GCE

Critical Thinking

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

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

Mark Scheme for June 2012

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	To indicate how marks are allocated in **Q25**.
	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	Cannabis	Name Argument Element (Ev)	AO1
2	D	Cannabis	Assumption	AO1
3	C	Cannabis	Weaken	AO2
4	B	Sign Language	Name Argument Element (MC)	AO1
5	B	Sign Language	Name Argument Element (Hyp R)	AO1
6	A	Sign Language	Strengthen	AO2
7	A	Lip Sync	Name Argument element (CA)	AO1
8	B	Lip Sync	Principle	AO1
9	A	Lip Sync	Flaw	AO2
10	D	Chewing Gum	Name Argument Element (R)	AO1
11	A	Chewing Gum	Intermediate Conclusion	AO1
12	B	Chewing Gum	Strengthen	AO2
13	D	Football Sex Scandals	Main Conclusion	AO1
14	B	Football Sex Scandals	Flaw	AO2
15	D	Football Sex Scandals	Further Conclusion	AO2

Section A Total = 15

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	to	3	Cannabis		**Analysis** Ev　A team of scientists injected new-born female rats with a compound that has the same biological effect as cannabis Ev　Under normal circumstances female rats spend 30% to 40% less time playing than their male counterparts Ev　the female rats who were injected with the compound played the same amount of time as male rats R　because cannabis makes females more masculine MC　Women in particular should avoid the drug
1			B	1	See analysis above
2			D	1	**Rationale** (a)　This value judgement is not made or assumed in the argument and is not needed to be assumed for conclusion to work. (b)　It is stated that the amount of play was changed and it does not need to be assumed that it was the only change in female rats. (c)　This general problem is not functioning as an unstated relevant reason for this argument, despite public views that there are problems in using cannabis. (d)　To conclude that women should avoid cannabis because it makes females more masculine, a missing unstated reason 'Women should not become more masculine' should be inserted for the conclusion to work.
3			C	1	**Rationale** (a)　This does not weaken the argument, as the evidence considers the effect on female rats, not the effect on male rats. Even if the compound had no effect on male rats, this does not weaken the point that cannabis makes female rats more masculine. (b)　This does not weaken the argument; it just adds to the evidence. It does not relate to female rats or to becoming more masculine. (c)　This significantly weakens the argument as the link between the reason with evidence and the conclusion cannot be established with this statement. If all of the evidence shows that the reason is irrelevant, the MC will not be supported. (d)　The bias of the scientists in the evidence part of the argument does not weaken the link between the reason with evidence and the conclusion, so will not weaken the argument.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	to	6	**Sign Language**		**Analysis** Scene setting A pressure group is campaigning for the European Union (EU) to make a sign language an official language Expl This is because an estimated one in seven people in the EU are deaf or hard of hearing HR The pressure group adds, "If the EU made a sign language an official language, more people would learn to communicate in this way Expl which would benefit a huge number of people." MC However, making this change would be really impractical R There are many different types of sign language Expl because deaf communities in different countries have developed their sign language independently
4			B	1	See analysis above
5			B	1	See analysis above
6			A	1	**Rationale** (a) This strengthens the argument as it gives another reason for why it would be impractical to make the change – on economic grounds, as well as practicality. (b) This neither strengthens nor weakens the argument, as it is not relevant to the issue of impracticality. (c) This would weaken the argument somewhat as it would challenge the impracticality issue and support the pressure group's campaign. (d) This weakens the argument somewhat as it gives a reason to dismiss the impracticality.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	to	9	**Lip Sync**		**Analysis**
					Ev In 'live' performances, some singers move their lips in synchronization (lip sync) with their recorded songs rather than actually singing them
					C They have valid reasons for doing this which should be accepted
					CA even though some fans feel that lip syncing is dishonest
					P People should be able to do whatever is best for their careers
					Ev Some singers lip sync to increase their number of live performances without damaging their voice; others do it because a live version of their songs is not possible
					R/ The fans who are bothered by lip syncing at concerts are selfish and ungrateful, and should
					RCA be thankful to be close to their favourite singer
7			A	1	See analysis above
8			B	1	See analysis above
9			A	1	**Rationale**
					(a) The author is making an ad hominem flaw. The author points out that 'the fans who are bothered by lip syncing at concerts are selfish and ungrateful', therefore attacking them as the arguer, rather than their argument that 'some fans feel that lip syncing is dishonest'.
					(b) The author is not making a reasoning from wrong actions flaw. The author points out the reasons WHY some musicians lip sync, without judgement that it is bad, and does not use this to justify and exonerate someone else's behaviour.
					(c) The author is not making a slippery slope flaw. The author has not given a number of steps leading to an unreasonable end point.
					(d) The author is not making a straw man flaw. The author has pointed out the counter-assertion that 'some fans feel that lip syncing is dishonest' and has not distorted it in order to dismiss it.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	to	**12**	**Chewing Gum**		**Analysis** IC Chewing gum is a nuisance MC so should not be allowed in UK schools R It is distracting to hear other people chewing in class IC Chewing gum is also unhygienic R because students do not throw their used gum in the rubbish bin R It is disgusting to find chewed gum stuck under a chair or desk, or on walls or floors Ev Singapore has been successful in completely banning chewing gum in all public places, proving that it can be done
10			**D**	1	See analysis above
11			**A**	1	See analysis above
12			**B**	1	**Rationale** (a) This weakens the argument, as it gives a reason for why it should be allowed in school. (b) This gives another reason for why chewing gum should not be allowed in school, on economic grounds, as well as hygiene and distraction. (c) This does not strengthen the argument, as it is an appeal to popularity. (d) This is not relevant to the argument to strengthen or weaken it.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
13	to	**15**	**Football Sex Scandals**		**Analysis** MC These stories (about football sex scandals) are harmful R which shows that people dislike reading about footballers' sex lives Ev Tabloid newspapers are increasingly obsessed with football sex scandals Ev Sales of tabloid newspapers are falling R The stories don't necessarily make people think worse of footballers R On the contrary, by revealing the bad behaviour of some footballers, tabloid articles encourage young people to imitate their heroes and behave badly themselves
13			**D**	1	See analysis above
14			**B**	1	**Rationale** (a) The author is not making an ad hominem flaw. The author points out that SOME footballers exhibit bad behaviour, not all. (b) The author considers that sales of tabloid newspapers are falling BECAUSE people dislike reading about footballers' sex lives. This cause may not be THE cause or even A cause of falling sales. There could be other reasons why sales are falling. (c) The author is not making a hasty generalisation. (d) The author is not making a slippery slope flaw. The author has not given a number of assumption laden steps leading to an unreasonable end point.
15			**D**	1	**Rationale** (a) This would not act as a further conclusion as the author has pointed out that 'The stories don't necessarily make people think worse of footballers' as well as their bad behaviour. This statement could not be drawn from the reasons and conclusion given. (b) This statement could not act as a further conclusion as the argument does not mention young people's obsession. (c) This is an overstated statement and would be difficult to draw from the reasons and conclusion already given. (d) This is a further conclusion that could be drawn, as it is supported by the reasons, especially the conclusion given that the stories are harmful.
			Total	**15**	

Section B – Analysing and Evaluating Argument

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
16			**2 marks** • (However,) extreme sports should not be banned. • (However,) extreme sports shouldn't be banned. **Examples for 1 mark** • Don't ban extreme sports. (*paraphrase*) • Extreme sports can't be banned. (*paraphrase*) • Sports should not be banned. (*word missing*) • However extreme, sports should not be banned. (*comma shift changes meaning*) **Example for 0 marks** • It would be impractical to ban extreme sports. (*Intermediate conclusion*)	2	**Questions 16 and 17** **Principle of discrimination** These questions discriminate 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 stating the argument element in the exact words of the author, but adding or missing out information. **OR** For a reasonably precise statement of the argument element which includes minor paraphrases.
17			**2 marks** It is the government's responsibility to protect its citizens (from harm). **Examples for 1 mark** • One reason they give is that it is the government's responsibility to protect its citizens from harm. (*adding information*) • It is the government's responsibility to protect people (from harm). (*paraphrase*) • The government should/must protect people. (*paraphrase*) • Citizens should/must be protected. (*paraphrase*) **Example for 0 marks** • People should/must be protected. (*too imprecise*)	2	**0 marks** For no creditworthy material, e.g. a statement of an incorrect part of the text. 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 3 marks**
	• Banning people from doing extreme sports is being compared to stopping young people from driving cars when danger can be reduced by preparation.*(WYZ)*
	
	• Banning inexperienced people from doing extreme sports is being compared to stopping young people driving cars. *(WXY)*
	
	Example for 2 marks
	• Banning extreme sports is being compared to stopping young people driving cars. *(WY)*
	
	Example for 1 mark
	• Banning extreme sports is compared to stopping young people from driving. *(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.
			
			The elements in the analogy to pick out:
			
			W ban/banning ➜ stop/stopping
			
			X unprepared / untrained /
			       inexperienced ➜ young
			
			Y extreme sports ➜ driving cars
			
			Z reduce danger (instead) by preparation /
			       training in both cases *(or similar)*
			
			3 marks
			For 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 4 does not get credit. Identification of the situations being compared must be explicit.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
18	(b)		**Examples for 3 marks** • Driving is more important than extreme sports as people need to use it regularly, so it does not give support to the idea that we should not ban extreme sports. *(WyH)* • Both pose serious risks because the chances of an injury are high in each, so as we do not ban driving, this supports the argument that we should not ban extreme sports. *(WYH)* • Driver training and tests are an alternative to banning driving and in the same way training in extreme sports is an alternative to banning them. In both cases there is a restriction of options where instead a middle way could be chosen. *(WY)* **Examples for 2 marks** • Driving is more important than extreme sports because people use it on a regular basis *(difference + developed explanation)* • Driving is more important than extreme sports so it matters more that the risk is reduced *(Wy)* **Example for 1 mark** • Driving is more important than extreme sports. • To drive, people need to pass a test, etc. whereas those that do extreme sports do not have to take a test.*(a relevant difference but misunderstands the use of the analogy)* **Examples for 0 marks** • It is a weakness/strength. • People already get training in extreme sports. *(counter not evaluation)* • Not all extreme sports happen at high speed *(not a relevant difference)*	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** Correct identification of WHAT a relevant similarity or difference is, with a CLEAR justification of WHY this matters. **OR** Correct identification of WHAT a relevant similarity or difference is, with a limited justification of WHY this matters and with an assessment of HOW this impacts on the conclusion (extreme sports should not be banned) **2 marks – LIMITED** Correct identification of WHAT a relevant similarity or difference is in the comparison, with a limited justification of WHY this matters. OR Correct identification of WHAT a relevant similarity or difference is in the comparison, with a developed explanation of the similarity or difference. **1 mark – SUPERFICIAL** Superficial identification of WHAT a relevant similarity or difference is. **0 marks** For no credit-worthy material. Candidates can give either a strength or a weakness.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
					They 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.
19	(a)		**Examples for 1 mark** • Explanation • It is an explanation not an argument. **Examples for 0 marks** • Argument • Claim • Argument/explanation. *(scattergun approach)*	1	**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. **1 mark – CLEAR IDENTIFICATION** For a clear identification that it is an explanation. **0 marks** **OR** For no credit-worthy material.
	(b)		**Examples for 2 marks** • It gives the cause for why extreme sports are not offered. • It explains why extreme sports have not been offered. • It states why extreme sports are not offered, rather than persuading that they should not be offered. **Examples for 1 mark** • It is an explanation because it does not give a reason and a conclusion. • It is an explanation because it is not trying to persuade us that schools should offer extreme sports. • It is an explanation because it is trying to give a cause for something *(no reference to the text)* **Examples for 0 marks** • It is an explanation. • It explains that extreme sports are not offered • It is an explanation due to having the indicator word 'because' in it.	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** For a clear justification why it is an explanation with reference to the text. **Note**: that the candidate does not need to explain why it is not an argument and then also explain why it is an explanation. **1 mark – LIMITED** For a definition of what an explanation is. **OR** For a justification which includes reference to the text but is limited or lacks clarity. **OR** For a justification of why it is **not** an argument (with or without reference to the text).

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
					0 marks For a statement that it is an explanation. **OR** For no credit-worthy material.
20			**Examples for 2 marks** • Winter Olympics do not include extreme sports • If something has been in the Winter Olympic Games, then it is not extreme, **Example for 1 marks** • Being in the Olympic Games makes it acceptable • Snowboarding is NOT an extreme sport *(inference not assumption)* **Examples for 0 marks** • Appeal to history / authority • Snowboarding is an extreme sport • Snowboarding is not new • Sports in the Olympic Games have less risk	2	**Principle of discrimination** This question discriminates between candidates who recognise the unstated assumption causing the argument not to function without it, from candidates who can show a slight recognition of missing reasons in the argument area, but who may lack clear understanding of whether the assumption is necessary. **2 marks – CLEAR** Identification of an assumption which is necessary for the argument and which would support the author's argument. **1 mark – LIMITED** Identification of an assumption which lends minimal support to the author's argument. **OR** Identification of an assumption which lends strong support to the author's argument, but lacks clarity in expression. **0 marks** For no credit-worthy material.
21	(a)		**Examples for 1 mark** • Evidence • Example • Evidence / Example **Examples for 0 marks** • Explanation • Statistics	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.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
					0 marks – APPROXIMATE For naming an unrelated/incorrect argument element, or other key term used in the specification. **OR** For no credit-worthy material.
21	(b)		**N.b. Maximum of one mark if a) evidence and b) justifies example, or vice-versa.** **EVIDENCE** **Example for 2 marks** • It is data / a fact which supports the claim that extreme sports are generally safer than other sports. **Examples for 1 mark** • It uses data. • It supports the claim that extreme sports are generally safer than other sports. • It supports the claim / reason • It is fact / data used to support a reason *(generic)* **EXAMPLE** **Example for 2 marks** • It uses sky-diving and horseriding to illustrate the reason • It gives an instance of a sport being more dangerous than extreme sports. • It illustrates the idea that extreme sports can be safer than other sports. • It illustrates the idea that both types of sport can be dangerous **Examples for 1 mark** • It has the indicator word "for instance" before it • It illustrates the reason	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** For a clear explanation of why it is evidence and/or example, showing an understanding of its nature and/or role in the argument, with reference to the text. **1 mark – LIMITED** For a limited explanation of why it is evidence and/or example, showing an incomplete understanding of its nature and/or role in the argument. **OR** For generic explanation what evidence and/or example is. **0 marks** For no credit-worthy material. N.b. • Evidence is fact / data used to support a reason • Example illustrates the reason / gives a situation where the reason occurs.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
21	(c)		**Examples for 3 marks** • More people horse-ride than sky-dive, a proportion should have been used instead. *(WY)* • We would expect more people to be injured when horse-riding as more people ride than sky-dive *(WY)* • More people ride than sky-dive so it is not a fair comparison so we cannot say that horse-riding is more dangerous *(WyH)* • Horse-riding may be considered as an extreme-sport in which case the comparison is flawed and does not support the claim that extreme sports are less dangerous. *(WyH)* **Examples for 2 marks** • As more people ride than sky-dive the figures are not significant because it is not a fair comparison *(Wy)* • It is wrong to assume that horse riding is not an extreme sport. *(Wy)* **Examples for 1 mark** • More people ride than sky-dive • A sport which is not an extreme sport (horse riding) has more injuries than an extreme sport • "fewer" does not indicate how significant the difference is • Horse riding is an extreme sport **Example for 0 marks** • It is a weakness/strength. • We don't know where the evidence comes from • One example is not enough to support the reasoning	3	**Principle of discrimination** This question discriminates between candidates who recognise and give a clear justification for the presence of a strength/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. **3 marks – CLEAR** Correct identification of WHAT a strength/weakness is, with a clear explanation of WHY this is a strength/weakness **OR** 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 conclusion (extreme sports should not be banned) or the argument as a whole. **2 marks – LIMITED** Correct identification of WHAT the strength/weakness is with a limited or unclear explanation of WHY this is a strength/weakness **1 mark – SUPERFICIAL** Superficial identification of WHAT the strength/weakness is that goes beyond a simple label. May be strength/weakness expressed as a counter.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
22			**Examples for 3 marks:** • The increase in schools offering boxing does not mean that boxing has benefits and so does not prove that extreme sports have benefits. *(WYH)* • An assumption is needed that by offering the sport, the school understands that there are benefits, it does not show that extreme sports are beneficial. *(WYH)* **Example for 2 marks:** • The increase in schools offering boxing does not mean that extreme sports have benefits. *(WH)* • You cannot generalise from boxing to extreme sports *(WY)* • There has been a huge increase in the number of schools offering boxing, so the evidence does support the point well. *(WH)* • Just because more schools are offering boxing does not mean more people are taking part so it does not show the benefits of extreme sports *(WH)* **Examples for 1 mark:** • Going from 1 to 10% is a small increase • 10% is still too low to be significant. **Example for 0 marks** • We don't know where this evidence comes from and if it is still true. • I don't know any school which offers boxing.	3	**Principle of discrimination** This question discriminates on a 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. **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.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
23			Do not credit repeated points.		The order in which candidates detail the two flaws in question 23 is flexible. The answers for 23a (i and ii) and 23b (i and ii) can be reversed.
23	(a) (b)	(i)	**Examples for 1 mark** • Straw man/straw person • Ad hominem/attacking the arguer There are no other credit-worthy answers to 23(a)(i) and 23(b)(i). **Examples for 0 marks** • Claim • Straw man/Ad hominem *(scattergun approach)* • False cause	1	**Principle of discrimination** This question discriminates between candidates who can identify flaws in reasoning, from candidates who identify obvious weaknesses in reasoning without accurate identification. **1 mark – PRECISION** For precisely naming the flaw in the exact words required in the specification. **0 marks** For naming an unrelated/incorrect flaw, or other key term used in the specification. **OR** For no credit-worthy material.
	(a) (b)	(ii)	**N.b. Maximum of one mark if i) straw man ii) explains ad hominem, or vice-versa.** **Explanation of straw man/straw person** **Example for 2 marks** • The author misrepresents the opponent's argument as 'extreme sports are for adrenaline junkies'. • People's reason for calling for a ban is not that the sports are for adrenaline junkies. **Examples for 1 mark** • The author has distorted the counter. • It isn't the opponent's real argument. • Not all opponents hold this view. • Not all people hold the view that extreme sports are for adrenaline junkies.	2	**Principle of discrimination** This question discriminates between candidates who can identify flaws in reasoning, explaining accurately what is weak about their use, from candidates who identify obvious weaknesses in reasoning with some understanding of what is wrong. **2 marks – CLEAR** A clear explanation of why the flaw does not give strong support, clearly related to the passage. **1 mark – LIMITED** A statement of what the flaw is, clearly related to the passage, but missing a clear explanation of why it does not give strong support. **OR** For generic explanation of the flaw.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
			Example for 0 marks • The people who are calling for a ban hate extreme sports just because these sports are modern, very popular with young people and just for 'adrenaline junkies'. *(quote)*		**0 marks** For just a reference to the text. **OR** For no credit-worthy material.
(a) (b)	(ii)		**N.b. Maximum of one mark if i) ad hominem, but ii) explains straw man, or vice-versa.** **Explanation of ad hominem/attacking the arguer** **Example for 2 marks** • Saying that they live in a dream world is not providing reasons to dismiss their views. • The author says that they have old-fashioned views, rather than providing reasons to dismiss their views. • The author attacks the arguer, rather than the argument, by saying they have old-fashioned views. **Examples for 1 mark** • The author is attacking the opponent, not their argument. • Living in a dream world/having old-fashioned views has nothing to do with their argument. • The author attacks the arguer by saying they have old-fashioned views. **Example for 0 marks** • These people live in a dream world; their views are old-fashioned and they should not be taken seriously. *(quote)*	2	**Principle of discrimination** This question discriminates between candidates who can identify flaws in reasoning, explaining accurately what is weak about their use, from candidates who identify obvious weaknesses in reasoning with some understanding of what is wrong. **2 marks – CLEAR** A clear explanation of why the flaw does not give strong support, clearly related to the passage. **1 mark – LIMITED** A statement of what the flaw is, clearly related to the passage, but missing a clear explanation of why it does not give strong support. **OR** For generic explanation of the flaw. **0 marks** For just a reference to the text. **OR** For no credit-worthy material.
			Total	30	

Section C – Developing Your Own Arguments

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
24	In this question, there are 4 requirements: • well-structured and developed argument • at least two reasons • a counter-argument and response • a main conclusion. The candidates may also include other argument elements. For each of the four areas, the assessment could be strong, weak or not covered / absent / missing. **Main Conclusion** **Strong** MC is stated and precisely responds to the question **Weak** MC present but significantly different to that required **Reasons** **Strong** 2 reasons giving sound support the MC, without intrusive assumptions and/or flaws **Weak** 1 or more relevant reasons **Counter and response** **Strong** Relevant and valid counter which is responded to effectively **Weak** A counter and a response are offered **Structure and development** **Strong** Organised and easily to follow.	**12**	**Principle of discrimination** This question discriminates on the whether a candidate can demonstrate the ability to select and use components of reasoning including sustained response to counter-argument, and synthesise them, to create well structured arguments. **Level 3 Cogent and sustained response** 4 areas are strong **11 marks** 3 areas are strong, 1 is weak **9 marks** Plus credit 1 mark for one of the following: **(MAX +1)** • Other argument elements, if present, effectively support the argument. • Argument as a whole can be considered as concise, not verbose. **Level 2 Fair response** 3 areas strong, 1 no credit or 2 areas are strong, 2 weak **6 marks** 2 areas are strong, 1 weak **5 marks** Plus credit 1 mark **each** bullet point: **(MAX +2)** • Other argument elements, if present, effectively support the argument. • Argument as a whole can be considered as concise, not verbose. **Level 1 Limited / Basic Response** 2 strong **4 marks** 1 strong, 2-3 weak **3 marks** At least 2 areas covered weakly **2 marks** 1 area covered weakly **1 mark**

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	Effective development (e.g. through connecting the reasons, supporting / illustrating / clarifying reasons through explanations / examples)		Plus credit 1 mark for the following: **(MAX +1)** • Other argument elements, if present, give some useful support to the argument.
	Weak Some clarity and organisation. GSP may impede understanding. May be characterised as a rant / emotive / rhetorical reasoning		
	Examples of acceptable conclusions Support • Competition is good for young people. • It is good for young people to have competition. Challenge • Competition is not good for young people. • Competition is bad for young people.		
	Examples of points that may be raised: Support • Life is a competition. • It allows opportunities to earn/win money/prizes. • It tests people's dedication. • It is good to learn how to lose. • It is an effective way to improve your performance. Challenge • Society needs people to be co-operative. • It is demoralising to be a loser. • People progress at their own speed. • It encourages negative rivalry. • It encourages people to be individualistic. • It can cause stress.		

Marking Grid for Question 24

Main Conclusion		**Reasons**	
Strong	MC is stated and precisely responds to the question	Strong	2 reasons giving sound support the MC, without intrusive assumptions and/or flaws
Weak	MC present but significantly different to that required	Weak	1 or more relevant reasons
No credit		No credit	
Counter and response		**Structure and development**	
Strong	Relevant and valid counter which is responded to effectively	Strong	Organised and easily to follow. Effective development (e.g. through connecting the reasons, supporting / illustrating / clarifying reasons through explanations / examples)
Weak	A counter and a response are offered	Weak	Some clarity and organisation. GSP may impede understanding. May be characterised as a rant / emotive / rhetorical reasoning
No credit		No credit	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
25	**Principle to support claim** Examples for 3 marks • Irrespective of risk, people should be able to do whatever they like. • It is right to allow people to do what they like. • People should be able to do what they like as long as it does not harm others. • People should be able to take risks • People should be able to take risks with their lives • People should be allowed to do dangerous activities. • People should be allowed to do the activities that they like. • People should be allowed to make their own decisions **Example for 2 marks** • People should be able to take risks because they have a right to make their own decisions *(adding argument element)* • Governments should not interfere in individual freedoms. *(limited support for the claim)* • Risky activities should be allowed *(limited support due to the circularity it causes)* • It is not the Government's responsibility to protect its citizens from harm. *(limited support)* **Example for 1 mark** • It is good that people are not always told what to do. *(statement of opinion, rather than principle)* **Example for 0 marks** • Activities should not be banned just because they have the potential to be dangerous. *(quote)* • It is the Government's responsibility to protect its citizens from harm. *(partial challenge to the claim)*	6	**Use ticks ✓ to identify where marks are awarded in the candidate's answer. Maximum 3 ticks for first point (claim) and maximum 3 ticks for second point (hypothetical reason). Key a mark out of 6 for Q25.** **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 principle that gives clear support to the claim. **2 marks – LIMITED** For a principle that gives some support to the claim. **OR** For a principle that includes other argument elements. **1 mark – SUPERFICIAL** For a claim that gives support to the claim, but is not a principle. **0 marks** For something unrelated so it does not give support. **OR** For a statement that is a direct quote of the claim. **OR** For no creditworthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
25	**Hypothetical reason to challenge** **Examples for 3 marks** • People would be safer, if dangerous activities were banned. • If dangerous activities are not banned, hospitals admissions will rise. **Examples for 2 marks** • If dangerous activities were banned then people would be protected from dangerous activities such as sky diving *(adding argument element)* • If they were banned, people would live longer *(gives limited challenge)* **Examples for 1 mark** • if someone you knew was injured from sky-diving, wouldn't you want it banned? *(rhetorical questioning, not hypothetical reasoning)* **Examples for 0 marks** • Danger is good.		**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 hypothetical reason that gives clear challenge to the claim. **2 marks – LIMITED** For a hypothetical reason which gives limited challenge. **OR** For a hypothetical reason that includes other argument elements. **1 mark – SUPERFICIAL** For a statement which challenges the claim, but is not a hypothetical reason. **0 marks** For something unrelated so it does not give support. **OR** For no creditworthy material.
26	In this question, there are 4 requirements: • well-structured and developed argument • three reasons • a well-supported intermediate conclusion • a main conclusion. The candidates may also include other argument elements. For each of the four areas, the assessment could be strong, weak or not covered / absent / missing.	12	**Principle of discrimination** This question discriminates on the whether a candidate can demonstrate the ability to select and use components of reasoning including well-supported intermediate conclusion, and synthesise them, to create well structured arguments. **Level 3 Cogent and sustained response** 4 areas are strong **11 marks** 3 areas are strong, 1 is weak **9 marks** Plus credit 1 mark for one of the following: **(MAX +1)** • Other argument elements, if present, effectively support the argument.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	Main Conclusion **Strong** MC is stated and precisely responds to the question **Weak** MC present but significantly different to that required **Reasons** **Strong** 3 reasons, 2 reasons giving sound support the MC, without intrusive assumptions and/or flaws **Weak** 1 or more relevant reasons **Intermediate conclusion** **Strong** Progressive IC – it is fully supported by one or more reasons and gives sound support to the MC **Weak** Simplistic summary statement or a statement of the MC reworked **Structure and development** **Strong** Organised and easily to follow. Effective development (e.g. through connecting the reasons, supporting / illustrating / clarifying reasons through explanations / examples) **Weak** Some clarity and organisation. GSP may impede understanding. May be characterised as a rant / emotive / rhetorical reasoning		• Argument as a whole can be considered as concise, not verbose. **Level 2 Fair response** 3 areas strong, 1 no credit or 2 areas are strong, 2 weak **6 marks** 2 areas are strong, 1 weak **5 marks** Plus credit 1 mark **each** bullet point: **(MAX +2)** • Other argument elements, if present, effectively support the argument. • Argument as a whole can be considered as concise, not verbose. **Level 1 Limited / Basic Response** 2 strong **4 marks** 1 strong, 2-3 weak **3 marks** At least 2 areas covered weakly **2 marks** 1 area covered weakly **1 mark** Plus credit 1 mark for the following: **(MAX +1)** • Other argument elements, if present, give some useful support to the argument.

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance
			Examples of acceptable conclusions		
			Acceptable conclusions		
			Support		
			• Schools should offer a broad range of sports options.		
			Challenge		
			• Schools should NOT offer a broad range of sports options.		
			Examples of points that may be raised:		
			Support		
			• It will generate interest in a wide range of sports.		
			• It is reflective of adult life, where people engage in a diverse number of sports.		
			• Different students have different abilities and a range of sports will cater to these.		
			• It allows students to succeed at something.		
			• Allows for a balance of team versus individual sports and competitive versus non-competitive sports.		
			Challenge		
			• The teachers may not be specialists.		
			• There will not be enough (money for) equipment.		
			• There will be a lack of competition between schools.		
			• It would be impractical to do so.		
			• Sport should not dominate the curriculum.		
			• Timetabling the different sports will be challenging.		
			• A broad range of sports are available in the community, so it doesn't need to occur within schools.		
			Total	**30**	
			Paper Total	**75**	

Marking grid for question 26

Main Conclusion		**Reasons**	
Strong	MC is stated and precisely responds to the question	Strong	3 reasons, 2 giving sound support the MC, without intrusive assumptions and/or flaws
Weak	MC present but significantly different to that required	Weak	1 or more relevant reasons
No credit		No credit	
Intermediate Conclusion		**Structure and development**	
Strong	Progressive IC – it is fully supported by one or more reasons and gives sound support to the MC	Strong	Organised and easily to follow. Effective development (e.g. through connecting the reasons, supporting / illustrating / clarifying reasons through explanations / examples)
Weak	Simplistic summary statement or a statement of the MC reworked	Weak	Some clarity and organisation. GSP may impede understanding. May be characterised as a rant / emotive / rhetorical reasoning
No credit		No credit	

APPENDIX 1

Assessment Objectives Grid

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total	Timing	Specification Reference
1	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.1 understand and use specific terms
2	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements
3		1		1	1-2	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments
4	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements
5		1		1	1-2	3.2.1.5 recognise, identify and explain flaws within arguments
6		1		1	1-2	3.2.1.1 draw further conclusion
7	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.1 understand and use specific terms
8	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements
9		1		1	1-2	3.2.1.5 recognise, identify and explain flaws within arguments
10	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements
11	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.1 understand and use specific terms
12		1		1	1-2	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments
13	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.1 understand and use specific terms
14	1			1	1-2	3.2.1.1 understand and use specific terms
15		1		1	1-2	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments
Section A Totals	**9**	**6**	**0**	**15**	**20**	
16	2			2	2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements
17	2			2	2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements
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 elements
19b		3		3	2-3	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments
20	2			2	2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements
21a	1			2	1	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements
21b	2			2	1-2	3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements
21c		3		2	2	3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments
22		3		3	3	3.2.2.1 Assessing the use of evidence
23ai		1		1	1	3.2.1.6 recognise, identify and explain appeals within arguments
23aii		2		2	2	3.2.1.6 recognise, identify and explain appeals within arguments

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total	Timing	Specification Reference
23bi		1		1	1	3.2.1.6 recognise, identify and explain appeals within arguments
23bii		2		2	2	3.2.1.6 recognise, identify and explain appeals within arguments
Section B Totals	**15**	**15**	**0**	**30**	**30**	
24			12	12	10-12	3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments
25a			3	3	2-3	3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments
25b			3	3	2-3	3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments
26			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

www.ocr.org.uk

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