

Critical Thinking

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

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

Mark Scheme for January 2011

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2011

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Section A – Multiple Choice

| Question | Key | Text | Type | AO |
|----------|-----|-------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| 1 | C | New Clothes | Main Conclusion | AO1 |
| 2 | D | New Clothes | Finding argument element (Expl) | AO1 |
| 3 | D | New Clothes | Flaws (from list) | AO2 |
| 4 | C | Languages | Assumptions | AO1 |
| 5 | D | Languages | Flaws (descriptions) | AO2 |
| 6 | A | Doctors | Intermediate Conclusion | AO1 |
| 7 | C | Doctors | Assumptions | AO1 |
| 8 | C | Pot Holes | Name argument element (Expl) | AO1 |
| 9 | D | Pot Holes | Weaken | AO2 |
| 10 | D | Pot Holes | Principle that supports | AO2 |
| 11 | C | Homework | Flaws (from list) | AO2 |
| 12 | D | Homework | Weaken | AO2 |
| 13 | A | Modern Art | Intermediate Conclusion | AO1 |
| 14 | D | Modern Art | Assumptions | AO1 |
| 15 | C | Modern Art | Appeals (from list) | AO2 |

Section A Total = [15]

Analysis of Multiple Choice Passages and Answers

| Question | | | Topic/Answer | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|----|---|---|------------|--|
| 1 | to | 3 | New Clothes | | <p>CA Environmentalists complain that each year in Britain we throw away about a million tonnes of clothes, most of which are perfectly wearable.</p> <p>Exp They dislike commercialism and want us to reject fashion and look scruffy.</p> <p>MC It is good to buy new clothes.</p> <p>R Shopping for clothes is exciting.</p> <p>R A new wardrobe can make you feel like a new person.</p> |
| 1 | | | C | [1] | See above |
| 2 | | | D Environmentalists' dislike of commercialism, together with their desire to reject fashion and look scruffy, is why they are complaining. It's (said to be) the cause of their complaints. | [1] | <p>(a) The fact that we throw away so many clothes is the content of the environmentalists' complaint, not an explanation of it. It's what the environmentalists are complaining about.</p> <p>(b) Similarly, the fact that most of the clothes are perfectly wearable is part of the environmentalists' complaint. It doesn't help us to understand why they are complaining in this way.</p> <p>(c) The excitement of shopping for new clothes is a reason that it is good to buy new clothes. It doesn't say why anything has taken place.</p> |
| 3 | | | D Opposition to commercialism and a preference for scruffiness are poor reasons to hang on to old clothes and avoid buying new ones. Environmentalists have much better reasons to do this, which are not mentioned. Therefore, we are being presented with a distorted, weak version of the environmentalists' argument. | [1] | <p>(a) The environmentalists' complaints are not answered by mentioning irrelevant personal qualities or circumstances. We are told that they dislike commercialism and want us to look scruffy, but these attitudes are relevant to the argument. If commercialism were a genuine evil, and buying new clothes truly promoted commercialism, for example, then environmentalists would have a strong case.</p> <p>(b) There is no argument that it is good to buy new clothes because we are happy to do something else that is similar, but wrong.</p> <p>(c) We are not told that it is good to buy new clothes because the only alternative is unacceptable. Looking scruffy is mentioned, not as an unacceptable consequence of failure to buy new clothes, but as the aim of environmentalists that causes them to object to throwing away old clothes. Even if we were being told that it is good to buy new clothes because we will look scruffy</p> |

| Question | | | Topic/Answer | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|----|---|--|------|--|
| | | | | | otherwise, this wouldn't involve a restriction of options because there are no options besides buying new clothes and not buying new clothes. |
| 4 | to | 5 | Languages | | R Interest in foreign language courses has declined greatly over the past decade. Ev The number of students doing German degrees is a quarter of what it was ten years ago. Ev The number doing French is a third. Ev Universities are considering dropping some language courses. MC The decision to allow pupils not take a foreign language for GCSE was a mistake and should be reversed. |
| 4 | | | C The first sentence, to act as a reason, has been drawn from the evidence of decline in some courses. If interest in other language courses has risen significantly then the overall interest in language courses may not have declined greatly – or even declined at all – just because the interest in French and German courses has declined. Hence we need to assume that this has not been the case for the reason, and therefore the conclusion, to follow from the evidence. | [1] | (a) It doesn't wreck the argument if interest in other languages courses has not declined as much as French and German. It may still have declined significantly. Even if it stayed the same, the great reduction of interest in French and German may be enough to constitute a significant reduction in overall interest. (b) The argument can still stand if French and German are not the most important languages for business. They could be very important without being the most important. Even if they are not important for business, they could be important for other reasons. (d) The argument can still stand if it is possible to learn a language easily as an adult. It may be that adults are far less willing to learn languages, or don't have enough time, and therefore that the decline in language-learning at school and university remains a problem. |
| 5 | | | D The argument says we should undo the changes at GCSE because languages are in decline at university. But this ignores the possibility that something else is responsible for the language decline. If so, then there is no reason to undo the changes. Doing so is unlikely to reverse the language decline. | [1] | (a) There is no assumption that GCSE languages are a necessary preparation for language degrees, only that a high uptake of GCSE languages is necessary for a high uptake of language degrees. (b) The argument does not treat language degrees and GCSE courses as though they are the same thing. It assumes that the decline in interest in language degrees is caused by the changes at GCSE. (c) The argument is not presenting us with a choice between |

| Question | | | Topic/Answer | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|----|----|---|------|---|
| | | | | | French and German degrees. It certainly isn't pretending that these are the only possible choices. |
| 6 | to | 7 | Doctors | | R Patients complain more readily about male doctors than they do about female ones. Ev A report examining medical complaints from the last eight years gave figures of 3,635 complaints about men with only 873 about women. Ev The complaints covered a range of issues from inappropriate behaviour to poor clinical skills. IC Almost all incompetent doctors are male. MC You should be thankful for a female doctor if you have one. |
| 6 | | | A | [1] | See above |
| 7 | | | C If the number of complaints is a poor measure of incompetence, then the argument falls apart. There could be more complaints about male doctors, while the number of incompetent male doctors is the same. Or, more precisely, it could be that the ratio of incompetent male doctors to incompetent female doctors is the same as the ratio of male doctors to female doctors. | [1] | (a) The argument doesn't fall apart if some of the complaints are not of a serious nature. It could be that the vast majority are. (b) The argument doesn't fall apart if complaint figures from the past eight years are not similar to those from previous decades. It's possible that the disparity was even more pronounced in the past. Besides, previous decades are irrelevant to this argument as the conclusion is about now. (d) The argument can still stand if there are fewer female doctors than male ones. The difference in the number of doctors could be small, whereas the difference in the number of complaints is dramatic. |
| 8 | to | 10 | Pot Holes | | R Councils spend thousands of pounds every year filling in potholes. Exp Hitting potholes at speed causes accidents and damage to cars and bikes. R At the same time, councils spend a lot of money on installing speed bumps and other traffic-calming measures. R This makes no financial sense. R If councils stop filling in potholes, then they won't have to spend taxpayers' money on artificial traffic-calming methods. MC Councils should stop filling in potholes. |
| 8 | | | C The fact that hitting potholes at speed causes | [1] | See above |

| Question | | | Topic/Answer | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|----|----|--|------|---|
| | | | accidents and damage is why councils are spending thousands of pounds every year filling them in. | | |
| 9 | | | D If most drivers do not slow down for potholes, then councils can't use potholes instead of speed bumps etc to limit speed. | [1] | (a) The relative cost of installing a speed bump and filling in a pothole is irrelevant. The council would save both costs. (b) The fact that many drivers break the speed limit does not weaken the argument. As long as potholes are as effective as speed bumps in discouraging excessive speed, the argument still stands. (c) The fact that more residents complain about speed bumps than potholes strengthens the argument. It suggests that residents would prefer potholes to speed bumps. |
| 10 | | | D The principle that taxpayers' money should be used carefully implies that councils should try to make savings, and using potholes instead of speed bumps to control speed would do this. | [1] | (a) The principle that drivers should take more care isn't relevant to a conclusion about how councils should act. (b) The principle that roads should be attractive as well as safe weakens the argument. Potholes make roads less attractive; speed bumps don't. (Even if you disagree with this assessment, it's contentious, and you can't say that this principle best supports the argument.) (c) The principle that safer roads should not be at the expense of damage to vehicles weakens the argument. Potholes will cause more damage to vehicles than speed bumps. |
| 11 | to | 12 | Homework | | R You give my homework back with only a few ticks. IC You won't taken time to read it properly. MC It's acceptable not to do my homework. |
| 11 | | | C Adam thinks that not doing his homework properly is acceptable because his teacher doesn't work properly; in fact, both actions are wrong. | [1] | (a) Adam is criticising his teacher but the criticism isn't intended as evidence that the teacher is wrong or that we should support his argument because of a personal attack. (b) There is no argument that something is true of a group because it is true of some members of the group. (d) Adam doesn't even mention anyone else's argument, let alone misrepresent it. |

| Question | | | Topic/Answer | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|----|----|--|------|---|
| 12 | | | D If there is benefit in doing homework that is not marked properly, then the fact that Adam's teacher doesn't mark his homework properly is a poor reason not to do it. | [1] | (a) If anything, the fact that homework doesn't normally count towards qualifications gives some justification to Adam's decision not to do it. (b) Again, if anything, the fact that most pupils are set too much homework partially justifies Adam's decision not to do this teacher's homework. (c) The behaviour of other teachers is irrelevant. The issue here is Adam's refusal to do this teacher's homework on the grounds that this teacher doesn't mark it properly. |
| 13 | to | 15 | Modern Art | | MC We ought to think seriously about how artists in Britain are trained. IC Art in Britain has completely lost its way. R They are unable to produce convincing representations of their subjects. Exp Artists working today lack traditional skills in the handling of paint. R Most people find contemporary artists' work ugly and pointless. Ev Few people attend contemporary art exhibitions. |
| 13 | | | A | [1] | See above |
| 14 | | | D If artistic skill is not an important factor when judging art, then the alleged fact that contemporary artists lack traditional skills ceases to stand as a reason to think that art in Britain has completely lost its way. | [1] | (a) The fact artists are unable to produce convincing representations of their subjects is being given as a problem whether they are trying to achieve that or not. The argument still stands if contemporary artists are not trying to produce convincing representations as it could be that they ought to be producing works like this, implying that art has lost its way. (b) The argument would not fall apart if colleges of art are spending the whole time teaching traditional skills. The issue is whether contemporary artists are acquiring the skills. Perhaps art colleges are not teaching them well enough or the artists in training are not interested in learning them. (c) We don't need to assume that any artists go to art college. The argument never mentions art colleges. It simply says that we ought to think seriously about how artists in Britain are trained. |
| 15 | | | C The argument appeals to popularity when it | [1] | (a) The argument does not mention an authority figure. (b) The argument does not try to persuade the reader by evoking |

| Question | | | Topic/Answer | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|--|---|-------------|---|
| | | | uses the fact that most people find contemporary artists' work ugly and pointless as a reason to think that contemporary art is not good. | | any particular emotion. (d) The argument mentions traditional skills but it does not argue that because things were done a certain way in the past, they should still be done in that way now. |
| | | | Section A Total | [15] | |

Section B – Analysing and Evaluating Argument

| Question | Answer | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|------|---|
| 16 | You should use the exact words of the author in your answers to 16 (a), (b) and (c). | | |
| 16 (a) | <p>State the main conclusion of the argument presented in the passage.</p> <p>Examples for 2 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (All of this shows that) organic farming is not better than conventional farming. • (All of this shows that) organic is not better than conventional farming. • (All of this shows that) organic farming is not better than conventional. <p>Examples for 1 mark:</p> <p><i>Less accurate statement of MC:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (All of this shows that) organic farming is not better. <p><i>Accurate statement of accepted IC:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Yet) organic farming is an impractical system of food production. <p>Example for 0 marks</p> <p><i>Accurate statement of IC but with additional information</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yet organic farming is an impractical system of food production, primarily because it is in capable of feeding the world. | [2] | <p>2 marks For precisely stating the main conclusion in the exact words of the author.</p> <p>1 mark For a less accurate statement of the main conclusion which has the gist but lacks precision and/or contains additional information and/or misses out information.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>For precisely stating the intermediate conclusion directly supporting the main conclusion in the exact words of the author.</p> <p>0 marks For a statement of an incorrect part of the text or for including additional argument elements.</p> <p>NB If candidates leave sections out by using ellipses (...) then credit only what is seen without filling in the gaps.</p> <p>Any words in brackets are not required but candidates should not be penalised if these words are included.</p> |

| Question | Answer | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|---|---------|---|
| 16 (b) | <p>State <u>three intermediate conclusions</u> in the passage.</p> <p>Examples for 2 marks:</p> <p>A (para 1) (Yet) organic farming is an impractical system of food production.</p> <p>B (para 1) It is incapable of feeding the world. <i>NB "it" can be replaced for context eg "organic farming".</i></p> <p>C (para 2) Organic farming is less efficient than conventional farming.</p> <p>D (para 3) (So) changing to a purely organic approach would lead to a decrease in the amount of food produced in the world.</p> <p>E (para 4) What they say is just a myth. <i>(para 4)</i> <i>NB "what they say" can be replaced for context eg "the claim that fertilisers must be made using fossil fuels" or similar.</i></p> <p>F (para 5) (Actually,) it's organic farming that threatens our health.</p> <p>Examples for 1 mark:</p> <p><i>Less accurate statement of the text</i></p> <p>C Organic farming is less efficient.</p> <p>D (So) changing to a purely organic approach would lead to a decrease in the amount of food produced.</p> <p>F Organic farming threatens our health.</p> <p>Examples for 0 marks</p> <p><i>Addition of another argument element</i></p> <p>A (Yet) organic farming is an impractical system of food production, primarily because it is incapable of feeding the world.</p> <p>E What they say is just a myth as we could make fertilisers using solar or wind energy.</p> | [3 x 2] | <p>For each:</p> <p>2 marks For precisely stating the intermediate conclusion in the exact words of the author.</p> <p>1 mark For a less accurate statement of the intermediate conclusion which has the gist but lacks precision and/or contains additional information and/or misses out information.</p> <p>0 marks For a statement of an incorrect part of the text or for including additional argument elements</p> <p>NB If candidates leave sections out by using ellipses (...) then credit only what is seen without filling in the gaps.</p> <p>Any words in brackets are not required but candidates should not be penalised if these words are included.</p> |

| Question | Answer | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|------|--|
| 16 (c) | <p>State <u>one counter-argument</u> given in the passage.</p> <p>Note that there are two counter-arguments (paras 4 and 5) in the passage, and one counter-assertion (para 1).</p> <p><u>Paragraph 4 (counter-argument)</u></p> <p><i>Example for 3 marks:</i></p> <p>Reason (They argue that) conventional farming uses man-made fertilisers which must be made using fossil fuels (and this accelerates global warming).</p> <p>Conclusion The organic movement claims to be more environmentally friendly than conventional farming.</p> <p>Example for 2 marks: (either one OR both parts lacking precision)</p> <p>Reason</p> <p><i>Conventional farming accelerates global warming.</i></p> <p>Conclusion The organic movement is more environmentally friendly than conventional farming.</p> <p>Example for 1 mark:</p> <p>Reason The organic movement is more environmentally friendly because conventional farming uses fertilisers that must be made using fossil fuels.</p> | [3] | <p>3 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For precisely stating both the reason and the conclusion in the exact words of the author. <p>2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For correct statement of elements, though one or both parts lack precision and has the gist and/or containing additional information and/or missing out information. <p>1 mark</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For correct statement of counter-reason and counter-conclusion, but placed under just one heading (the other heading being blank). For correct statement of counter-reason and counter-conclusion, but placed the reverse headings. For correct statement of one element but an incorrect element under the other heading. <p>0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For a statement of an incorrect part of the text. For correct statement of counter-reason and counter-conclusion, but placed under just one heading and additional material under the other heading. Mixing the two different counter arguments (para 4 and para 5) and/or counter-assertion (para 1). <p>NB If candidates leave sections out by using ellipses (...) then credit only what is seen without filling in the gaps.</p> <p>Any words in brackets are not required but candidates should not be penalised if these words are included.</p> |

| Question | | | Answer | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|-----|-----|---|------|---|
| 16 | (c) | con | <p><u>Paragraph 5 (counter-argument)</u></p> <p>Example for 3 marks: Reason (It is often said that) man-made chemicals cause health problems.</p> <p><i>Conclusion</i> (so) we should restrict their use in farming.</p> <p>Example for 2 marks: Reason Chemicals cause health problems.</p> <p><i>Conclusion</i> so we should restrict their use.</p> <p>Example for 1 mark: Reason We should restrict their use in farming.</p> <p><i>Conclusion</i> As man-made chemicals cause health problems.</p> <p>Example for 0 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (We are constantly told that) an organic approach to farming would be better for us and better for the | | <p>3 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For precisely stating both the reason and the conclusion in the exact words of the author. <p>2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For correct statement of elements, though one or both parts lack precision and has the gist and/or containing additional information and/or missing out information. <p>1 mark</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For correct statement of counter-reason and counter-conclusion, but placed under just one heading (the other heading being blank). For correct statement of counter-reason and counter-conclusion, but placed the reverse headings. For correct statement of one element but an incorrect element under the other heading. <p>0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For a statement of an incorrect part of the text. For correct statement of counter-reason and counter-conclusion, but placed under just one heading and additional material under the other heading. Mixing the two different counter arguments (para 4 and para 5) and/or counter-assertion (para 1). <p>NB If candidates leave sections out by using ellipses (...) then credit only what is seen without filling in the gaps.</p> |

| Question | Answer | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|--------|---|
| | <p>environment. <i>Paragraph 1 (counter-assertion)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reason (It is often said that) man-made chemicals cause health problems, so we should restrict their use in farming. <p><i>Conclusion</i> But there is no solid evidence for this. <i>(For correct statement of counter-reason and counter-conclusion, but placed under just one heading and additional material under the other heading)</i></p> | | <p>Any words in brackets are not required but candidates should not be penalised if these words are included.</p> |
| 17 | <p>In paragraph 2 the author uses evidence to support his claim that “Organic farming is less efficient than conventional farming”. Make <u>two points of evaluation</u> about the use made of the evidence.</p> <p>Examples for 3 marks:</p> <p>A Organic tomatoes needed <u>much more</u> land than normal tomatoes, a significant difference, which backs up to the claim that organic farming is less efficient.</p> <p>B It may not be inefficient because the organic chicken may be larger in size, so the extra energy use is justified.</p> <p>Example for 2 marks:</p> <p>A The difference in the land needed for the tomatoes is large which gives more support than if the difference was small. <i>(identification & explanation)</i></p> <p>A Organic tomatoes need a lot more land showing they are much less efficient. <i>(identification & assessment)</i></p> <p>B The two types of chicken may be different sizes, so it is not a fair comparison. <i>(identification & explanation)</i></p> | [3, 3] | <p><i>NB There is no need for the candidate to circle the strength or weakness on the script. The answer itself is evidence of which they have done.</i></p> <p>1 mark Correct identification of WHAT the strength or weakness is in the evidence (see examples)</p> <p>+ 1 mark and an explanation of WHY this strength or weakness matters/is significant</p> <p>+ 1 mark with an assessment of HOW this strength/weakness impacts the claim that ‘Organic farming is less efficient than conventional farming.’</p> <p>Example topics for identification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land use comparison looks at tomatoes each time so is consistent •however vine tomatoes and loose tomatoes may contain different amounts of food. <i>(points describing this as a negative acceptable)</i> • The organic chicken may be larger • The organic chicken may produce more useable amounts of meat |

| Question | | | Answer | Mark | Guidance |
|----------|--|--|--|------|---|
| | | | <p>B Organic chicken may be larger in size, so it doesn't show that farming is inefficient. (<i>identification & assessment</i>)</p> <p>Examples for 1 mark:</p> <p>A Organic tomatoes need much more land / 6 times more land / more than 103 m³ more. (<i>identification</i>)</p> <p>B The two types of chicken may be different sizes.</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The two examples cover two different areas of farming (sufficiency, relevancy, representative, wide applicability, etc) <p>Alternative explanations for the validity of organic farming (eg tastiness, consumer demand) or explanations that the examples cannot be generalised are not evaluations of the use of this evidence to support the claim – they are counters to the claim.</p> |

| Question | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale/Additional Guidance |
|----------|---|------|--|
| 18 | <p>What <u>assumption</u> is being made in the author's reasoning in paragraph 3?</p> <p>Examples for 2 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a problem if less food is produced. • In the future, we won't find a way to farm with only natural fertilisers. • In the future, we won't find a new natural source of fertilisers. • There has not been an increase in the amount of natural fertiliser in the past 100 years. • The past is a guide to the future/present. • Farming requirements in the future are similar to those nowadays. • It assumes the demand for food will remain the same or increase. <p>Examples for 1 mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We should increase the amount of food in the world. • In the future we won't find a fresh store of bird droppings. | [2] | <p>2 marks A statement of an assumption necessary in the author's reasoning to support the IC/MC.</p> <p>1 mark A statement which is relevant, in the author's reasoning to support the IC/MC, but may not be necessary, or lacks clarity.</p> <p>NB IC = Changing to a purely organic approach would lead to a decrease in the amount of food produced in the world. MC = Organic farming is not better than conventional farming.</p> <p>Example for 0 marks: The author assumes that bird droppings are the only source of fertilisers.</p> |
| 19 | <p>In paragraph 4, the author states: "we could make fertilisers using solar or wind energy."</p> | | |
| 19 (a) | <p>Name the <u>argument element</u>.</p> <p>Example for 1 mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reason | [1] | |
| 19 (b) | <p>Briefly justify your answer to question 19(a).</p> <p>Examples for 1 mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It supports the (intermediate) conclusion. • It supports the statement "it's just a myth". • It supports the statement "organic farming is not better than conventional farming". | [1] | |

| Question | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale/Additional Guidance |
|----------|--|------|---|
| 20 | <p>How well does the <u>reasoning</u> work in paragraph 5?</p> <p>You should make <u>at least three</u> points which evaluate the reasoning by explaining some of the strengths and/or weaknesses. These might include the use of examples/evidence, hypothetical reasoning, assumptions, flaws, appeals or other evaluative points.</p> <p>Example evaluative points:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Post hoc/correlation not causation/false cause</u></p> <p>3 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decrease in cancer rates may not have been caused by the increase in chemical farming <u>but by some different change</u>. • The life expectancy could have increased <u>because of another factor</u> and not had anything to do with the use of chemicals in farming. <p>2 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decrease in cancer rates may not have been caused by the use of chemicals. • Just because the life expectancy increase happened after the use of chemicals does not mean it was caused by it. <p>1 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is post hoc between decreasing cancer and chemical use • Life expectancy might have increased in any case. <p><i>Note that an evaluation about cancer and life expectancy separately should not be scored as two separate points as they are both examples for the same reasoning.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Appeal to Emotion</u></p> | [9] | <p>Credit only the 3 <u>best</u> responses.</p> <p>For each point of evaluation, a maximum of 3 marks:</p> <p>3 marks CLEAR A statement of what the strength/weakness is, with a clear and developed explanation in context of why it does/does not give strong support.</p> <p>2 marks LIMITED A statement of what the strength/weakness is, giving a limited explanation in context, of why it does/does not give strong support to the argument.</p> <p>1 mark SUPERFICIAL Simple statement of a weakness or strength, with no attempt to explain or justify. It may point to the gist of a correct weakness but lack any detail for it to be considered a limited explanation.</p> <p>0 marks: No creditworthy material or simplistic counter-assertions.</p> <p>NB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flaws may be worded as assumptions. • The assessment of evidence needs to focus on the USE of evidence in the reasoning. • The naming of the flaws is not necessary, it is the quality of evaluation that matters. |

| Question | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale/Additional Guidance |
|----------|--|-------------|---|
| 20 | <p>con</p> <p>3 mark example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Giving the reader a disgusting image of droppings on food is supposed to put them off organic food <u>but does not actually give any reasons to be against it.</u> <p>2 mark example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The image of droppings on food is there to disgust the reader and put them off organic food <u>unfairly.</u> <p><i>Some suggestion of this being weak or unfair needed for 2 marks in this thread.</i></p> <p>1 mark example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The image of droppings appeals to reader's emotions. <i>This is descriptive and does not make clear that it is weak. Answers which suggest it is a good thing can still get 1 mark.</i> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Hasty Generalisation</u></p> <p>3 mark example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other countries may not have had the increase in life expectancy that the US has had after using chemical farming, <u>so it is not safe to conclude generally they are safe.</u> <p>2 mark example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other countries may not have had the increase in life expectancy that the US has had after using chemical farming. <p>1 mark example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We shouldn't generalise from the US to other countries. <p>Other examples of evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It assumes that E coli is bad/harmful. Non-sequitur in saying some health benefits don't have health problems. | | <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Straw Man/unfair association</u></p> <p>3 mark example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unfair to suggest animal droppings are put on food, <u>when what happens is not as simple as this.</u> <p>2 mark example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unfair to suggest animal droppings are put on food. <p>1 mark example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Animal droppings are not put on food. <i>This counter-assertion has the gist of a weakness but is a counter-assertion, not an evaluation.</i> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Use of E Coli Evidence/False Cause</u></p> <p>3 mark example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The infection with spinach not necessarily anything to do with the fact they were organically grown <u>as it may be caused by another factor.</u> <p>2 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The infection with spinach not necessarily anything to do with the fact they were organically grown. Chemically produced food can get infected by bacteria as well. <p>1 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any food can get infected by a bacteria. <p><i>NB This is a separate issue from the false cause evaluation with life expectancy/cancer and chemical use.</i></p> <p>Other examples of evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appeal to history (E.coli scare). Appeal to emotion (Mother Nature isn't our friend). It assumes that conventionally grown spinach was not also infected with E Coli. |
| | Section B Total | [30] | |

Section C – Developing Your Own Arguments

| Question | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale/Additional Guidance |
|----------|--|------|--|
| 21 (a) | <p>'It should be compulsory for packaged food to have clear labelling showing how all ingredients have been produced.'</p> <p>Give <u>one</u> hypothetical reason that would give <u>support</u> to the above claim.</p> <p>Examples for 3 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If people wish to avoid certain foods (<i>health, religion, creeds</i>) then they need to be able to check the processes used. • People may have ethical requirements of how their food is made, in which case they need to be able to check this on the label. <p>Examples for 2 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If people wish to avoid certain foods (<i>health, allergies, religion, creeds</i>) then they can check the ingredients included. (<i>partial support</i>) • If people are interested in reading about the background of food they need to be able to see it on labels. (<i>not giving strong support</i>) • If people are interested in only certain types of foods they need to be able to check the information, so that they can avoid the foods (like nuts) they don't want to eat. (<i>IC and example included</i>) <p>Examples for 1 mark:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People are interested in how foods have been prepared. (<i>not hypothetical</i>) • Customers like to know where food has come from. (<i>not hypothetical</i>) • Some people are not allowed certain chemicals. (<i>not hypothetical</i>) <p>Example for 0 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food labels already have to show the ingredients. | [3] | <p>3 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For a statement that is a hypothetical reason that gives clear support to the claim. <p>2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For a statement that is a hypothetical reason but gives only limited support. • For a statement that includes a hypothetical reason that gives clear support to the claim, but with additional argument element(s) such as intermediate conclusions, examples, etc. <p>1 mark</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For a statement that gives support to the claim, so is a reason, but is not a hypothetical reason • OR a statement that has the structure of a hypothetical reason but does not give support to the claim. <p>0 marks No creditworthy material.</p> <p>NB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full support will link to the METHOD of production of the ingredients (eg free-range, organic, halal, kosher, etc). • Partial support may refer to the ingredients themselves (eg nuts, allergies, etc). |

| Question | | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale/Additional Guidance |
|----------|-----|--|------|---|
| 21 | (b) | <p>‘Making it compulsory for packaged food to have clear labelling showing how all ingredients have been produced would be very problematic.’</p> <p>Give <u>one</u> detailed example of a problem that would <u>support</u> this claim.</p> <p>Examples for 3 marks:</p> <p>A. It is expensive for companies to research and print this information so this could put the price up of products/ decrease profit margins.</p> <p>B. The public may not understand all the labelling, which may cause confusion or paranoia about particular issues incorrectly</p> <p>Examples for 2 marks:</p> <p>A. It is expensive for companies to research and print this information. <i>(this lacks referencing)</i></p> <p>A. It is expensive proving that making it compulsory for packaged food to have clear labelling is problematic (statement and reference, but lacking detail)</p> <p>B. The public may not understand the information. <i>(this lacks referencing)</i></p> <p>C. Packets may have to get larger to hold all the information on. <i>(this lacks referencing)</i></p> <p>Examples for 1 mark:</p> <p>A. It is expensive.</p> <p>B. No-one would understand</p> <p>C. The labelling would take up a lot of space. <i>(lacks detail and reference)</i></p> | [3] | <p>1 mark Stating a relevant problem</p> <p>2 marks developed with detail and/or explanation</p> <p>3 marks with a reference to the claim that ‘Making it compulsory for packaged food to have clear labelling showing how all ingredients have been produced would be very problematic’ with statement of a negative consequence.</p> <p>OR</p> |

| |
|---|
| Marking Grid to assist in level-finding for Q22 and Q23 |
|---|

| Level | Reason | Development of Reasoning | Quality of Argument | Conclusion | Other Argument Elements (if used) | GSP |
|------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 10-12 marks | At least 3 or more relevant and reasonable reasons | At least one IC supported by more than one reason | Sound. Weaknesses, if present, are subtle | Precise and correctly stated | Relevant and effective use | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good • Errors few if any |
| 3 7-9 marks | 3 or more relevant reasons, 2 or more being reasonable | At least one IC | Generally sound. Weaknesses may be present but are not intrusive so as to damage the whole | Clearly stated, may have minor paraphrase(s) | Signposted and functional use | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good • Errors few |
| 2 4-6 marks | 3 or more relevant reasons | Some development of reasoning | Basic argument which contains obvious weaknesses | Stated. May have different wording / meaning but right direction | Weak or little support to the argument | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic • Errors may be intrusive |
| 1 1-3 marks | 2 or less relevant reasons | No development | Limited attempt which is not persuasive. Perhaps emotive | May be unstated or different but related to that required (eg opposite to what asked for) | Examples or evidence if given are in the place of reasoning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor • Errors impede comprehension |

| |
|--|
| Performance Descriptors to assist in level-finding for Q22 and Q23 |
|--|

Level 4: 10 – 12 marks

Candidates present their own relevant argument, with a clear structure where the conclusion is supported by at least three relevant and reasonable reasons and at least one intermediate conclusion, which is supported by more than one reason. The main conclusion is precisely and correctly stated. The argument is convincing and may rely on only one or two reasonable assumptions. The argument may also contain other argument elements which are effectively used eg evidence/examples, counter-assertion. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are very good: errors are few, if any.

Level 3: 7-9 marks

Candidates present their own argument that contains at least three relevant reasons, two or more of which are reasonable and there is an intermediate conclusion. The argument may be convincing, though weaknesses may be present but are not intrusive so as to damage the whole. The main conclusion is clearly stated, perhaps with minor paraphrase(s). There may be signposted and functional use of other argument elements. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are good: errors are few.

Level 2: 4-6 marks

Candidates present a basic argument that contains at least three relevant reasons. There is a development in the reasoning, perhaps with an attempt to form an intermediate conclusion. The conclusion is stated but may have a slightly different wording and/or meaning to that required. The argument may contain obvious weaknesses. Other argument elements may be included but they give little or no support to the argument. Grammar, spelling and punctuation may have errors which are sometimes intrusive.

Level 1: 1-3 marks

There is a limited attempt at an argument, which is not persuasive and perhaps emotive. Fewer than three relevant reasons are given. The conclusion may be not stated, or different from that asked for in the question. There is hardly any development in the reasoning and certainly no intermediate conclusion present. Examples or evidence, if given, may be in the place of reasoning. Grammar, spelling and punctuation may be poor with errors which are intrusive and can impede comprehension.

0 marks

No creditworthy material. Do not credit arguments simply lifted or paraphrased from the passage.

| Question | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale/Additional Guidance |
|----------|---|------|--|
| 22 | <p>'The government should tax unhealthy foods like they tax tobacco and alcohol.'</p> <p>Write your own argument to <u>support or challenge</u> this claim.</p> <p>Marks will be given for a well-structured and developed argument. You should include <u>at least three reasons</u>, a well-supported intermediate conclusion and a main conclusion. Your argument may also contain other argument elements.</p> <p>You may use information and ideas from the passage, but you must use them to form a new argument. No credit will be given for repeating the arguments in the passage.</p> <p>Acceptable conclusions – examples:</p> <p><u>Support:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The government should tax unhealthy foods. <p><u>Challenge:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The government should not tax unhealthy foods. • The government should tax unhealthy foods, but not to the same extent as tobacco and alcohol. (<i>a comparative argument</i>) | [12] | <p>Examples of points which support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue for government which is much needed. • Taxing allows people freedom of choice with guidance – better than banning. • Unhealthy foods cause health issues which need funding which the tax could pay for. • A tax on unhealthy foods would put people off from eating them. • It shows the government cares about society. <p>Example of points which challenge: (<i>these focus on the no taxation, rather than taxation but less than tobacco argument</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to define unhealthy foods. • Contravenes the right of liberty. • Bias against the poor – it won't affect the rich people. • What is healthy can change so it will be a problem if habits get formed. • Healthy food is already more expensive, so poor will be affected. • Government money is misused so they should not have more. • Tobacco and alcohol taxation has not worked to stop. • Taxation itself is wrong as it invades people's free choices. |

| Question | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale/Additional Guidance |
|----------|--|-------------|--|
| 23 | <p>‘We should all be vegetarians.’</p> <p>Write your own argument to support or challenge this claim.</p> <p>Marks will be given for a well-structured and developed argument. You should include at least three reasons, a well-supported intermediate conclusion and a main conclusion. Your argument may also contain other argument elements.</p> <p>You may use information and ideas from the passage, but you must use them to form a new argument. No credit will be given for repeating the arguments in the passage.</p> <p>Acceptable conclusions – examples:</p> <p><u>Support:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We should all be vegetarians. <p><u>Challenge:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We should not be vegetarians. • It can be down to individuals whether they want to be vegetarians or not. | [12] | <p>Examples of points which support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If everyone was vegetarian there would be enough food for the world. • Much animal farming is cruel and banning meat eating would avoid this. • Animal farming is less efficient as animal farming requires food. • Avoids meat contamination issues. • We would be able to grow our own foods and be self-sufficient. <p>Example of points which challenge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We were designed to eat meat. • Meat contains lots of vitamins and iron in easy to access ways. • Many people enjoy meat-eating and it is a shame to take that away from them. • It would cost a lot to change farm types. • Employment of people in the meat industry (in the short term). • Some areas are ideal for animal farming but could not be used for crop farming. |
| | Section C Total | [30] | |
| | Paper Total | [75] | |

Assessment Objectives Grid (includes QWC)

| Question | AO1 | AO2 | AO3 | Total |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1-15 | 8 | 7 | | 15 |
| 16a | 2 | | | 2 |
| 16b | 6 | | | 6 |
| 16c | 3 | | | 3 |
| 17 | | 6 | | 6 |
| 18 | 2 | | | 2 |
| 19 | 2 | | | 2 |
| 20 | | 9 | | 9 |
| 21a | | | 3 | 3 |
| 21b | | | 3 | 3 |
| 22 | | | 12 | 12 |
| 23 | | | 12 | 12 |
| Total | 23 | 22 | 30 | 75 |

| Specification Reference | Question Numbers |
|---|----------------------|
| 3.2.1.1 understand and use specific terms | 1,2,3,5,8,10,11,13 |
| 3.2.1.2 identify and explain the purpose of argument elements | 1,2,6,8,10,13,16,19 |
| 3.2.1.3 explain the difference between explanation and argument | 2,8, |
| 3.2.1.4 recognise explanations in longer arguments | 19 |
| 3.2.2.1 assessing strengths or weaknesses within arguments | 4,7,9,12,14,17,18,20 |
| 3.2.2.2 identify and explain flaws within arguments | 3,5,11,20 |
| 3.2.2.3 identify and describe appeals within arguments | 15,20, |
| 3.2.3 develop own reasoned arguments | 20,21,22,23 |

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

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

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



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