</i> than six litres to produce one litre of tap water which would help the first reason to support the IC (b) This is not assumed, as it is not a gap between the reasoning and conclusion. This would act as a counter assertion (c) This is not an assumption because it is stated by the author (d) The author does assume that without testing requirements that the bottled water will not be safe or as safe as tap water, for the third reason to relate to the MC
6	<b>A</b>	1	(a) This strengthens the argument as it gives an additional impetus for why people should not buy bottled water – cost, as well as safety and it not being environmentally friendly (b) Whilst this may be true, it is irrelevant to the issue of why people should not buy bottled water (c) Whilst this may be true, it is irrelevant to the issue of why people should not buy bottled water – it is actually a counter assertion (d) Whilst this may be true, it is irrelevant to the issue of why people should not buy bottled water.
7-9	<b>Falling behind in computer science</b>		<b>Analysis</b> R Britain is falling behind in computer science. Ev In the past, we led the way: the world's first stored-program computer was built at the University of Manchester and the World Wide Web was invented by an Englishman, Sir Tim Berners-Lee Ev Today, none of the leaders of the computing industry is from the UK R The problem is that schools train students to use computer software, but do not teach computer science in which they would learn how software is made Ev The chairman of Google said, "I was amazed to learn that computer science isn't even taught as standard in UK schools." MC All UK students should be taught computer science in school.
7	<b>B</b>	1	see analysis above

Qu.	Answer	Marks	Guidance
8	A	1	<p>(a) The argument appeals to the authority of the chairman of Google to support the claim that not teaching computer science in schools is the problem with computer science in the UK</p> <p>(b) It is possible that the reader will feel emotion because Britain is falling behind in computer science but the author of the argument has not presented the facts in a way that is calculated to stir up emotion. There is no exaggeration or sentimental language, for example</p> <p>(c) The argument talks about the history of computer science in Britain but it does not appeal to history. An appeal to history uses facts from the past to make a prediction about what will happen in the future. This argument does not make a prediction about what will happen in the future. Moreover, since we don't know if computer science was taught in British schools before British scientists made important computing advances, the historical evidence does not support the conclusion that all UK students should be taught computer science at school.</p> <p>(d) An appeal to popularity argues that something is true or desirable because a large number of people believe or want it. This argument does not do that.</p>
9	C	1	<p>(a) It is irrelevant that software can be used effectively without knowing how it is made. The argument is not concerned about how effectively people can use software. It is concerned about the number of British people becoming leaders of the computing industry. If anything, the fact that software can be used effectively without knowing how it is made weakens the argument, because it removes a possible advantage of teaching computer science</p> <p>(b) The fact that most students are already experts in using Google to search the web does not tell us anything about the need for lessons in computer science at school. The ability to use Google is very different from understanding how software is made.</p> <p>(c) If the leaders of the computing industry are from countries where computer science is taught in schools, then it is more likely that teaching computer science in schools has a role to play in developing leaders of the computing industry. This strengthens the argument, even though to assert a definite causal link would be a <i>post hoc</i> flaw.</p> <p>(d) The possibility that there is not enough time in the school curriculum for computer science weakens the argument; it does not strengthen it. The absence of space on the timetable suggests that computer science should not be taught.</p>

Qu.	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10-12	Magazines		<b>Analysis</b> MC Readers should be very cautious of magazines that are dominated by advertising. R The magazine companies earn almost all their money from advertisers, not readers. Ex Cosmopolitan in the US makes over \$350 million per year by selling advertising space and only \$10 million by selling copies of the magazine IC These magazines have a vested interest to promote the products that advertisers want to sell MC (restated/summarized) Readers should be particularly cautious R Magazines sometimes promote advertisers' products in very subtle ways Ex Instead of promoting the products directly, the articles glamorise a lifestyle that encourages readers to buy the products.
10	B	1	see analysis above
11	D	1	see analysis above
12	A	1	(a) The author of the argument has to think and has assumed that advertisers are more likely to buy space in a magazine that promotes their products. Otherwise the magazines would have nothing to gain by promoting their products and it would not be true that they have a vested interest to promote the products that advertisers want to sell (b) It would not matter for the argument if <i>Cosmopolitan</i> were not the top-selling US women's magazine. <i>Cosmopolitan</i> is mentioned only as an example of a magazine that is dominated by advertising and earns almost all its money from advertisers rather than readers. It is not used as evidence for any claim. Even if it were used as evidence for the claim that magazines dominated by advertising earn almost all their money from advertisers, rather than readers, the degree of support it gives is not affected by its sales rank. Magazines with a higher sales rank could earn an even higher proportion of their income from advertisers (c) The argument works even if it is not impossible to know when a magazine is promoting a product. It could be that only some readers can know when this is happening and only on some occasions. So the process could still be described as "subtle" Even a reader that is able to know when a magazine is promoting a product may have to exercise caution in order to do so. So the author may not be wrong to say that these magazines should be read with extreme caution. (d) The author does not need to believe that the products are harmful. Even if they are perfectly safe, the author can say that readers need to be cautious so that they do not end up wasting their money on products that they do not need.
13-15	Tattoo removal		<b>Analysis</b> MC The National Health Service (NHS) should provide tattoo removal free of charge. R The NHS already pays for many kinds of 'cosmetic' procedures, Ex such as ears being pinned back HYP If a tattoo is making it difficult for the person to get a job, it is in the country's interest for the NHS to remove it Analogy People who choose to smoke are not charged for NHS treatment to help them quit and nor should they be R People who made a mistake with getting a tattoo should not be punished further.



Qu.	Answer	Marks	Guidance
13	D	1	see analysis above
14	D	1	see analysis above
15	C	1	<p>(a) This is clearly a principle as it expresses a general rule about what everyone should do. This does not support the argument very strongly, as the focus is on getting the tattoo, rather than its removal</p> <p>(b) This may be general enough to be a principle but it does not give strong support to the argument because it does not imply that the NHS is right to remove tattoos free of charge</p> <p>(c) This is clearly a principle as it expresses a general rule about how the NHS treats people. Moreover, it gives strong support to the argument, because it works jointly with the analogy and the final reason to show that regardless of a person's actions, they should receive free NHS treatment</p> <p>(d) This may be general enough to be a principle but it does not give strong support to the argument because the same clinical treatments are not necessary, or even suitable for all. There is no reason for the same clinical treatments for all, as it would not be appropriate – for example, tattoo removal is not necessary, if there is no tattoo to remove</p>
	<b>Section A Total</b>	<b>15</b>	

## Section B – Analysing and Evaluating Argument

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
16 (a)	<b>MAIN CONCLUSION (§2)</b> <b>2 marks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (The) voting age in (the) UK should be reduced to 16 years (old).</li> </ul> <b>Examples for 1 mark:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The voting age should be reduced to 16 (<i>missing out information</i>)</li> <li>• UK voting age should be 16 (<i>paraphrase</i>)</li> </ul> <b>Examples for 0 marks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Everyone should have a say in the decisions that affect their lives (<i>principle</i>)</li> <li>• The voting age should be raised not lowered (<i>MC Reader's response</i>).</li> </ul>	2	<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.  <b>2 marks - PRECISION</b> For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author.  <b>1 mark - APPROXIMATE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For imprecise stating the argument element in the exact words of the author, but adding or missing out information</li> </ul>
(b)	<b>PRINCIPLE (§1)</b> <b>Examples for 2 marks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Everyone should have a say in (the) decisions that affect their lives</li> <li>• Every young person has the right to express his or her views freely (about everything that affects him or her).</li> </ul> <b>Example for 1 mark:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Everyone should have a say in decisions (<i>missing out information</i>).</li> <li>• Every young person has a right to express <i>their</i> views freely.</li> </ul> <b>Examples for 0 marks:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nobody who is immature should have the right to vote. (<i>Principle but from Reader's response</i>)</li> </ul>	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>OR</b> For a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrases.</li> </ul> <b>0 marks</b> For a statement of an incorrect part of the text. <b>OR</b> for no creditworthy material.  <b>NB</b> Only credit the words actually written. Do not credit words replaced by dots.  <b>NB</b> Any words in brackets are not required but candidates should not be penalised if these words are included.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b>INTERMEDIATE CONCLUSION (§1)</b></p> <p><b>Example for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having an entitlement to vote would empower and motivate young people.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having a vote would empower and motivate young people. <i>(missing information)</i></li> <li>• Having an entitlement to vote would motivate young people. <i>(missing information)</i></li> <li>• Having an entitlement to vote would empower and motivate young people because they would feel that they could make a difference. <i>(adding argument element)</i>.</li> <li>• Having an entitlement to vote WILL empower and motivate young people <i>(paraphrase – will is not the same as would)</i>.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing the voting age would help young people to participate in our democracy. <i>(§3 not an IC – not supported by reasons)</i></li> <li>• This shows that young people like to engage in the democratic process. <i>(§3 not an IC – “this” refers to evidence, not reason(s))</i></li> </ul>	2	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
17 (a)	<p><b>HYPOTHETICAL REASONING (NAME) (§2)</b></p> <p><b>Example for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hypothetical reason(ing).</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>False dichotomy</li> <li>Reason</li> <li>Hypothetical</li> <li>Hypothetical claim</li> <li>Hypothetical argument</li> <li>Hypothetical reason/claim (or any other scattergun attempt).</li> </ul>	1	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b></p> <p>This question discriminates between candidates who can apply the language of reasoning appropriately and precisely to an identified selection of the text, with those who have a basic level of analysis of argument elements.</p> <p><b>1 mark – PRECISION</b></p> <p>For precisely naming the argument element in the exact words required in the specification.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <p>For naming an unrelated/incorrect argument element, or other key term used in the specification.</p> <p><b>OR</b> for a less precise naming of the argument element</p> <p><b>OR</b> for no credit-worthy material.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b>HYPOTHETICAL REASONING (EXPLANATION)</b>  <b>Examples for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It contains a consequence “they will become” which depends upon a condition (“if we do not listen”). (V)</li> <li>It uses the word “if” to show that becoming alienated is a consequence of not being listened to. (V)</li> <li>It takes the form of “if and then” and supports the MC that the voting age in the UK should be reduced. (W)</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It uses the indicator word ‘if’ (and implies ‘then’). (X)</li> <li>It gives a negative outcome which <i>may</i> occur if we do not listen to young people’s views. (X)</li> <li>It supports the IC and/or MC. (Z)</li> <li>It suggests what could happen in the future. (Z)</li> <li>It speculates what might happen if we do not listen to young people’s views. (W)</li> <li>Young people becoming angry depends on whether or not we listen. (X)</li> <li>It takes the form of/ has ‘if’ and (implies) ‘then’ and acts as a reason for the (main) conclusion. (Z)</li> <li>It has “If” and it gives support to the conclusion. (Z)</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is saying that “If we do not listen to young people’s views, they will become alienated and voiceless, becoming an angry and resentful group who feel abandoned by society”. (<i>quote</i>)</li> <li>They won’t become angry and resentful, the author is assuming this. (<i>counter</i>)</li> <li>It assumes all young people will become angry and there is no evidence for this. (<i>counter</i>)</li> <li>It has a consequence. (<i>this is a partial response – consequence does not necessarily make it hypothetical</i>)</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b>  This question discriminates between candidates who can give clear justification for their analysis of argument structure, with those who do not have a secure understanding of the argument elements relevant for F502.</p> <p><b>2 marks – CLEAR JUSTIFICATION</b>  <b>V</b> For a clear explanation of why it is a <i>hypothetical</i> reason, showing an understanding of its nature and/or role in the argument, with reference to the text.  <b>OR</b>  <b>W</b> a less clear explanation of why it is <i>hypothetical</i> AND an explanation of why it is a <i>reason</i>, with a reference to the text.</p> <p><b>1 mark – LIMITED JUSTIFICATION</b>  <b>X</b> For a limited explanation of why it is a hypothetical reason, showing an incomplete understanding of its nature and/or role in the argument.  <b>OR</b>  <b>Y</b> for an explanation of why it is a <i>reason</i> but no explanation of <i>hypothetical</i>  <b>OR</b>  <b>Z</b> For generic explanation what a reason/hypothetical reason is.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b>  For no credit-worthy material, e.g. merely quoting or paraphrasing the text</p> <p><b>N.B.</b> Credit answers that refer to conditional/speculative reasoning or similar expression.  Ignore circularity of the type “(It is hypothetical because) it uses a hypothetical scenario”.  Ignore references to the “future”</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(c)	<p><b>HYPOTHETICAL REASONING (EVALUATION)</b>  <b>Examples for 3 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We can listen to young people's views without giving them the right to vote, such as by having youth parliaments. So the fact that young people will feel alienated if we do not listen to them does not mean that we should lower the voting age. (w)(K)</li> <li>The claim offers strong support for the conclusion that we should lower the voting age to 16 because it is plausible that election candidates have no vested interest in listening to the views of young people who cannot vote for them. (s) (K)</li> <li>It is a slippery slope. The reasoning is weak because not reducing the voting age will not necessarily lead to the consequence of young people becoming angry. (w) (L)</li> <li>The idea that young people will become angry if they are not listened to is plausible because people often do get angry when they are ignored. (s) (J)</li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consequence given is a slippery slope. There are too many assumptions needed for the consequence to really occur from the condition. (w) (J or L)</li> <li>There are other ways of listening to young people's views apart from giving them the vote. (w) (K)</li> <li>It is weak because even though young people do not have the vote they can still be listened to. (w) (K)</li> <li>It is a slippery slope; the author is drawing an extreme, exaggerated conclusion so the reasoning is weakened/without any proof (L)</li> <li>The author has to assume that a <i>significant number</i> of young people care about democracy in order for this reason to support a conclusion about voting. (w) (L)</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are other ways of listening to young people's views (w)(K)</li> <li>the author is drawing an extreme exaggerated conclusion so the reasoning is weakened (w) (L)</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b>  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/weakness in specific parts of the argument.</p> <p><b>3 marks – CLEAR JUSTIFICATION</b>  Correct identification of WHAT a strength/weakness is in the comparison, WITH a clear explanation of WHY this is a strength/weakness.  <b>OR</b>  Correct identification of WHAT the strength/weakness is WITH a limited explanation of WHY this is a strength/weakness.  AND WITH an assessment of HOW this strength/weakness impacts on the reasoning.</p> <p><b>2 marks – LIMITED JUSTIFICATION</b>  Correct identification of WHAT the strength/weakness is WITH a limited explanation of WHY this is a strength/weakness <b>OR</b> HOW this impacts the reasoning.</p> <p><b>1 mark – SUPERFICIAL JUSTIFICATION</b>  Correct identification of WHAT the strength/weakness is that goes beyond a simple label.  May be weakness expressed as a counter.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b>  For no credit-worthy material, e.g. it is a strength because it says (followed by a quote or paraphrase of the text).</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The author assumes (or makes a hasty generalisation that) <i>all</i> young people care about voting. (<i>w</i>) (<i>L</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is a strength because it says if we do not listen to young people's views, they will become alienated and voiceless, becoming an angry and resentful group who feels abandoned by society. (<i>quote</i>)</li> <li>They won't become angry and resentful; the author is just assuming this. (<i>counter</i>)</li> <li>It is weak because we cannot be certain that the outcome will happen, as outcomes may vary in reality.</li> <li>The argument requires a condition to be fulfilled for the outcome to happen. We cannot be sure young people would actually feel alienated or become angry if they are not listened to, so this weakens the author's reasoning.</li> </ul>		<p><b>N.B.</b> Do not credit responses that merely state that the argument element is a weakness Do not credit answers which merely state that the outcome is uncertain without reference to the conditional aspect</p> <p><b>How?</b> Consider if it is clear which link they are evaluating <i>J</i> Not listened to → anger etc <i>K</i> Not listened to ↔ not being allowed to vote <i>L</i> becoming angry ← not being allowed to vote</p> <p><b>What?</b> Is there a judgement (slippery slope, extreme, implausible, questionable assumption etc.)</p> <p><b>WhY?</b> Is there a justification or illustration (alternatives such as youth parliaments, young people may not be bothered, have different priorities etc.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
18 (a)	<p><b>ARGUMENT OR EXPLANATION (STATE) (§3)</b>  <b>1 mark</b>            (It is an) explanation (not an argument).</p> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• argument</li> <li>• claim</li> <li>• flaw</li> <li>• argument/explanation (<i>Scattergun approach</i>).</li> </ul>	1	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b>            This discriminates between candidates who can apply the language of reasoning appropriately and precisely to the context, from those who have a basic level of application.</p> <p><b>1 mark – CLEAR IDENTIFICATION</b>            For a clear identification that it is an explanation.</p> <p><b>0 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a statement that it is an argument.</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> For no creditworthy material.</li> </ul>
	<p>(b) <b>ARGUMENT OR EXPLANATION (EXPLAIN)</b>  <b>Examples for 2 marks:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It explains/says why Citizenship was introduced.</li> <li>• It is giving a reason why Citizenship was introduced but does not try to persuade us.</li> <li>• It says/explains why the subject was introduced, rather than persuading that it should be introduced/ giving a conclusion.</li> <li>• The claim ‘was put into the National Curriculum.’ gives an account rather than supports a conclusion.</li> <li>• The belief that Citizenship would encourage more people to vote was a cause and it had the effect of leading people to introduce it into the curriculum.</li> <li>• The author makes it easier to understand why CE was introduced.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It does not give a reason and a conclusion. (<i>generic</i>)</li> <li>• It is not trying to persuade us that Citizenship Education should be introduced. (<i>why it is NOT an argument</i>)</li> <li>• It is trying to give a cause for something. (<i>generic</i>)</li> <li>• It is there to justify the reasoning as to why Citizenship was put on the curriculum (<i>lack of clarity in the expressions ‘justify’ and ‘reasoning’</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It explains the point about how young people learn about voting.</li> <li>• It is not an argument.</li> <li>• Because it refers to “reasons”.</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b>            This question discriminates between candidates who can apply the language of reasoning appropriately and precisely to the context, with those who have a basic level of application.</p> <p><b>2 marks – CLEAR JUSTIFICATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a clear justification why it is an explanation with reference to the text.</li> </ul> <p>Note that the candidate does not need to explain why it is not an argument provided they explain <i>clearly</i> why it is an explanation.</p> <p><b>1 mark – PARTIAL EXPLANATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a statement that it is an explanation with a definition of what that is.</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> For a statement that it is an explanation with an attempt to justify that has value but lacks clarity to be labelled a clear justification.</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> any statement which only says why it is NOT an argument.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a statement that it is an explanation.</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> For no creditworthy material.</li> </ul>



Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance									
19	(a)	<p><b>ANALOGY (IDENTIFICATION) (§3)</b></p> <p><b>Example for 3 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Training for a marathon but not being allowed to run it because of some trivial entry requirement and learning about the voting system but not being allowed to use it because of being too young are compared (X,Y,Z)</li></ul> <p><b>Example for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Training to run a marathon but not being allowed to run it and learning to vote but not being allowed to are being compared (X, Y)</li></ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Not being allowed to run a marathon despite having training and not being allowed to vote despite being taught/having Citizenship lessons are compared (Y).</li><li>Training for a marathon and learning to vote in Citizenship lessons are being compared (X)</li></ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>“From this subject young people learn about the voting system and how laws are made. They know how it works but are not allowed to use it.” is being compared with “training for a marathon but not being allowed to run it because of some trivial entry requirement, such as the colour of your running shoes” (<i>has X,Y,Z but is virtually a direct quote</i>)</li><li>Not being allowed either to do a marathon or to vote are being compared (<i>omits “run”</i>)</li></ul>	3	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b> This question discriminates between candidates who can identify all areas of an analogy, showing a secure understanding of the structure of the argument element, from those who can only recognise the gist of the argument element.</p> <p>There are three elements in the analogy to pick out:</p> <table><tr><td>X</td><td><b>Learning</b></td><td><b>training</b></td></tr><tr><td>Y</td><td><b>not being allowed to vote / use the voting system</b></td><td><b>not being allowed to run a marathon</b></td></tr><tr><td>Z</td><td>(not the right) <b>age/young</b></td><td><b>trivial entry requirement/ colour of (your running) shoes</b></td></tr></table> <p><b>3 marks</b> For any three elements of the analogy precisely identified.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> For two elements of the analogy precisely identified.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> For one of the elements of the analogy precisely identified.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> For none of the above elements picked out. Note that a complete element has to be written, and sub-parts of different elements do not together get credit.</p> <p><b>Note that copying out the section of text in paragraph 3 does not get credit. Candidates need to actively tell us what is being compared with what, as in the elements above.</b></p>	X	<b>Learning</b>	<b>training</b>	Y	<b>not being allowed to vote / use the voting system</b>	<b>not being allowed to run a marathon</b>	Z	(not the right) <b>age/young</b>	<b>trivial entry requirement/ colour of (your running) shoes</b>
X	<b>Learning</b>	<b>training</b>											
Y	<b>not being allowed to vote / use the voting system</b>	<b>not being allowed to run a marathon</b>											
Z	(not the right) <b>age/young</b>	<b>trivial entry requirement/ colour of (your running) shoes</b>											

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p><b>ANALOGY (EVALUATION)</b>  <b>Examples for 3 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strength of the analogy is the similarity that both voting and running a marathon are voluntary activities. It shows that it is unfair to disqualify those who do make the effort to take part because they fail to conform to trivial requirements. So, young people should not be prevented from voting.</li> <li>• The analogy only weakly supports the author's reasoning because while it is reasonable to suppose that having shoes of a particular colour is a trivial reason for not allowing someone to run a marathon, it fails to address the objection that being too young could be a valid reason for not being allowed to vote.</li> <li>• The colour of your shoes will not affect how you run whereas being young/immature may affect how you vote so that weakens the conclusion that young/ immature people should be allowed to vote</li> <li>• Those who do Citizenship Education know that they cannot vote, whereas the marathon runner may not expect to be disqualified because of the colour of their shoes. That weakens the support the analogy gives to the conclusion about voting as it is more unfair to spring a nasty surprise.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A strength/similarity is that both situations involve hard work followed by frustration, so it supports the conclusion that 16 year olds have earned the right to vote.</li> <li>• Age is not a trivial issue like the wrong colour shoes, so does not support the idea of lowering the voting age.</li> <li>• A weakness/difference is that how people vote affects everyone, whereas running a marathon only benefits those who run, so the effects are not as widespread.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training is physical and being taught is mental.</li> <li>• Training for a marathon is voluntary whereas you have to go to lessons</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b>  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>3 marks – CLEAR JUSTIFICATION</b></p> <p>Correct identification of WHAT a strength/weakness is in the comparison, WITH a clear explanation of WHY this is a strength/weakness.</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correct identification of WHAT the strength/weakness is</li> <li>• WITH a limited explanation of WHY this strength/weakness matters/is significant</li> <li>• AND WITH an assessment of HOW this strength/weakness impacts the conclusion or the argument as a whole.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks – LIMITED JUSTIFICATION</b>  Correct identification of WHAT a strength/weakness is in the comparison, WITH an explanation of WHY this is a strength/weakness <b>OR</b> HOW this impacts the reasoning</p> <p><b>1 mark – SUPERFICIAL</b>  Superficial but correct identification of WHAT a strength/weakness is in the comparison</p> <p><b>0 marks</b>  For no credit-worthy material.  <b>OR</b> For stating a strength is that the some of the things being compared (being prevented from doing something</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it is a weakness/strength</li> <li>• The situations are similar ...this weakens the argument (<i>contradictory</i>)</li> <li>• It does not justify reducing the voting age because the two situations are completely different (<i>needs to say WHAT the difference is in order to get the HOW mark</i>)</li> <li>• The weakness is that whereas there is no law about the colour of shoes, there is a law about voting at 16 (<i>this misses the point that the analogy is seeking to show that there <b>should not</b> be a law against voting at 16</i>)</li> </ul>		<p>etc) are similar without saying what the similarity is</p> <p>Candidates can give either strength or 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
20 (a)	<b>APPEAL (NAME) (§5)</b> <b>Example for 1 mark</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(Appeal to) history</li> </ul> <b>Examples for 0 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Historical</li> <li>Appeal to tradition</li> <li>Appeal to history/tradition (<i>scattergun approach</i>)</li> <li>What has happened before will happen again (<i>description not naming the appeal</i>).</li> </ul>	1	<b>Principle of discrimination</b> This question discriminates between candidates who can identify appeals in reasoning, from candidates who identify obvious weaknesses in reasoning without accurate identification. <b>1 mark - PRECISION</b> For precisely naming the appeal in the exact words required in the specification. <b>0 marks</b> <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 no credit-worthy material.</li> </ul>
	<b>(b) APPEAL (EXPLANATION)</b> <b>Examples for 2 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This argument predicts that the Isle of Man will be proved right again, whereas this may not be correct.</li> <li>Past performance, in this case by the Isle of Man, is not a reliable guide to the future.</li> <li>Even though the Isle of Man was proved right in the past, it doesn't mean they will be right again.</li> </ul> <b>Examples for 1 mark</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It uses facts from the past to make a prediction about what will happen in the future but this is not always reliable. (<i>generic</i>)</li> <li>1881 was a long time ago, and things are different now.</li> </ul> <b>Example for 0 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An appeal to history uses facts from the past to make a prediction about what will happen in the future. (<i>no suggestion of weakness</i>)</li> <li>They lowered the voting age to 16 in 2006, so let's follow their example. (<i>implies the appeal DOES support the argument</i>)</li> <li>Weak because only a minority of countries allow voting at 16. (<i>missing the main point of the appeal to history</i>)</li> <li>Even if the Isle of Man was right to introduce votes for 16 year olds, this does not mean that it would work in the UK. (<i>not evaluating the appeal to history</i>)</li> </ul>	2	<b>Principle of discrimination</b> 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.  <b>2 marks – CLEAR JUSTIFICATION</b> A clear explanation, with reference to the context, of why the appeal does not give strong support. <b>1 mark – LIMITED JUSTIFICATION</b> For a generic justification that the appeal is weak. <b>OR</b> a limited justification that the appeal is weak, perhaps phrased as a counter. <b>0 marks</b> For just reference to the text, or no credit-worthy material. <b>OR</b> for an explanation that does not necessarily imply any weakness. <b>OR</b> for an explanation of why the appeal DOES support the argument.  <b>N.B. An appeal to history is where evidence of past performance is used to predict future performance.</b>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
21	<p><b>EVALUATION (READER'S RESPONSE) (§6 &amp; §7)</b></p> <p><b>Possible approaches</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non sequitur – the conclusion (that the voting age should be raised) does not follow from the reasoning (about risk taking).</li> <li>• Use of evidence – generalisations do not take account of exceptions.</li> <li>• Assumptions – risk taking behaviour is not beneficial for voting OR that age is a reliable guide to maturity.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 3 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If it is true that maturity increases with age, then the evidence used is relevant and makes it reasonable to argue that the voting age should be raised. <b>WYH</b></li> <li>• The author assumes that risk taking behaviour is not beneficial for voting and this means that the link between the reason and conclusion is weakened. <b>WYY</b></li> <li>• It raises a problem which cannot be solved by changing the voting age limit because although some 18-year-olds may be mature, we cannot use maturity as a criterion for voting as it cannot be objectively measured. <b>WYH</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The author assumes that risk taking behaviour is not beneficial for/will adversely affect voting, but the two things are not the same. <b>WY</b></li> <li>• The author assumes that age is a reliable guide to maturity, but some over 18s are less mature than younger people. <b>WY</b></li> <li>• Maturity cannot be measured, so it can't be used as a guide to who can vote. <b>WH</b></li> <li>• Some 18 year olds are mature, so this weakens the case for raising the voting age. <b>WH</b></li> </ul>		<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b> This question discriminates between candidates who can identify areas of evaluation in reasoning, explaining accurately what is weak or strong about their use, from candidates who identify obvious strengths or weaknesses in reasoning with some understanding of what is wrong.</p> <p><b>3 marks - CLEAR JUSTIFICATION</b> Correct identification of WHAT a strength/weakness is in the comparison, WITH a clear explanation of WHY this is a strength/weakness.</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Correct identification of WHAT the strength/weakness is</li> <li>• WITH a limited explanation of WHY this strength/weakness matters/is significant</li> <li>• AND WITH an assessment of HOW this strength/weakness impacts the conclusion or the argument as a whole.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks - LIMITED JUSTIFICATION</b> Correct identification of WHAT a strength/weakness is in the comparison, WITH an explanation of WHY this is a strength/weakness <b>OR</b> HOW this impacts the reasoning.</p> <p><b>1 mark - SUPERFICIAL</b> Identification of WHAT the strength/weakness is.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a counter masquerading as an assumption</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> For just reference to the text</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> For no credit-worthy material.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some 18-year-olds are mature.</li> <li>• Maturity cannot be measured.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for points to be capped at 1 mark: Points which, if true would strengthen the argument, but which the author is not claiming/assuming/generalising</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The author generalises that all 18-year olds are immature.</li> <li>• The author assumes that no 18-year olds are mature.</li> <li>• A weakness is that the author is conflating age and maturity</li> <li>• A weakness is that the author is conflating being a student/not paying income tax with lacking real experience.</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>• It is a strength because most people would agree with it.</li> <li>• The author assumes that 18-year olds are "still growing up (<i>this is stated</i>). This is not true because they can drive, join the army etc. (<i>counter masquerading as an assumption</i>)</li> </ul>		<p><b>N.B.</b> Candidates can give either 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>(References to maturity (§6) and risk-taking (§7) make separate points. If a candidate mentions both, only credit the one which is best explained.</p> <p>It is not correct to say the reader <i>conflates</i> risk taking with (im)maturity.</p> <p><b>Do not give credit to the second answer if it is essentially a repetition of the same point.</b></p>
	<b>Section B Total</b>	<b>30</b>	

## SECTION C – Developing your own arguments

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
22	<p><b>OWN ARGUMENT</b></p> <p>In this question, there are 4 requirements: well-structured and developed argument, at least 2 reasons, a counter-argument and response, a main conclusion. They may also include other argument elements. For each of the 4 areas, the assessment could be strong, weak or not covered / absent / missing.</p> <p><b>Main Conclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong = MC is stated and precisely responds to the question</li> <li>Weak = MC present but significantly different to that required</li> </ul> <p><b>Reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong = 2 reasons giving support the MC, without intrusive assumptions and/or flaws</li> <li>Weak = 1 or more relevant reasons</li> </ul> <p><b>Counter and response</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong = Relevant and valid counter which is responded to effectively</li> <li>Weak = A counter and a response are offered</li> </ul> <p><b>Structure and development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong = Sustained, organised, easy to follow. Effective development (e.g. through connecting the reasons, supporting / illustrating / clarifying reasons through explanations / examples)</li> <li>Weak = Some clarity and organisation. GSP may impede understanding. May be characterised as a rant / emotive / rhetorical reasoning / undeveloped.</li> </ul>	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 counterargument, 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, 1 is weak <b>9 marks</b></li> </ul> <p>Plus credit 1 mark for each 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 for each 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 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, 0-1 weak <b>2 marks</b></li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Acceptable conclusions</b></p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students should have a greater influence on how their school is run.</li> </ul> <p>Challenge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students should not have a greater influence on how their school is run.</li> <li>Students already have enough influence on how their school is run.</li> <li>Students should not have any influence on how their school is run.</li> </ul> <p><b>Weak conclusions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students have the right to say how their school is run.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of points that may be raised:</b></p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it teaches democratic participation and skills</li> <li>opportunity to listen to student voice</li> <li>practice for elections</li> <li>they are the consumers/main stakeholders</li> <li>policy decisions are more likely to be heard</li> <li>it promotes dialogue</li> <li>their perspective is unique.</li> </ul> <p>Challenge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>waste of time</li> <li>schools are for education</li> <li>professionals are paid to run the school</li> <li>students can be immature</li> <li>it may seem like lip service.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <p><b>NB:</b></p> <p>The response to the counter cannot be ‘doubled marked’ as a response to CA and as a reason. Candidates are required to give 2 reasons, as well as a response to their counter.</p> <p>Candidates who argue towards the conclusion that ‘students should have a greater influence on how their school is run’ need to ensure that their reasoning as a whole focuses on the concept of ‘greater’ to provide effective support for their conclusion.</p> <p><b>Examples of material derived from the resource booklet that would need development to be considered as their own argument:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the UN convention implies that they should have the right to express their views</li> <li>85% of schools already have student councils.</li> </ul>



Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
23	(a)	(i) (ii)	<p><b>TWO OWN REASONS TO SUPPORT</b></p> <p><b>Examples for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will increase voter turnout</li> <li>• Because universal suffrage is important in a democracy</li> <li>• It allows everyone to express their view</li> <li>• Voting ensures everyone's views on the running of the country are taken into account</li> <li>• People ought to be concerned about how their country is run</li> <li>• If more vote, politicians will have a stronger mandate (<i>HR</i>)</li> <li>• It is all part of being a democracy</li> <li>• Voting involves you in democracy</li> <li>• The government that is elected can make important decisions which affect everybody.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People who have the right to vote should use it because otherwise extremists may dominate elections (<i>even quoting the Q is still adding an element</i>)</li> <li>• It will increase voter turnout, which needs to improve (<i>added argument element</i>)</li> <li>• People have had to fight for the right to vote, for example women (<i>added element</i>)</li> <li>• Because they have the right. (<i>circular - limited support</i>)</li> <li>• Democracy is good (<i>limited support</i>)</li> <li>• Because they can change the government (<i>limited</i>)</li> <li>• Because they have no other way of giving their opinion (<i>implausible</i>)</li> <li>• Because it is impossible to be satisfied with the country the way it is (<i>hard maybe, but not impossible</i>)</li> <li>• You get to decide who governs you (<i>only if enough other people agree with you</i>)</li> <li>• If you have not voted then you can't complain about the result. (<i>not support for the claim, but a challenge to the counter</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Because that is the law. (not true; voting is not compulsory)</li> </ul>	4	<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>2 marks – PRECISE</b></p> <p>For a relevant and precise reason that gives clear support to the claim.</p> <p><b>1 mark – LIMITED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a reason that gives some support to the claim</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> for a reason that includes other argument elements, such as the claim in the question</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For something unrelated so it does not give support, or for a statement that is too lacking in plausibility to offer recognisable support.</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> For no credit-worthy material.</li> </ul> <p><b>N.B.</b> Hypothetical reasons and principles used as reasons are valid</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
23 (b)	<p><b>ONE OWN REASON TO CHALLENGE</b>  <b>Examples for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Everyone has freedom to choose</li> <li>• Politics should not be forced</li> <li>• It may be that it is not possible</li> <li>• If they fall ill they can't get to the polling station (<i>HR</i>)</li> <li>• Travelling to vote may cost them time and money (<i>the "fish and chips" rule – doesn't count as two reasons</i>)</li> <li>• Many people work long hours</li> <li>• They may not understand the issues</li> <li>• They may not agree with any of the parties' policies</li> <li>• If everyone who had the right to vote did so, then some would waste their vote on uninformed decisions which could affect the whole country (<i>long HR, but not added elements</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Everyone has freedom to choose and voting is something people should be able to choose (<i>added argument element</i>)</li> <li>• Some people have the right to vote but they don't know who to vote for (<i>added argument element</i>)</li> <li>• There will be a limited number of choices and you may not like any of them (<i>added argument element</i>)</li> <li>• It may be that it is not possible, for example, some people need wheelchair access (<i>added argument element</i>)</li> <li>• Rights do not have to come with responsibilities (<i>limited</i>)</li> <li>• It forces people to take sides (<i>limited challenge</i>)</li> <li>• It is unlikely politicians will heed their views (<i>speculative</i>)</li> <li>• Ultimately it is the government that decides the outcome (<i>possibly true in some places, the question did not specify UK</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People have different ideas (<i>not a reason not to vote</i>)</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b>  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>2 marks – PRECISE</b>  For a relevant and precise reason that gives a clear challenge to the claim.</p> <p><b>1 mark – LIMITED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a reason that gives a limited challenge to the claim.</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> For a reason (which challenges the claim) that includes other argument elements, such as the claim in the question</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For something unrelated so it does not give any challenge</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> for a statement that is too lacking in plausibility to offer recognisable challenge</li> <li>• <b>OR</b> for no credit-worthy material.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
24	<p><b>OWN ARGUMENT</b> In this question, there are 4 requirements: well-structured and developed argument, at least 3 reasons, a well-supported intermediate conclusion, a main conclusion. They may also include other argument elements. For each of the 4 areas, the assessment could be strong, weak or not covered / absent / missing.</p> <p><b>Main Conclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong = MC is stated and precisely responds to the question</li> <li>Weak = MC present but significantly different to that required</li> </ul> <p><b>Reasons</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong = 3 relevant reasons, 2 giving strong support the MC, without intrusive assumptions and/or flaws</li> <li>Weak = 1 or more relevant reasons</li> </ul> <p><b>Intermediate conclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong = Progressive IC – it is fully supported by one or more reasons and gives support to the MC</li> <li>Weak - Simplistic summary statement or a statement of the MC reworked</li> </ul> <p><b>Structure and development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong = Sustained, organised, easy to follow. Effective development (e.g. through connecting the reasons, supporting / illustrating / clarifying reasons through explanations / examples)</li> <li>Weak = Some clarity and organisation. GSP may impede understanding. May be characterised as a rant / emotive / rhetorical reasoning / undeveloped.</li> </ul>	12	<p><b>Principle of discrimination</b> This question discriminates on whether a candidate can demonstrate the ability to select and use components of reasoning including intermediate conclusion(s), and synthesise them, to create perceptive, complex, 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, 1 is weak <b>9 marks</b></li> </ul> <p>Plus credit 1 mark for <b>each</b> 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, 0-1 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>Acceptable conclusions</b></p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The main aim of schools should be to prepare students for employment.</li> </ul> <p>Challenge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The main aim of schools should NOT be to prepare students for employment (but rather they should focus on ...)</li> <li>Preparing students for employment is just one of a number of important aims for schools.</li> </ul> <p><b>Weak conclusions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Schools should prepare students for employment.</li> <li>The main aim of schools should be to prepare students for employment or university. (<i>limited support/challenge</i>)</li> <li>The government should seriously consider making the main aim of schools to be to prepare students for employment.</li> <li>Employment should be the main aim of students so schools should prepare them for this.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of points that may be raised:</b></p> <p>Support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure equality of provision.</li> <li>Education should prepare you for life and most spend will spend most of their lives in employment.</li> <li>It will benefit the country if everyone has had basic preparation for employment.</li> <li>It is the only place to ensure that everyone has minimum competence and attitudes.</li> </ul> <p>Challenge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not all people will have/want employment after leaving school</li> <li>Education should prepare you for all aspects of life</li> <li>Employment is not the school's concern</li> <li>There is more to life than employment.</li> <li>Not all schools are secondary schools: employment will be a lesser concern in nursery schools, etc.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 area covered weakly <b>1 mark</b></li> </ul> <p>Plus credit 1 mark for the following: <b>(MAX +1)</b> Other argument elements, if present, give some useful support to the argument.</p> <p><b>NB:</b> <b>The intermediate conclusion cannot be ‘doubled marked’ as an intermediate conclusion <i>and</i> as a reason. Candidates were required to give 3 reasons, as well as an intermediate conclusion.</b></p>
			<b>Section C Total</b>	<b>30</b>	
			<b>Paper Total</b>	<b>75</b>	

## APPENDIX 1

## Marking grid for question 22

Main Conclusion (C)		Reasons (R)	
<b>Strong (C+)</b>	MC is stated and precisely responds to the question	<b>Strong (R+)</b>	2 reasons giving support to the MC, without intrusive assumptions and/or flaws
<b>Weak (C)</b>	MC present but significantly different to that required	<b>Weak (R)</b>	1 or more relevant reasons
Counter and response (J)		Structure and development (S)	
<b>Strong (J+)</b>	Relevant and valid counter which is responded to effectively	<b>Strong (S+)</b>	<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>
<b>Weak (J)</b>	<p>A counter and a response are offered</p> <p><i>The counter may just be of the form "Some people don't agree that ... [followed by the MC] or the response may be a reason not addressing the counter, <b>OR</b> a blanket denial "but this is not the case"</i></p>	<b>Weak (S)</b>	<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>

**Level 4**4 areas are strong **12 marks****Level 3**3 areas are strong, 1 is weak **9 marks**Credit 1 mark for each: **(MAX +2)**

- Other argument elements
- Concision

**Level 2**3 areas are strong **7 marks**2 areas are strong, 2 weak **6 marks**2 areas are strong, 1 weak **5 marks**Credit 1 mark for each: **(MAX +2)**

- Other argument elements
- Concision

**Level 1**2 areas are strong **4 marks**1 strong, 2-3 weak **3 marks**1 strong, 0-1 weak **2 marks**At least 2 areas covered weakly **2 marks**1 area covered weakly **1 mark**Credit 1 mark for: **(MAX +1)**

- Other argument elements

## Marking grid for question 24

Main Conclusion (C)		Reasons (R)	
<b>Strong (C+)</b>	MC is stated and precisely responds to the question	<b>Strong (R+)</b>	3 relevant reasons, 2 giving strong support to the <b>MC/IC</b> , without intrusive assumptions and/or flaws
<b>Weak (C)</b>	MC present but significantly different to that required	<b>Weak (R)</b>	1 or more relevant reasons
Intermediate conclusion (I)		Structure and development (S)	
<b>Strong (I+)</b>	Progressive IC – it is fully supported by one or more reasons and gives support to the MC	<b>Strong (S+)</b>	<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>
<b>Weak (I)</b>	Simplistic summary statement or a statement of the MC reworked	<b>Weak (S)</b>	<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>

**Level 4**4 areas are strong **12 marks****Level 3**3 areas are strong, 1 is weak **9 marks**Credit 1 mark for each: **(MAX +2)**

- Other argument elements
- Concision

**Level 2**3 areas are strong **7 marks**2 areas are strong, 2 weak **6 marks**2 areas are strong, 1 weak **5 marks**Credit 1 mark for each: **(MAX +2)**

- Other argument elements
- Concision

**Level 1**2 areas are strong **4 marks**1 strong, 2-3 weak **3 marks**1 strong, 0-1 weak **2 marks**At least 2 areas covered weakly **2 marks**1 area covered weakly **1 mark**Credit 1 mark for: **(MAX +1)**

- Other argument elements

## 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 components (IC)
2		1		1	1-2	3.2.2 Assessing the extent to which general principles apply
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 components (IC)
5	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument components (Assumption)
6		1		1	1-2	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments
7	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument components (Ev)
8		1		1	1-2	3.2.2.3 identify and explain appeals within arguments (AA)
9		1		1	1-2	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments
10	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument components (IC)
11	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument components (R)
12	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument components (Assumption)
13	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument components (MC)
14	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument components (R)
15		1		1	1-2	3.2.2 Assessing the extent to which general principles apply
Section A Totals	9	6		15	20	
16a	2			2	2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument components (MC)
16b	2			2	2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument components (P)
16c	2			2	2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument components (IC)
17a	1			2	1	3.1.1.6 / 3.2.1.2 identify argument elements (HYP)
17b	2			2	1-2	3.1.1.6 / 3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements (HYP)
17c		3		2	2	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments
18a	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.3 recognise and explain the difference between explanation and argument
18b	2			2	2	3.2.1.3 recognise and explain the difference between explanation and argument
19a	3			3	2-3	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument components (Ana)
19b		3		3	2-3	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments
20a		1		1	1	3.2.2.3 identify and explain appeals within arguments (AH)
20b		2		2	2	3.2.2.3 identify and explain appeals within arguments (AH)
21		6		6	5	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments
Section B Totals	15	15	0	30	30	
22			12	12	10-12	3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments
23ai			2	2	2-3	3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments
23ai			2	2	2-3	3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments
23b			2	2	2-3	3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments
24			12	12	10-12	3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments
Section C Totals			30	30	30	
Paper Totals	24	21	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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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**

