

Thinking and Reasoning Skills

OCR Level 2 Award in Thinking and Reasoning Skills **B902**

Unit 2 Thinking and Reasoning Skills Case Study

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

| Question | | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----|---|-----------|--|-----------|--|------------|--|----------------|--|-----|--|
| 1 | (a) | Underline the conclusion [1] – if anything else is underlined, no marks. <i>[So] we should do away with school meals [altogether].</i> | [1] | If one set of brackets is put round both reasons, then 2 marks should be credited. | | | | | | | | |
| | (b) | Circle one indicator word [1] – more than one circle, no marks. Accept 'So' or 'should' circled. | [1] | | | | | | | | | |
| | (c) | Put brackets around the two reasons [2] 1 mark each; if anything else is bracketed, zero. <i>([The] kids all prefer packed lunches). (It's a lot cheaper for everyone [anyway]).</i> | [2] | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | One mark for <u>Jamie Oliver's campaign really did work in those schools</u> If anything else is underlined, zero. | [1] | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | <table border="1"> <tbody> <tr> <td>Straw man</td> <td>√</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Tu quoque</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Ad hominem</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Slippery slope</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Straw man | √ | Tu quoque | | Ad hominem | | Slippery slope | | [1] | |
| Straw man | √ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tu quoque | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ad hominem | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Slippery slope | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | (a) | He writes for trade journals in the food industry/ paid adviser for a leading fast food chain. | [1] | | | | | | | | | |
| | (b) | He is a member of an association for the promotion of civil liberties. | [1] | Paraphrase must include civil liberties. | | | | | | | | |
| | (c) | He is a former school canteen manager/writes for trade journals in the food industry. | [1] | | | | | | | | | |
| | (d) | He is no longer a school canteen manager. | [1] | | | | | | | | | |

| Question | | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale | | |
|--------------|-----|---|--------------|--|-----|--|
| 5 | | <table border="1"> <tr> <td>police state</td> <td>√</td> </tr> </table> | police state | √ | [1] | |
| police state | √ | | | | | |
| 6 | (a) | <p>One mark for</p> <p>She is chair of the School Food Trust.</p> | [1] | Allow 'works for the School Food Trust' or similar. Reference to vested interest would not invalidate an otherwise correct answer. | | |
| | (b) | <p>One mark for stating that the increase in figures is too small [to be significant] or that the figures do not show this has happened throughout the length and breadth of the country.</p> | [1] | | | |
| 7 | (a) | <p>One mark for Analogy.</p> | [1] | | | |
| | (b) | <p>One mark for</p> <p>"Because it is using someone with greater expertise." "They are both trained to do their job." Credit any reasonable similarities.</p> | [1] | | | |
| | (c) | <p>One mark for</p> <p>Pipes don't have a mind of their own (whereas people do). Plumbers fix the pipes whereas nutritionists only advise. Fixing a leaky pipe is a short term problem, whereas changing eating habits would take longer. Pipes are inanimate, bodies are animate. Credit any reasonable differences.</p> | [1] | | | |

| Question | | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale |
|----------|-----|---|------|-----------|
| 8 | (a) | Credit one mark for any of the following, up to a maximum of 2 marks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • governments have the right to dictate to the public • government campaigns work • that anti-smoking campaigns work • that healthy eating campaigns work • we should reduce cost to the NHS • 10 years is long enough to bring about change • an analogy/comparison can be drawn between obesity and smoking • proper diet will reduce obesity • a public campaign will cost less than NHS spends on treating obesity. | [2] | |
| | (b) | | | |
| 9 | (a) | Credit one mark for mentioning that the comment quotes the highest figure which is not representative of all schools. Credit can also be given to an answer which points out that no schools achieved 6% rise at level 5 and above. | [1] | |
| | (b) | Credit one mark for information relating to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the quality of the cohort • take up of meals within the 5 schools • the quality of the teaching • part of an improving trend • trend in schools not participating in the scheme. | [1] | |
| 10 | (a) | Credit one mark for any answer related to the rising price of school meals. | [1] | |

| Question | | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale |
|----------|-----|---|------|---|
| | (b) | <p>Credit one mark for any reasonable alternative explanations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing nutritional habits • More children bringing packed lunches • Increasing number of allergies • Changing patterns of family mealtimes • Fewer children take up free school meals • Change in the quality of the food served • Decrease in the number of primary school children. <p>Answers which clearly relate to secondary schools <u>only</u> should not be credited (eg Allowing children off premises)</p> | [1] | Reference to any plausible change that could have caused the decrease should be credited. |
| 11 | (a) | Credit one mark for any option relating to a reduction in costs (including free meals). | [1] | |
| | (b) | <p>Credit one mark for any reasonable option such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improving quality of the food • Providing more choice • Provide healthier versions of popular foods • Banning packed lunches • Increasing the number of students qualifying for free school meals • Financial issues (not already used in (a)) such as discounts for larger families • Incentive cards • Cashless catering. | [1] | |

| Question | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale |
|----------|---|------|--|
| (c) | <p>One mark for a clear and relevant conclusion.</p> <p>One mark for a reason, two marks for developed reason (x2).</p> | [5] | <p>A developed reason might contain evidence or an example. Alternatively it might clarify how a more general reason can apply to this specific case.</p> <p>Award up to a maximum of 2 marks for an answer which presents the opposite conclusion, if this answer contains one or more developed reasons.</p> |
| 12 | <div data-bbox="456 437 1099 1031" data-label="Diagram"> </div> <p data-bbox="383 1062 1182 1126">Award one mark for each correctly placed number as shown above.</p> | [8] | |

| Question | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale |
|------------------------|---|-------------|--|
| 13 | <p>One mark for circling either ability to see, vested interest, expertise or bias.</p> <p>An additional mark for a partial explanation linked to the criterion.</p> <p>Two additional marks for a developed explanation linked to the criterion.</p> <p>Example:</p> <p>The credibility of Document 7 may be weakened by: reputation/ability to see/vested interest/expertise/bias because they are experts in fish so they don't have expertise in writing articles about school meals and parental action [3 marks]</p> <p>The credibility of Document 7 may be weakened by: reputation/ability to see/vested interest/expertise/bias because they are experts in fish [2 marks]</p> | [3] | <p>Developed explanations contain reasoning and will often contain indicator words like 'because', 'as', 'so' and 'if...then'.</p> <p>Partial explanations offer a reason but are incomplete and invite the response 'and so?'</p> |
| Section A Total | | [40] | |

| Question | | | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale |
|----------|-----|------|---|------|---|
| 14 | (a) | (i) | One mark for Y. | [1] | |
| | (a) | (ii) | One mark for X. | [1] | |
| | (b) | | One mark for 'The freedom to grow up fit and well educated is more important than the freedom of fast food firms to profit from our youngsters' bad eating habits.' Allow an accurate paraphrase of the above. | [1] | |
| | (c) | | One mark for clear conclusion. One mark for a reason, two marks for developed reason (x2). | [5] | A developed reason might contain evidence or an example. Alternatively it might clarify how a more general reason can apply to this specific case. Award up to a maximum of 2 marks for an answer which presents the opposite conclusion, if this answer contains one or more developed reasons. |

| Question | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale |
|----------|---|------|-----------|
| 15 | <p>Marks are to be allocated in accordance with the performance descriptors below.</p> <p>The content for the arguments may be borrowed from the documents or may be independent of those documents.</p> <p>Performance descriptions 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>Example: The argument for schools being allowed only to serve healthy meals is very strong. Despite the misleading way their figures are commented upon, the independent report on students' performance in five schools shows that exam results do improve with better nutrition. This is supported by most experts on the subject like the Schools Food Trust, based on research on pupils' behaviour and concentration. If we want to deal with the growing threat of over a third of the population becoming obese by the 2020s, policies like only serving healthy school meals are necessary alongside other policies. The advantages in terms of health and education mean that the state should provide free healthy school meals to all children up to 18. (10 marks)</p> | [10] | |

| Question | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale |
|----------|--|------|-----------|
| 15 | <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 • Grammar, spelling and punctuation are adequate. <p>Example. "There are many reasons why schools should only serve healthy meals. Experts do know better than ordinary people who are reduced to passing cheap junk through electrified school gates instead of giving them a proper packed lunch or encouraging them to eat proper food. The independent experiment in 5 schools shows that results improve so Jamie Oliver and the Head was right all along and the "Meat Pie Mum" was wrong." (5 marks)</p> <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 | Expected Answer | Mark | Rationale |
|----------|--|-------------|-----------|
| 15 | <p>Example: "Schools should only serve healthy meals. It helps them with their job of teaching children. The children will learn better. Jamie Oliver's view is that it is important for all school kids to have a nutritious hot and affordable meal at school every day. It will stop obesity overnight." (3 marks)</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy material</p> | | |
| 16 | <p>1 mark for an appropriate reason, such as:</p> <p>The rights of individuals (children/parents)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • many children do not like to be forced to eat certain things. <p>Practicality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it will reverse the fall in the number of children taking school meals. <p>Fairness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the problems of a minority should not be imposed on a majority. <p>1 mark for a supporting piece of evidence/example eg the problems of a minority eating unhealthily should not lead to a policy of only serving healthy meals being imposed on the majority – for example, it is still a minority of children who are obese.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(2 marks)</p> | [2] | |
| | Section B Total | [20] | |
| | Paper Total | [60] | |

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

© OCR 2011