

Critical Thinking

Advanced GCE

Unit **F504**: Critical Reasoning

Mark Scheme for June 2013

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, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2013

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Quality of reasoning / Questioning / Definition / Qualification of conclusion
	Thinking deeply/clearly. Insight complexity
	Judgement / Justification / Conclusion (can be used in all questions)
	Evaluation (especially question 4)
	Accurate / effective use of other argument elements (eg examples)
	Level 1
	Level 2
	Level 3
	Level 4
	Counter / countering (use in question 4-5)
	Response (to counter) (use in question 4-5)
	Not answering question
	Unclear / negated points / wrong / incorrect use of argument elements / incorrect use of terminology
	Additional/supplementary/blank page seen – this MUST be used

NB Examiners should use the above annotations to assist them in deciding their marks. They do not, however, have to use them to annotate every instance seen.

Marking Grid – Question 1

Level 4 (6 marks)	<p>Reasonable judgement about whether the document is an argument or not which is well supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> justified thinking about whether some or all parts of the reasoning (such as reasons, explanations, report, anecdote etc) give rationally persuasive support to a stated main conclusion or not, or, when appropriate, whether there might be an implied but unstated conclusion justified thinking about what types of reasoning, such as explanation, report or a short argument as part of the whole document, are present in the document. (If appropriate, a clear and correct indication of what that conclusion might be)
Level 3 (4 – 5 marks)	<p>Judgement about whether the document is an argument or not which is mostly supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> thinking about whether some or all parts of the reasoning (such as reasons, explanations, report, anecdote etc) give rationally persuasive support to a stated main conclusion or not some acceptable thinking about what types of reasoning, such as explanation or report, are present in the document. (If appropriate, a clear and reasonable indication of what that conclusion might be)
Level 2 (2 – 3 marks)	<p>Judgement about whether the document is an argument or not which is partly supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> simple thinking about whether some parts of the reasoning (such as reasons or anecdotes) give rationally persuasive support to a stated main conclusion or not simple thinking about what types of reasoning, such as background information, are present in the document. (If appropriate, a reasonable although possibly inaccurate indication of what that conclusion might be)
Level 1 (1 mark)	<p>If a judgement is present, it is likely to be arbitrary, unsupported or contradicted. It may be accompanied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> simplistic comments about whether some parts of the reasoning support a main conclusion or not simplistic comments about elements of argument, such as ‘it has reasons and a counter argument.’ an inaccurate and unreasonable indication of what that conclusion might be (even where this is inappropriate)
Level 0 (0 marks)	No creditworthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>This is not an argument because none of the parts gives any support to any of the other parts. It is, however, persuasive reasoning, expressing opinions and trying to persuade the reader to agree, largely by considering the meaning of protest (defining, clarifying terms). It could be seen as a response to the assumed counter-assertion that protest is an attack on democracy but it is not itself an argument. It is, however, following a train of thought and is not illogical.</p> <p>(It could be argued that ‘it’s a refusal to be part of the silent majority any more, gives a reason to support ‘it’s a demand for it [democracy]’).</p> <p>Level 4 It’s not an argument, there isn’t a conclusion supported by reasons, it’s giving his opinion about what protest is – definition of protest – and circumstances when we should protest, but he doesn’t support his opinion.</p> <p>Examples for Level 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It’s not an argument because there isn’t a conclusion. It’s just his opinions about protest. (+quotations). • It is not an argument despite having a conclusion (protest is[n’t] an attack on democracy). <i>Incorrect use of term C when candidate means ‘claim’.</i> <p>Examples for Level 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not an argument because it does not have a conclusion and/or reasons. • It’s an argument to support the conclusion that protest is necessary, supported by the reasons ‘protest isn’t an attack on democracy it’s a demand for it’ and ‘politicians are defying the will of the people.’ <p>Level 1 It’s an argument that protest is a good thing.</p>	6	<p>LOOK AT THE MARKING GRID</p> <p>Assign a level first.</p> <p>Reasonable judgement, supported by thoughts about support given to any one claim and about the kinds of reasoning present. Correct use of terminology.</p> <p>Reasonable judgement, partly supported.</p> <p>Judgement, not accurate, partly supported by inaccurate analysis.</p> <p>2 marks – limited reference to the text</p> <p>Unsupported judgement accompanied by vague gist.</p>

Marking grid – Question 2

Level 4 (6 marks)	<p>Reasonable judgement well supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • thoughtful justification making reference to key parts of the documents and what they imply, possibly with reference to limitations of inference from such information.
Level 3 (4 – 5 marks)	<p>Fairly reasonable judgement, possibly with some overstatement, mostly supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clear justification making reference to parts of the documents, with perhaps some (implicit) awareness of the limitations of inference from such information.
Level 2 (2 – 3 marks)	<p>Judgement, possibly overstated, partly supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • simple justification with reference to the documents (which may be either too general or too descriptive) with basic awareness of the limitations of inference from such information.
Level 1 (1 mark)	<p>If a judgement is made, it is likely to be unsupported, extreme and/or based on significant and possibly problematic assumptions OR tend to re-describe the evidence. Accompanied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unconvincing justification, possibly based on speculation and very vague or imprecise reference to the documents.
Level 0 (0 marks)	No creditworthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>We cannot be 100% certain that rioters bought batons and bats to use in the UK riots. It is possible that the increase in the sales of baseball bats was caused by an important baseball event, although it is more plausible that the riots were the cause. More significantly, we cannot be sure that the bats were bought by rioters rather than by people wanting to defend their homes. Online retailers would be a slow and unreliable way of getting a bat for a riot happening today or tomorrow which might indicate that the rise was caused by people who did not intend immediate participation in riots but wanted some longer term defence in response to the riots.</p> <p>Level 4 We can conclude that the sales of baseball bats rose extremely significantly, and that this is probably because of the UK riots. We don't want to confuse correlation and cause, but the riots are the most plausible explanation for people buying baseball bats. But we can't be sure whether people were intending to attack others or defend themselves. There is a big difference between bats which could be used for sport and batons.</p> <p>Level 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People bought baseball bats because of the riots. People were arming themselves for violence. You don't get a 7000% rise during a riot because people fancy trying a new sport. • You can't confuse correlation and cause so you can't conclude anything from these statistics except that sales of baseball bats rose. It might not have been because of the riots. <p>Level 2 People were planning to go looting and fighting so they bought baseball bats. You can tell this from the massive 7000% sales increases.</p> <p>Level 1 Lots of people bought baseball bats.</p>	6	<p>LOOK AT THE MARKING GRIDS</p> <p>Reasonable, caveats (correlation not causation), thoughtful justification of what the text implies and/or what could reasonably be inferred.</p> <p>Reasonable, slightly overstated, clear justification, some understanding of inference. Other plausible explanations, such as self-defence, police purchasing, bargain hunters. Effective discussion of the evidence, such as worldwide purchases or distortion of statistics due to low baseline.</p> <p>Some understanding of inference but overstated and applied with insufficient thought.</p> <p>Possible but overstated with limited awareness of inference.</p>

Marking Grid – Question 3

Level 4 (7 – 8 marks)	<p>Candidates demonstrate thorough understanding of argument structure, including some complexity by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accurately identifying the main conclusion • AND accurately identifying most elements of reasoning (including significant elements) using appropriate terminology • AND showing accurately how the main elements relate to each other, using words or a diagram. <p>Mistakes are rare and not serious.</p>
Level 3 (5 – 6 marks)	<p>Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of argument structure by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifying the main conclusion • AND identifying most significant elements of reasoning accurately using appropriate terminology • AND some accurate indications of how they relate to each other. <p>There may be mistakes, occasionally serious ones.</p>
Level 2 (3 – 4 marks)	<p>Candidates demonstrate basic understanding of argument structure by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifying the main conclusion and perhaps one other element accurately. <p>There are likely to be serious mistakes, and possibly some gist.</p>
Level 1 (1 – 2 marks)	<p>Candidates demonstrate limited understanding of argument structure by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inaccurately identifying most elements of argument • providing poor paraphrases or overall gist.
Level 0 (0 marks)	No creditworthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>Counter argument: Counter reason</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some people argue that the police are deliberately brutal to innocent citizens during protests and <p>Counter conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> that they therefore deliberately infringe our civil right to protest peacefully. <p>All of what follows is RCA:</p> <p>R1 However, the police believe they are protecting innocent citizens against troublemakers.</p> <p>Problem of police belief (syllogism / inductive reasoning) used as R2 to support IC: The problem is that the police believe that, ‘troublemakers at protests are all protesters, and there are always troublemakers at protests, so protesters are troublemakers.’</p> <p>(This can be broken down into the syllogism: R trouble makers at protests are all protesters R there are always troublemakers at protests C protesters are troublemakers)</p> <p>IC So the police are guilty of poor reasoning rather than brutality and</p> <p>MC (so) it is therefore unfair to claim that they deliberately infringe our civil right to protest peacefully</p>	8	<p>LOOK AT THE MARKING GRID</p> <p>Level 4 candidates will probably distinguish between the counter reason and the counter conclusion in the counter argument. They are also likely to notice the ‘problem of the police belief’ as a syllogism and/or inductive reasoning and/or its invalid nature.</p>

Marking Grid – Question 4

Level 4 (16 – 20 marks)	<p>Candidates come to a reasonable conclusion about whether the reasoning is stronger in document 3 or document 4 supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mostly well justified and perhaps occasionally insightful evaluation of key points in BOTH documents, which may show understanding that a single point could be a strength interpreted in one light yet a weakness interpreted in another light. • effective weighing up of which document argues more effectively overall, which might include direct comparison and/or consideration of how significant a strength or weakness is. <p>Inappropriate forms of evaluation may occur. The language is clear and mostly precise.</p>
Level 3 (11 – 15 marks)	<p>Candidates come to a conclusion (perhaps slightly too strongly stated) about whether the reasoning is stronger in document 3 or document 4, mostly supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • mostly relevant and mostly justified evaluative comments. • weighing up of which document argues more effectively overall, which perhaps lacks balance, but may attempt comparison or consideration of how significant a strength or weakness is. <p>Inappropriate forms of evaluation may occur. The language is mostly clear.</p>
Level 2 (6 – 10 marks)	<p>Candidates come to a conclusion which may be overstated / implied about whether the reasoning is stronger in document 3 or document 4, partly supported by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some basic evaluative comments with an attempt at justification, possibly phrased as counters. • some attempt to weigh up which document argues more effectively overall, perhaps by comparing two points of limited significance or using simple phrases such as ‘this weakens the argument.’ <p>The language is simple and may lack precision.</p>
Level 1 (1 – 5 marks)	<p>Candidates may come to a conclusion which does not follow from their reasoning or they may have reached no conclusion at all. This may be accompanied by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited comment about the reasoning with little or no explanation, possibly consisting of stock, pre-learned phrases which are not applied to this reasoning. • any weighing up is assertive and unconnected to other points and may be contradictory. <p>Answers may be descriptive or incoherent. The language does not always communicate candidates’ thinking.</p>
Level 0 (0 marks)	No creditworthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>Examples of evaluative points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both generally ignore the CAs rather than taking them into consideration and responding to them. (<i>w</i>) • Both use examples rather than reasoning (Notting Hill Carnival, TUs, Nelson Mandela, etc.) (<i>w</i>) • These use an appeal to history in both documents. • Both had expertise and ‘insider knowledge’ (<i>s</i>) • Neither document is illogical, but do rely on strong assertions, often without rational links. (<i>j</i>) <p>Andy Hayman Document 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of HR – the consequences may / may not plausibly follow from the conditions (<i>s/w</i>) • Para 2 – there is ambiguity in the terms ‘major protest’ and ‘serious disorder’ which means that this plausibility of this evidence can be questioned. (<i>w</i>) • Advocates tough, aggressive policing despite acknowledging criticisms (<i>s</i>) • Ignores criticisms based on human rights (<i>w</i>) • Assumes that suspects are guilty (<i>w</i>) • Assumes that it is acceptable to detain people before they have committed a crime (<i>w</i>) • Assumes that protesters generally should accept tough police measures even if innocent. (<i>w</i>) • The term ‘appropriate’ (para 4) is debateable, as it is not for the police alone to decide, must also take civil liberties and innocent people into consideration as well as effectiveness (<i>w</i>) • Restricting the options between kettling and charging by mounted police (and others), as there are other options / methods of crowd control. (<i>w</i>) • There is a contradiction between the unacceptable use of violence by the protestors (para 2) and the (implied) acceptability of the violent nature of police actions (paras 5-6). (<i>w</i>) 	20	<p>LOOK AT THE MARKING GRID</p> <p>Credit can be given whichever document candidates think is stronger, so long as the judgement is supported.</p> <p>Check that the candidate’s reasoning supports the conclusion they have come to.</p> <p>Counters couched as evaluative points may be characteristic of a Level 2 response.</p> <p>The mark scheme cannot cover every possible reasonable point or interpretation that candidates might make so this mark scheme is not an exhaustive list of creditworthy material.</p> <p>Candidates can gain credit for responses which include interpretations and ideas not explicitly made in the mark scheme if they seem reasonable and are argued well.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Uses Notting Hill Carnival to justify that the tough stance works but:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • two wrongs don't make a right / tu quoque (<i>w</i>) • generalisation from single instance(<i>w</i>) • correlation does not mean causation (<i>w</i>) • there are significant differences between carnival (not a right) and lawful protest (important right) (<i>w</i>) • the NHC is not actually a protest and so is not a relevant example of a tough stance of against protesters (<i>w</i>) • There is some merit in his argument that violent aspects of a protest should not be allowed to stop the peaceful protest. • Kettling may be effective at 'nipping it in the bud' but charging the crowd may not be used as a first action. <p>Tony Benn Document 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a clear line of argument or a single clear conclusion, but several strands of reasoning could be identified leading to a possible MC that 'protest is vital to thriving democracy'. • Benn wants to persuade us that protest is wrongly seen as fundamentally violent, that the police contribute to violence in demonstrations, that protest is historically of great value and that we will see more of it and that protest should be seen as an integral part of political action. Some of these points are supported, others only asserted, others shown by example, which may not always be relevant. • The examples of Nelson Mandela and Gandhi are extreme examples of peaceful protestors, whereas most protestors are not figureheads / icons. • Not all of the suffragettes were peaceful, (whereas the Suffragists were). (<i>counter / w</i>) 		<p>Candidates that note that NHC is not a protest and therefore may not be a relevant example of protest, may be characteristic of a Level 3/4 response.</p> <p>The ability to identify and/or distinguish between supported points, asserted points and evidence led claims may be characteristic of a Level 3/4 response.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He demonstrates successfully that protest can play a positive role in democracy and changing public opinion. However, he doesn't show that we should be positive about all protest or that all protest is equally important. (<i>s and w</i>) • He responds to an unstated counter that protests should not be allowed as it always involves violence and adequately proves that this is a gross over-simplification. (<i>s</i>) • He does demonstrate, through examples, that violence is not always inevitable, so does effectively dismiss the counter assertion in para 1. (<i>s</i>) • He does successfully illustrate (rather than argue for) how peaceful protest might become violent due to police action, and how such violence may be used to give a distorted view of protest. However, he does not give sufficient consideration to the angry, violent protesters and how to deal with them. (<i>s and w</i>) 		

Question 4 Levels Table

Level 4 (16 – 20 marks)	<p>Answers must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • answer the question which was asked with some precision and subtlety. • give generally strong support to their stated conclusion, using reasons and intermediate conclusions (although there may be some weaker parts to the argument). <p>Answers may include some of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accomplished argument structure using strands of reasoning. • questioning of key terms; this questioning if present informs the argument, possibly qualifying the conclusion. • subtle thinking about the issue/relevant own ideas or examples about the issue/thoughtful use of ideas from resource booklet. • anticipation of key counter-arguments and effective response to these. <p>The argument is written in clear, precise prose in language capable of dealing with complexity.</p>
Level 3 (11 – 15 marks)	<p>Answers must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • answer the question which was asked. • give support to their stated conclusion, using reasons and intermediate conclusions (although there may be some irrelevance or reliance on dubious assumptions). <p>Answers may include some of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clear argument structure, which may be simple and precise or attempt complexity with only some success. • an attempt to question or define terms and possibly an attempt to use this questioning or definition in the argument. • clear (if perhaps one dimensional) thinking about the issue/own ideas or examples about the issue/reasonable use of ideas from the resource booklet. • anticipation of relevant counter-arguments and some response to these. <p>The argument is written in prose in language which is clear and developing complexity.</p>

Level 2 (6 – 10 marks)	<p>Answers must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • answer the general thrust of the question which was asked, possibly in an overstated or vague way. • give some support to their stated / implied conclusion, using examples and reasons (although there may be considerable irrelevance and/or reliance on dubious assumptions). <p>Answers may include some of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • either clear, straightforward, possibly simplistic arguments, or a discourse at length with a focus on the ideas and content but only basic structure of reasoning. • an attempt to define some terms, but this definition is used ineffectively if at all. • some thinking/own ideas about the issue/inclusion of ideas from the resource booklet. • inclusion of a counter argument or counter reason but any response to this is ineffective, possibly merely dismissive. <p>The argument may be written as annotated bullet points rather than in coherent prose. The language may be either simple and clear or overly flowing, with little attention to meaning and precision.</p>
Level 1 (1 – 5 marks)	<p>Answers must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • attempt to answer the general thrust of the question, although there may be no stated conclusion. • attempt to support this answer, possibly using examples in place of reasoning (and there is likely to be considerable overstatement and reliance on very dubious assumptions). <p>Answers may include some of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • disjointed, incoherent reasoning with little structure, possibly a discourse or rant on the theme. • rhetorical questions and emotive language. • ‘reasons’ and ‘intermediate conclusions’ presented with no logical connection. • ideas which tend to be contradictory, asserted or derived largely from the stimulus material. <p>The argument may be written as annotated bullet points rather than in coherent prose. Language is used in a vague, imprecise way.</p>
Level 0 (0 marks)	No creditworthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p>Examples of lines of reasoning which may be raised</p> <p>Yes, violent protest is sometimes justifiable because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it sometimes works. • violence or semi-violence can get a cause noticed • It can end violence against the people or abuses of human rights and therefore be of ultimate benefit to many. For example, war as a form of violent protest against another country's actions, can be better than the alternative. (Utilitarianism) • It is justifiable as the alternatives may be much worse. • Although peaceful negotiations are better, they are not always effective. • Peaceful negotiations often exclude those who are affected. • Violence has a greater impact in the media. <p>No, violent protest cannot be justified because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it causes harm to people. • it harms the economy, which in turn harms people. • it can cause a cycle of destruction and harm people psychologically. • Violent protest feeds the selfish, looting groups in society • Ethics, such as Kantian ethics, Buddhist/Hindu ahimsa. • Violence can put people off a cause. • Gandhi – non-violent protest is more effective. 	20	<p>LOOK AT THE MARKING GRID</p> <p>Effective questioning / defining key terms such as violent, protest, justified, may be characteristic of a Level 3/4 response. In Level 4, this informs the argument, possibly qualifying the conclusion.</p> <p>Look for structured, reasoned argument rather than discourse.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Example of a Level 4 response In this argument the definition of ‘violent protest’ is that of a demonstration against a government in which significant damage is caused to property or people.</p> <p>Violent protests can be justified in some cases. For example, in a dictatorship, it can be assumed that the citizens do not have a forum to express their views. If it were ever to arise that peaceful protests were being met with hostility from government forces, then violent protest maybe justified because it is for the good of the people especially if a large number of people are affected and the matter is serious. In this situation, the people would be defending themselves against violent government forces and ensuring that they are listened to.</p> <p>However, in an advanced democratic society, violent protest cannot be justified in that, if there is not threat of violence towards peaceful protesters, then they should not use violence as a means of demonstrating..... (reasons then given: eg damage to property, human injury/fatality, turning public opinion against demonstrators)</p> <p>Therefore, only in rare cases when people’s liberties are at risk from an oppressive government, may violent protest be justified.</p> <p>Example of a Level 2 response Violent protesting almost inevitably leads to the cause that is being protest (hic) being weakened. If a protest turns violent then often the media, and therefore the general public, portrays the cause as being motivated by violence Therefore violent protest is wrong.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Peaceful protests often lead to better results. This is shown in cases such as Gandhi, Mandela and the civil rights movement in America. In all these cases peaceful protest worked.</p> <p>However it is important to address the word justified. While peaceful protest may bring better results this does not necessarily mean that violent protests are unjustified. When faced with police brutality some protesters may feel that violence is the only possible response. However protesters should try to rise above it.</p> <p>In light of all this I believe that violent protest is not ever justified.</p>		

APPENDIX 1

Candidates should be able to...		Qn 1	Qn 2	Qn 3	Qn 4	Qn 5
The Cambridge Assessment Definition of Critical Thinking quoted on p4 of the specification	The rational processes of critical thinking include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> analysing arguments judging the relevance and significance of information evaluating claims, inferences, arguments and explanations constructing clear and coherent arguments forming well-reasoned judgments and decisions. 	/	/	/	/	/
General demand	F504 offers a synoptic assessment. Unit F504 differs from previous units, and in particular, the AS units, by presenting a greater level of challenge, rather than by introducing new concepts and ideas.	/ (3.1.1 identify an argument, 3.2.1.3, 3.2.1.4)	/ (3.2.1 infer and inference, draw a conclusion)		/*	/
Depth of Study	Candidates will be asked to analyse the structure of a short argument (or significant part of an argument) in detail, identifying elements, and commenting on the structure using words and/or a diagram. Candidates are expected to be able to take an overview, identifying several issues, in an assessment of the strength (or weakness) of an entire argument. Candidates will be presented with a wide range of material based on articles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> found in newspapers, journals, books and magazines including diagrams, images and statistical data. 	/	/	/	/	/

Candidates should be able to....		Qn 1	Qn 2	Qn 3	Qn 4	Qn 5
	<p>Candidates will be expected to sift passages of argument from articles which, in themselves are not argument.</p> <p>Candidates will be expected to follow a train of reasoning, even though this may not be technically an argument.</p> <p>Candidates will be expected to analyse and evaluate a wider range of forms of reasoning than those encountered at AS.</p>	/			/	
		/			/	
		/	/		/	
3.4.1.1	<p>Analyse and describe the structure of complex arguments, or part arguments, identifying strands of reasoning. In addition to identifying elements of reasoning encountered in previous units, candidates should recognise, identify and describe:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumptions • Valid and invalid arguments • Syllogisms • Sustained suppositional reasoning • Sustained counter-argument • The relationship between the various components in the argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether reasons act independently or jointly in supporting an IC or MC • Smaller arguments, counter-arguments or explanations • Sections of text that are not part of the argument but have other functions such as scene setting, clarification, repetition, rhetorical statements or questions, etc. 	<p>/</p> <p>(understanding of relationships of support)</p> <p>/</p>	/	/	/	
		/		/	/	
		/		/	/	

Candidates should be able to....		Qn 1	Qn 2	Qn 3	Qn 4	Qn 5
3.4.1.2	<p>Candidates should be able to evaluate the strength or weakness of an argument, or part argument by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> identifying and explaining any flaws in the reasoning; identifying and explaining the use in the reasoning of rhetorical means of persuasion, such as appeals; identifying and explaining any weaknesses in the way that evidence is presented or used in the reasoning; identifying any explanations and offering alternatives; identifying and assessing any assumptions needed by the argument; evaluating the impact of the use of analogy on the strength (or weakness) of the reasoning; suggesting alternative conclusions that could be drawn from the reasoning presented; evaluating and commenting on weakness or strength in an argument, such as reasons which give strong relevant support to a conclusion, or evidence which comes from a reliable/credible source and is relevantly used. 	/			/	
3.4.1.3	Candidates should demonstrate an understanding that a complex argument may have both strengths and weaknesses within it and be able to make a holistic evaluation of the reasoning.				/	
3.4.2	Candidates should be able to form their own cogent arguments in response to source material. They should demonstrate the ability to select and use components of reasoning (including sustained response to counter-argument), and synthesise them, to create perceptive, complex, structured arguments.					/

*Note re 'Whose reasoning is stronger?' Qn3. Candidates are required to be able to compare and contrast (credibility) in F501. This is an extension of that skill beyond credibility. Candidates are required to make judgements in F501 and F503 between different scenarios or choices, informed to some extent by considerations of the quality of the source material and reasoning. The judgement formation between extended passages of reasoning is an application of these skills in a synoptic, challenging context. Candidates are expected to 'make a holistic evaluation' of the reasoning in F504. This question is a comparison of holistic evaluations of reasoning leading to a judgement. P4 spec 'form judgements.'

Assessment Objectives [AOs] and Allocation of Marks

The total mark for the paper is 60, allocated as follows:

- AO1 Analyse argument 20 marks
- AO2 Evaluate argument 20 marks
- AO3 Develop own arguments 20 marks

This weighting is reflected in the different types of questions asked and in the application of the mark scheme.

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
1	6			6
2	4	2		6
3	8			8
4	2	16	2	20
5		2	18	20
Total	20	20	20	60

'NB In Critical Thinking the three assessment objectives are inter-dependent. It is not, therefore, feasible to assess them entirely discretely. Accordingly, the weightings indicated are approximate.' Specification p24

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 2013

