

Level 2 Award

Thinking and Reasoning Skills

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

OCR Level 2 Award

Mark Scheme for June 2016

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 2016

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

Annotation	Meaning of annotation
	Demonstrates a point which can be credited with a mark. Only to be used in questions 3, 9a, 9b, 11 & 12
	Blank page
	Answer seen where this appears outside the normal viewing window for that question

Here are the subject specific instructions for this question paper

This is a Thinking and Reasoning Skills examination paper, so the answers should be assessed against the skills in the specification. Historical knowledge therefore, beyond what candidates have had access to in the pre-release documents, should not be expected and is not being tested. Equally, the use of emotive language, particularly in the final two questions testing candidates' skills to develop their own arguments, should be treated with caution if this language is not supported by plausible and relevant reasoning.

Here is the mark scheme for this question paper.

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)	Credit 1 mark for circling 'so'.	[1]	
	(b)	Credit 1 mark for circling 'independent'.	[1]	
	(c)	Credit 1 mark for an explanation that clearly shows an understanding that each of the two reasons could support the conclusion without the other. Creditworthy examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two reasons are not linked. • Each reason could both support the conclusion on its own. • The reasons don't depend on each other. • Each reason makes sense on its own. 	[1]	
2	(a)	(i) Credit 1 mark for underlining the conclusion: Although the advert is nice and makes you all warm and fluffy inside, it isn't very historically accurate <u>so</u> people are right to complain.	[1]	No mark can be awarded if the reason (<i>'it isn't very historically accurate'</i>) is also underlined. The mark can be awarded regardless of whether the indicator word 'so' is included or not.
		(ii) Credit 1 mark for putting brackets around the reason as follows: Although the advert is nice and makes you all warm and fluffy inside, (it isn't very historically accurate) so people are right to complain.	[1]	Accept answers which don't bracket the word ' <i>it</i> ', but otherwise, the whole reason needs to be bracketed for a mark to be awarded. No mark can be awarded if any words which are not part of the reason are also bracketed.

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
2	(b)	Credit 1 mark for ticking the third box 'A counter-argument, one reason and a conclusion'.	[1]	Please follow the guidance on crossed out and duplicated answers.
	(c)	Credit 1 mark for stating a reasonable assumption. Creditworthy examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverts should be historically accurate. • That the advert is based upon an historical event • That people are complaining because of the lack of historical accuracy 		No credit can be awarded for an answer which is repeating anything which is actually stated in the argument – e.g. 'The advert makes you feel warm and fluffy.'
	(d)	Credit 1 mark for ticking the 'explanation' box	[1]	Please follow the guidance on crossed out and duplicated answers.
3		Credit 1 mark for each reasonable explanation. Creditworthy examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More people were injured not killed • The death rate before Christmas was unusually high • Military strategy hadn't planned any action in the UK parts of the front line at that time. • The weather was too bad to fight. • The Germans were short on ammunition. • They were celebrating Christmas rather than fighting. • Fewer British soldiers were going 'over the top' • There could have been other truces, not just the football one. • The fighting stopped for religious reasons because it was Christmas • They may have been spending this time burying the dead and not fighting 	[1+1]	Credit can be awarded for any reasonable explanation beyond those given as exemplars. Answers which focus on disease and illness being major causes of death and a reduction in these causing the decline should not be credited as this is not a reasonable explanation. Where the second explanation given is simply a re-phrasing of the first explanation, no mark should be awarded as this will be repetition.

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
4	(a)	<p>Credit 1 mark for an explanation which shows an understanding of ability to see in relation to these claims.</p> <p>Creditworthy examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They have access to all of these letters. • The letters were written by soldiers who were there at the time of the truce • The letters all came from the Western Front which was where the fighting was happening 	[1]	
	(b)	<p>Credit 1 mark for an explanation which shows an understanding of expertise in relation to these claims.</p> <p>Creditworthy examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are not historians. • Their business is letters, not war. 	[1]	No credit can be given for generic answers about expertise which are not specific to the Royal Mail e.g. <i>'They have no expert evidence to back up their claim.'</i>
	(c)	<p>Credit 1 mark for an explanation which shows an understanding of vested interest in relation to these claims.</p> <p>Creditworthy examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People might buy their stamps. • To promote their products. • They might be able to sell the letters to a museum for good money if they publicise them well. 	[1]	No credit can be given for generic answers about vested interest which are not specific to the Royal Mail e.g. <i>'They have a vested interest because they want to make money for their business.'</i>
5		<p>Award 2 marks for a clear and developed explanation of a valid credibility criterion.</p> <p>2 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He is a Professor of History at St. Andrews so has a good reputation as this is a good university. • He is a Professor of History so he should have good expertise in this subject. • As a historian he is neutral as he has nothing to gain and will only look at the facts. <p>1 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He knows about history. • He has written a book about it. • He doesn't have anything to gain from what he says 	[2]	<p>No credit can be given for simply stating a valid criterion – it must be explained or developed within the 'explanation' space.</p> <p>No credit can be given for generic answers about expertise which are not specific to the claim e.g. <i>'He has expertise because he knows what he is talking about.'</i></p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
6	(a)	Credit 1 mark for ticking 'straw man'	[1]	
	(b)	<p>Credit 1 mark for an answer that shows an understanding of the straw man flaw, in that it distorts the argument in order to knock it down.</p> <p>Creditworthy examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He is distorting their argument to make it easier to knock down • He is misrepresenting what they are saying • He is exaggerating what they are saying to make it look worse so he can easily discredit their argument 	[1]	
7	(a)	<p>Credit 2 marks for a clear statement of a relevant similarity.</p> <p>2 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both 'Santa's Grotto' and the football truce advert are deliberately peddling a myth in order to boost sales. • Both are making things up to get more customers in the shop. <p>1 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are both lies. • Both are used to attract customers 	[2]	In order to gain both marks here candidates must make reference both to the things being made up and to the commercial gain intended. Where the answer is based on the two things not being real, but without reference to commercial gain, only 1 mark can be awarded. Equally, reference to commercial gain without including the 'made-up' element should also be awarded one mark.
	(b)	<p>Credit 2 marks for a clear statement of a relevant difference.</p> <p>1 mark answers will be less clear or the difference less relevant to the analogy.</p> <p>2 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Santa is entertaining for children, but the ad just wants to sell chocolate. • The ad is based on something that actually happened, whereas Santa has never been real. • One is lying about a great tragedy where millions died, whereas the other is lying about a fairy tale being true. 	[2]	Answers must refer explicitly to both sides of the analogy to access both marks.

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	1 mark examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lying about Santa is a good lie. • Santa's grotto is aimed at children whereas supermarket ads are more for adults. 		
8	Credit 2 marks for a clear explanation of a weakness. 2 mark examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the advert is not necessarily the cause of the chocolate bar sales, it could be other reasons. • It assumes that if enough money goes to the charity to make it worth it. • An assumption is made that the cause of the charity itself is worthwhile. • It confuses correlation with cause. Just because they sold charity bars doesn't mean it was because of the ad. • It assumes that morally questionable acts can be justified if they help to raise money for a charity. 1 mark answers will lack development and/or clarity. 1 mark examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It confuses correlation with cause. • We don't know how much money is going to charity • People would probably buy the chocolate bars anyway • It's a false appeal to popularity. Just because 5000 people buy it doesn't mean it's right • Some people just like chocolate! 	[2]	This is a question about the weakness of the reasoning, so to gain 2 marks answers do need to focus on this. This can be in the form of pointing out assumptions that are required or to recognise that the link between the ad and the sales has not been proved. 1 mark answers will lack development or will be less focused on the reasoning involved in the argument. For instance credit can be given for reference to a false appeal to popularity, but this will only gain partial credit as it is not central to the reasoning required for the conclusion to be drawn.

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
9	(a)	<p>Credit 1 mark for each correctly placed letter in the diagram as follows:</p>	[7]	Where a letter is repeated in more than one section of the diagram no mark can be credited, even if one of these is correctly placed.

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
9	(b)	<p>Credit 2 marks for an explanation, other than it not having happened at all, for the inconsistencies in accounts of what happened.</p> <p>2 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They were all from soldiers in different positions in the trenches, so they experienced different events. • Some of the soldiers made up aspects of the stories to reassure their families about what was going on. • Soldiers might have remembered events differently because of the chaos on the frontline. • The truce was unofficial so the troops may have been scared to reveal all in case they were punished. <p>1 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all the soldiers saw the football taking place. • Some soldiers made their stories up / exaggerated. • The soldiers were all in different places. • They saw different things. 	[4]	<p>For 2 marks candidates should be providing a developed explanation which provides a reason for the differences which is then explained, possibly through an '..... and so' approach.</p> <p>1 mark answers will provide valid explanations, but will lack this development.</p>

Question		Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
10	(a)	Credit 1 mark for ticking the fourth box 'socially and morally appropriate'.	[1]	'Please follow the guidance on crossed out and duplicated answers.
	(b)	<p>Credit 2 marks for a clear, relevant and developed reason that challenges the view.</p> <p>2 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Advertising is just business. Using people's emotions to sell things is what advertising is all about. The ad helped to sell a lot of charity chocolate which helped to support the veterans, so this is good. <p>Credit one mark for an undeveloped reason or for a valid reason which is less clear or less focused on challenging the view.</p> <p>1 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> People have a choice about whether or not they buy products. The money earned has been used for a good cause, so it's ok. It's ok to do this because it teaches people about an important bit of history. 	[2]	For both marks to be awarded the reason must be clearly focused on the view expressed in the question as well as being developed.
11		<p>Credit 1 mark for each reasonable question that would gather useful information.</p> <p>Creditworthy examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When was it taken? Are the uniforms/sides clearly visible in the photo? Where was it taken? Could anyone verify the identity of the people in the photo? Is there a football visible in the photo? Who are the people in the photo? 	[3]	<p>Questions that are too simplistic or vague to gather useful information about whether or not the truce happened should not be credited e.g. 'who took it'?</p> <p>Questions which simply imply the photo was doctored should also not be credited as the photo is presented as being genuine.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
12	<p>Credit up to 2 marks for each relevant, developed reason that challenges Nasima's argument.</p> <p>2 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Something that harms others in order to raise money for charity would not be a good thing, because ends don't always justify means. • Some things can't be considered 'good', no matter what their goal, such as hurting animals or people. • Not all charities would be worth giving to, for instance animal charities don't do as much good as those that support vulnerable people. • Not all charities are the same. Some use most of the money raised to pay for themselves and give very little to good causes. <p>Credit 1 mark for a reason that is relevant but less clearly developed/challenging.</p> <p>1 mark examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some charities prey on people's emotions to scam them out of their hard earned money. • Charities waste people's money. • I don't believe in the causes that some charities stand for • Using money that has been gained from something illegal or unethical to give to charity isn't good 	[2+2]	<p>Answers which use extreme and very unlikely examples to develop the reason (for instance, answers which suggest people would kill to raise money for charity) should only be credited with one mark as these answers will lack the relevance needed for full credit.</p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
13	<p>Marks are to be allocated in accordance with the performance descriptors below. 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. <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 	[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>Level 3 exemplar:</p> <p><i>It is definitely acceptable to distort history in order to make money. Firstly, if you are making an historical film then it is important to make it interesting in order to attract an audience and make money. This provides important entertainment for the general public and adds to people's enjoyment. This is totally acceptable because it really doesn't matter if, for instance, the events in France in the nineteenth century weren't quite the way they're shown in Les Miserables, the fact is millions of people loved the film and the producers made a lot of money.</i></p> <p><i>It is also important that people remember key events in history and if money making films or events allow them to do this better through some distortion then this is a good thing. For instance Schindler's List wasn't how it really happened, but it was so important in ensuring the holocaust was understood better by millions of people. So, yes, it is acceptable to distort history to make money. [10 marks]</i></p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grammar, spelling and punctuation may be inadequate. <p>Example of Level 1 answer:</p> <p>0 marks – no creditworthy material</p>		<p>Level 2 exemplar:</p> <p><i>I don't think it's ever acceptable to change what really happened to make money. In WW1 people died and suffered, so we need to remember this like it really was, not to make it look like a walk in the park with chocolate. How can it be right for people to make money out of the suffering of others? It's disgusting. Also it won't do kids any good to be taught the wrong things about history. What if they repeat them in exams and get bad marks? They'll fail their GCSEs so others can make money. So people shouldn't change history. [5 marks]</i></p> <p>Level 1 exemplar:</p> <p><i>Just because history happened doesn't mean you can't switch it round a bit. Sainbury's ad was really good and loads of people enjoyed it, so what's wrong with that? Some of the films that are mentioned in Document 7 were really good too, especially Braveheart. So what if people make a lot of money out of it? Good luck to them I say. [3 marks]</i></p>

Question	Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
14	<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, at least one of which is persuasive, cogent and fully 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 to 2 marks: 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 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>Level 3 exemplar:</p> <p><i>The 11th November 2018 should definitely not be the last Remembrance Day. The First World War may have been over for 100 years, but on 11/11 we don't just remember those who were killed in WW1, we also remember soldiers killed in much more recent wars. So it is important to those who have recently lost loved ones in war that they have the chance on this special day to remember them. Also remembering the horror and destruction of war is really important so we never forget this. If we continue to mark Remembrance Day it is more likely we will continue to do all we can to avoid repeating the deaths of WW1. [6 marks]</i></p> <p>Level 2 exemplar:</p> <p><i>It is time to stop Remembrance Day when we get to 2018. The First World War will have ended a hundred years ago and nobody is still alive who fought in it. We should stop wearing poppies because it just brings back bad memories of horrible things. We should live in the present, not in the past. We've moved on a lot in 100 years, so it's time to forget Remembrance Day. [4 marks]</i></p>

Question			Answer/Indicative content	Mark	Guidance
					Level 1 exemplar: <i>We need to carry on wearing poppies for ever. They grew in the fields during the war so we should keep wearing them. History is a good thing to study as the past is important so we should remember because they fought for us. [2 marks]</i>

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 2016

