



## **GCE**

### **Critical Thinking**

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

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

### **Mark Scheme for June 2018**

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 2018

Annotation	Meaning
<b>BP</b>	Blank Page – this annotation <b>must</b> be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response
<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)
✓	Tick to indicate more precisely where marks have been awarded in questions with more than one part. To be used for questions <b>21a, 25a</b> Can also be used in Q24 and 26 to indicate “Other argument element” (place tick in the body of the response) or “Concision” (place tick at the end of the response)
<b>C</b>	Weak main conclusion <b>Q24 &amp; 26</b>
<b>C +</b>	Strong main conclusion <b>Q24 &amp; 26</b>
<b>R</b>	Weak reasons <b>Q24 &amp; 26</b>
<b>R +</b>	Strong reasons <b>Q24 &amp; 26</b> (only use the + sign once, however many strong reasons are given)
<b>I</b>	Weak intermediate conclusion <b>Q24</b> only
<b>I +</b>	Strong intermediate conclusion <b>Q24</b> only
<b>J</b>	Weak Counter argument and response to CA <b>Q26</b> only
<b>J +</b>	Strong Counter argument and response to CA <b>Q26</b> only
<b>S</b>	Weak structure and development <b>Q24 &amp; 26</b>
<b>S +</b>	Strong structure and development <b>Q24 &amp; 26</b>

## Section A – Multiple Choice

Question	Key	Text	Type	AO	
1	B	Running at school	Argument elements	AO1	
2	A		Appeal	AO2	
3	A	Black cabs	Identify MC	AO1	
4	C		Weaken	AO2	
5	A		Assumption	AO1	
6	C	Flooding	Identify IC	AO1	
7	D		Argument elements	AO1	
8	A		Strengthen	AO2	
9	C	Exam	Assumption	AO1	
10	B		Further conclusion	AO2	
11	C		Additional claim	AO2	
12	C	New roads	Identify MC	AO1	
13	B		Appeal	AO2	
14	C		Weakness	AO2	
15	C		Flaw	AO2	

## Analysis of Multiple choice Passages and Answers

Qu.	Answer	Mark	Guidance
<b>1-2</b>			<b>Running at school</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>B</b>	1	The statement is a counter-assertion because it is not combined with a reason or conclusion to make a counter-argument
<b>2</b>	<b>A</b>	1	The passage includes an appeal to authority. The head teachers are the authority in this case.
<b>3-5</b>			<b>Black cabs</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>A</b>	1	A. This is the correct answer and it is supported by the rest of this sentence. B. This is a counter-conclusion C. This is a counter-reason D. This is one of the reasons used to support the conclusion of the argument.
<b>4</b>	<b>C</b>	1	A. This does not provide any further information or weaken the argument, as the reason has said that 'many are' rather than 'all are'. B. This provides some additional information which could have been used to support the counter-argument, rather than weakening the argument given. C. This is the correct answer. The claim would most weaken the argument, as it provides further information which undermines / limits the relevance of the reason that foreign tourists may not know the postcode of the place they want to go to. D. This does not weaken the argument, as it is not the rarity of people passing the 'The Knowledge' that is being countered by the argument.
<b>5</b>	<b>A</b>	1	A. This is the correct answer. Passing the "knowledge" is only useful if taxi drivers can remember it! B. This is not assumed, as it is a paraphrase of a stated reason in the argument. C. This statement does not need to be assumed for the reasons to link to the conclusion. This is further information that would strengthen the argument, if true. D. This is not assumed, as it is a paraphrase of a stated reason in the argument.
<b>6-8</b>			<b>Floods</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>C</b>	1	A. This is a counter assertion. B. This is a counter conclusion. C. This is the correct answer. It is supported by a reason ("it is impossible to predict...") and supports the main conclusion ("However we should not require authorities to erect flood barriers beside rivers"). D. This is the conclusion of the argument.
<b>7</b>	<b>D</b>	1	This is the correct answer. It supports the conclusion: 'we should not require authorities to erect flood barriers beside rivers'
<b>8</b>	<b>A</b>	1	A. This is the correct answer, as it shows that flood barriers can be counter-productive, so strengthens the argument for not building them. B. This claim does not impact the author's argument. C. This claim supports the opposite view to this argument. It gives reason in favour of barriers, in that it might lower insurance costs D. This claim does not impact the author's argument.

Qu.	Answer	Mark	Guidance
9-11			<b>Education</b>
9	C	1	<p>A. This cannot be an assumption as it is stated.</p> <p>B. This is not relied upon to be true for the reasoning to support the conclusion. It could act as a further conclusion.</p> <p>C. The argument relies on this to be true to support the IC (there is no special merit in memorising facts)</p> <p>D. This is not relied upon to be true for the reasoning to support the conclusion. If true, it would strengthen the argument.</p>
10	B	1	<p>A. This is a plausible counter assertion, rather than a something which could be concluded from the reasoning.</p> <p>B. This is the correct answer as it would be supported by the context (Our education and examination system spends far too much time and effort requiring students to memorise facts) and the MC (what education should be doing is concentrating on developing students' skills).</p> <p>C. This cannot be concluded from the reasoning. It suggests a way to enable students to access factual information whilst in school, but that is neither necessary nor sufficient for the development of student's skills.</p> <p>D. This cannot be concluded from the reasoning. There is no reasoning relating to the teachers' training being a cause of the focus of memorising facts.</p>
11	C	1	Option C is the correct answer. The passage concludes that what education should be doing is concentrating on developing students' skills. The additional claim (it is not possible to do well at university without demonstrating a number of skills) strengthens this argument, by giving another context to show the importance of doing so.
12-15			<b>New Roads</b>
12	C	1	<p>A. This is a reason used to support the main conclusion</p> <p>B. This is another reason used to support the main conclusion</p> <p>C. This is the main conclusion</p> <p>D. This is a contextual reference to people who pose counter-arguments.</p>
13	B	1	Option B is the correct answer. The author appeals to history. Past performance (roads and canals facilitated trade in the 19 <sup>th</sup> century) is being used to predict future performance (the reason that 'new roads will ensure we keep our place within the global economy').
14	C	1	Option C is the correct answer. The weakness in the analogy is that it confuses necessary and sufficient conditions. In the 19 <sup>th</sup> century roads and canals may have been necessary to establish the global economy, but they were not sufficient. Similarly, it is arguable that new roads are necessary, but they are not sufficient to ensure Britain keeps its place in the global economy.
15	C	1	Option C is the correct answer. The author presents a distorted version of the opponent's argument (objecting to the new road plans) in order to dismiss it.
Section A Total	[15]		

## Section B – Analysing and Evaluating Argument

Question	Topic /Answer	Mark	Guidance
16	<p><b>CONCLUSION</b> [Para. 2]</p> <p><b>2 marks:</b> Local councils would be well-advised to take advantage of this additional source of income.</p> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local councils should take advantage of this additional source of income. <i>[minor paraphrase]</i></li> <li>• Moreover £100 is a small amount compared with the thousands of pounds the average motorist spends on vehicle tax, fuel and insurance. Local councils would be well-advised to take advantage of this additional source of income. <i>[adding additional text]</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 0 marks:</b> Councils should therefore welcome any new source of income that helps them raise the revenue they so desperately need. <i>[Para. 1 - IC]</i></p>	2	<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 stating the argument element in the exact words of the author, but adding or missing out information</li> <li>• OR For a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrases</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a statement of an incorrect part of the text</li> <li>• For no creditworthy material</li> </ul> <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	Topic /Answer	Mark	Guidance
17 (a)	<p><b>PRINCIPLE [Para. 6]</b></p> <p><b>2 marks:</b> Safety should always have the highest priority.</p> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safety should always have the highest priority and could easily be improved by these roadside parking charges. <i>[added information]</i></li> <li>• Safety should always be the highest priority. <i>[paraphrase]</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 0 marks:</b> People should be allowed to park their car on the public road outside their house for free. <i>[Para 2 – not sufficiently general AND as it is part of the counter assertion, it is responded to rather than “used”]</i></p>	2	<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 stating the argument element in the exact words of the author, but adding or missing out information</li> <li>• OR For a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrases</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a statement of an incorrect part of the text</li> <li>• For no creditworthy material</li> </ul> <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	Topic /Answer	Mark	Guidance
17 (b)	<p><b>INTERMEDIATE CONCLUSION</b> [Para. 1]</p> <p><b>2 marks:</b> Councils should (therefore) welcome any new source of income that helps them raise the revenue they so desperately need.</p> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Councils should therefore welcome any new source of income. <i>[missing information]</i></li> <li>• Councils should welcome any extra source of revenue. <i>[paraphrase]</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 0 marks:</b> Local councils would be well-advised to take advantage of this additional source of income. <i>[main conclusion]</i></p>	2	<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 stating the argument element in the exact words of the author, but adding or missing out information</li> <li>• OR For a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrases</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a statement of an incorrect part of the text</li> <li>• For no creditworthy material</li> </ul> <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	Topic /Answer	Mark	Guidance
(c)	<p><b>COUNTER-ASSERTION</b> [Para. 2]</p> <p><b>2 marks:</b> (Many believe that) it is a basic human right that people should be allowed to park their car on the public road outside their house for free.</p> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Many believe that it is a basic human right that people should be allowed to park their car on the public road outside their house. <i>[missing information ("for free")]</i></li> <li>Many believe that they should be allowed to park outside their house for free. <i>[paraphrase]</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 0 marks:</b> On the other hand, it is very hard for them to raise money. [Para. 1]</p>	2	<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 stating the argument element in the exact words of the author, but adding or missing out information</li> <li>OR For a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrases</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For a statement of an incorrect part of the text</li> <li>For no creditworthy material</li> </ul> <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	Topic /Answer	Mark	Guidance
18 (a)	<b>EXPLANATION / ARGUMENT</b> <p><b>1 mark</b> (an) explanation</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> an argument / counter argument</p>	1	
(b)	<b>EXPLANATION (Explanation)</b> <p><b>Example for 3 marks</b> It is not an argument because it is not seeking to persuade; [1] it does not support/oppose the main conclusion, [1] it is just explaining the difference between the author's proposals and existing parking schemes. [1]</p> <p><b>Example for 2 marks</b> It is not an argument because it is not seeking to persuade; [1] it is just explaining the difference between the author's proposals and existing parking schemes. [1]</p> <p><b>Example for 1 mark</b> It is an explanation because it is not trying to persuade.</p> <p><b>Example for 0 marks</b> It is an argument because it is trying to persuade the reader.</p>	3	<p><b>Indicative content [1 mark for each up maximum of 2]</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanations show cause and effect.</li> <li>• Explanations give clarification.</li> <li>• Explanations do not seek to persuade.</li> <li>• There is no support / challenge to a conclusion.</li> </ul> <p><b>Plus 1 mark</b> for supportive and relevant reference to the text.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For reason(s) why it IS an argument/ counter-argument</li> <li>• For just a quote and nothing else</li> <li>• For claims that beg the question of it not being an argument ("there is no reasoning" or "no conclusion").</li> </ul>

Question	Topic /Answer	Mark	Guidance
19 (a)	<b>FLAW (NAME)</b> [Para 5] <b>1 mark</b> Slippery slope (flaw)	1	
(b)	<b>FLAW (EXPLANATION)</b>  <b>Example for 2 marks</b> The author reasons from a possibility (cars parked on both sides of a road), through a series of events that are not properly linked (cars meeting, queues lengthening, road rage, serious injuries) to an improbable consequence (court cases).  <b>Examples for 1 mark</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Because the extreme consequences, road rage, are unlikely to follow from traffic jams <i>[valid comment on the conclusion]</i></li> <li>The author jumps from parked cars to road rage without explaining how one leads to the other <i>[valid comment on the links]</i></li> </ul> <b>Example for 0 marks</b> The author makes a lot of general statements without any evidence about how parking leads to road rage.	2	<b>2 marks</b> For identifying a weakness with the steps or reasoning <b>and</b> for identifying a weakness with the consequence <b>plus a</b> relevant reference to the text  <b>1 mark</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For identifying a weakness with the steps or reasoning <b>and</b> for identifying a weakness with the consequence without reference to the text OR</li> <li>For identifying a weakness with the steps or reasoning <b>plus a</b> relevant reference to the text OR</li> <li>For identifying a weakness with the consequence <b>plus a</b> relevant reference to the text</li> </ul>

Question	Topic /Answer	Mark	Guidance
20 (a)	<p><b>ASSUMPTION</b> [Para. 2]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (It assumes) they (people who currently park on the street) would pay the charges.</li> <li>• It assumes car owners won't change behaviour / will continue to park in the street.</li> <li>• That councils have can enforce the charges.</li> <li>• That the number of cars remains the same.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It assumes that cars are parked all year round.</li> <li>• This implies that cars are parked.</li> <li>• The car is driven by the owner. <i>[residents would still need to buy permits for hired cars, and non-residents would face parking restrictions]</i></li> <li>• That each person owns just one car.</li> </ul>	1	If two or more assumptions are stated, <b>all</b> have to be correct to get the mark.
(b)	<p><b>ASSUMPTION IMPACT</b></p> <p><b>Example for 2 marks</b></p> <p>In fact, it is very likely that taxing on-street parking will persuade many owners to adopt other options (parking on driveways, getting rid of one's car) <b>[1]</b> and this will reduce the potential revenue from the tax / benefits from the scheme. <b>[1]</b></p> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unlikely that everyone will pay so the amount raised will be less <i>[impact only]</i></li> <li>• Some people may own more than one car, so (if the £100 charge is per owner rather than per car) the money raised will be less <i>[it is narrowing the text to a hypothetical scenario which they are then responding to]</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People are lazy and will pay up <i>[not a weakness]</i> disregarding the danger to children. <i>[Q asks about Para 2; this comes from Para 6]</i></li> <li>• The figures are not accurate <i>[too vague]</i></li> </ul>	2	<p><b>2 Marks</b> For explaining why it implausible <b>[1]</b> and why it weakens the authors' reasoning. <b>[1]</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> For either one of the above points</p>

Question	Topic /Answer	Mark	Guidance																								
21 (a)	<b>ANALOGY [Para. 4]</b> <b>Example for 3 marks: Any three points from the following</b> <table border="1" data-bbox="314 293 1235 611"> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>U</b></td><td>place not owned</td> <td><b>gardens</b></td> <td><b>driveways/ garages</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>V</b></td><td>verb</td> <td><b>grow (vegetables)</b></td> <td><b>park (car)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>W</b></td><td>verb - undesirable behaviour</td> <td><b>Dig up</b></td> <td><b>use roads to park / help themselves</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>X</b></td><td>location of W</td> <td><b>(public) parks</b></td> <td><b>roads / highways</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Y</b></td><td>verb – desired behaviour</td> <td><b>rent (an allotment)</b></td> <td><b>pay (to park)</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Z</b></td><td>location of Y</td> <td><b>allotments</b></td> <td><b>public car parks</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>U</b>	place not owned	<b>gardens</b>	<b>driveways/ garages</b>	<b>V</b>	verb	<b>grow (vegetables)</b>	<b>park (car)</b>	<b>W</b>	verb - undesirable behaviour	<b>Dig up</b>	<b>use roads to park / help themselves</b>	<b>X</b>	location of W	<b>(public) parks</b>	<b>roads / highways</b>	<b>Y</b>	verb – desired behaviour	<b>rent (an allotment)</b>	<b>pay (to park)</b>	<b>Z</b>	location of Y	<b>allotments</b>	<b>public car parks</b>	3	<b>3 marks</b> For any three out of a possible 6 scoring parallels. In each case both sides of the comparison must be stated and it must be clear what corresponds to what.  <b>2 marks</b> For any two complete and correct parallels  <b>1 mark</b> For any one complete and correct parallel
<b>U</b>	place not owned	<b>gardens</b>	<b>driveways/ garages</b>																								
<b>V</b>	verb	<b>grow (vegetables)</b>	<b>park (car)</b>																								
<b>W</b>	verb - undesirable behaviour	<b>Dig up</b>	<b>use roads to park / help themselves</b>																								
<b>X</b>	location of W	<b>(public) parks</b>	<b>roads / highways</b>																								
<b>Y</b>	verb – desired behaviour	<b>rent (an allotment)</b>	<b>pay (to park)</b>																								
<b>Z</b>	location of Y	<b>allotments</b>	<b>public car parks</b>																								
(b)	<b>ANALOGY WEAKNESS</b> <b>Examples for 3 marks</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Digging up a public park causes damage [1] whereas parking causes inconvenience [comparison] [1] so the analogy exaggerates the extent of the problem. [consequence] [1]</li> <li>Far <b>more</b> people probably currently park their cars on the road [1] <b>than</b> grow their own vegetables. [comparison] [1] That means charging for on street parking would be far <b>more</b> unpopular <b>than</b> charging for allotments. [consequence] [1]</li> <li>No one has to grow their own vegetables [1] <b>but</b> for some people, owning a car is a necessity, [comparison] [1] so charging for parking is much more unfair than charging for allotments. [consequence] [1]</li> <li>Under the author's proposals you would be allowed to park on the road for a fee, [1] <b>whereas</b> you would not be allowed to dig up part of a public park, [1] [comparison] so charging for parking is feasible whereas digging up a park is not. [consequence] [1]</li> <li>(Some) roads are designed to allow parking [1] whereas public parks are not designed to grow vegetables [1] so the objection to free parking on roads is unreasonable. [1]</li> <li>The proposed parking charges would be in addition to the existing vehicle tax, [1] <b>whereas</b> allotment holders pay rent but no other vegetable tax. [1] The analogy ignores the unfairness to car owners. [1]</li> </ul>	3	The most frequent weakness in analogies is that they are disanalogies; there is a lack of comparability in the items being compared. In marking this type of response, award one mark for each of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identification of what a relevant weakness is through reference to one side of the analogy</li> <li>Explanation of this weakness by reference to the other side of the analogy (whereas)</li> <li>An explanation of how this weakness will impact on the author's reasoning (consequence)</li> </ul> <b>Examples of relevant weaknesses / points of disanalogy:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Necessity</li> <li>Popularity</li> <li>Timescale</li> <li>Degree/scale of impact</li> <li>Permanency</li> <li>Feasibility</li> </ul> Cap at 1 mark responses which identify a trivial weakness or one of limited relevance to the reasoning																								

Question	Topic /Answer	Mark	Guidance
	<p><b>Examples for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under the author's proposals you would be allowed to park on the road for a fee, [1] whereas you would not be allowed to dig up part of a public park, [1] [comparison] so you would have to rent an allotment. <i>[irrelevant consequence]</i></li> <li>Growing vegetables takes long and during that time they cannot be moved [1] whereas a parked car can be moved at any time. [1]</li> <li>Parking outside your house affects other people less [1] than digging up a park. [1]</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cars are much more valuable than vegetables.</li> <li>Parking outside your house doesn't affect anyone else; <i>[not true]</i> whereas digging up a park affects everyone.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Examples of differences which have no relevance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parks have living organisms; roads are made of tarmac.</li> <li>Cars are more expensive than vegetables.</li> </ul> <p><b>2 marks</b> for a relevant "WHAT" and a "WHEREAS", or clear, relevant comparison of the two situations plus <b>one mark</b> for exploring the consequences (not just a paraphrase or elaboration of the comparison).</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> for a comparison which is irrelevant</p>
22 (a)	<p><b>APPEAL (NAME) [Para. 6]</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> (appeal to) emotion(s)</p> <p>Allow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(appeal to) fear</li> <li>(appeal to) pity</li> <li>emotional appeal</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Appeal to tradition</li> <li>Appeal to safety</li> </ul>	1	If more than one appeal is named, all have to be from those which are allowable.

Question	Topic /Answer	Mark	Guidance
(b)	<p><b>APPEAL (EXPLANATION)</b></p> <p><b>Examples for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This appeal provides strong support for the author's argument because it appeals to parents and children who do not want to risk being <b>run down</b> as well as cyclists who do not want to be cycling in a "not safe place". It is appealing to their <b>fear</b> of these situations to support the conclusion that roadside parking should not be free to improve safety.</li> <li>• The appeal doesn't support the author's argument as the <b>loaded language</b> "think how <b>dangerous</b> it is for children" is a substitute for the reasoning.</li> <li>• It supports the argument because it illustrates the <b>dangers to children</b> of using roads with too many parked cars.</li> <li>• The appeal does help to support the author's argument as people become more <b>concerned</b> when safety gets involved than when the issue is around parking cars.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The appeal does support the author's argument because it is arguing the point that "Safety should always have the highest priority" from which the conclusion that roadside parking charges will increase safety can be drawn. <i>[lacks explanation of appeal to emotion]</i></li> <li>• It supports the argument because it illustrates the <b>dangers</b> of using roads with too many parked cars. <i>[insufficient explanation]</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Example for 0 marks.</b></p> <p>In some aspects this appeal contradicts the original reasoning. The idea of charging home owners to park was not to increase safety but to increase funds for the local councils "Local councils would be well advised to take advantage of this additional source of income" <i>[attempting to explain weaknesses in the conclusion rather than the appeal]</i></p>	2	<p><b>2 marks</b> For identifying whether or not it supports the author's argument <b>and</b> for explaining this <b>plus</b> a relevant reference to the text.</p> <p><b>Examples of explanatory points</b></p> <p><b>Explanation of why it does support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is persuasive because it successfully leads to fear / emotion /concern / makes people realise this is a serious matter.</li> <li>• It is persuasive because it describes the danger to cyclists or children caused by parking.</li> </ul> <p><b>Explanation of why it does not support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not persuasive because the language used is loaded / exaggerated etc.</li> <li>• The appeal is used as a substitute for reasoning.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark – LIMITED JUSTIFICATION</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For identifying whether or not it supports the author's argument <b>plus</b> a relevant reference to the text without clear explanation.</li> <li>• For explaining the appeal <b>plus</b> a relevant reference to the text without making it clear whether or not it supports the author's argument.</li> <li>• For identifying whether or not it supports or the author's argument <b>and</b> for explaining this without a relevant reference to the text.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For just a quoting / paraphrasing the text</li> <li>• For explaining a weakness in the argument which does not relate to the appeal</li> <li>• For no credit-worthy material</li> </ul>

Question	Topic /Answer	Mark	Guidance
23	<p><b>INCONSISTENCY</b></p> <p><b>Example for 3 marks</b> Paragraphs 5 &amp; 6 offer reasons why on-street parking should be banned on grounds of safety, whereas the main conclusion in Para. 2 is that councils should use on-street parking as a source of revenue. [1] You cannot logically do both completely. OR These are different aims, [1] though either way there would be some benefits [1]</p> <p><b>Example for 2 marks</b> Paragraphs 5 &amp; 6 offer reasons why on-street parking should be banned on grounds of safety, whereas the main conclusion is that councils should use on street parking as a source of revenue. [1] You cannot logically do both completely / if you discourage parking then the revenue will fall. [1]</p> <p><b>Example for 1 mark</b> Paragraphs 1 &amp; 2 encourage parking as a source of revenue, whereas Paragraphs 5 &amp; 6 discourage parking as a safety hazard.</p> <p><b>Example for 0 marks</b> Paragraphs 1 &amp; 2 are coherent but Paragraphs 5 &amp; 6 are unreliable as the author is desperate to find more reasons to support parking charges.</p>	3	<p><b>3 marks</b> For a nuanced assessment of the <i>extent</i> of weakness, which recognises that councils cannot eliminate parking on the public roads <i>completely and</i> raise revenue by charging people to park on roads, <i>but</i> in another sense, it is a win-win situation in that they can either get revenue or reduce parking, or a bit of both.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> For a one-sided or less nuanced statement that councils cannot eliminate parking on the public roads <i>completely and</i> raise revenue by charging people to park on roads.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> For describing the difference between the strands of reasoning of Paragraphs 1 &amp; 2 and 5 &amp; 6.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> For responses that do not make clear the difference in emphasis.</p>
	<b>Section B Total</b>	30	

## SECTION C – Developing your own arguments

Question	Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
24	<p><b>OWN ARGUMENT with INTERMEDIATE CONCLUSION</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <p><b>Correct strong main conclusion</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (I think that) the government should increase (the) tax on petrol and diesel.</li> <li>• Allow The government should definitely increase tax on petrol and diesel</li> </ul> <p><b>Example of weak main conclusions</b></p> <p>The government should increase tax on fuel. <i>[paraphrase]</i></p> <p><b>Examples of points that may be raised:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• pollution, air quality</li> <li>• climate change</li> <li>• benefits of extra government revenue</li> </ul> <p><b>CHALLENGE</b></p> <p><b>Correct strong main conclusions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The government should <b>not</b> increase (the) tax on petrol and diesel.</li> <li>• The government should <b>not</b> change (the level of the) tax on petrol and diesel.</li> <li>• The government should <b>lower</b> (the) tax on petrol and diesel.</li> </ul> <p><b>Weak main conclusions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I don't think the government should increase tax on petrol and diesel <i>[stating what the conclusion <b>isn't</b>, rather than what it <b>is</b>]</i>.</li> <li>• The government would be ill-advised to increase the tax on petrol and diesel. <i>[too much of a paraphrase]</i></li> </ul>	12	<p><b>See marking grid in Appendix 1</b></p> <p><b>Do NOT</b> credit material simply repeated from the Resource Booklet (e.g. copying particular reasons / examples).</p> <p>If the candidate has adapted/developed material from the Resource Booklet into a new argument, then this is acceptable.</p> <p><b>Main Conclusion</b></p> <p>For support, a strong main conclusion must contain the exact words in the question. It is allowable to make additions ("I think that", "definitely" etc.) provided they don't significantly alter the meaning.</p> <p>For challenge, the candidates have to do more than just quote the question, and a bigger variety of alternatives is acceptable as strong.</p> <p><b>Concision</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bonus mark for concision can <b>only</b> be awarded if the candidate has given a well-developed and sustained argument.</li> <li>• This mark on Levels 2 and 3 is to recognise that the candidate has been <b>actively</b> concise, rather than creating a short argument which makes omissions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Intermediate conclusions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A <b>progressive</b> IC is able to act as a reason on its own for the MC, as well as being supported by a reason. Examiners are recommended to do the "therefore .... because" tests to ensure that the IC on its own is sufficient on its own as a reason for the MC.</li> <li>• Examiners are alerted to the fact that the presence of the word "because" in an argument may not indicate the presence of a strong IC. It may be part of an explanation,</li> </ul>

Question	Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
	<p><b>Examples of points that may be raised:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Damages competitiveness</li> <li>• Impracticable as it would lose votes at elections</li> <li>• There is already too much tax on motorists</li> </ul>		<p>and whilst explanations can form part of longer arguments, the presence of a cause and effect in a response is at best only a weak attempt at an IC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IC cannot be double marked as an intermediate conclusion <i>and</i> as a reason. Candidates are required to give three reasons as well as an intermediate conclusion. Examiners should credit such ICs in whichever way gives the candidate more marks. This means maximising the number of “strong” aspects, since “strong + absent” generally gets more marks than “weak + weak”.</li> </ul>

Question	Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
25 (a)	<p><b>OWN REASONS TO SUPPORT</b></p> <p><b>Examples for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Because) this (helps them to) deter(s) road users from speeding</li> <li>• They (drivers) would slow down</li> <li>• It would improve road safety by encouraging cautious speeds.</li> <li>• There is less risk of panic braking when a driver sees the speed camera too late</li> <li>• It forces those behind to slow down as well</li> <li>• (Because) it is unfair to try and catch motorists out</li> <li>• Speed cameras should not get money by stealth.</li> <li>• Fewer drivers / Sat Nav owners will get fined</li> <li>• Fines cost people a lot of money</li> <li>• It reduces driver stress (from worrying about speed cameras)</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sat Navs should warn drivers when they are approaching speed cameras because this helps them to deter road-users from speeding <i>[added element]</i></li> <li>• This would boost sales of Sat Navs <i>[limited support]</i></li> <li>• Fewer dangerous drivers would be caught speeding <i>[ambiguity]</i></li> <li>• Drivers would slow down on some roads <i>[requires assumptions]</i></li> <li>• It would prevent people from speeding <i>[overstated]</i></li> <li>• Drivers have a right to know</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helps drivers to navigate <i>[implausible]</i></li> <li>• Drivers need to know what the speed limit is / where it begins <i>[irrelevant]</i></li> <li>• Sat Navs are designed to do this</li> </ul>	2 x 2	<p><b>2 marks – PRECISE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a relevant and precise reason that gives clear support to the claim</li> </ul> <p><b>1 marks – LIMITED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For a reason with that gives some support to the claim</li> <li>• OR for a reason with that includes other argument elements.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For no credit-worthy material</li> <li>• For something unrelated so it does not give support, or a statement that is too lacking in plausibility to offer recognisable support</li> <li>• For a reason which challenges the claim</li> <li>• Where Reason 1 and Reason 2 are very similar, credit the better version and give 0 marks to the other version</li> <li>• For two or more added elements</li> </ul>

Question	Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
25 (b)	<p><b>OWN REASON TO CHALLENGE</b></p> <p><b>Examples for 2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drivers would (just) slow down temporarily</li> <li>It would encourage drivers to go fast everywhere else</li> <li>Motorists should (be encouraged to) obey limits everywhere</li> <li>Not knowing where cameras are would make drivers more cautious everywhere</li> <li>Safe drivers don't need to worry where speed cameras are</li> <li>Warnings make the motorist look at the speedometer/Sat Nav instead of at the road ahead</li> <li>Speeding drivers deserve to be caught and punished <i>[fish and chips principle]</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drivers who observe speed limits need not worry so they don't need to know where the cameras are <i>[extra element]</i></li> <li>It would allow speeding drivers to avoid punishment <i>[ambiguity]</i></li> <li>Councils would raise more money from motorists.</li> <li>Drivers would slow for the cameras</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples for 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is illegal <i>[untrue]</i></li> <li>Fewer dangerous drivers would be caught speeding <i>[not clear why absence of warnings would have this effect]</i></li> </ul>	2	<p><b>2 marks – PRECISE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For a relevant and precise reason that gives clear challenge to the claim</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark – LIMITED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For a reason that gives some challenge to the claim</li> <li>OR for a reason that includes other argument elements.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For no credit-worthy material</li> <li>For something unrelated so it does not give challenge, or a statement that is too lacking in plausibility to offer recognisable challenge</li> <li>For a reason which could be seen to support or challenge the claim</li> <li>For two or more added elements</li> </ul>

Question	Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
26	<p><b>OWN ARGUMENT with COUNTER-ARGUMENT and RESPONSE</b></p> <p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <p><b>Strong main conclusion</b></p> <p>(I think etc.) anyone who breaks the speed limit should receive a very large fine.</p> <p>(Allow) With the exception of emergency vehicles, anyone who breaks the speed limit should receive a very large fine.</p> <p><b>Weak main conclusions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People should be fined a lot of money for speeding.</li> <li>• Those that break speed limits are breaking the law and therefore should receive a large fine.</li> </ul> <p><b>Absent conclusions</b></p> <p>Where candidates have given two opposing conclusions, treat as if C is absent, but if there is reasoning towards both conclusions, credit the reasoning of the better section. Where this occurs, structure may be weak and concision cannot be awarded.</p> <p><b>Example of points that may be raised:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large fines discourage an individual from speeding.</li> <li>• Large fines deter others.</li> <li>• Speed limits are there for a reason.</li> <li>• It reflects the serious danger of speeding.</li> <li>• Speeding can have horrific consequences.</li> <li>• Laws must be obeyed.</li> </ul>	12	<p><b>See marking grid in appendix 2</b></p> <p><b>Do NOT credit material simply repeated from the Resource Booklet (e.g. copying particular reasons / examples).</b></p> <p><b>If the candidate has adapted/developed material from the Resource Booklet into a new argument, then this is acceptable.</b></p> <p><b>Concision</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bonus mark for concision can <b>only</b> be awarded if the candidate has given a well-developed and sustained argument.</li> <li>• This mark on Levels 2 and 3 is to recognise that the candidate has been <b>actively</b> concise, rather than creating a short argument which makes omissions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Counter-argument and response</b></p> <p>In order to be strong, the counter-argument must consist of (at least one) counter-reason and a counter-conclusion, and the response must address the point raised in the counter-argument, and not merely be an unconnected reason in support of the main conclusion.</p> <p>The response cannot be double-marked as one of the two reasons. However, where the counter-argument and response are not going to be strong, it may benefit the candidate to count the response as a reason if that means the reasons are now “strong”.</p>

Question	Topic/Answer	Mark	Guidance
	<p><b>CHALLENGE</b></p> <p><b>Strong main conclusions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not everyone who breaks the speed limit should receive a very large fine.</li> <li>• We shouldn't give large fines to everyone who breaks the speed limit.</li> </ul> <p><b>Weak main conclusions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sometimes there are genuine reasons for speeding. <i>[could be an intermediate conclusion, but does not address the issue of fines]</i></li> <li>• The government should not impose very large fines on everyone who breaks the speed limit.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of points that could be made:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There can be genuine reasons for speeding.</li> <li>• Fines should reflect by how much the limit has been broken.</li> <li>• The fine should reflect your income.</li> <li>• Speed-awareness courses are more effective.</li> <li>• Points on your licence or being banned from driving are more effective.</li> </ul>		
	<b>Section C Total</b>	<b>30</b>	
	<b>Paper Total</b>	<b>75</b>	

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**The Triangle Building**  
**Shaftesbury Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB2 8EA**

**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; The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA**  
**Registered Company Number: 3484466**  
**OCR is an exempt Charity**

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

© OCR 2018

 **Cambridge  
Assessment**

