GCE

Critical Thinking

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

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

Mark Scheme for January 2012

Annotations

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

Section A – Multiple Choice

Question	Key	Text	Type	AO
1	B	Starting Education Later	Name Argument Element (Ex)	AO1
2	C	Starting Education Later	Flaw	AO2
3	D	Starting Education Later	Strengthen	AO2
4	C	NFL	Main Conclusion	AO1
5	C	NFL	Principle	AO2
6	C	NFL	Appeal	AO2
7	C	Economist	Alternative Conclusion	AO2
8	A	Economist	Assumption	AO1
9	D	Economist	Name Argument Element (R)	AO1
10	B	Climate Change	Intermediate Conclusion	AO1
11	A	Climate Change	Name Argument Element (Analogy)	AO1
12	B	Climate Change	Weaken	AO2
13	D	Autumn Babies	Name Argument Element (R)	AO1
14	C	Autumn Babies	Assumption	AO1
15	C	Autumn Babies	Weaken	AO2

Section A Total = 15

Analysis of Multiple Choice Passages and Answers

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	to	3	**Starting Education Later**		**Analysis** Ev In Denmark, children start school at six or seven years old. Ev In comparison, children in the UK begin school at the age of five or earlier and endure assessments every two to three years, Ex including SATs, controlled assessments and GCSEs. R Denmark consistently scores highly on so-called 'happiness' scales, whereas the UK scores significantly lower. MC It is obvious that starting education later will help to improve the happiness of the population of the UK.
1			**B**	1	See analysis above
2			**C**	1	**Rationale** (a) The author has not conflated education with GCSE examinations, as GCSEs are given just as an example of assessments. (b) The author is providing a link between happiness and education, but not necessarily stating that one is a condition for the other, so is not confusing necessary and sufficient conditions. (c) The author does imply a causal link between Denmark's happiness ratings and the later start to education, but the two concepts may not be related, let alone one being the cause of the other. (d) The author does not generalise from Denmark to all countries. Denmark is used as evidence for the argument, but not to relate to all countries.
3			**D**	1	**Rationale** (a) The fact that Denmark is a more tolerant society does not strengthen the argument, as the argument is not judging or promoting tolerance. (b) This explanation acts as a (tangential) assumption in the argument, but does not offer strong support to the idea that education should be started later. (c) This does relate to the argument and provides some support for the evidence, but does not support the point that education should be started later. (d) This supports the conclusion that education should be started later, as it would be welcomed by UK parents who report that they are themselves happiest before their children start school.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	to	6	**NFL**		**Analysis** IC American football has become too violent. R Even the sport's main governing body, the NFL, has started to worry about the effects of ever bigger, faster players smashing into each other. R The resulting concussions can cause memory loss and depression. MC The NFL's proposal to suspend or fine players who use their helmets to injure their opponents ought to be supported.
4			**C**	1	See analysis above
5			**C**	1	**Rationale** (a) This is stated in the argument and is not a principle. (b) Principles should be guides to action and not just statement of opinions or ethics. This is a statement of opinion. (c) This is a principle and relevant to the argument. This principle acts as a clear reason and/or IC for the argument. (d) This is stated in the argument and is not a general principle.
6			**C**		**Rationale** (a) This reports that people love the violence, but is not using this to evoke an emotional response from the reader. It is the force of numbers that is used in place of reasoning. (b) The author does not use past history in place of reasoning, so it is not an appeal to history. (c) The author uses the reason 'Many people love the violent aspect of the game' with the examples in place of a clear reason to support the view that the NFL's proposal should be ignored, so it is an appeal to popularity. Just because many people love it, does not mean the conclusion should be accepted. (d) The author does not use tradition in place of reasoning, so it is not an appeal to tradition.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	to	9	**Economist**		**Analysis** Ev In 1984, The Economist magazine asked groups of people from different occupations to make ten-year predictions about the economy. The group of London dustmen (refuse collectors) proved to be more accurate in their predictions than the group of former finance ministers. Ev In addition, an American study of over 300 experts in economics showed that these experts' long-term predictions were no more accurate "than guesses you or I might have made". R The more expertise a person has in this area, the less accurate their predictions are likely to be. MC Therefore, we should no longer be encouraging young people to take economics degrees.
7			C	1	**Rationale** (a) This is an evaluation of the evidence rather than an alternative conclusion which would be supported by the evidence and reason. (b) This is a statement of implication which is drawn from the evidence, but not the reason. The implication does not act as an alternative conclusion from the argument as a whole. (c) This is an alternative conclusion which would be supported by the evidence and reason, as it draws on the results of the evidence and persuades us that it is unwise to rely upon these long-term predictions about the economy. (d) This statement highlights an unreasonable assumption concerning the motivation of the London dustmen, which is based solely on one piece of evidence and not the argument as a whole, so cannot be said to be an alternative conclusion to the argument.
8			A	1	**Rationale** (a) The reason relies on this assumption, based on the comparison of groups in the evidence. The more expertise a person has in this area, the less accurate their predictions are likely to be relies on the assumption that most of the London dustmen do not have economics degrees. (b) This is not necessary for the reason to link to the conclusion as neither relate to the accuracy over time of economic predictions. (c) This is arguing in the opposite direction. The argument assumes that the representative nature of the one study does not need to be queried and the argument does not require the results of the US study to be applied to the UK, as the reason and conclusions may not necessarily be limited to the UK. (d) Stated and is the conclusion.
9			D	1	See analysis above

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	to	12	Climate Change		**Analysis** CA We should not take steps to reduce carbon emissions because there is no proof that human activity causes global warming. MC We should not wait for proof. R It is at least probable that human activity causes global warming. R the predicted consequences of climate change are terrible. IC It is sensible to act as if human activity is the cause of the problem. Ana If a train has a significant chance of blowing up, you'd get off straightaway, wouldn't you?
10			B	1	See analysis above
11			A	1	See analysis above
12			B	1	**Rationale** (a) This describes why things may not have been acted upon until now, but does not weaken the imperative of the conclusion, that we should not wait for proof. (b) This weakens the argument by offering an equally terrible consequence to counter the first reason. (c) Whilst this is relevant, it does rely on the assumption that human activity has not been occurring for thousands of years, which means that it is not the option that MOST weakens the argument. (d) This supports the argument.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
13	to	15	Autumn Babies		**Analysis** P Parents should give their children the best chances in life MC so we should encourage parents to have babies in the autumn. R People born in the autumn have the longest life expectancy and the best chance of good health. R they are the most likely to succeed in sport. Ev A study by the Association of Football Statisticians revealed that 40% of Englishmen in the Premier League were born in the autumn, compared with just 15% in the summer.
13			D	1	See analysis above
14			C	1	**Rationale** (a) This is not being assumed by the argument. It just gives an explanation relating to the evidence of why autumn born children may be better at football. (b) This does not express an unstated link between the reasons and the conclusion, so is not being assumed by the argument. It is an attempt to conflate the key points of the two reasons and the evidence. (c) This is assumed in the argument. For the parents to be encouraged to have children in the autumn relies on the reason that they can control this timing, whereas many cannot control the time of year when their babies will be born. (d) This does not express an unstated link between the reasons and the conclusion, so is not being assumed by the argument. It is acting as a counter.
15			C	1	**Rationale** (a) This strengthens the argument because it gives a further reason for parents to be encouraged to have children in the autumn. (b) This does not weaken the argument, as the length of the footballers' careers (from the evidence) is not important, as the success mentioned in the reason does not need to have a time limit. (c) This works to weaken the argument as it suggests a reason why parents should be encouraged to have children in the springtime, comparatively over parents who have children in the autumn. (d) This suggests a disadvantage about another group of people – winter-born – and a disadvantage that may relate to their birth-timing. This does not strengthen the argument, as it is not related to the relevant group – autumn-born. Additionally, the text itself has already addressed the advantage of autumn-born having a better chance of health.
			Total	15	

Section B – Analysing and Evaluating Argument

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
16	**2 marks** (Therefore) parks should no longer be owned by councils. **Examples for 1 mark** • Parks should not be owned by councils. • Councils shouldn't own parks anymore. • (Overall,) councils are doing a poor job of running parks and therefore parks should no longer be owned by councils. *(IC+MC)* **Examples for 0 marks** • These beautiful, green spaces should be the ideal places to relax. *(claim)* • People should only have to pay tax for the things that they use or which benefit them. *(principle)* • Councils are doing a poor job of running parks. *(IC)* • So things should be changed. *(IC)*	2	**Principle of discrimination** 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. **2 marks – PRECISION** For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author. **1 mark – APPROXIMATE** For a less accurate statement of the argument element which has the gist but lacks precision and/or adds or misses out information. **OR** For a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrases. **0 marks** For a statement of an incorrect part of the text. **OR** For no credit-worthy material. NB Only credit the words actually written. Do not credit words replaced by dots. NB Any words in brackets are not required but candidates should not be penalised if these words are included.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
17			**2 marks** People should only have to pay tax for the things that they use or which benefit them. **Examples for 1 mark** • Tax should be paid for relevant things. • People should pay tax for the things that they use. **Examples for 0 marks** • It simply costs too much. *(reason)* • If councils no longer had to look after parks, then the money would be spent on better things. *(HYP)* • Parks should be for leisure. *(para 2)*	2	**Principle of discrimination** 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. **2 marks – PRECISION** For precisely stating the argument element in the exact words of the author. **1 mark – APPROXIMATE** For a less accurate statement of the argument element which has the gist but lacks precision and/or adds or misses out information. **OR** For a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrases. **0 marks** For a statement of an incorrect part of the text. **OR** For inclusion of another argument element. **OR** For no credit-worthy material. NB Only credit the words actually written. Do not credit words replaced by dots. NB Any words in brackets are not required but candidates should not be penalised if these words are included.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
18	(a)	**Example for 1 mark** • Argument. **Examples for 0 marks** • Argument/explanation. *(Scattergun approach)* • Explanation.	1	**Principle of discrimination** This question discriminates between candidates who differentiate between an argument and an explanation and those who do not.
	(b)	**Examples for 2 marks** • It is an argument because the conclusion 'things should be changed' is supported with a reason. • It is an argument because the reason 'parks cost a lot to maintain and anti-social behaviour discourages people from using them' supports its conclusion. **Examples for 1 mark** • It is an argument because it gives a reason and a conclusion. • It is an argument because it has an element of persuasion. • It has a reason with "parks cost a lot to maintain", which makes it an argument. • It is not an explanation because it is not trying to give a cause for something or an account of why something is occurring. **Examples for 0 marks** • It is an argument. • It is not an explanation.	2	**Principle of discrimination** 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. **2 marks – CLEAR JUSTIFICATION** For a clear justification of why it is an argument with reference to the text. **Note:** the candidate does not need to explain why it is an argument and then also explain why it is not an explanation. **1 mark – LIMITED JUSTIFICATION** For a definition of what an argument is, or generic explanation. **OR** For a justification which includes reference to the text but is limited or lacks clarity. **OR** For justification of why it is **not** an explanation (with or without reference to the text). **0 marks** For a statement that it is an argument. **OR** For no credit-worthy material. **NB** R = "parks cost a lot to maintain" and "anti-social behaviour discourages people from using them" C = "so things should be changed".

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
19	(a)		**Examples for 1 mark** • Hypothetical reason • Hypothetical reasoning **Examples for 0 marks** • False dichotomy • Reason • Hypothetical • Hypothetical claim • Hypothetical argument *0 marks for a scattergun approach (correct answer along with others).*	1	**Principle of discrimination** 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 structures. **1 mark – PRECISION** For precisely naming the argument element in the exact words required in the specification. **0 marks** For naming an unrelated/incorrect argument element, or other key term used in the specification. **OR** For a less precise naming of the argument element but showing an idea of the essence of its nature and role in the argument. **OR** For no credit-worthy material.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
19	(b)		**Examples for 2 marks** • It contains a consequence, "money would be better spent" which depends upon a condition being fulfilled. *(a thorough and clear explanation of nature)* • It takes the form of 'if' and 'then' and acts as a reason for the main conclusion. *(a clear explanation of nature and role in argument)* **Examples for 1 mark** • It uses the indicator words 'if' and 'then'. *(both are required).* • It gives support to the conclusion. • It acts as a reason for "council ownership of parks is an inefficient use of taxpayers' money". • It acts as a reason for "parks should no longer be owned by councils". • It speculates what could happen in the future and acts as a reason for the main conclusion.	2	**Principle of discrimination** 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. **2 marks – CLEAR JUSTIFICATION** For a clear explanation of why it is a hypothetical reason, showing an understanding of its nature and/or role in the argument, with reference to the text. Credit answers that refer to conditional/speculative reasoning or similar expression. **1 mark – LIMITED JUSTIFICATION** For a limited explanation of why it is a hypothetical reason, showing an incomplete understanding of its nature and/or role in the argument. **OR** For generic explanation what a hypothetical reason is. **0 marks** For no credit-worthy material.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
19	(c)		**Examples for 3 marks** • The author confuses necessary and sufficient conditions – transferring ownership of parks may be sufficient to save money, but it is not necessary for money to be saved. • It does not give strong support to the conclusion because it provides a false dichotomy as the money may not be used for other things, so it does not prove that the council shouldn't own the parks. **Example for 2 marks** • The money may not be spent on better things, so the consequence may not follow. **Examples for 1 mark** • The money may not be spent on better things. • The money could just be saved. • Expense on schools may not be better. *(weakness expressed as a counter)* **Example for 0 marks** • It is a weakness. • Necessary and sufficient conditions.	3	**Principle of discrimination** This question discriminates between candidates who recognise and give a clear justification for the presence of a 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 weakness in specific parts of the argument. **3 marks – CLEAR JUSTIFICATION** Correct identification of WHAT a weakness is, WITH a clear explanation of WHY this is a weakness. **OR** Correct identification of WHAT the weakness is WITH a limited explanation of WHY this is a weakness AND WITH an assessment of HOW this weakness impacts on the conclusion (parks should no longer be in the ownership of councils) or the argument as a whole. **2 marks – LIMITED JUSTIFICATION** Correct identification of WHAT the weakness is WITH a limited explanation of WHY this is a weakness. **1 mark – SUPERFICIAL JUSTIFICATION** Correct identification of WHAT the weakness is that goes beyond a simple label. May be weakness expressed as a counter. **0 marks** For no credit-worthy material. Do not credit responses that merely state that the argument element is a weakness.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance

20	**Examples for 2 marks**
	
	• The council was wrong.
	• The council has made a mistake.
	• (The author thinks that) if ball games were allowed, then childhood obesity could be reduced.
	• (In the author's view) childhood obesity will be even higher without ball games.
	
	Examples for 1 mark
	
	• Childhood obesity could be stopped if ball games were allowed. *(too strong to be safely inferred)*
	• The lack of ball games is a cause of the childhood obesity.
	• Ball games must be allowed in parks.
	• The Midlands council does not care about obesity.
	
	Example for 0 marks
	
	• The council made other provisions to tackle childhood obesity.
		2	**Principle of discrimination**
			This question discriminates between candidates who recognise and give a clear explanation of a possible inference, understanding that argument areas can be interpreted differently, with candidates who can show a slight recognition of different views on argument areas but who may lack clear explanation of this.
			
			2 marks – CLEAR
			Identification of an inference which could be safely drawn.
			
			1 mark – LIMITED
			The stated inference either:
			    - lacks clarity of expression
			    - could be true, but is not safe from the statement.
			
			0 marks
			For no credit-worthy material, such as an irrelevant statement.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
21	(a)		**Examples for 1 mark** • Tradition. • Appeal to tradition. **Examples for 0 marks** • Appeal to history. • It is a weakness. *0 marks for a scattergun approach (correct answer along with others).*	1	**Principle of discrimination** This question discriminates between candidates who can identify appeals in reasoning, from candidates who identify obvious weaknesses in reasoning without accurate identification. **1 mark – PRECISION** For precisely naming the appeal in the exact words required in the specification. **0 marks** For naming an unrelated/incorrect appeal, or other key term used in the specification. **OR** For no credit-worthy material.
21	(b)		**Example for 2 marks** • Although cricket may have been played for a long time this does not indicate it is sensible for the future. • Just because cricket is traditional in parks does not give any reasons for it being a good idea. **Examples for 1 marks** • Just because it is a tradition doesn't mean to say it is right. *(generic)* • The argument has no reasons for the conclusion other than the sense of tradition. *(generic)* **Example for 0 marks** • Cricket has been played in most parks for over 150 years, so it must be allowed to continue. *(just reference to the text)*	2	**Principle of discrimination** 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. **2 marks – CLEAR JUSTIFICATION** A clear explanation, with reference to the context, of why the appeal does not give strong support. **1 mark – LIMITED JUSTIFICATION** For a generic justification that the appeal is weak. **OR** a limited justification that the appeal is weak, perhaps phrased as a counter. **0 marks** For just reference to the text, or no credit-worthy material.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
22	(a)		**Example for 3 marks** • Muscles become wasted without exercise is being compared to parks not being used and so becoming unpleasant, neglected and worthless. *(WXY)* **Example for 2 marks** • Muscles without exercise is being compared to under-used parks. *(WY)* • Wasted muscles are being compared to unpleasant parks. *(WX)* • Muscles wasting away if they are not used is compared to parks becoming unpleasant from under-use. *(WX) (not Y as "not used" is not the same as "no exercise")* **Example for 1 mark** • Muscles are being compared to parks. *(W)*	3	**Principle of discrimination** 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. There are three elements in the analogy to pick out: W "muscles" and "parks" X "wasted" and "unpleasant/worthless/neglected" Y "no exercise/without exercise" and "under-use" **3 marks** For all three elements of the analogy precisely identified. **2 marks** For two elements of the analogy precisely identified. **1 mark** For one of the elements of the analogy precisely identified. **0 marks** 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. **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.**

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
22	(b)		**Examples for 3 marks** • Under-use leads to decline in both cases and we can put a stop to the under-use. So the use of parks should be controlled. *(strength)* • Under-use leads to decline in both cases and we can put a stop to the under-use and therefore stop the damage occurring. *(strength)* • Muscles are vital but parks are not, so it does not matter if parks are not used as the effect of that is not as important. *(weakness)* **Examples for 2 marks** • Under-use leads to decline in both cases and we can put a stop to the under-use in each situation. *(strength)* • Muscles are vital but parks are not, so it does not matter if parks are not used. *(weakness)* **Examples for 1 mark** • Under-use leads to decline in both cases. *(strength)* • Muscles are vital but parks are not. *(weakness)* **Example for 0 marks** • Under-use of parks could make them look better. *(counter to analogy; not an evaluation of comparison).*	3	**Principle of discrimination** 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. **3 marks – CLEAR JUSTIFICATION** Correct identification of WHAT a weakness or strength is in the comparison, WITH a clear explanation of WHY this is a strength or weakness. **OR** Correct identification of WHAT a weakness or strength is in the comparison, WITH a limited explanation of WHY this is a strength or weakness AND WITH an assessment of HOW this weakness or strength impacts on the conclusion (parks should no longer be in the ownership of councils) or the argument as a whole. **2 marks – LIMITED JUSTIFICATION** Correct identification of WHAT a weakness or strength is in the comparison, WITH a limited explanation of WHY this is a strength or weakness. **1 mark – SUPERFICIAL JUSTIFICATION** Superficial but correct identification of WHAT a weakness or strength is in the comparison **0 marks** For no credit-worthy material. Candidates can give either a strength or a weakness and do not need to identify whether their evaluation is a strength or a weakness. Do not credit responses that merely state that the claim is a strength or a weakness

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
23	**Examples for 3 marks** • Inefficiency is not shown by the amount of expense or cost to tax payers, so we cannot make the claim that the borough is being inefficient. *(w)* • Other boroughs might have to charge different amounts to their residents so London is not representative so it can't be said that in general the cost is too much. *(w)* • The amount of money needed for the parks is huge, as not every person is necessarily a tax payer, so it strongly supports the idea that the cost is too much. *(s)* **Examples for 2 marks** • Inefficiency is not shown by the amount of expense or cost to tax payers. *(w)* • Other boroughs might have to charge different amounts to their residents so London is not representative. *(w)* • The amount of money needed for the parks is huge because not every man, woman and child is a tax payer. *(s)* **Examples for 1 mark** • The claim does not follow from the evidence/it is a non-sequitur. *(w)* • The London borough may not be representative of all areas. *(w)* • Not every man, woman and child is a tax payer. *(s)* **Example for 0 marks** We don't know where this evidence comes from and if it is still true.	3 + 3	**Principle of discrimination** This question discriminates on candidate's ability to assess evidence used in the argument, by commenting on its relevance, and/or by assessing the degree to which the evidence helps the author to make the point. **Within each answer three marks are independently available:** • Correct identification of **WHAT** a weakness or strength is in the <u>use of the evidence.</u> • An explanation of **WHY** this is a weakness or strength. • An assessment of **HOW** this weakness or strength impacts on the argument/claim. **0 marks** For no credit-worthy material. Candidates can give either a strength or a weakness and do not need to identify whether their evaluation is a strength or a weakness. Do not credit responses that merely state that the claim is a strength or a weakness. **Do not give credit to the second answer if it is essentially a repetition of the same point.**
	Total	**30**	

Section C – Developing your own arguments
Marking grid for question 24

	Communication of argument (Structure, quality, GSP)	Conclusion	Reasons	Counter	Other Argument Elements (including IC) MAY BE PRESENT
Level 4 Cogent and sustained 10-12 marks	Well constructed, organised, easily understood	• Stated • Precisely responds to the question	• 2 developed and relevant • Both giving sound support the MC	• Relevant and valid • Effectively responded to	Selected to effectively support the argument
Level 3 Structured and developed 7-9 marks	• Generally clear and organised, can be understood as a whole • Assumptions may be present but subtle and do not detract from argument	• Stated • Responds to the question	• 2 developed and relevant • reasonable support to the MC	• Relevant and valid • Limited response	Some functional use
Level 2 Fair response 4-6 marks	• Some clarity and organisation and easy to follow in parts • Communication errors may be intrusive and impede some understanding • Relies on unreasonable assumptions • May have significant flaws	• Stated • Requires development to respond fully to the question	• 2 reasons, one of which is developed • Limited support to the MC	• May lack plausibility or is superficial • Limited response	Offer little support for the argument
Level 1 Limited response 1-3 marks	• May be unclear or disorganised • may be characterised as a rant or emotive/rhetorical reasoning • Communication errors impede comprehension	May be unstated or different but related to that required	• At least 1 • Slight support to MC • Relevant reasons but these may not be developed	• Superficial or implausible CA • No response	Evidence may be in place of the reasoning

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
24	**Acceptable conclusions** Support • There should be a greater number of activities provided by the government for young people. Challenge • There should NOT be a greater number of activities provided by the government for young people. • The government should not provide activities for young people. **Examples of points that may be raised:** Support • It will allow for consistency across the country. • It will develop their social skills. • The government has a duty of care. • There are not enough private clubs. • To deter young people from crime. • To ensure that young people choose socially acceptable behaviour. • To ensure that young people's gifts and talents are developed. • To keep them occupied/to relieve boredom. • Young people have a lot of free time. Challenge • Charities, churches, etc already do this. • If activities are not provided for older people, then it is inequitable that they should be provided for the young. • It will distract young people from their education. • Most parents will do this task. • There is too much choice already.	12	**Principle of discrimination** This question discriminates on whether a candidate can demonstrate the ability to select and use components of reasoning including sustained response to counter-argument, and synthesise them, to create perceptive, complex, structured arguments. **Performance Descriptors for Question 24** **Level 4: Cogent and sustained response 10-12 marks** Candidates provide an argument, which is CHARACTERISED as: Well constructed, organised, easily understood. **AND** which MUST include: • A stated **main conclusion** which precisely responds to the question. • 2 developed and relevant **reasons**, which give sound support the MC. • A relevant and valid **counter** (assertion or argument), which is effectively responded to. Other argument elements, which MAY be offered, (which may include IC) are selected to effectively support the argument. **Level 3: Structured and developed response 7-9 marks** Candidates provide an argument, which is CHARACTERISED as: • Generally clear and organised, can be understood as a whole. **AND** which MUST include: • A stated **main conclusion** which is responds to the question. • 2 developed **reasons** which may offer limited support to the MC. • A **counter** (assertion or argument) and response, though the response may be limited. Other argument elements, which MAY be offered, are selected with some functional use.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
			Level 2: Fair response **4-6 marks** Candidates provide an argument, which is CHARACTERISED as: • Having some clarity and organisation and is easy to follow in parts. • Communication errors may be intrusive and impede some understanding. **AND** which MUST include: • A stated **main conclusion** which may require development to respond fully to the question. • 2 **reasons**, one of which is developed, offering limited support to the MC. • A **counter** (assertion or argument) and response, which may lack plausibility and/or is simplistically stated. Other argument elements, which MAY be offered, are selected with little support for the argument. **Level 1: Limited response** **1-3 marks** Candidates provide an argument, which may be CHARACTERISED as: • Being unclear or disorganised. • A rant or emotive/rhetorical reasoning. **AND** which MUST include: • A **main conclusion** which may be unstated or different but related to that required. • A **reason/reasons**, but this/these may not be developed. • A **counter** (assertion or argument) is offered, which may lack plausibility and/or is simplistically stated and there may be no attempt to respond to it. Other argument elements, such as evidence, may be in place of the reasoning. **0 marks:** For no credit-worthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
25	**Examples for 3 marks** • If there were free leisure facilities, then more people would be able to access and use them. • If there were free leisure facilities, then fitness levels of the country would be improved. • If there were free leisure facilities, then there may be less crime. • If leisure facilities were not free, then fewer people might use them. *(arguing against the opposite is fine)* **Examples for 2 marks** • If there were free leisure facilities, then it would be good. • If there were free leisure facilities, then more people would be able to access and use them, for example young people. *(adding argument element)* **Example for 1 mark** • More people would be able to access and use them. *(not hypothetical reasoning)* **Example for 0 marks** • If there were free leisure facilities, then the government would be wasting its money.*	3	**Principle of discrimination** 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. **3 marks – PRECISE** For a relevant and precise hypothetical reason that gives clear support to the claim. **2 marks – LIMITED** For a hypothetical reason that gives limited support to the claim. **OR** For a hypothetical reason that includes other argument elements. **1 mark – SUPERFICIAL** For a reason that gives support to the claim, but is not a hypothetical reason. **0 marks** For something unrelated so it does not give support, or a statement that is too lacking in plausibility to offer recognisable support. For no credit-worthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
26	**Examples for 3 marks** • Council money should be used to benefit a large number of people. • Parks should appeal to a wide range of people. **Examples for 2 marks** • Council money/tax must be effectively used. *(limited support)* • The Government has a responsibility to its citizens. *(limited support)* • Council money should be used to benefit a large number of people, in order to make them happy. *(adding argument element)* • People need to have a place to go to do a wide range of activities. *(the form of a principle, but missing the 'guide to action' imperative)* **Example for 1 mark** • Council money is used effectively when the results of its use benefits a large range of people. *(not a principle)* • Activities such as bowls, picnics and dog walking appeal to a wide range of people. *(reason, not a principle)* **Example for 0 marks** • Parks allow a diverse range of activities, for example, playing bowls, picnics and dog walking. *(quote)*	3	**Principle of discrimination** 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. **3 marks – PRECISE** For a relevant and precise principle that gives clear support to the argument. **2 marks – LIMITED** For a principle that gives limited support to the argument. **OR** For a principle that includes other argument elements. **OR** A statement which has gives support to the claim, has the form of a principle but is too specific or not clearly enough a guide to action to be classed as a principle. **1 mark – SUPERFICIAL** For a statement that gives support to the argument, but is clearly not a principle. **0 marks** For something unrelated so it does not give support, or a statement that is too lacking in plausibility to offer recognisable support. For no credit-worthy material.

Marking grid for question 27

	Communication of argument (Structure, quality, GSP)	MC	IC	Reasons	Other Argument Elements MAY BE PRESENT
Level 4 Cogent and sustained 10-12 marks	Well constructed, organised, easily understood	MC stated and precisely responds to the question	IC which is fully supported by one or more reasons	3 or more relevant reasons giving sound support to the conclusion	Selected to effectively support the argument
Level 3 Structured and developed 7-9 marks	• Generally clear and organised, can be understood as a whole • Assumptions may be present but subtle and do not detract from argument	MC stated and responds to the question	• IC may be a simplistic summary • Is offered limited support OR • Gives limited support to the MC	3 or more relevant reasons, 2 giving sound support to the conclusion	Some functional use
Level 2 Fair response 4-6 marks	• Some clarity and organisation and easy to follow in parts • Communication errors may be intrusive and impede some understanding • Relies on unreasonable assumptions • May have significant flaws	MC stated, but requires development to respond fully to the question	Some development of reasoning in place of IC	3 or more relevant reasons	Offer little support for the argument
Level 1 Limited response 1-3 marks	• May be unclear or disorganised • may be characterised as a rant or emotive/rhetorical reasoning • Communication errors impede comprehension	MC may be unstated or different but related to that required	No development of reasoning	1 or 2 relevant reasons	Evidence may be in place of the reasoning

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
27	**Acceptable conclusions** Support • Ball games should be banned in parks. Challenge • Ball games should NOT be banned in parks. • Ball games should be allowed/permitted in parks. • Ball games should be encouraged in parks. **Examples of points that may be raised:** Support • Ball games may be a nuisance to others, for example to neighbours and to other park users. • Ball games take up a considerable amount of space and will disturb others. Challenge • Ball games need the amount of space parks can provide. • It develops community spirit.	12	**Principle of discrimination** 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. **Performance Descriptors for Question 27** **Level 4: Cogent and sustained response 10-12 marks** Candidates provide an argument, which is CHARACTERISED as: Well constructed, organised, easily understood. **AND** which MUST include: • A stated **main conclusion** which precisely responds to the question. • 3 developed and relevant **reasons**, which fully support the MC. • An **intermediate conclusion** which is fully supported by one or more reasons. Other argument elements, which MAY be offered, are selected to effectively support the argument. **Level 3: Structured and developed response 7-9 marks** Candidates provide an argument, which is CHARACTERISED as: Generally clear and organised, can be understood as a whole. **AND** which MUST include: • A stated **main conclusion** which responds to the question. • 3 or more relevant reasons, 2 of which give sound support to the MC. • An **intermediate conclusion** which may be a simplistic summary, OR is offered limited support OR gives limited support to the MC. Other argument elements, which MAY be offered, are selected with some functional use.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
			Level 2: Fair response **4-6 marks** Candidates provide an argument, which is CHARACTERISED as: • Having some clarity and organisation and is easy to follow in parts. • Communication errors may be intrusive and impede some understanding. **AND** which MUST include: • A stated **main conclusion** which may require development to respond fully to the question. • 3 or more relevant **reasons**. • Some development of reasoning in place of an **intermediate conclusion**. Other argument elements, which MAY be offered, are selected with little support for the argument. **Level 1: Limited response** **1-3 marks** Candidates provide an argument, which may be CHARACTERISED as: • Being unclear or disorganised. • A rant or emotive/rhetorical reasoning. **AND** which MUST include: • A **main conclusion** which may be unstated or different but related to that required. • 1 or 2 relevant **reasons**. • No development of reasoning or **intermediate conclusion**. Other argument elements, such as evidence, may be offered in place of the reasoning. **0 marks:** For no credit-worthy material.
		Total	30	
		Paper Total	75	

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

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

www.ocr.org.uk

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