

A-LEVEL CRITICAL THINKING

Unit 1 (CRIT 1) Foundation Unit
Mark scheme

2770
June 2014

Version/Stage: v1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Critical Thinking Unit 1 (CRIT1)

Marking methods

In fairness to students, all examiners **must** use the same marking methods. The following advice may seem obvious, but all examiners **must** follow it as closely as possible.

1. If you have any doubt about which mark to award, consult your Team Leader.
2. Refer constantly to the mark scheme throughout marking.
3. **Always** credit **accurate, relevant and appropriate** answers which are not given in the mark scheme.
4. Do **not** credit material irrelevant to the question / stated target, however impressive it might be.
5. If a one word answer is required yet a list is given, take the first answer (unless it is crossed out).
6. If you are considering whether or not to award a mark, ask yourself 'Is this student nearer those who have given a correct answer or those who have little idea?'
7. Read the information on the following page about levels of response mark schemes.
8. Use the full range of marks. Don't hesitate to give full marks when the answer merits them or give no marks where there is nothing creditable.
9. No half marks or bonus marks can be given under any circumstances.
10. The key to good and fair marking is **consistency**. Once approved, do **not** change your standard of marking.

Marking using CMI+

All GCE Critical Thinking papers are marked electronically using a software application called CMI+ (Computer Marking from Image). Instead of paper being posted to examiners, student responses are scanned and sent electronically. The software is easy to use, but demands a different approach.

1. Instead of marking paper-by-paper you will mark item-by-item. An item is a part-question. Each time you log on you will need to choose an item to mark.
2. Before you start marking your own items you will need to mark some pre-marked items known as seeds. These ensure you are still applying the same standard set during standardising. If you are not, you will need to speak to your Team Leader before you can continue marking in order to clarify the correct interpretation and application of the mark scheme.
3. Seeds will also appear at random intervals during your marking to ensure you are maintaining the correct standard. If your marking is out of tolerance for a seed you will be prevented from marking that item until your Team Leader discusses this with you and clears you. You will, however, be able to mark other items.
4. Some higher mark questions are Double Marked. This means that a certain number of answers that you mark will be marked by another person. If the marks are within tolerance of one another, the higher mark awarded is the mark the student will be awarded.
5. You can annotate items in various ways: underlining, highlighting and adding icons from a drop-down menu. Your Team Leader will tell you which types of annotation to use. Examiners must not add extra annotation as this can be confusing for teachers and students if they request Access to Scripts.

6. As you mark each response, enter the mark you are going to award in the box at the bottom of the screen. If you realise you have made a mistake you can go back one paper to change the mark.
7. Your assessments will be monitored throughout the marking period. This ensures you are marking to the same standard, regardless of how many clips you have marked or what time of day you are marking. This approach allows senior examiners to ensure your marking remains consistent. Your Team Leader can bring you back to the right standard should you start to drift.
8. If your marking of a particular item is out of line, your Team Leader will contact you as soon as possible to explain where differences are occurring and how this can be addressed.

Levels of Response marking

Levels of response marking requires a different approach than traditional ‘point for point’ marking. It is essential the **whole response is read** and allocated the level it **best fits**.

Marking should be positive, rewarding achievement rather than penalising for failure or omissions. The award of marks must be directly related to the marking criteria.

Use your professional judgement to select the level that **best** describes a student’s work. Levels of response mark schemes enable examiners to fully reward valid, high ability responses which do not conform exactly to the requirements of a particular level.

If a student demonstrates knowledge, understanding and/or evaluation at a certain level, he/she must be credited at that level. **Length** of response or **literary ability** should **not be confused with critical thinking skills themselves**. A short answer which shows a high level of conceptual ability, for example, must be credited at that level.

Levels are tied to specific skills. Examiners should **refer to the stated assessment target** of a question (see the mark scheme) when there is any doubt as to the relevance of a student’s response.

Levels of response mark schemes include either **examples** of possible students’ responses or **material** which students might use. These are intended as a **guide** only as students will produce a wide range of responses to each question.

Assessment of Quality of Written Communication (QWC)

Where students are required to produce extended written material in English, they will be assessed on the quality of written communication.

Students will have to:

- ensure text is legible; spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate and meaning is clear
- select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter
- organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

Quality of written communication will be assessed in all units in this specification via Assessment Objective 3.

Critical Thinking Mark Scheme

INTRODUCTION

The nationally agreed **assessment objectives** in the QCA Subject Criteria for Critical Thinking are:

- AO1** Analyse critically the use of different kinds of reasoning in a wide range of contexts.
- AO2** Evaluate critically the use of different kinds of reasoning in a wide range of contexts.
- AO3** Develop and communicate relevant and coherent arguments clearly and accurately in a concise and logical manner.

- Marks are allocated to the assessment objectives according to the nature of each question and what it is intended to test.
- For Section A, Examiners need only provide a total mark for each of the candidates' answers. They do not need to provide a breakdown by Assessment Objective.
- For Section B, marks should be awarded according to the generic marking grid.
- For Section B you should add summative comments to justify the mark awarded (comments can be added, where necessary, to Section A).
- Candidates should be able to achieve the highest marks with a selection of relevant points, not necessarily the complete range.
- **Indicative content is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and other valid points must be credited.**

Critical Thinking Unit 1 (CRIT1) Mark Scheme

Section A

Questions 1 to 3 refer to Document A.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
1	<p>'Mathematical', 'scientific', 'ethical' and 'aesthetic' are all examples of different areas of discourse.</p> <p>Identify to which one of the above areas of discourse Document A belongs. Briefly justify your answer with reference to the text.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[3 marks]</p>		2	1	

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	Descriptor	Q-specific: Qu 1
Good: 3 marks	Credited or plausible answer justified by a convincing explanatory reason for the answer and supporting reference to, or quote from, the text.	Ethical, because the author is making value judgments and talking about issues such as fairness and rights, eg. para 2 'growing problem of unfairness in tipping'.
Intermediate: 2 marks	Credited answer or plausible alternative with relevant (but perhaps undeveloped) explanatory reason and/or some relevant reference to the text.	Ethical, because it's about rights, eg. para 7 'it hardly seems right'.
Basic: 1 mark	Credited answer.	Ethical.

2 Read the following argument from Dave Turnbull, in paragraph 4, before answering Question 2.

“The £0 basic wage is an abomination,” [...] “You can’t claim to have a minimum wage and at the same time allow customers’ tips to contribute towards that; for it negates the whole point of the minimum wage. And it undermines the purpose of the tip.”

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
2 (a)	Analyse the structure of Dave Turnbull’s argument by clearly identifying the reasons, the main conclusion and any intermediate conclusions. [5 marks]		5		

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	Descriptor	Q-specific: Qu 2 (a)
Good: 4 – 5 marks	For full marks candidates must demonstrate knowledge of the argument structure. 4 marks if the IC is called a reason and MC and a further 2 reasons identified.	See below
Intermediate: 2 – 3 marks	Two or three parts of argument identified.	3 marks for MC and two reasons. 2 marks for MC and one reason
Basic: 1 mark	One part of argument identified or paraphrase.	MC or R, or ‘he’s arguing that paying people nothing is bad because if tips contribute to it you can’t claim it’s a minimum wage.’

MC: The £0 basic wage is an abomination. [1 mark]

R: It negates the whole point of the minimum wage. [1 mark]

R: It undermines the purpose of tipping. [1 mark]

IC: You can’t have a minimum wage and allow tips to contribute to that. [2 marks]

0 marks for R identified as an IC; or MC wrongly identified as an R or IC.

1 mark for IC identified as R.

Credit 1 mark for identifying any assumption that links reasons (morally) to MC. For example: ‘Allowing tips to make up minimum wage is wrong’.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
2 (b)	Briefly explain how the reference to pre-tax profits (in paragraph 4) might strengthen Turnbull's position. [2 marks]			2	

Three types of correct answer worth 2 marks.

1. Mentioning pre-tax profits of £129m suggests they can well afford to pay waiters the minimum wage but are deliberately keeping this money for themselves. This strengthens Turnbull's conclusion that the £0 basic wage is an abomination, because they would be less blameworthy if they were just breaking even and simply didn't have the money to pay them.
2. It's also worth 2 marks if candidate fastens on the word 'allow' as used by Turnbull, meaning the owners had a genuine choice to pay the wages at minimum level themselves. The fact that they have £129m supports/strengthens Turnbull's claim that they allowed customers to foot the wage bill, and therefore his argument.
3. Up to 2 marks for candidates who point out that knowledge of Tuttons' profits may make the reader more empathetic towards the staff/Turnbull's position.

NB. Award only 1 mark for short/implicit/partial accounts – e.g. If candidate says 'It means they can afford to pay more'. Or, 'It means they had a choice'.

3 In **paragraph 5**, the statement by Tutttons’ owner makes the following claims.

Critically assess the plausibility of each claim in light of information contained in **paragraphs 3 and 6**.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
3 (a)	“Tutttons values its customers and staff in equal measure.”	[4 marks]	2	2	

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	Descriptor	Q-specific: Qu 3 (a)
Good: 3 – 4 marks	Relevant information is used to make a critical response to the claim by giving plausible reasons for accepting or rejecting it, with reference to the text.	See below
Basic: 1 – 2 marks	Critical assessment likely to be limited to merely asserting agreement/disagreement with the claim. Limited, minimal or no reference to text.	See below

This is a misleading and ambiguous claim which looks positive (e.g. positive sounding words like ‘values’ and ‘equally’), but may hide a negative attitude towards both staff and customers.

Valuing ‘equally’ is compatible with treating like dirt, especially in the light of para 3 which states that they pay their waiters zero. This could imply that they place no value on their waiters; and therefore no value on their customers too.

However, it may not be totally bad because, they talk of ‘staff’, which is a broader term than ‘waiter’, so there is room, despite zero pay for waiters, for other staff such as chefs to be properly valued with a decent wage.

It’s also possible they show their value for staff/waiters in other ways besides rates of pay, e.g. perks, holidays, health care, pensions, etc., so para 3 doesn’t *prove* that this value is worthless.

Para 3 indicates that customers are kept in the dark about waiters’ pay and how their tips are used. This shows Tutttons don’t value customers highly and treat both waiters and customers the same. This could make the claim either:

- (a) Plausible (if the word ‘values’ is taken as meaning ‘treats’ or ‘rates’)
- (b) Implausible (if the ‘values’ is taken as meaning ‘treats well’ or ‘esteems highly’)

Claim is implausible because Para 3 says they pay no wages to waiter, yet customers benefit from waiters' hard work. So they value customers more than staff.

Waiters work hard and get paid nothing, so are treated badly, while customers enjoy Tutttons as an attractive London restaurant (Para 3). So claim is implausible.

No evidence of valuing either (in a positive sense) because they've charged £129 million more than it costs to run the place, thus underpaying their waiters and at the same time overcharging their customers.

NB: Up to 3 marks for answers that confine themselves to either customers or staff/waiters but don't compare the two.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
3 (b)	“Our staff currently enjoy pay that exceeds the National Minimum Wage by more than 30 per cent.”				
		[4 marks]	2	2	

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	Descriptor	Q-specific: Qu 3 (b)
Good: 3 – 4 marks	Relevant information is used to make a critical response to the claim by giving plausible reasons for accepting or rejecting it, with reference to the text.	See below
Basic: 1 – 2 marks	Critical assessment likely to be limited to merely asserting agreement/disagreement with the claim. Limited, minimal or no reference to text.	See below

The word ‘pay’ seems inappropriate when the wage is zero. (para 3)

Voluntary tips don’t equate to ‘pay’ even if they are money received and lived on. Tips are not a contracted wage, so shouldn’t be called ‘pay’ despite diners paying them to the waiter.

The use of ‘enjoy’ is a bit overdone in the light of para 3, and ‘more than’ is vague.

The claim that they get more than 30% over the minimum wage looks like a lot until you realise (from para 6) that the minimum wage is only £5.52 per hour and that 30% works out at around £1.65 extra (so total = £7.17), which is not much in real terms. You can hardly ‘enjoy’ it.

Also, as para 6 says, the minimum wage is only for staff 22 years and over. So what happens to staff younger than 22? Nothing is said about them, so this claim is only partial.

Questions 4 to 6 refer to Document B.

4 Read the following extract before answering Question 4.

PDG Well, according to your argument, you shouldn't have to give money to compensate people for things you've no control over. But things like earthquakes and tsunamis are beyond your control. So it follows that you should never give to disaster relief charities. But the thing is you do give to these sorts of charities, so you're being inconsistent, because it's contradictory to give to charity and, at the same time, not tip. Therefore, you should tip me despite the fact that the weather, Christmas, and the location of the house, are outside your control.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
4 (a)	Analyse the structure of PDG's argument by clearly identifying the reasons, the main conclusion and any intermediate conclusions. [8 marks]		8		

Allocate marks according to the structure below in the first instance, but use descriptor table beneath the structure if answer is a paraphrase or you're not certain of the overall mark. [NB: 2 marks for an IC + R run together and called an IC. 1 mark if called an R]

- R1:** According to your argument, you shouldn't have to give money to compensate people for things you've no control over. [1 mark]
- R2:** But things like earthquakes and tsunamis are beyond your control. [1 mark]
- IC1/R3:** So it follows that you should never give to Disaster Relief charities. [2 marks for IC; 1 mark for R]
- R4:** But the thing is you do do this sort of thing (give to these sorts of charities). [1 mark]
- R5:** Because it's contradictory to give to charity and at the same time not tip. [1 mark]
- IC2/R6:** So you're being inconsistent. [2 marks for IC; 1 mark for R]
- MC:** You should tip me [despite the fact that the weather, Christmas, and the location of the house are beyond your control]. [1 mark]

Level	Descriptor	Q-specific: Qu 4 (a)
Good: 7 – 8 marks	All or nearly all parts of argument identified; could include both ICs and/or any distinctive features.	Must include MC and one or more ICs to get full marks.
Intermediate: 4 – 6 marks	Most parts of argument identified; could include one of ICs.	eg. MC along with a few Rs.
Basic: 1 – 3 marks	One or more parts of argument identified.	eg. MC and/or one or two Rs Or a paraphrase of argument

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
4 (b)	Explain one flaw in PDG’s argument in the above extract. [4 marks]			4	

NB: If candidates identify a flaw not listed below, scroll up to see whether the flaw they identify is a flaw of their (possibly non-standard) reconstruction of the argument. Award up to 2 marks for effective assessment of their reconstruction.

Invalid move from IC2/R6 to the MC:

Consistency can also be maintained by ceasing to give to charity and continuing not to tip. The flaw can be seen as a kind of limiting the options. [up to 4 marks]

2nd flaw in the above reasoning is that even if the move from giving to charity, to tipping, were indeed valid, the move from giving to charity, to tipping ME (as claimed in the MC), is not. This is because, just as my obligation to give to charity does not entail that I give to all charities all the time (it allows me to pick and choose which ones I help), so my obligation to tip does not entail that I have to tip everyone at all times. Instead, it allows me to pick and choose who I tip and when – which means I don’t have to tip the PDG specifically and on this particular occasion. [up to 4 marks]

3rd flaw: Invalid move from R1 to IC1:

‘Not having to give money to charity’ doesn’t imply that ‘One should never give to charity’. This conclusion is overdrawn because it could be true that although one is not obliged to do X, one nevertheless does X from time to time. (Just because I don’t have to get my hair cut doesn’t mean I should never get it cut.) [up to 4 marks]

4th flaw: weak analogy between charity and tipping (e.g. seriousness of natural disasters compared to delivering pizza in the rain). [up to 2 marks for critical assessment of the comparison] (NB: no more than 2 marks here because PDG is not making an argument by analogy in the usual inductive sense.)

Somewhat weaker responses may confine themselves to commenting on the falseness of various reasons/premises. [max 1 mark]

[0 marks] for responses that simply talk about how bad the argument is, or vague stuff about how unconvincing it is.

5 Read the following before answering Question 5.

In response to PDG’s argument about tipping being like giving to charity, Megan replies:

Megan Behold the Pizza Delivery Disaster Victim Guy! Drenched, not because of the rain, but because he was washed to my doorstep by a tsunami, with pizzas miraculously intact, and arguing that, because of this, I owe him a charitable donation in the form of a Disaster Relief tip. That’s hilarious!

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
5	Critically assess Megan’s response.	[4 marks]	2	2	

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	Descriptor	Q-specific: Qu 5
Good: 3 – 4 marks	Clearly states a plausible critical judgment on in/effectiveness; refers to one or more logical/rhetorical features in text.	Straw man; Megan exaggerates PDG’s argument; didn’t claim to be a disaster victim; ineffective reply.
Basic: 1 – 2 marks	Offers a judgment on in/effectiveness with little or no reference to text. Or offers basic critical response	Poor response from Megan; twists PDG’s words/makes fun of him.

NB. 0 marks for ‘ad hominem’.
0 marks for **bare** judgement: e.g. ‘Megan’s response is good/effective’

If a candidate explains the distortion as the unjustifiable changing of a simile/analogy (tipping is like/ comparable to giving to charity) into a metaphor/ identity statement (tipping *is* charity/I *am* a disaster victim), then this is definitely top level.

NB. Candidates may say that Megan’s use of sarcasm was justified, and she uses powerful/effective rhetoric as an appropriate retort to PDG’s stance.
Some credit (eg 1-2 extra marks deserved for this.)

6 Read the following exchange before answering Question 6.

PDG But everybody else tips. You're the only one who doesn't. Besides, Christmas has always been the season when people give a little extra to others. Think of it as a gift.

Megan Well, if you're getting tips from everyone else you should have more than enough money without needing a tip from me. "Think of it as a gift", you say. No, I don't think I will. When the Wise Men brought gifts for the baby Jesus they weren't bringing him tips. But you're right; it *is* Christmas – a time of giving a little extra to others. So I'll make a deal with you. I'll offer you a £2 tip as my little extra gift to you, if you in turn refuse to accept it, as your little extra gift to me.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
6	How effective is Megan's counter-argument to PDG's argument? [5 marks]		1	2	2

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	Descriptor	Q-specific: Qu 6
Good: 4 – 5 marks	Clearly states a plausible critical judgment on in/effectiveness, justifying their answer with a couple of references to the logical/rhetorical features in text.	See below
Intermediate: 2 – 3 marks	Offers an acceptable judgment on in/effectiveness backed by a bit of reasoning with a reference to text.	See below
Basic: 1 mark	Offers a judgment on in/effectiveness with little or no reasoning or reference to text.	See below

NB: 0 marks for **bare** judgement: e.g. 'very'; 'ineffective'; or judgement with very bad or ineffective reasoning.

Specifics:

Megan's claim that PDG will have enough money if everyone else tips, is based on the flawed assumption that the tips were significantly big; but it's possible they were miserly and therefore not enough. Also, there's an assumption that 'everyone else' refers to quite a lot of people, making it likely that all these tips would be enough; but the phrase may only refer to a few people, so PDG might still need a tip from Megan.

Candidates can get credited for appropriate comments on the vagueness/subjectivity of phrase 'more than enough'.

Regarding Megan's response to PDG's idea/definition that the tip should be seen as a gift – while Megan is correct about the Wise Men, it's only one example so may not be much to go on (hasty generalisation?), and therefore a weakness;
... but on the other hand, *one* counter-example should be enough to refute a poor definition since a good definition should cover *all* cases; so this could be viewed as a strength not a weakness.
A strength of Megan's response is that she turns PDG's argument about Christmas and gift-giving against PDG, drawing out the implication that it means PDG should give back the tip, as his Christmas gift to Megan.

Candidates may note that Megan misses the chance to refute PDG's flaws on popularity and appeal to history, and that this is a sort of weakness (not so much a flaw in reasoning, rather than a missed opportunity). [Max 3 marks for this]

Questions 7 and 8 refer to Document C.

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
7	<p>Document C argues against tipping and in favour of the service charge.</p> <p>Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 offer reasons for this. Assess the extent to which these reasons support the author’s point of view.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[9 marks]</p>			9	

Marks should be awarded according to the following level descriptors.

Level	Descriptor	Q-specific: Qu 7
Good: 7 – 9 marks	Relevant information is effectively used to make a critical response to Doc C’s argument by giving plausible reasons for accepting or rejecting it, with reference to the text of paras 3, 4 and 5	See below
Intermediate: 4 – 6 marks	Relevant information is fairly used to make a critical response to Doc C’s argument. Some reasons are offered for accepting or rejecting it, with reference to at least two paras.	See below
Basic: 1 – 3 marks	Critical assessment likely to be limited to merely asserting agreement/disagreement with the reasoning in the paras, with limited reference to text. Or, one point reasonably well made with ref to one para.	See below

What follows is an account of the wide variety of things candidates might come up with on each reason/para. Examiners should use their judgment as to which level a candidate should be placed in. Candidates who think of good points not covered below should still be credited. Again, if candidates make similar points to those made below but word them differently, whether better or worse, then credit them accordingly. Use the grid descriptors as an aid in addition to your own professional judgment.

Specifics:

Para 3:

Although this looks like an appeal to ignorance flaw, it’s not really because he is not using ignorance of evidence of X to argue that it’s ok to believe X or that X is true. Ignorance is being used in a different way here, but it’s still flawed.

It’s a perfectionist fallacy/flaw. Just because we don’t have *perfect* knowledge of comparative wages of *all* jobs’ salaries doesn’t mean we can’t tip anyone. The implication of this argument is

that only God is in a position to tip! However: setting a service charge in the first place also depends on this knowledge.

Besides, the author relies on a massive and dubious assumption that the purpose of the tip is somehow to redress the economic imbalance between all jobs in society (and perhaps the world). This is highly implausible. And even if true, some progress can still be made by knowing the wages of comparable groups in the service industry. Just because we don't know it all doesn't mean we don't know anything, and so the alternative to perfect knowledge is not 'a stab in the dark'. For example, none of us have perfect moral knowledge, but that doesn't mean that my claim that rape is wrong, is just a 'stab in the dark'. It looks very much as if the author is limiting the options here.

Also, several of the author's examples are entirely inappropriate. Only kitchen staff and restaurant owner are reasonably relevant; head teachers, policemen etc. are arbitrarily introduced. This could be seen as a weak analogy.

Finally, the focus on the question of whether to tip 'under or over 10%' is irrelevant. The problem of how much to tip is a sliding scale from 0 to whatever, and picking on 10% seems an arbitrary amount on this scale. Why pick that? Because it's a convention? But the author is arguing against abiding by convention.

Para 4:

This starts off by committing the genetic fallacy (candidates may label this an appeal to history, which is acceptable in this case).

Even if tipping was originally like this or originated from this, it doesn't follow that this is its purpose now. Justice may have originated in revenge but that doesn't mean it is revenge now. Christmas may have its origins in a pagan festival but that doesn't mean it is a pagan festival now. Things evolve into different things.

There is also an emotive exaggeration in the use of language here, eg. 'grovel', 'get uppity', but this 'weakness' is further weakened by the point that this language seems inconsistent with the author's own point in para 3, that tipping is a 'well-intentioned gesture'. Surely wanting people to grovel can't be well-intentioned.

The point about tipping being objectionable way for higher status people to 'lord it over' their inferiors is applicable to the service charge too, thus undermining the argument

Para 5:

Several points can be made against the reasoning here.

- 1) Maybe it should be a one-way street. After all, the diner is the one who is paying – the waiter is the one who is paid – therefore shouldn't the diner call the tune?
- 2) The waiter has other means of redress besides tipping the soup into the diner's lap. (limiting options?) eg. complain to the manager; get diner banned if so obnoxious; delay serving him as punishment for arrogance; etc. (use your imagination).
- 3) The author's argument in this para can be used equally against the service-charge which he actually argues for and prefers to tipping. If the diner doesn't like the waiter, he can 'in extremis' refuse to pay the service-charge, and the waiter can do nothing about it. It's still a 'one-way

street'. A bad waiter would constitute 'in extremis', but a bad customer could still get away with being arrogant etc.
This is a serious weakness.

8 At the end of **Document C**, one reader responded as follows.

“Service charges are a bad idea because waiters should earn the extra money, since the better the service is, the better the tip will be!”

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
8	Identify one implicit assumption that needs to be made for this argument to work.	[2 marks]	2		

Award 2 marks for any assumptions that express the following points:

1. Tipping is a good idea
2. Tips encourage waiters to give better service/earn the tip
3. Tips (size of) are motivated by good service/reflect good service
4. Service charges don't have to be earned to be received
5. It's bad to get money you haven't earned/don't deserve
6. It's good to get money if you've earned it
7. It is a matter of either service charge or tipping

Award 1 mark for too narrow or broad assumption, such as:

- that one shouldn't implement a bad idea
- that all waiters serve customers when some only clear tables
- that all customers have spare cash over and above the cost of the meal.

NB: 1 mark for answers that challenge/reject/deny an implicit assumption but do not explicitly identify it.

The reader's argument can be reconstructed in the following way:

MC: Service charges are bad and tipping is good

R1: Service charge doesn't have to be earned by the waiter

R2: But waiters should have to earn any extra money

R3: It's bad to get money you haven't earned

R4: Tips are motivated by good service

R5: The more waiters do to earn the tip the better the tip will be

IC/R6: Tipping encourages waiters to earn the tip by giving better service (from (R4) & (R5))

R7: It's good to get extra money if you've earned it

[NB: Statements in **bold** are explicit: no marks for referring to those; 2 marks for versions of statements not in bold.]

Section B

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
9	<p>Write a reasoned argument in response to the following statement.</p> <p>‘Tipping is a good social practice and should be continued. In fact, why not extend tipping to anyone who performs a good service, not just waiters and taxi drivers?’</p> <p>In your answer you should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> state your conclusion clearly offer effective reasoning that includes at least one counter-argument make use of any relevant claims/arguments in the source documents. 				
		[20 marks]			20

Some suggestions of the kinds of argument candidates may use.

For tipping:

- rewards extra effort so is fair/effective
- gives low paid a liveable wage
- encourages better service(especially if you are a regular)
- even if service not great it shows generosity/kindness
- it’s a good custom/better than taking money off people
- encourages bad waiters to do better when they see better waiters getting more money
- it’s better to give than to receive
- makes people happy
- it’s a gift/token of esteem
- gives diner a choice, unlike the service-charge which is fixed at a certain percentage
- pay cash tips because credit-card tips can go to owners instead of waiters
- if tips are taxed whether waiter gets them or not, then not tipping makes waiters pay tax on money they didn’t get and that’s not right
- it’s arbitrary to limit tipping to just waiters and taxi drivers
- to be consistent it should be extended to PDGs, paper boys etc.

Against tipping:

- doesn’t reward waiter if tips are shared (most restaurants?)
- many restaurants take the money given by credit-card tips and the waiter doesn’t see it
- (Tuttons) it encourages restaurants to pay low/slave wages below national minimum
- tip comes too late and is therefore useless, because if it’s intended to improve service how can it do this after the service has been done (cart before horse) – especially if you don’t return to that restaurant again.
- problems deciding what/how much to tip
- it causes anxiety every time – for waiters as well as diners
- could it be a kind of bribe?
- service-charge is more consistent (same for everyone) and fair

- you're paying for the meal, along with the service (this includes having it brought to the table). Why pay extra since it's already been paid for?
- extending tipping in this way would lead to absurdity (tipping anyone who does you a favour!)
- people couldn't afford it.

Generic mark-grid for Section B (Qu 9):

Descriptor	Award Level		
	Good response	Intermediate response	Basic response
<p>Conclusion</p> <p>A conclusion is clearly stated that is consistent with the reasoning, and directly responds to the question.</p>	<p>Criteria well met. Communication is clear and appropriate.</p> <p>3</p>	<p>Criteria partially met. Communication is mostly clear and appropriate.</p> <p>2</p>	<p>Criteria barely met. Communication errors may impede understanding.</p> <p>1</p>
<p>Reasons / Lines of Reasoning</p> <p>The above conclusion is well supported with reasons, contributory arguments, examples, clarification of terms. Counter-arguments considered and replied to.</p>	<p>8 – 11</p>	<p>4 – 7</p>	<p>1 – 3</p>
<p>Use of source documents</p> <p>Candidate has engaged critically with source material.</p>	<p>5 – 6</p>	<p>3 – 4</p>	<p>1 – 2</p>

	Good response	Reasonable response	Basic response
<p>QWC Quality of Written Communication</p>	<p>Consistently communicates clearly and appropriately</p>	<p>Generally communicates clearly and appropriately</p>	<p>Communication may impede understanding.</p>

Approximate distribution of marks across the questions and assessment objectives for Unit 1

AO Balance	AO1	AO2	AO3	Totals
Qu 1	2	1		3
Qu 2(a)	5			5
Qu 2(b)		2		2
Qu 3(a)	2	2		4
Qu 3(b)	2	2		4
Qu 4(a)	8			8
Qu 4(b)		4		4
Qu 5	2	2		4
Qu 6	1	2	2	5
Qu 7		9		9
Qu 8	2			2
Total Section A				50
Qu 9	24	24	22	20
Total Section B				20
Paper Total: [70] Marks	24	24	22	70
Paper Total: [70] Percentage	34%	34%	32%	100%