

Thinking and Reasoning Skills

OCR Level 2 Award

Unit 1 **B901**: Thinking and Reasoning Skills

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

Subject-specific Marking Instructions

- 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 Responses

Where a candidate has crossed out a response and provided a clear alternative then the crossed out response is not marked. Where no alternative response has been provided, examiners may give candidates the benefit of the doubt and mark the crossed out response where legible.

Short Answer Questions (requiring only a list by way of a response, usually worth only **one mark per response**)

Where candidates are required to provide a set number of short answer responses then only the set number of responses should be marked. The response space should be marked from left to right on each line and then line by line until the required number of responses have been considered. The remaining responses should not then be marked. Examiners will have to apply judgement as to whether a 'second response' on a line is a development of the 'first response', rather than a separate, discrete response. *(The underlying assumption is that the candidate is attempting to hedge their bets and therefore getting undue benefit rather than engaging with the question and giving the most relevant/correct responses.)*

Short Answer Questions (requiring a more developed response, worth **two or more marks**)

If the candidates are required to provide a description of, say, three items or factors and four items or factors are provided, then mark on a similar basis – that is downwards (as it is unlikely in this situation that a candidate will provide more than one response in each section of the response space.)

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>1 mark for underlining “you will be put in detention.”</p> <p>1 mark for placing brackets around “you deserve to be punished”.</p> <p>1 mark for circling “so”.</p> <p>1 mark for circling “therefore”.</p>	4	<p>The mark is to be awarded to candidates who underline the indicator word as part of the main conclusion.</p> <p>Similarly the mark is to be awarded to candidates who include the indicator word within the brackets which contain the intermediate conclusion.</p>
	(b)	<p>1 mark for identifying that there are 2 reasons.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying that only one reason immediately supports the intermediate conclusion.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying that one reason is joined to the intermediate conclusion and together they support the main conclusion.</p>	3	<p>Map should look like this:</p> <div style="text-align: center;"> <pre> R1 ↓ IC + R2 ↓ C </pre> </div> <p>The reasons do not have to be numbered provided 2 reasons are identified. Accept MC for main conclusion. Alternatively allow C1 for IC and C2 for main conclusion.</p>
2	(a)	1 mark for either identifying that it is claim B or for writing out the claim that Paris is a beautiful city.	1	
	(b)	<p>1 mark for either pointing out that all the others are facts or for explaining this is just opinion because cannot be proven.</p> <p>Example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The others are all facts” (1 mark). • “It is an opinion because there is no evidence for it/no proof” (1 mark). • Known for certain (1 mark) • Not in dispute/everyone agrees or accepts it (1 mark) 	1	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>1 mark for identifying that this is an appeal. 1 mark for identifying that there is emotive reasoning. 1 mark for explaining that this is irrelevant to countering the argument.</p> <p>Example</p> <p>“This is an appeal (1 mark) to emotion (2nd mark) and this has nothing to do with the argument” (3rd mark).</p>	3	<p>Each mark is awarded independently</p> <p>The second mark is awarded for identifying that there is emotive reasoning. Look for words such as “emotion”, “pity”, “sympathy” or “guilt”.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)	<p>1 mark for any option which satisfies the key criteria in the question of saving money and being implementable without necessarily leading to poorer educational outcomes.</p> <p>Examples</p> <p>“Turn the heating down” (1 mark) “Reduce teacher pay” (1 mark) “Larger schools” (1 mark) “Cheaper school dinners” (1 mark) “Students buy their own textbooks” (1 mark) “Abolish sport or other extra-curricular activities” (1 mark) “Reduce heating” (1 mark) “Stop buying interactive whiteboards” (1 mark) “Cut down on school trips” (1 mark) “Teach fewer subjects” (1 mark) “Schools raise money through fundraising activities” (1 mark) “Cut down on non-teaching staff” (1 mark) “Only teach core subjects” (1 mark) “Merge smaller schools” (1 mark) “Remove non-essential buildings that are not used for teaching.” (1 mark)</p>	2	<p>Proposals for raising money are accepted (because if extra money is raised, it effectively means that the original budget is saved).</p> <p>The proposal should relate to spending on schools generally rather than the budget of one individual school.</p>
(b)	<p>1 mark for explaining how it will save money.</p> <p>1 mark for explaining how it will not damage education.</p> <p>Example:</p> <p>“If you reduce teacher pay a little bit this will not put teachers off teaching because they won’t notice it much but will add up to a huge saving across the country” (2 marks).</p>	2	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
5		1 mark for circling "18 cows".	1	
6		1 mark for identifying Bill is 11 years old and Ben is 7 years old.	1	
7	(a)	1 mark for Y.	1	
	(b)	1 mark for Z.	1	
	(c)	1 mark for X.	1	
8		1 mark for Physics. 1 mark for Economics. 1 mark for German. 1 mark for History.	4	
9		The person who came first was AHMED and it took them 3 hours 45 minutes to complete the race. (1 mark) The person who came second was RACHEL and it took them 5 hours to complete the race. (1 mark) The person who came third was SHANNON and it took them 6 hours to complete the race. (1 mark) The person who came fourth was JOS and it took them 7 hours to complete the race. (1 mark) The person who came fifth was TERRY and it took them 8 hours to complete the race. (1 mark)	5	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
10	<p>1 mark for identifying any weakness in the reasoning.</p> <p>2nd mark for explaining it.</p> <p>Up to 4 marks for two separate weaknesses explained.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>“He assumes everyone will give £5 like him” (1 mark).</p> <p>“He assumes all will give £5 like him and the other councillors. But this is unlikely as most people in parish are “poor” (2 marks).</p>	4	<p>Possible points of weakness include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overestimates the number of regular attendees at 100 but told “up to 80”. • Overestimates the amount average parishioner will give using the 5 councillors as the norm when they will be atypical being professional and outside area where most are poor and elderly (retired). • Assumes the amount of money or church attendance given has not changed over the 10 years.
11	<p>1 mark for identifying an alternative explanation.</p> <p>2nd mark for explaining the idea.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>“The money could have been spent” (1 mark).</p> <p>“The money was spent on repairs to the church” (2 marks).</p>	2	<p>Possible alternative explanations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The money could have been spent honestly as there will be legitimate expenditure over the 10 years especially as “church is in constant need of repair” • Rev Spoon is said to be forgetful (the umbrellas) so maybe it is in a drawer somewhere as he forgot to put it in the bank. • Mr Clifford has invested the money legitimately.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
12	<p>Either: 1 mark for any piece of evidence simply identified without further development.</p> <p>Up to 2 marks for two separate pieces of evidence identified without development.</p> <p>Or: 2 marks for one piece of evidence identified and its relevance further developed and explained.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>“receipts for church expenditure” (1 mark).</p> <p>“bills for church repairs” (1 mark).</p> <p>“money in drawers or cupboards” (1 mark).</p> <p>Also</p> <p>“If you could find the church accounts then you would know exactly how much money came in and this could be less than was thought “(2 marks).</p>	2	Candidates should be seeking to show that no crime has been committed rather than seeking to establish that Rev Spoon is innocent. If Rev Spoon did not steal the money, it may be the case that someone else did.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
13 (a)	<p>1 mark for identifying a common feature to both sides of the analogy.</p> <p>1 mark for explanation, expansion or an example which clarifies the similarity.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>“Money is being given to those who need it.” (1 mark)</p> <p>“The money is used to do good” (1 mark)</p> <p>“In both cases there is a transfer of money” (1 mark)</p> <p>“Money is being taken from people who do not need it and given to those who need it more.” (2 marks)</p> <p>“In both cases the money is used for good causes and not for selfish reasons” (2 marks)</p> <p>“In both cases the money is used to do good. For example, the government uses tax revenue to fund hospitals and education” (2 marks)</p>	2	<p>In the analogy, the comparisons are:</p> <p>(i) Rev Spoon is compared to the government</p> <p>(ii) Parishioners are compared to rich taxpayers</p> <p>(iii) Famine relief is compared to spending on hospitals and schools.</p>
(b)	<p>1 mark for identifying a key difference between the two sides.</p> <p>1 mark for explanation, expansion or an example which clarifies the difference.</p> <p>“Stealing is illegal” (1 mark)</p> <p>“Rich people know they are being taxed.” (1 mark)</p> <p>“Stealing is illegal but taxation is not” (2 marks)</p> <p>“Rich people know they are being taxed but the church did not know that its funds were being stolen.” (2 marks)</p>	2	<p>In the analogy, the comparisons are:</p> <p>(i) Rev Spoon is compared to the government</p> <p>(ii) Parishioners are compared to rich taxpayers</p> <p>(iii) Famine relief is compared to spending on hospitals and schools.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
14	<p>1 mark for any relevant credibility criterion.</p> <p>Example</p> <p>“He has a bias” (1 mark).</p> <p>“He has a vested interest” (1 mark).</p> <p>1 mark for any plausible explanation which relates to the criterion.</p> <p>Example</p> <p>“He went to school with him” (1 mark).</p> <p>“He is in business with him” (1 mark).</p>	2	<p>Where there is a mismatch between credibility criterion and explanation a maximum of 1 mark.</p> <p>Acceptable credibility criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bias Lack of Neutrality Vested Interest Lack of Ability to See/Observe/Perceive.

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance	
				Content	Levels of response
15		<p>Indicative content for 9 marks</p> <p>It is very unlikely that the Rev Spoon has been stealing from the church funds. Firstly there is no conclusive proof that any money has been stolen. Mr Bank has exaggerated the income of the church based in “a poor area of Liverpool” and totally overlooked the cost of maintaining a church “in constant need of repair”. Secondly if money has gone missing it is more likely lost than stolen by Spoon. For there is no evidence of personal wealth. He only has a broken down car and the money for that could have come from his “wealthy sisters”. If he did give money to charity that too could have come from an inheritance when one of the sisters died. Also we are told “he was always forgetting where he put things” so if any money is missing it is probably in a drawer somewhere. Finally in the unlikely event of money being stolen it could have been any one of a number of people, some of whom are more suspicious than Spoon, for example Mr Clifford.</p>	9	<p>Anticipated points include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is possible no money is missing because Mr Bank has exaggerated income (miscalculating size of congregation and wealth of congregation) and overlooked legitimate costs such as repairs. • It is possible if money is missing it has not been stolen just mislaid. For example we are told Spoon is forgetful eg mislays umbrellas • His alleged extravagance is not supported by the examples of buying umbrellas and a second hand car. • He had no motive to steal money because he had rich sisters. • Money could have been stolen by Mr Clifford. He had opportunity and allegedly has large sums of money. • There is insufficient evidence to make the accusation. Burden of proof is not met. • Mr Mansfield, who was very keen to keep police out of it; keen to blame Spoon; could be in league with Clifford. • He was donating rather than stealing. As the vicar, he was entitled to use church funds as he saw fit. 	<p>Performance descriptions for 7 to 9 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion is precisely and clearly stated • Reasons are persuasive, cogent and fully developed • The structure of the reasoning is clear and explicit and places minimal reliance on assumptions • Any ideas borrowed from the documents are developed and expanded • Evidence derived from the documents is used critically and strengthens the argument • Grammar, spelling and punctuation are good. <p>Performance description for 4 to 6 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion is clearly stated • Reasons which are plausible and relevant are offered • The structure of the reasoning is not fully explicit and does rely on some assumptions

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance	
					Content	Levels of response
			<p>Indicative content for 6 marks</p> <p>The Rev Spoon did not steal the money, Mr Clifford and Mr Mansfield did it. There is no evidence that Spoon had large sums of money. He only has a cheap car and only gets new clothes at Christmas. Also his money for charity comes from his “wealthy sisters”. Mr Mansfield and Mr Clifford did it together. Mansfield is covering up for him and they have just bought property in Spain together.</p> <p>Indicative content for 3 marks</p> <p>It could have been anyone. Clifford is suspicious. He has a large house in Cheshire and Spain. Spoon didn’t even have much money to spend. Anyway who says the money was stolen?</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any ideas borrowed from the documents are re-expressed in the students own words and used appropriately but not necessarily further developed Evidence derived from the documents is used to strengthen the argument Grammar, spelling and punctuation are adequate. <p>Performance description for 1 to 3 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conclusion is imprecise and unclear, possibly implied rather than stated. Reasons offered against are undeveloped and only provide weak support for their conclusion and are mixed with rant and irrelevant information Structure is either absent or minimal or unclear Ideas are copied from the documents without further development Evidence derived from the documents is not always relevant or significant

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance	
					Content	Levels of response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar, spelling and punctuation may be inadequate. <p>Candidates who argue in the wrong direction can be awarded a maximum of 4 marks</p>
16		<p>Indicative content for 7 marks</p> <p>Stealing is only wrong when it is done for selfish reasons and people are harmed by it. The Rev Spoon did not steal for selfish reasons. Mr Mansfield is neutral and he says Spoon gave the money to charity. Even Mrs Banks admits Spoon only had a broken down car. People had given the money to the church expecting it to be used for good causes and Rev Spoon used it to save lives. So what he did was not wrong.</p> <p>Indicative content for 4 marks</p> <p>He did not do anything wrong. He used the money to save lives. He acted from a good motive he wanted to help people. It is not as if he spent it on himself. People are more important than buildings.</p> <p>Indicative content for 2 marks</p> <p>What Rev Spoon did was good. Saving famine victims is more important than church buildings.</p>	7	<p>Anticipated points include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not wrong if no personal gain Not wrong if has consequences which are good Not wrong if no one harmed Not wrong if done from a good motive People give to church for the money to be spent on good causes Famine relief is more important than church buildings. Spoon had lost his mind and so could not be held accountable for his actions and so it cannot be said that what he was doing was “wrong”. 	<p>Performance description for 5 to 7 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Precise conclusion clearly identified At least two reasons are provided for the conclusion, which are persuasive, cogent and fully developed Evidence and/or examples are provided which are both precisely relevant and adequate The structure of the reasoning is clear and explicit and does not rely on assumptions. <p>Performance description for 3 to 4 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A conclusion is identified but may be imprecise or over blown At least two reasons are provided for the conclusion but at most one is fully developed and not open to challenge 	

Question			Answer	Marks	Guidance	
					Content	Levels of response
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence and/or examples if provided may be relevant but not adequate The structure of the reasoning is not fully explicit and does rely on some assumptions. <p>Performance description for 1 to 2 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conclusion may not be explicitly identified Reasons are undeveloped and only provide weak support for their conclusion Evidence and/or examples are not provided Structure is either absent or minimal or unclear. <p>Candidates who argue in the wrong direction should be awarded a maximum of 3 marks.</p>

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

