



**General Certificate of Education (A-level)**  
**June 2011**

**Critical Thinking**

**CRIT1**

**(Specification 2770)**

**Unit 1: Foundation Unit**

**Final**

***Mark Scheme***

---

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner 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 examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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](http://aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### **Copyright**

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

# 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.
- 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.**

# Unit 1 Critical Thinking Foundation Unit

## Section A

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
<b>Questions 1 and 2 refer to the online discussion in Document A.</b>					
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Identify <u>two</u> predictions that the article makes.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p>In value terms, China's sportswear market is destined to grow from an estimated US \$7.2bn in 2009 to around US\$12.4bn in 2012. [1]</p> <p>Such growth will catapult Chinese sportswear brands into powerful or even dominant positions in the industry worldwide. [1]</p> <p>Nike and Adidas are likely to (each) make around \$1bn in sales in China this year. [1]</p> <p>Credit any two of these (or any other valid response)</p> <p>NB. Do <b>not</b> credit "People won't see the label". As this is reported <b>in</b> the article, not made <b>by</b> the article.</p>		<b>2</b>		
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Consider the claims made in paragraph 1 and the 'evidence' provided in paragraph 2.</b></p> <p><b>Suggest <u>one</u> implicit assumption that is needed for the 'evidence' to justify the claim.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p>For a clear, precise articulation of an implicit assumption [2]</p> <p>For an unclear / imprecise expression, eg. That over or under states the assumption [1]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the city is representative [1] (of wider trends in China) [1]</li> <li>• That the number of shops is enough to present a significant challenge / rival to the shops that sell western brands / Nike &amp; Adidas [2]</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that there are not many more shops selling western brands [2]</li> </ul>		<b>2</b>		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
<b>Questions 3 to 7 refer to Document B.</b>					
<b>3</b>	<p><b>Look closely at the dialogue below:</b></p> <p><b>KERRY asks NAZ:</b></p> <p><b>‘And where do you stand on the designer labels, like Armani, Hugo Boss, that kind of thing?’</b></p> <p><b>NAZ replies:</b></p> <p><b>‘As far as I’m concerned, as a so-called fashion statement it’s even worse. It’s still all about the brand name. It’s just a more expensive name. There’s no meaning or message: nothing artistic or creative about it. It’s all just about telling the world how much money you’ve got.’</b></p>				
<b>3(a)</b>	<p><b>Identify NAZ’s conclusion</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(1 marks)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As a so-called fashion statement it’s even worse. [1] (Credit any of the following bracketed additions to the above)</li> </ul> <p>(As far as I’m concerned,) as a so-called fashion statement it’s (designer labels are) even worse (than trainers / sportswear) [1]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If a candidate says “The first sentence”. Credit this [1]</li> <li>N.B. Don’t credit “It’s even worse”.</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>			

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
3(b)	<p>Identify <u>two</u> implicit assumptions that NAZ makes</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(4 marks)</b></p> <p>There are numerous assumptions candidates could select, some of the most obvious being:</p> <p>For a clear, precise articulation of an implicit assumption [2] For an unclear, imprecise expression, eg. That over or under states the assumption [1]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That being (all) about the brand name makes a bad fashion statement</li> <li>• That if something is expensive / if the brand name is important, then it cannot have meaning / a message / anything artistic / creative about it</li> <li>• That if something / the brand name is expensive, then it can only be about telling the world how much money you've got</li> <li>• That if there's no meaning or message / nothing artistic / creative then this makes a bad fashion statement</li> <li>• Telling the world how much money you've got, is not artistic / not creative / not a proper or valid message / meaning</li> <li>• The only kind of meaning or message that counts, is either an artistic or a creative one</li> <li>• That people don't buy brand names because they like them</li> <li>• That those labels are (always) expensive [1]</li> </ul>		4		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
4	<p><b>KERRY responds to NAZ's complaint about fashion and wealth as follows:</b></p> <p><b>You can't complain about that. Fashion's always been tied into wealth. Think of all those 18<sup>th</sup> century ladies and gentlemen showing off their latest garments from India or somewhere exotic; or the Victorian ladies with the enormous dresses made of expensive materials! It was all just a display of wealth.</b></p> <p><b>Explain two ways in which KERRY's comment might be considered flawed or weak.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(4 marks)</b></p> <p>The <b>Explanation</b> is the most important part of the answer, so candidates can be credited [2 marks] for just this, without naming the flaw.</p> <p>If all they do is name the flaw [credit 1 mark].</p> <p>If they <b>name and explain</b>, [still credit only 2 marks].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fact that fashion has 'always been tied into wealth' does not mean it should be. OR,</li> <li>• Just because something's been a tradition doesn't mean it's right. (NAZ is still entitled to complain about it.) [2] Name of flaw: "Appeal to history / tradition" [on its own, 1 mark].</li> <li>• Kerry uses an inadequate sample, a mere two examples – from the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and from the Victorian era – to support a massive generalization, 'Fashion's <b>always</b> been tied into wealth' [2] Name of flaw: "Hasty generalisation" [on its own, 1 mark].</li> <li>• Kerry's evidence is biased / selective / cherry picked, eg. Only cites ladies and gentlemen (no other class); only exotic origins / India, (no local products); only dresses that are enormous, (not small ones); only ones made of expensive materials, (not cheap ones). [credit 2 marks for reference to biased evidence plus any one or more of these examples] [credit 1 mark for mere mention of bias, selectiveness, or cherry picking, but no accompanying example]</li> <li>• Kerry begins by asserting that "Fashion's always been tied into wealth", but ends up supporting this assertion with the claim that, "It was all just a display of wealth". This is flawed because it tries to support a conclusion with the very same conclusion. But statements aren't self-supporting. [2]</li> <li>• Name of flaw: "Begging the question" or "Arguing in a circle" or "Circular argument" [on its own, 1 mark].</li> </ul>			4	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Dubious assumption that 18<sup>th</sup>C ladies only wore expensive dresses because of the price. (We don't know this. They may have just liked the look of them.)</li><li>• N.B. Don't credit: "Fashion may have moved on from 18<sup>th</sup>C to today so the comparison no longer works". In the context of a response to NAZ's complaint about today's fashion and wealth this is not a flaw.</li></ul>				



No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3												
5	<p>Consider the following section of the debate:</p> <p><b>NAZ</b> ...for your appearance to be interesting, I agree that it needs to have some sort of individual twist. Otherwise you're just following the crowd.</p> <p><b>KERRY</b> Isn't that exactly what fashion is?</p> <p><b>NAZ</b> No! Fashion should be about defining yourself <i>against</i></p> <p><b>NB. 'against' is not italicised in the source docs, but is italicised in the question paper.</b></p> <p><b>the crowd.</b> Or at least, it should be about saying, I'm part of this small crowd that is different from the rest of you.</p> <p><b>KERRY</b> It's still about being part of a crowd, though. So it's not a personal, individual expression.</p> <p><b>Who do you think gets the better of this part of the debate? NAZ, KERRY or neither?</b></p> <p><b>Explain your answer by commenting critically on the claims and / or arguments that either makes.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(6 marks)</b></p>																
	<p>Candidates' answers are to be assessed by the following performance grid:</p> <table><tr><th>Levels</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptors</th></tr><tr><td>Level 3</td><td>5 – 6</td><td>Judgement fairly supported by accurate and convincing critical comment on the relative strengths and weaknesses of the participant's reasoning.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 2</td><td>3 – 4</td><td>Judgement partly supported by critical comment that is occasionally effective / convincing.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 1</td><td>1 – 2</td><td>Judgement and critical comment largely asserted and / or relevance to the participants' reasoning is unclear.</td></tr></table>	Levels	Marks	Descriptors	Level 3	5 – 6	Judgement fairly supported by accurate and convincing critical comment on the relative strengths and weaknesses of the participant's reasoning.	Level 2	3 – 4	Judgement partly supported by critical comment that is occasionally effective / convincing.	Level 1	1 – 2	Judgement and critical comment largely asserted and / or relevance to the participants' reasoning is unclear.				
Levels	Marks	Descriptors															
Level 3	5 – 6	Judgement fairly supported by accurate and convincing critical comment on the relative strengths and weaknesses of the participant's reasoning.															
Level 2	3 – 4	Judgement partly supported by critical comment that is occasionally effective / convincing.															
Level 1	1 – 2	Judgement and critical comment largely asserted and / or relevance to the participants' reasoning is unclear.															

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>The following represent suitable lines of response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• NAZ’s contributions are largely claims / assertions rather than an argument and are largely matters of opinion.</li><li>• Candidates could question the assumption that Naz makes – that your appearance can’t be ‘interesting’ if you’re following the crowd; or that the crowd is (by definition / inherently) uninteresting.</li><li>• Candidates could question whether or not NAZ’s position – that fashion is not just about following the crowd, given what he says about it being part of a small crowd – is self-contradictory.</li><li>• Naz is guilty of two shifts in meaning (possible equivocation)<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i) From “following” the crowd, to “part of” the crowd</li><li>ii) From “crowd”, to “small crowd”</li></ul>Using terms loosely, or vaguely, weakens an argument.</li><li>• Alternatively, candidates could accept this as a fine yet important distinction, that is meaningfully and sufficiently clearly made. But they can’t just <b>say</b> this. They need to <b>argue</b> that Naz has done a good job. (This will be a tough call because Naz’s case looks a bit weak).</li><li>• As for KERRY, candidates could suggest that Kerry’s response, “It’s still being part of a crowd, though.” is effective because it does point to a potential weakness or confusion in NAZ’s line of reasoning; and does offer fairly good support for Naz’s (implied) claim that fashion <i>is</i> just ‘following the crowd.’</li><li>• However, Kerry, in assuming that if fashion involves being part of a crowd, it cannot involve a ‘personal, individual expression’, arguably is guilty of restricting the options, because a third possibility is that the group people choose could itself be seen as a personal individual expression.</li><li>• It is also acceptable to ask: are they both ‘right’ (does it just depend on what you mean by ‘the crowd’?)</li><li>• Naz is inconsistent in that he dismisses being part of the crowd, but values being interesting which implies you are concerned that others (the crowd) will react positively to you.</li><li>• <b>NB.</b> candidates should be credited for recognising that KERRY puts forward an argument / some reasoning, whereas NAZ’s position is largely asserted; however, this is not sufficient for judging that KERRY gets the better of the exchange / ‘wins’.</li><li>• <b>NB. DO NOT CREDIT</b> the following claims:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i) Since Naz says more than Kerry, Naz wins.</li><li>ii) Since Kerry speaks last, or gets the last word, Kerry wins.</li></ul></li></ul>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
6	<p><b>Consider the following exchange:</b></p> <p><b>NAZ</b>                So you're telling me that designer labels and big sports brands are not dictating what young people wear? Look at the clothes young people are wearing. And then look at the stuff you see being advertised on the television. The kids just buy into brands that have marketed themselves well to the young. Young people are no longer in control of street fashion; they are slaves to the marketing men.</p> <p><b>KERRY</b>            You're assuming that there is no meaning or message to any clothes that any young people wear. Either that's the case, or you just don't like people in trainers.</p>				
6(a)	<p><b>Briefly explain <u>two</u> ways in which KERRY's thinking might be considered flawed.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>4 marks)</b></p> <p>The explanation is the most important part of the answer so candidates can be credited [2 marks] for this even without naming the flaw.</p> <p>If all they do is name the flaw [credit 1 mark]</p> <p>If flaw is both named and explained [credit maximum 2 marks]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The first claim distorts / oversimplifies / misrepresents what NAZ is saying, making it easier to refute. NAZ is <i>not</i> assuming this [2] Name of flaw: "Straw Man" [on its own 1 mark].</li> <li>Kerry's second sentence unfairly rules out other (third) options open to Naz, eg. Thinking young people's clothes don't convey any message, but being ok with <b>some</b> kids in trainers / or trainers that are originally designed / or, has nothing against trainers in particular but merely any kind of standard uniform clothing. [2 marks for any mention that there are other (third) options].</li> </ul> <p>Name of flaw: "Restricting the options" or "Limiting the options" or "False dilemma" [on its own, 1 mark only].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Possible ad hominem with "you just don't like people in trainers" [1 mark only].</li> </ul>		4		

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3											
6(b)	<p><b>NAZ is arguing that what young people wear is controlled / dictated by the companies that advertise to them.</b></p> <p><b>How well does he support this viewpoint? Explain your answer.</b> <b>(6 marks)</b></p> <p>Candidates' answers are to be assessed by the following performance grid:</p> <table><tr><th>Levels</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptors</th></tr><tr><td>Level 3</td><td>5 – 6</td><td>Candidates support their viewpoint through a relevant and effective evaluation of the case Naz gives, making relevant and effective critical comments.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 2</td><td>3 – 4</td><td>Candidates offer a viewpoint which receives some effective support from an evaluation of the relevant material.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 1</td><td>1 – 2</td><td>Candidates make some effort to engage critically with the task and make at least one relevant critical comment.</td></tr></table> <p>Candidates are likely to judge that the support – for what are very strong claims / opinions – is a little bit thin / weak.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The main support / 'evidence' for this is when NAZ says: 'Look at the clothes young people are wearing. And then look at the stuff you see being advertised on the television.' Candidates could observe that Naz is making some causal assumptions here that could perhaps be questioned. Could be guilty of causal flaw called "Post hoc ergo propter hoc", or "Post hoc" for short. This involves getting the cause and effect the wrong way round. For example, the kids may be the driving force of fashion, with the fashion houses being slaves to the trends.</li><li>It could be that the kids' decisions about what they wear on the street are being reflected by the big corporations / what they advertise. (i.e. the kids could still be leading the fashion creatively, then it is being sold to the mainstream through the marketing etc).</li><li>There are various ways in which the situation has been over-simplified: while advertising / marketing may exert <i>an</i> influence over young people's choice of clothing, it may not be the <i>only</i> factor. Other factors may include (e.g. peers / bands / parents / movies) which may be equally important, and which may not be entirely controlled by the clothing companies themselves.</li></ul>	Levels	Marks	Descriptors	Level 3	5 – 6	Candidates support their viewpoint through a relevant and effective evaluation of the case Naz gives, making relevant and effective critical comments.	Level 2	3 – 4	Candidates offer a viewpoint which receives some effective support from an evaluation of the relevant material.	Level 1	1 – 2	Candidates make some effort to engage critically with the task and make at least one relevant critical comment.	1	5	
Levels	Marks	Descriptors														
Level 3	5 – 6	Candidates support their viewpoint through a relevant and effective evaluation of the case Naz gives, making relevant and effective critical comments.														
Level 2	3 – 4	Candidates offer a viewpoint which receives some effective support from an evaluation of the relevant material.														
Level 1	1 – 2	Candidates make some effort to engage critically with the task and make at least one relevant critical comment.														

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beyond the ‘evidence’, the rest is largely rhetoric, eg. “slaves to the marketing men” , or repeating the assertion in different ways which does not really give any further support – and arguably relies a little too much on persuasive language (e.g. rhetorical question).</li> <li>Evidence is very narrowly based: eg. <b>Personal</b> look, casual observations of TV, and the kids that happen to be around.</li> <li>However, candidates could argue that Naz perhaps has a case. While not concrete, and while presented vaguely, there is some evidence for a relationship between what’s worn and what is advertised and it is intuitive to believe that the causal connection goes the way NAZ assumes at least some of the time.</li> <li>Candidates could support this with reference to the general influence / pervasiveness of the media, and the idealisation of e.g. celebrity culture / sponsorship / endorsements / placements in movies.</li> <li>NB. Note, the question asks how well he (NAZ) supports this viewpoint. NOT, how well does the candidate support NAZ’s viewpoint; NAZ doesn’t use any of the arguments above, so <b><u>these responses can’t be credited higher than level 2.</u></b></li> </ul>				
7	<p><b>Consider NAZ’s final contribution to the debate:</b></p> <p><b>NAZ</b> But where has all the dynamism gone – all the shock of the new? OK there are variations between types and makes of trainers, but sportswear is basically a uniform now – it’s become the default setting for the look of the ‘youth’ – just in the same way that a suit and tie has become the default setting for the look of ‘smart’ or professional or grown up. Basically if you were wearing a pair of old skool Adidas trainers and a decent hoodie any time in the last 30 years you would have been accepted on the streets.</p> <p><b>Consider the analogy NAZ makes between the different types of clothing (‘sportswear’ and ‘suit and tie’).</b></p> <p><b>What is the analogy trying to show – and how successfully does it do this?</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(5 marks)</b></p>		2	3	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<p>Credit up to [2 marks] for explaining what the analogy is trying to show</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The analogy is trying to show that sportswear is 'basically a uniform now', or that it's a fixed look / 'default setting' [1]; also that it shows little or no variation / dynamism / 'shock of new' [1]</li> </ul> <p>Credit up to [3 marks] for evaluation of how successful it is.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To assess this analogy, candidates need to question, not how similar sportswear is to a suit and tie in terms of appearance / etc, but the extent to which they are both 'uniforms' and / or default settings, or exhibit dynamism / newness.</li> <li>Aren't jeans, (not sportswear), the default setting of youth? If so, there's no analogy at all!</li> <li>Candidates could argue that the analogy holds only up to a point: there are many more ways of appearing 'youthful' e.g. loads of piercings / skinny jeans / band t-shirts whereas there are comparatively few ways of looking smart.</li> <li>Candidates could also question the assumption that staying within some sort of form means that it must be undynamic / fixed – there is room for creativity / the 'new' within a form, e.g. massive wide ties, skinny ties, bright pink ties novelty / cartoon ties / loud suits; ditto variations in trainers. Also, the suit and tie can be worn for other reasons than to look 'smart'; it can be worn in a more artistic way eg. as part of a pop artist's image or may connote e.g. ruthlessness (mafia hit man!)</li> <li>The analogy omits female professionals, whose 'default setting' may be a dress, not a suit and tie.</li> <li>'smart'– casual, eg at parties, eating out, etc. may include many alternatives to suit and tie, so it's not a default setting.</li> <li>Analogy is quite good as a lot of people wear suits and ties without a second thought, as do those who wear trainers etc.</li> </ul>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
<b>Questions 8 to 11 refer to Document C.</b>					
<b>8</b>	<p><b>Identify the author's main conclusion</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p>When it comes to fashion and taste (– in anything, not just clothes –) people are far too obsessed with the idea of 'the new'. [2]</p> <p>NB the part in parenthesis is unnecessary, but the rest is required for [2]. Simply choosing 'people are far too obsessed with the idea of the new' [1]</p>		<b>2</b>		
<b>9</b>	<p><b>Explain a possible flaw in the reasoning in paragraph 2.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(3 marks)</b></p> <p>Award up to a maximum of [3] for a developed explanation, with or without the flaw being labelled.</p> <p>If flaw labelled but not explained [credit only 1 mark].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limits / restricts options / false dilemma: ('new' or 'original' are the options unfairly restricted) people either think something is good because it is new or original, but <b>it could be both</b>.</li> <li>Limits / restricts options / false dilemma. Being (new or original), OR deeper, eg beautiful, etc. This is wrong because something could be both new / original, <b>AND DEEPER</b> / beautiful.</li> <li>Unsupported assumption that being beautiful, speaking to us, affecting us emotionally, is 'deeper' than being new or original. This is also a vague claim. What does 'deeper' actually mean?</li> </ul>			<b>3</b>	

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3											
10	Give an analysis of the reasoning in paragraphs 3 and 4. <div>(8 marks)</div>		8													
	<p>Candidates' answers are to be assessed by the following performance grid:</p> <table><tr><th>Levels</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptors</th></tr><tr><td>Level 3</td><td>7 – 8</td><td>Recognising the main argument , the main reasons, the main conclusion, and the role of examples / evidence and counter-argument.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 2</td><td>4 – 6</td><td>Some understanding of the argument but more limited reasoning / examples / evidence counter-argument missed, or perhaps wrong conclusion identified.</td></tr><tr><td>Level 1</td><td>1 – 3</td><td>Limited sense of the argument and its structure. Only one or two aspects of the argument identified, eg. A reason, or conclusion, or architecture example.</td></tr></table> <p><b>NB</b> candidates do not need to provide an exhaustive list of analytical points, but the following are indicative of a good response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The main conclusion is the first sentence: This obsession with 'the new' spells creative disaster. [1]</li></ul> <p>Reasons:</p> <p>The main argument / reasons are given in the paragraph three: Credit [1 mark] for each reason identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>That being creative requires a sense of judgement, of taste</li><li>You need to know what you are trying to achieve.</li><li>You need a sense of what looks good.</li><li>In assuming that what is new must be good, people confuse what looks good with what simply looks new.</li></ul>	Levels	Marks	Descriptors	Level 3	7 – 8	Recognising the main argument , the main reasons, the main conclusion, and the role of examples / evidence and counter-argument.	Level 2	4 – 6	Some understanding of the argument but more limited reasoning / examples / evidence counter-argument missed, or perhaps wrong conclusion identified.	Level 1	1 – 3	Limited sense of the argument and its structure. Only one or two aspects of the argument identified, eg. A reason, or conclusion, or architecture example.			
Levels	Marks	Descriptors														
Level 3	7 – 8	Recognising the main argument , the main reasons, the main conclusion, and the role of examples / evidence and counter-argument.														
Level 2	4 – 6	Some understanding of the argument but more limited reasoning / examples / evidence counter-argument missed, or perhaps wrong conclusion identified.														
Level 1	1 – 3	Limited sense of the argument and its structure. Only one or two aspects of the argument identified, eg. A reason, or conclusion, or architecture example.														



No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The author then uses the example / analogy of architecture to show how this is true of any artistic enterprise. They imply by a rhetorical question that there are (a number of) buildings that clutter up our environment simply because some architect, in the pursuit of the new, forgot to consider his or her own sense of judgement, taste or proportion. (This is presumably deemed to be an example, or evidence, of people in artistic enterprises confusing what looks new with what looks good; and therefore spelling creative disaster). For recognising the role of evidence / example / attempt to generalise their position. [credit up to 2 marks].</li> </ul> <p>A potential counter-argument / objection is then considered:</p> <p>It's true that you can't be especially creative by just copying things that have been done before, and it's true that you sometimes need to be critical of current ideas in order to discover something better.</p> <p>And then dealt with:</p> <p>But people easily go too far. Being critical of the present is one thing; assuming that anything that is new or different must therefore be better is another. [credit up to 2 marks]</p>				

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
11	<p><b>Identify and explain a possible flaw, weakness or unfair technique in the reasoning in paragraph 4.</b></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(3 marks)</b></p> <p>Credit [1] for identifying a possible flaw, and up to [2] for the explanation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identification: Leading / persuasive language ‘clutter up our environment’, ‘some architect’. [1]</li> <li>• Explanation: ‘some’ is demeaning and biased. It, along with ‘clutter up’ is intended to play on our emotions rather than address our reason. [2]</li> <li>• Several unsupported claims, eg. ‘you need to know what you’re trying to achieve’; ‘you need a sense of what looks good’.</li> <li>• Hasty generalizations about people in general, eg. ‘people confuse what looks good with what simply looks new’; ‘people easily go too far’. What evidence is there for these claims?</li> <li>• Another hasty generalization: using the example of architecture to draw the inference that ‘the same is true of <b>any</b> artistic enterprise’.</li> </ul> <p>Straw man / exaggeration in last sentence unfairly makes opponents easier to refute: Hardly anyone thinks what the author assumes they think. (even if people think it’s a necessary condition, no one thinks it’s sufficient).</p>			3	

**Section B (see Generic Mark Scheme, page 16)**

No.	Question	AO:	1	2	3
12	<p><b>‘If you want to be an individual you cannot be a follower of fashion.’</b></p> <p><b>Write a reasoned argument for or against the above claim.</b></p> <p><b>In answering the question you should:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>state your conclusion (or conclusions) clearly</b></li> <li><b>offer effective reasoning to support your conclusion</b></li> <li><b>use the information, and respond to issues or arguments, in Documents A – C.</b></li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><b>(20 marks)</b></p> <p>The following are suggested lines of argument:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Against: no; it’s not what you wear it’s how you wear it; fashion is about following a trend in your own way</li> <li>For: yes; copying other people by definition not being individual (candidates could agree with / develop the comments / arguments by B in Document B)</li> <li>Both: unless you make your own clothes (that have an entirely original shape) you have to be following some sort of ‘fashion’ (could refer to comments by B near start of Document B)</li> <li>Both: what is meant by fashion? Etc. (Candidates could question the clarity and e.g. intensive range of the term)</li> <li>Both: ditto an ‘individual’</li> <li>For: deliberately avoiding fashion is itself a statement?</li> <li>For: <i>setting</i> not following fashion is a sign of individuality</li> <li>For: fashion is set by advertising / media / brands / endorsements</li> <li>Against: fashion is just an outer layer so you can be a ‘follower’ on the surface but your individuality is expressed elsewhere (via thinking / speech / attitudes / beliefs)</li> <li>Against: individuality is compatible with / constituted by group membership / rejections (i.e. choice of)</li> <li>Against: following, if a <i>choice</i>, is not a lack of individuality (reasons not outcomes define individuality)</li> <li>Against: individual does not mean unique; you can be one of a <i>type</i>; there are certain <i>types</i> of people...</li> <li>For: To be an individual is to take charge of one’s own life / to make one’s own decisions, whereas a follower does neither.</li> </ul>				20

**GENERIC MARKING GUIDE for Question 12**

<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Award Level</b>		
	<b>Good response</b>  Criteria well met. Communication is clear and appropriate.	<b>Reasonable response</b>  Criteria partially met. Communication is mostly clear and appropriate.	<b>Limited response</b>  Criteria barely met. Communication errors may impede understanding.
<b>Conclusion</b>  A conclusion is clearly stated that is consistent with the reasoning, and directly responds to the question.	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Reasons / Lines of Reasoning</b>  The above conclusion is well supported with reasons, contributory arguments, examples, clarification of terms. Counter-arguments considered and replied to.	<b>9 – 11</b>	<b>5 – 8</b>	<b>1 – 4</b>
<b>Use of source documents</b>  Candidate has engaged critically with source material.	<b>5 – 6</b>	<b>3 – 4</b>	<b>1 – 2</b>

**Distribution of marks across the questions and assessment objectives for Unit 1**

<b>AO Balance</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Total Section A</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>–</b>
<b>Total Section B</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>–</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Paper Total: [70] Marks</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Paper Total: [70] Percentage</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>29%</b>

**UMS conversion calculator** [www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion](http://www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion)