

Thinking and Reasoning Skills

OCR Level 2 Award

Unit **B902**: Thinking and Reasoning Skills Case Study

Mark Scheme for January 2012

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates 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 2012

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

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Correct point
	Incorrect point
	Benefit of the doubt
	No benefit of doubt given
	Omission mark
	Unclear
	Not answered question
	Irrelevant, a significant amount of material that does not answer the question
	Level one
	Level two
	Level three
	Level four

Subject-specific Marking Instructions

Use of the Mark Scheme

- 1.1 Marking must be positive. Marks must not be deducted for inaccurate or irrelevant answers. Half-marks must not be used.
- 1.2 The full range of marks should be used. Do not be afraid to award full marks or no marks. Failure to do this will seriously affect the distribution of marks.
- 1.3 Be consistent from script to script and from batch to batch.
- 1.4 It is not possible to cover every possible type of response within a levels of response mark scheme and examiners are expected to use their professional judgement at all times in ensuring that responses are placed in the correct levels and given an appropriate mark within that level.
- 1.5 If a candidate reaches a particular level s/he must be rewarded with a mark within that level. It is not necessary to work through the levels.
- 1.6 Where a band of marks is indicated for a level these marks should be used with reference to the development of the answer within that level. Decide the appropriate level first and then mark within that level.
- 1.7 The mark scheme primarily aims to reward the demonstration of the skills. **Where examples are given these are not prescriptive but intended as a guide.** If in doubt refer to your team leader.

Crossed out and duplicated answers

Crossed out answers

- where a candidate crosses out an answer and provides an alternative response the crossed out response is not marked and gains no marks
- where a candidate crosses out an answer to a whole question, but makes no second attempt and the inclusion of the answer would not cause a rubric infringement, the assessor should attempt to mark the crossed out response and award marks appropriately.

Duplicated answers

- normally all responses are marked and the highest mark given
- where alternate answers are provided to a multiple choice question, no mark should be awarded (for example: following a request to tick one box, the candidate ticks two or more boxes)
- where the candidate provides contradictory responses, no mark should be awarded (for example: the candidate writes a statement such as 'water freezes at 0C and this means it is a liquid at -10C). The candidate, here, does not seem to understand the context of the 'question.
- where the candidate has adopted a 'scattergun' approach by providing multiple answers to a single response question, no mark should be awarded.

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	1 Mark for underlining “I believe that it’s wrong to download songs”.	1	The mark is to be awarded if “I believe that” is omitted. No credit can be given if other argument components are also included in either answer. Either of the two uses of the word because are acceptable. If more than one word is circled then no marks will be awarded, unless the two words concerned are ‘because’.
		1 Mark for circling “because”.	1	
	(b)	1 Mark for circling “Counter Argument”.	1	No other answer is acceptable.
	(c)	1 Mark for “Although”.	1	No credit can be given if other argument components are also included. If the candidate answers ‘reason’ to 1(b) then the answer ‘because’ here should be awarded with the mark.
2		1 Mark for “Straw Man”.	1	Accept any answer which contains the idea of misrepresenting an argument; this can either be related directly to the argument that Mary uses or can be a more general explanation of a straw man flaw.
		1 Mark for explaining that Mary misrepresents the talent show winner’s argument by suggesting that fining downloaders will ‘take all their money away’.	1	
3	(a)	1 Mark for “Andrew Robinson”.	1	A partial explanation will only contain reference to the votes won by Andrew Robinson <u>or</u> to the information in the graph. A developed explanation will include some information taken from the table (eg Andrew getting 190 votes) <u>and</u> relate this to the graph.
		1 Mark for a partial or vague explanation eg “None of the bars show 190 votes”. “There’s only one bar between 150 and 200” 2 Marks for a developed explanation which uses evidence from the graph for support. eg “There is only one bar which shows a vote between 150 and 200 and this is clearly not showing the 190 votes which Andrew Robinson received.” “None of the bars show 190 votes, which is what Andrew got”	2	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
	(b) (i)	<p>1 Mark for a partial or vague explanation “The Pirate Party candidates all won less than 1% of the vote in their constituency.” “The Pirate Party didn’t win ‘thousands’ of votes.”</p> <p>2 Marks for a developed and full explanation “The Pirate Party candidates all won less than 1% of the vote in their constituency, so this shows that very few people actually supported their ideas that the Act was wrong.” “The Pirate Party only won just over a thousand votes, not the ‘thousands’ that Beth claims.”</p>	2	<p>Developed explanations contain reasoning and will often contain indicator words like “because”, “as”, “so”, “if ...then”, etc.</p> <p>Partial explanations offer a reason but are incomplete and invite the response “And so?”</p> <p>For two marks candidates must produce an explanation which clearly makes use of evidence drawn from document 5 which challenges at least one aspect of Beth Bennett’s claim. These can include either the claim that there are ‘thousands of activists’ or that the Pirate Party is ‘taking votes away from those who voted for this Act’.</p> <p>Answers which focus on different ways in which the evidence could be presented are not to be credited.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b) (ii)	<p>1 Mark for a partial or vague explanation “The Pirate Party candidates got hundreds of votes in the General Election.” “The total votes won was over a thousand”</p> <p>2 Marks for a developed and full explanation “The Pirate Party candidates got hundreds of votes in the General Election, so this shows that lots of people supported their ideas that the Act was wrong.” “The party got some votes everywhere. This shows that they took votes away from other parties.”</p>	2	<p>Developed explanations contain reasoning and will often contain indicator words like “because”, “as”, “so”, “if ...then”, etc. Partial explanations offer a reason but are incomplete and invite the response “And so?”</p> <p>For two marks candidates must produce an explanation which clearly makes use of evidence drawn from document 5 which supports at least one aspect of Beth Bennett’s claim.</p> <p>Answers which focus on different ways in which the evidence could be presented are not to be credited.</p>
(c)	<p>1 Mark each for any piece of information which seeks additional information that would enable you to assess the impact of the Pirate Party candidates. eg ‘Who the other candidates were in the constituency’ ‘How the Pirate Party did in the last election’ ‘If there were any candidates who were campaigning <u>for</u> the Act’ ‘Whether the Pirate Party got a lot of publicity’.</p> <p>1 Mark for each partial or vague explanation ‘The Pirate Party might have won more votes than them.’ (third example above) ‘More people would have heard of the Pirate Party.’ (fourth example above).</p> <p>2 Marks for each developed and full explanation ‘If the Pirate Party candidate won more votes than them, this would show that the Party succeeded.’ ‘If the Pirate Party got more votes than last time then they will have been successful.’</p>	6	<p>Developed explanations contain reasoning and will often contain indicator words like “because”, “as”, “so”, “if ...then”, etc. Partial explanations offer a reason but are incomplete and invite the response “And so?” Credit can be given for the explanation, even if no mark is awarded for the additional piece of information. Answers which refer to needing information about the total number of votes cast or the percentage of votes won by the Pirate Party are not to be credited as this information is available in the original document.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>Examples of explanations could include: 'Beth Bennett – Bias weakens her credibility because she is an active supporter of the Pirate Party, which opposes the Act.' 'Chris Carter – Reputation weakens his credibility because he has just been found guilty for lying about internet service providers.' 'Daisy Donnelly – Expertise strengthens her credibility because she is well known for supporting both famous musicians and those just starting.' 1 Mark for a relevant explanation. 1 Mark for identifying whether the criterion selected is appropriate and strengthens or weakens the person's credibility.</p>	6	<p>In theory, any of the credibility criteria can be applied to any of the people quoted. The marks are to be awarded for the quality of the explanation, not for the selection of the credibility criteria themselves. Where a candidate has used the same criterion more than once, credit only the best example using this criterion.</p> <p>Only one mark should be awarded for an answer which identifies a correct credibility criterion and provides an explanation which is not in context – eg a generic answer such as "she's biased (weakens) because she is favouring one side without facts."</p>
5	<p>1 Mark for circling 'Beth Bennett'. 1 Mark for an explanation which supports this choice Examples of explanations could include: 'She is the only one who opposes the Act.' 'They both think copyright law should be changed.' 'She thinks the Digital Economy Act is "an utter disgrace".'</p>	2	<p>Credit candidates who make valid points relating to John and Beth holding similar views.</p>
6	(a)	1	
	(b)	2	<p>Developed explanations contain reasoning and will often contain indicator words like "because", "as", "so", "if ...then", etc. Partial explanations offer a reason but are incomplete and invite the response "And so?"</p> <p>For both marks to be awarded candidates must refer to the views of both Anna and the Pirate Party.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
7	(a)	<p>Credit a mark for any reasonable similarity between the two parts of the analogy.</p> <p>“Copying music and following a recipe are both using somebody else’s work for your own needs.”</p> <p>“Both items are borrowed.”</p> <p>“Both items are copied.”</p>	1	
	(b)	<p>Credit a mark for any reasonable difference between the two parts of the analogy.</p> <p>“Breaking copyright law is illegal, whereas using a recipe from a cookbook isn’t.”</p> <p>“Copying a CD doesn’t need extra materials, making a cake does.”</p>	1	
	(c)	<p>Either ‘Strong’ or ‘Weak’ can be circled here, the marks should be awarded for the explanation, which must match the response circled.</p> <p>1 Mark for an explanation which is based largely on ‘weighing’ the similarities or differences or which focuses on the significance of, or develops a similarity or difference already identified in 7a or 7b.</p> <p>2 Marks for an explanation which goes beyond the weight or the significance of differences/similarities and considers the relevance of this to the argument that copying a CD should not be illegal.</p> <p>“The analogy is weak because the differences outweigh the similarities” (1 mark)</p> <p>“The analogy is strong because the similarity between both items being borrowed is more important than the differences.” (1 mark)</p> <p>“The analogy is weak because the difference between creating a cake and copying a piece of music to a CD fails to support the argument that copying music should be free.” (2 marks)</p>	2	<p>If ‘Strong’ or ‘Weak’ are circled but no explanation is given, no marks can be awarded.</p> <p>If neither word is circled, but the explanation makes it clear which is intended then two marks can still be awarded if the explanation is developed.</p> <p>If a candidate simply identifies or repeats a similarity/difference then no mark should be awarded.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p>“The analogy is strong because the argument that copying music should be free is supported by the significance of the similarity between these two ideas.” (2 marks)</p>		
8	(a)	<p>1 Mark for a counter claim which opposes the claim being made. eg ‘The UK legislation is not a decisive step towards dealing with illegal distribution.’</p> <p>A second mark to be awarded if a reason is added which supports the counter claim. eg ‘The UK legislation is not a decisive step towards dealing with illegal distribution’ because it won’t work.’</p> <p>A third mark if the reason is developed. eg ‘The UK legislation is not a decisive step towards dealing with illegal distribution’ because it won’t work. As document 2 says <i>“More persistent file-sharers are already beginning to use software which hides their internet address.”</i></p>	3	If reasons are developed to counter the claim, but no counter claim or counter conclusion is included then a maximum of 2 marks can be awarded if the reason is developed.
	(b)	<p>1 Mark for a counter claim which opposes the claim being made. eg ‘Illegal copying of the material doesn’t limit the creativity of content.’</p> <p>A second mark to be awarded if a reason is added which supports the counter claim. eg ‘Illegal copying doesn’t limit the creativity of content because bands will still make music.’</p> <p>A third mark if the reason is developed. eg ‘Illegal copying doesn’t limit the creativity of content because bands will still make music and the internet actually allows more people to hear it.’</p>	3	If reasons are developed to counter the claim, but no counter claim or counter conclusion is included then a maximum of 2 marks can be awarded if the reason is developed.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
9	<p>Credit one mark for each precise claim which could be used to support the argument that the Act is a bad idea. Answers must be drawn from Document 2 and can be direct quotes, paraphrases or inferences.</p> <p>No mark should be awarded for imprecise or vague generalities.</p> <p>Examples of claims which could be awarded a mark are:</p> <p>'There are also concerns about how the file-sharing measures could affect public wi-fi services, such as universities and libraries.'</p> <p>'The legislation has only been brought in to appease big business, whilst penalising individuals.'</p> <p>'The legislation won't work and will only drive illegal file-sharing underground.'</p> <p>'Innocent people could be caught out by the legislation if their net connections are hijacked by pirates.'</p> <p>'Plans to block websites could result in legal content also being blocked.'</p> <p>'More persistent file-sharers are already beginning to use software which hides their internet address.'</p> <p>'Innocent people could be caught out by the legislation if they share their internet connection with an illegal downloader.'</p> <p>'It is difficult to measure how much illegal file sharing is going on.'</p> <p>'The difficulty is that the problem is a moving target.'</p> <p>'The music industry is targeting the soft underbelly of file sharing.'</p> <p>'Campaign groups contest these figures.'</p> <p>'The music industry has been slow to adapt to the internet age.'</p>	4	Any of the examples given can be paraphrased and the mark should still be awarded.

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance	
				Content	Levels of response
10		<p>'The Digital Economy Act is a disgraceful law which needs to be got rid of immediately. It has only been passed to put more money in the pockets of already rich record producers like the ones Alan Arnold represents. People should be allowed to share files freely. This will give free advertising to exciting new bands and allow them to become better known. For example, if I buy a new CD and lend it to my friend then she should be able to put it on her iPod. The Act is another example of <i>Big Brother</i> watching what we are doing and stopping free speech. We should be allowed to use the internet freely without being watched all the time. This Act should go! [10 marks]</p> <p>'The Digital Economy Act is bad. Why should people have their internet connection cut off just because they copy a few songs from a website? Also, young children might get their parents cut off without understanding what they're doing is wrong. The Act won't work anyway because people will find a way not to be caught, like hiding their name when they go on the net.' [6 marks]</p>	10	<p>Expect better answers to make use of Document 4 and Beth Bennett's response in Document 3 to provide a focus on the views of the Pirate Party, but this should not be a requirement for level 3.</p> <p>The key to reaching the top of level 3 should be the quality of the reasoning against the Digital Economy Act, so effective argument in support of claims identified in question 9 should be rewarded fully, even though they may not exactly match the platform of the Pirate Party.</p>	<p>Performance description for 7 to 10 marks: Level 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion is precisely stated • Reasons are provided for the conclusion, which are persuasive, cogent and fully developed • The structure of the reasoning is clear and explicit and places minimal reliance on assumptions • Evidence and examples are provided which are both relevant and clearly strengthen the reasoning • Grammar, spelling and punctuation are good. <p>Performance description for 4 to 6 marks: Level 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion is clearly stated • Reasons are provided for the conclusion, which are plausible and relevant • The structure of the reasoning is not fully explicit and does rely on some assumptions • Evidence and examples are provided which are relevant but are open to challenge

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance	
					Content	Levels of response
			<p>'They should change the law. I think people should be able to copy whatever they like from the internet. My friends and me do it all the time and we wouldn't have anything to play on our iPods if we didn't. It shouldn't be illegal cos we're only young and can't afford to pay for it.'</p> <p>[3 marks]</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grammar, spelling and punctuation are adequate. <p>Performance description for 1 to 3 marks: Level 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion is imprecise and unclear • Reasons are undeveloped and only provide weak support for their conclusion • Structure is either absent or minimal or unclear • Evidence and examples are poorly developed or explained and are open to obvious counter examples and objections • Grammar, spelling and punctuation may be inadequate.

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
11	(a)	Award one mark for any suggested punishment which is an alternative to disconnection or blocking the internet. Examples of acceptable suggestions could be: 'A fine' 'Confiscation of the computer used for the downloads'. 'A police caution' 'Community service.' 'Repaying the companies for the downloads.'	1	The alternative must be different from both the suggestions given in the question stem. So anything about blocking or filtering websites cannot be credited. Preventative measures such as monitoring use, prosecuting or warning letters are not punishments, so cannot be credited.

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance	
				Content	Levels of response
	(b)	<p>'Many people download music illegally because it is free to do so. If they were punished by a fine then this might stop them from doing it because it would be cheaper to pay for the downloads than to risk the fine. So a fine would be a suitable punishment for people who repeatedly download music illegally.' [5 marks]</p> <p>'The computer should be confiscated because then they couldn't download anymore. They also couldn't share files with their friends.' [3 marks]</p> <p>'A fine will stop them'. [1 mark]</p>	5	<p>The distinction between level 2 and level 3 should depend on the development of the reasoning rather than the number of reasons given to support the suggestion. The mark within the level can be determined by the number of reasons given.</p> <p>Credit must be given here for the reasoning in support of their suggested punishment, regardless of whether the suggestion was credited in 11(a).</p> <p>Within level 2 a number of reasons may be stated, but not developed.</p>	<p>Performance description for 4 to 5 marks: Level 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conclusion is precisely stated At least one reason is provided for the conclusion, which is persuasive, cogent and fully developed The structure of the reasoning is clear and explicit and places minimal reliance on assumptions Grammar, spelling and punctuation are good. <p>Performance description for 2 to 3 marks: Level 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conclusion is clearly stated Reason(s) are provided for the conclusion, which are plausible and relevant, but are not developed The structure of the reasoning is not fully explicit and does rely on some assumptions Grammar, spelling and punctuation are adequate. <p>Performance description for 1 mark: Level 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conclusion is imprecise and unclear

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance	
					Content	Levels of response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reason is given but it is vague and imprecise • Structure is either absent or minimal or unclear • Grammar, spelling and punctuation may be inadequate.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

© OCR 2012

