

Level 2 Award

Thinking and Reasoning Skills

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

OCR Level 2 Award

Mark Scheme for June 2015

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 2015

Annotations

These are the annotations, (including abbreviations), including those used in scoris, which are used when marking

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
Green Tick	This indicates how many marks have been awarded for each answer in a question which requires more than one response.
SEEN	This indicates that the examiner has seen part of an answer that appears on continuation pages at the back of the booklet.

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)	(i)	Credit 1 mark for underlining the first sentence 'It wasn't a curse that killed these people'.	[1]	Where more than one section is underlined, no mark can be awarded. The whole sentence must be underlined for the mark to be awarded.
		(ii)	Credit 1 mark for putting brackets around 'It's not surprising that people got sick after going in the tomb'.	[1]	The whole of this claim must be bracketed. If any of the words in the claim are missed out then no mark can be awarded. Where more than one section is underlined, no mark can be awarded.
		(iii)	Credit 1 mark for circling 'because'.	[1]	
	(b)	(i)	Credit 1 mark for circling the 2 nd map.	[1]	Please follow the guidance on crossed out and duplicated answers.
		(ii)	Credit any reference to the reasons being joint/ working together/dependent/linked Creditworthy examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are joint reasons • The reasons are linked together • The reasons only make sense when they're put together • The two reasons need each other. 	[1]	A candidate who has circled an incorrect map in (i) can still be credited for explaining that the reasons are joint in (ii). References to the intermediate conclusion and the main conclusion are not needed in answers as the only distinguishing feature of the two diagrams is the difference between independent and joint reasons.
2			Credit 1 mark for each clear statement of any reasonable assumption. Creditworthy examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They only put curses on the tombs of long-serving pharaohs. • That they only put curses on some tombs. • That the length of a pharaoh's reign determined how important they were • That curses were a sign of how much they valued the pharaoh. 	[1]	Answers which are just a restatement of the original argument cannot be credited as, by definition assumptions cannot be taken from the argument itself.

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
		0 mark examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Ancient Egyptians wouldn't have bothered put a curse on Tutankhamen's tomb anyway. 		
3	(a)	Credit 1 mark for putting a tick next to 'false dilemma'.	[1]	Please follow the guidance on crossed out and duplicated answers.
	(b)	Credit 1 mark for answers which show an understanding of the false dilemma flaw. Creditworthy examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> She makes it seem like there the newspapers only had those two options. They could have written the truth about something else more interesting. They could have written about something else. Because she is only giving two options when there could be more. Because it is restricting the options falsely. 	[1]	Candidates who indicate that a false dilemma flaw is restricting the options should be credited.
4		Award up to 2 marks for a clear and developed explanation of the weakness (that just because one thing followed another in time does not mean it caused it). 2 mark examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Just because her auntie got a tummy bug and had her bag stolen after going to the tomb it doesn't mean the tomb caused it. There could be other explanations. There are lots of pick pockets in holiday places and people often get tummy bugs from unfamiliar food. One thing can come after another without being caused by it She is confusing correlation with cause. This is an example of a post hoc flaw. 	[2]	Answers which simply identify that having a tummy bug is not related to having a bag snatched cannot be credited as this does not relate to the <u>reasoning</u> which links these two events to visiting the tomb.

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
		<p>1 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It could have been a coincidence • There could be other explanations for what happened 		
5	(a)	<p>Award up to 2 marks for each clear and developed explanation related to vested interest.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for an answer that lacks clarity or for a partial but clear explanation.</p> <p>2 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They would lose out if people thought there was a curse, as they would not want to visit and risk an early death. • The company get money from visitors to Egypt and they don't want them scared off by a curse. <p>1 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They don't want people to think Egypt is dangerous. • They would lose out if people thought there was a curse. • They have a vested interest in getting people to visit as they earn their money from this. 	[2]	<p>For a clear and developed explanation candidates should indicate that the company earns money from selling holidays to Egypt <u>and</u> that the curse could put people off.</p> <p>Candidates who demonstrate an understanding of the vested interest of the company, but then suggest that the existence of the curse would interest people in visiting, cannot be credited more than one mark because they have misunderstood the fact that the company are actually dismissing the curse as a myth.</p>
	(b)	<p>Credit 1 mark for each clear statement of any reasonable assumption.</p> <p>Creditworthy examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That people remember Tutankhamen more than Rameses. • That there is truth in what they believed. • People don't remember Rameses • King Tut must be well remembered. 	[1]	<p>Answers which are just a restatement of the original argument cannot be credited as, by definition assumptions cannot be taken from the argument itself.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
		0 mark examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That if their name was remembered, their soul would live on. 		
6	(a)	Credit 1 mark for circling NO	[1]	
	(b)	Credit 1 mark for circling NO	[1]	
	(c)	Credit 1 mark for circling YES	[1]	
	(d)	Credit 1 mark for circling NO	[1]	
7		Credit 1 mark for each relevant and credible point that would challenge Ollie's claim. Creditworthy examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> He might have been immune to the deadly toxins His death might have been the work of the curse, just not straight away. The curse might have made his life more difficult instead of killing him. He may have received treatment to counteract the effects of the toxins. He may have been taking some medicine which stopped the toxins killing him straightaway. 0 mark example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maybe Carter was only exposed to a small amount of the toxin 	[2]	Where two valid answers are given, but the second is just a reworded repeat of the first, only one answer can be credited. Suggesting that Carter might only have been exposed to a small amount of the toxin is not credible as he was the chief archaeologist and would have spent a considerable time in the tomb.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
8 (a) (b)	<p>Award up to 2 marks for each clear and developed explanation of a strength related to a relevant credibility criterion.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for an answer that lacks clarity or for a partial but clear explanation.</p> <p>2 mark examples:</p> <p>Expertise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He knows about ancient Egyptian archaeology so he can talk about their customs. • He's done work before on Tutankhamen's reign. <p>Reputation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He is a 'respected Egyptologist' so he can be trusted. <p>Vested Interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He has a vested interest to keep his 'respected' reputation' so would tell the truth. <p>Neutrality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He was not directly involved in the excavation, so he has nothing to gain or lose by saying this. <p>1 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He was an Egyptologist. • He was a respected Egyptologist. • He would want to keep his reputation. • He presents an unbiased argument. • He has nothing to gain from this so he's neutral. 	[2]+[2]	<p>Candidates have been asked to give a different criterion in (b), so explanations that use the same criterion as for (a) should not be credited.</p> <p>Where candidates have used reputation and expertise as their two criteria, the explanation in 8(b) needs to be sufficiently different from 8(a) to warrant a mark being awarded. The same would apply to two answers which use neutrality and vested interest.</p> <p>Marks are to be awarded for the quality of the explanation and cannot be awarded for the circling of the criterion alone. The explanation must, however, match the criterion for credit to be given.</p> <p>Answers which provide generic explanations of a credibility criterion but which lack specific reference to Arthur Weignall's claim can only be credited with one mark if they show sufficient understanding the criteria.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
<p>9 (a)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Nottingham Post 1926</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Western Morning News 1945</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Aberdeen Journal 1929</p> <p>Credit 1 mark for each answer placed in the correct area of the venn diagram as follows:</p> <p>A Aberdeen Journal and Nottingham Post B Aberdeen Journal C Western Morning News D Western Morning News and Aberdeen Journal E Nottingham Post F Aberdeen Journal</p>	<p>[6]</p>	
<p>10</p>	<p>Award up to 2 marks for each clear and developed explanation of the weakness (that the conclusion is about a curse on those who enter a tomb but the evidence is about being present at the unwrapping of a mummy (which doesn't necessarily involve having entered the tomb).</p> <p>2 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evidence is about something different, so the curse wouldn't have affected someone just for watching a mummy only for entering the tomb. 	<p>[2]</p>	<p>Answers which simply suggest that the evidence doesn't 'prove' anything about the curse cannot be credited as they are not addressing the question about the weakness in the <u>link</u> between the evidence and the conclusion.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The conclusion is about entering the tomb whereas the evidence is about unwrapping the mummy, so the evidence doesn't link to the conclusion. <p>1 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Entering the tomb is different. They might not have entered the tomb. People still died from entering the tomb. 		
11	(a)	Credit 1 mark for putting a tick next to 'false appeal'.	[1]	Please follow the guidance on crossed out and duplicated answers.
	(b)	<p>Credit 1 mark for an answer that shows an understanding of the appeal to history.</p> <p>Creditworthy examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Just because the public believed in curses then they might not now. The public might be more sceptical of curses nowadays. You can't assume that people will react in the same way today. It appeals to history. 	[1]	Candidates should not be expected to name the appeal to history to get the mark.
12	(a)	Credit 1 mark for putting a tick next to statement C	[1]	Please follow the guidance on crossed out and duplicated answers.
	(b)	<p>Credit up to 2 marks for a relevant, valid, developed reason that challenges Nabeela's claim.</p> <p>Credit 1 mark for a reason that is relevant but less clearly developed/challenging.</p>	[2]	The focus here should be on why it is fair for Carter and Carnarvon to give exclusive rights. Developed reasons for two marks should therefore focus on their right to do this or on the benefits it brings to them. Where candidates focus on why it would be good for the Times to have exclusive rights this is likely to only be worth one mark as it doesn't address the issue of fairness.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>2 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because it was their hard work that led to the discovery so they could tell whoever they wanted. • By only telling one paper, the truth can be told, but they wouldn't be interrupted from their important work by journalists all the time. • By only telling one paper it protects the valuable archaeological site from being overrun and damaged by lots of journalists. <p>1 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was their story to tell. • The Times was a reliable newspaper so they would have been able to tell the world the truth about the findings in the tomb • The Times is a widely read paper so giving it exclusive access will get lots of publicity for the tomb. 		<p>Only one developed reason has been asked for, so giving two undeveloped reasons will still only generate one mark.</p> <p>Answers which simply imply that giving the Times the rights will stop other papers printing things that are not true cannot be credited as the reverse is the more logical outcome.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
13 (a)	<p>Award up to two marks for each relevant, clear and complete explanation of a key difference.</p> <p>2 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The teacher is expecting the whole class to perform well in their homework unfairly, whereas Carter and Carnarvon did not have expectations of other newspapers. • They had every right to sign a contract with The Times, whereas a teacher has a responsibility to treat all her class fairly. • Students without books could still use other sources to get their information, but other newspapers don't have anywhere to find out what's happening. • The King Tut tomb story has significance and interest across the world, but the homework only really matters to that one class. <p>1 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Times having exclusive rights is much more significant than a piece of homework. • The teacher is deliberately making it unfair. • Newspapers don't have to publish the story about the tomb. 	[2]	<p>For 2 marks the answer must explicitly deal with both sides of the analogy. An answer which gives one side and implies a difference with the other which weakens the analogy can only gain one mark.</p> <p>The identified difference must clearly weaken the analogy in order to be seen as relevant and credited with both marks. More simplistic, but still relevant differences should be awarded one mark.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
(b)	<p>Credit 2 marks for a relevant similarity which is clearly explained.</p> <p>2 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both situations make it difficult for a task to be done properly – journalists can't write about the tomb without access and a student can't do homework without the textbook. • Both situations have some people being given everything they need for a task whilst others have things missing. <p>1 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are both unfair. • In both situations only some people get the information 	[2]	<p>Answers which are relevant, but lack clarity of explanation should be awarded one mark.</p> <p>Answers which simply repeat the two sides of the analogy without identifying a relevant similarity should be given no credit.</p>
14	<p>Marks are to be allocated in accordance with the performance descriptors below.</p> <p>The content for the arguments may be utilised and/or developed 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. 	[10]	<p>The main discriminator here in terms of levels is likely to be the quality of the reasoning.</p> <p>The candidates should all have had an opportunity to study the pre-release documents, so developed reasons should be expected in order to reach level 3, making use of evidence and/or examples drawn from the documents or introduced independently.</p> <p>Marks within the levels can be determined by the number of reasons provided and the extent of the evidence or examples provided.</p> <p>Example of a Level 3 answer <i>Journalists should not only ever report facts. A lot of articles in newspapers contain interviews where different people express their opinions about something that has happened. Adding opinions and predictions make stories a lot more</i></p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<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>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 provided 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. <p>Example of Level 1 answer:</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy material</p>		<p><i>interesting and allow people to see things from different angles. It is a basic freedom to allow people to express opinions and it would be violating journalists' rights if we said they could only report facts.</i></p> <p><i>Some people might argue that if journalists go beyond the facts then they might start to mislead people and get them to believe something that isn't true. However, printing only facts would be very boring. If all newspapers only reported facts then we wouldn't know that people disagree about how they can be interpreted. For instance, if newspapers writing about Tutankhamen only gave the fact that Lord Carnarvon died six weeks after the tomb was opened, we wouldn't know anything about the controversy of the mystery curse. Therefore, journalists should be allowed to report more than just facts. [10 marks]</i></p> <p>Example of a Level 2 answer</p> <p><i>I agree with Emilie that journalists should only ever report facts. If journalists add things to their newspapers which aren't facts then this can mislead people and scare them. For instance, if they say there might be a terrorist attack, this might stop people going out of their house when actually they're perfectly safe.</i></p> <p><i>Also journalists should stick to the facts so people can make their own minds up about something. Journalists shouldn't tell us what to do.</i></p> <p><i>If newspapers are full of things that aren't true then people will stop buying them and the journalists would be out of a job, so they should only report the facts. [6 marks]</i></p> <p>Example of a Level 1 answer</p> <p><i>It's completely wrong for journalists to tell lies. What gives them the right? We don't want to read things that are made up all the time. It's just like saying Carnarvon died of a shark bite when it was really an insect that bit him. Also the curse</i></p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
				<i>thing is just a load of rubbish, so why do papers write about it? Journalists should tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. [3 marks]</i>
15	(a)	<p>Marks are to be allocated in accordance with the performance descriptors below.</p> <p>Performance descriptions for 5 to 6 marks: Level 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion is precisely stated • Two reasons are provided for the conclusion, which are persuasive, cogent and developed, which could be supported by evidence or examples. • 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 3 to 4 marks: Level 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion is clearly stated, though not necessarily precisely focused. • At least one reason is provided for the conclusion, which is plausible and relevant • 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 • The reason(s) provides very weak support for the conclusion • Structure is either absent or minimal or unclear • Grammar, spelling and punctuation may be inadequate 	[6]	<p>The main discriminator here in terms of levels is the quality of the reasoning, but as two developed reasons have been asked for in the question, this is a requirement for reaching level 3.</p> <p>Marks within the levels can be determined by the quality and relevance of the reasons given.</p> <p>Where a candidate argues the opposite case, i.e. that tombs <u>should</u> continue to be excavated, marks should be capped at the bottom of L2 for an answer which provides two developed reasons and would have reached L3 had it focused on the correct conclusion. In other cases of arguing the opposite case marks should be awarded within L1.</p> <p>Example of a Level 3 answer</p> <p><i>You should stop any further tomb excavations because they are disturbing bodies which were buried according to the religious beliefs of the time. Just as we wouldn't dig up people buried in a Christian churchyard, so we shouldn't attempt to dig up ancient Egyptians. The pharaohs should be left with their possessions for the afterlife as they believed they needed them.</i></p> <p><i>Another reason for stopping tomb excavations is that the area where the tombs are found has been preserved for thousands of years and should be kept as it is. The discovery of King Tuts tomb taught us a lot and we don't need to find out any more and create yet more tourists in an historic region. Please stop excavating more tombs. [6 marks]</i></p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
			<p>Example of a Level 2 answer <i>You need to stop digging up more tombs. It's dangerous as there could be toxins that make people ill and cause death. It's just disrespectful to all those people who spent so much time and energy building the tombs for you to go and dig them up again. Pharaohs should be left in peace and allowed to enjoy the afterlife. [4 marks]</i></p> <p>Example of a Level 1 answer <i>Please will you stop digging. You're killing people with the curse. The past is gone and forgotten so why dig it up again? Tutankhamen was only a boy so it's not fair to dig him up. [2 marks]</i></p>
(b)	<p>Credit up to 2 marks for each relevant, developed reason that supports Georgina's conclusion.</p> <p>Credit 1 mark for a reason that is relevant but less clearly developed/challenging.</p> <p>2 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important that archaeologists are not restricted, so that they do not miss out on important historical discoveries. • Archaeologists are professionals, so we should trust them to do their jobs without interfering. • It is an archaeologist's job to dig things up from the past. If we stop him doing this then we're preventing him doing a legal job. <p>1 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finding things out about the past is important. • It's their job and we should let them do it. 	[4]	Where the second reason is simply a rewording of the first, no further credit can be given.

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 2015

