

Critical Thinking

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS 3821

Combined Mark Schemes And Report on the Units

June 2005

3821/MS/R/05

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

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 2005

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

Advanced Subsidiary GCE Critical Thinking (3821)

MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
2870/11/12	Paper 1	1
2870/02	Paper 2	7

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	22
2870/11/12	Paper 1	23
2870/02	Paper 2	26
*	Grade Thresholds	31

**Mark Scheme 2870/11/12
June 2005**

Section A

Multiple Choice Questions 1-16

- 1 E
- 2 B
- 3 A
- 4 C
- 5 D
- 6 E
- 7 D
- 8 A
- 9 B
- 10 C
- 11 A
- 12 C
- 13 D
- 14 E
- 15 E
- 16 B

Section B

17

- Evidence from other countries fails to show that banning smacking is good for children.
- Children are already protected by the law from unreasonable physical punishment.
- The evidence for smacking children leading to them being aggressive has many problems.
- There are significant differences between physical assaults between adults and parents smacking children.
- A ban on smacking couldn't be enforced.
- People are wrong to think that all children are always reasonable.
- The whole case against smacking is wrong.

Any one of the above (1)

Any two of the above (2)

18 (a) The evidence that most parents in the UK smack their children. (1)

(b) Whether or not 'other forms of punishment' lead to aggression does not affect/is irrelevant to/cannot be used in the argument that smacking does. This could be expressed as a *tu quoque* flaw. (Credit should be given to the appropriate development of the point.) (1)

19

- The significance of both pieces of evidence needs to be considered in the light of possible changes in the way that the information was recorded/classified.
- There could have been changes in the definition of assault and/or child abuse.
- There could have been changes in the willingness to record assaults and/or cases of child abuse.
- We need to know the extent to which the ban on smacking was enforced.
- There could have been an increase in the number of social workers and/or police who would have therefore have been able to detect more cases of child abuse.
- We need to know if there were other changes in Swedish society that could explain either or both of these increases. This could be given more generally as the evidence being no more than an example of *post hoc* (no more than coincidence).
- Both pieces of evidence could be used to explain why banning smacking is a problem: by being less effective at disciplining children (meaning more aggressive children and children who cause their parents to lose their temper more).
- If the argument against smacking is the ethical one that violence against the weak can never be justified, then the evidence on assaults and child abuse would be seen as irrelevant.
- Assaults by children on children and child abuse could also have increased in other countries.
- The timescale of the ban and that of the evidence do not correspond exactly.

Any one of the above (1)

Any two of the above (2)

20 (a)

- Banning smacking might have been of use in reducing the rate of child abuse in countries other than these.
- The evidence is consistent with Sweden having the lowest rate of child abuse.
- In the four countries that haven't banned smacking, it could still be very rarely used.
- In the four countries that haven't banned smacking, there might be relevant differences to explain this. (Credit relevant examples.)
- The definition of 'child abuse' needs to be the same across societies for this evidence to be meaningful.
- The evidence is not strong enough to conclude that 'banning smacking is of no value' in that child abuse rates are only one measure of how children are treated.
- In the four countries that have not banned smacking, the rate of child abuse could be even lower if they did.

Any one of the above (1)

- (b)** This is an example of false dichotomy or restricting the options/there are types of smacking that are not 'gentle' and there are types of assault that are not serious. (1)

21 (a)

- They are successful inasmuch that they have shown there are relevant differences in the way in which we deal with adults and children.
- The author's own argument is flawed in that they have exaggerated their case/straw man/reductio ad absurdum.
- They are in part unsuccessful because they have failed to show that there are no similarities.

Any one of the above (1)

(b)

- A ban could be enforced largely by parents deciding not to smack their children simply because it is banned (like most people obey the law both in relation to the way in which they bring up their children and in other areas of their life).
- The information on the milk cartons might have the effect of parents not smacking their children, thus not requiring enforcement in any other way.
- The difficulty of enforcing a ban on smacking does not affect the issue of whether smacking is right or wrong.
- The difficulty of enforcing a ban on smacking does not mean that there shouldn't be a law against it.

Any one of the above (1)

- 22 (a)** This is an example of a straw man: the author has presented an extreme version of an argument against smacking which is very unlikely to be held by many of those who oppose smacking. (1)

(b)

- The argument is weak because smacking need not be an example of violence: violence is physical force designed to injure or abuse; smacking will rarely be like this.
- The argument is weak because not all violence is bad: some violence can be defended in terms of its outcome, for example protecting a third party.

Any one of the above (1)

23 (a)

- That a relatively high/significant proportion of those who die are under-age drinkers.
- That a relatively high/significant proportion of those who die are British.
- That a relatively high/significant proportion of those who died began as under-age drinkers.

One of the above (1)

(b)

- The percentage of those in the age-group 12-17 in Britain who drink compared to the percentages in most/all other European countries.
- The percentage of drinkers aged 11 in the other countries with the heaviest level of under-age drinkers.
- The age limit for drinking in most/all other European countries.
- The percentage of under-age drinkers in most/all European countries.

Any of the above (1)

24 (a) The adverts against alcohol were not sufficiently strong in their impact to counteract those for it. (1)**(b)** The young people's familiarity with/or preference for the Budweiser adverts means that they are very likely to go on to drink alcohol. (1)**25** Candidates could get one mark for making the general point that the author fails to show how the alcohol industry is 'always happy to ignore' the code of practice. They could gain a further mark for developing this general point by citing one of the following:

- The author gives only the example of the ban linking alcohol and sport.
- The author gives examples only of how (two) football teams are linked with companies producing alcohol.

Alternatively, candidates could get two marks for giving no more than these two points.

26

- What teenagers believe does not in itself prove/show that alcohol companies are using advertising to link alcohol with sexual success.
- The evidence that teenagers believe that alcohol adverts target them does not prove/show that companies *are* targeting them.

Any one relevant point (1)

Any two relevant points (2)

27

- The author has to assume that alcohol advertising did target the 18-24 age-group by the 1980s. They provide no evidence for this.
- The lack of targeted advertising for the low levels of alcohol consumption by the 18-24 age-group in the 1920s and 1930s could be no more than coincidence/a *post hoc* argument. (Credit relevant detail, such as changes in the degree of freedom enjoyed by young people between the 1920s and the 1930s, and the 1980s.)
- The author has to assume that there are no explanations other than advertising for the change in drinking habits by the 18-24 age-group by the 1980s.
- The author fails to provide evidence on alcohol consumption by the 18-24 age group between the 1940s and the 1970s.
- The evidence on advertising and consumption by 11-15 year-olds between 1992-2000 could be no more than coincidence/a *post hoc* argument. (This could be developed in terms of alternative explanations for the growth in drinking)
- The growth in advertising and consumption by 11-15 year olds between 1992-2000 needs to be considered in the light of the initial levels of each.
- It would be useful to know if the consumption of alcohol by 16-17 year-olds had followed the same pattern between 1992-2000 as the growth of advertising.

Any one of the above (1)

Any two of the above (2)

28 (a)

- That alcohol is seen as acceptable/good
- Alcohol advertising encourages young people to drink
- Alcohol advertising causes young people to drink

Any one of the above (1)

(b)

- The author's conclusion that we should ban alcohol advertising is weakened by the evidence on the frequency of incidents involving alcohol in major soaps (paragraph 6)
- The link that young people make between alcohol and sexual success (detailed in paragraph 4) might mean that, even without advertising, they would still make that link (albeit, without direct advertising, possibly less often).

Any one of the above (1)

Mark Scheme 2870/02
June 2005

- 1 (a) The candidate needs to assess the credibility of EACH participant's/source's evidence against the relevant criteria:
[AO1, AO2, AO3, AO4]

Credit correctly made points and ignore the incorrect, unless points made are contradictory. However, presenting two justified alternative interpretations should gain 2 marks (mark scheme – s/w).

Accept candidates' answers in a variety of formats e.g. bullet points, headings, tables.

Award up to 2 marks in relation to each participant/source named in the mark scheme. If a participant/source is omitted, those 2 marks cannot be accessed in any other way.

[5 X 2 marks]

Award the remaining 2 marks for additional points made in relation to any participants/sources or other available evidence or a well reasoned answer in relation to up to two participants.

Eg

(0 marks)

(1 mark)

(2 marks) for well developed answer eg relates assessment to specific claim (see grid page 5, G's reputation); or includes suppositional reasoning, if . . . (see page 6, S's reputation).

[maximum 2 marks]

Award no marks eg

- if the criterion of credibility is simply named;

- if there is a generalisation without reference to this situation. It is necessary to explain how this affects the credibility of the evidence by referring to what is being claimed about the situation.

Where the same point can be made about two participants at the same time, award 2 marks if correctly linked and explained.

However, where the circumstances are slightly different for each participant and this is ignored, only the correct element can be awarded a mark.

Where a participant/source makes several claims in the passage, award the mark **if** the criterion specified correctly applies to all the claims **or** if the answer correctly applies to the relevant claim.

[12]

1 (a)

<p>G Garage manager</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Neutral -s has no vested interest to verbally exaggerate the defects or question the validity of the previous MOT/ ▪ Vested interest -w unless he would make an overall profit from the scrap value of the car, or gain from rivals' loss of reputation ▪ Vested interest -s to give an accurate written report, as the MOT certificate is an official document for which he is accountable. ▪ Ability to see -s The task of inspecting the car for an MOT would entail rigorous inspection to identify corrosion. ▪ Expertise -s would have been trained to correctly assess roadworthiness, according to the requirements of an MOT Registered Centre. ▪ Reputation -w given by (M) as being overcautious. This depends upon (M)'s credibility – possible motive to lie to defend his sale. -s/n given by (S) as maintaining company cars without problems. If this relates to newer cars, it would strengthen reputation for general reliability but not expertise in dealing with the condition of cars requiring scrapping. ▪ Characteristic -n His possible generosity towards (S) does not strengthen the credibility of his claims re the car, only his beliefs about these.
<p>M Mechanic</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vested interest -w to lie about (G) being overcautious to make his sale appear valid/and to protect his own reputation sideline. ▪ Expertise -s as a mechanic to assess the roadworthiness of the car when he sold it. -w although he may have been over optimistic re the rust problem based on his own ability to keep on top of it by filling/welding. -s/w NVQs might indicate more specific practical training/knowledge, but does not guarantee this was applied here. ▪ Ability to see -s/w Depends upon whether he checked underneath the car to notice its condition, to claim only a few rust spots. ▪ Reputation -s/w as (C)'s best MA. This is relative to the standard of his colleagues and depends upon (C)'s judgement motive to defend (M). -s given by (S) as a well qualified mechanic. (S) would have a VI to malign (M) but does not, - might indicate reliability of claim. ▪ Circumstantial -w The sale occurred 3 months after the MOT, so it cannot be used as evidence of continued roadworthiness. -w As the car was sold after the rust/corrosion liability expired, it might indicate a knowledge of defective corrosion. -w The expectation for £250 – as 'a run about' – must include roadworthiness. -w The fact that the defects could be fixed is irrelevant – it does not mean the car is roadworthy nor does it mention repair costs.
<p>C MOT Centre owner</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vested Interest -w to side step the issue if guilty, by referring to the general validity of his MOTs rather than the specifics of this car. ▪ Bias -w to defend (M) as a member of his workforce ▪ Vested Interest -w to be selective about (M)'s expertise (not told whether (M) was successful at College) to defend the reputation of his Centre. <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The credibility of the MOT Certificate as contributing to this case maybe assessed as a separate source or through a relevant participant.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expertise -s would have been trained to correctly assess roadworthiness, according to the requirements of an MOT Registered Centre. ▪ Ability to see -s The MOT should reflect rigorous inspection to identify specified criteria are met. ▪ Reliability -s The MOT certificate is an official document for which the Centre is accountable. ▪ Relevance -w However, the sale occurred 3 months after the MOT, so it could not be used as evidence of continued roadworthiness, -w nor as an indication of all its parts of the car.

<p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Student</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Vested Interest -w To blame (M) to enable the possibility of financial recompense/ -w to distract attention from herself if guilty of negligent car maintenance. -s took car to Ford dealer, showing responsible attitude to car maintenance ▪ Reputation -w given (R) for using callouts for non-mechanical failure may indicate mismanagement of the car. -w given by (M) for lack of knowledge about cars, depends upon (M)'s motive to distract attention from himself if at fault. ▪ Ability to see -s/w The significance having rubbed down 'all ... I could find' depends on whether she had looked at specific points under the car, ▪ Expertise -w and the ability to judge the severity of defect to require attention. -w Perhaps naïve in her belief that a mechanic would necessarily transfer his good working practice to his sideline/own cars.
<p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Vehicle recovery driver</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Neutral -s He would have no apparent motive to lie about the condition of the car as a professional who deals purely with recovery. ▪ Vested Interest -s and would have a vested interest to tell the truth so that their claims would not jeopardise the reputation of the company. ▪ Ability to see -s He would have been able to see the extent of the corrosion under the car when the exhaust was made safe, to justify the remark that they weren't aware of any immediate dangerous conditions, -w although night conditions might have prevented them from seeing clearly enough to make a good judgement. ▪ Expertise -s He would have had the training to recognise the extent of the corrosion to make this remark.

w = Weaken s = Strengthen credibility of evidence

- 1 (b) The candidate needs to come to a reasoned judgement as to whether (M) knowingly sold (S) a defective vehicle.

Present a reasoned case in a clear logical and coherent way [AO5]

Judgement [1] – there is no one correct answer.

Corroboration/ conflict [2]

- may include uncorroborated points if these are significant to the judgement;
- no marks should be awarded where candidate simply says that two participants agree/conflict;
- there needs to be a statement of what they agree upon.

Balance [1] – this specifies the outline of supporting and conflicting evidence, identifying 'sides' that oppose each other

Eg (G) vs (M) and (C)
(S) (R)

G and S on one side; M and C on the other; R's evidence is inconclusive and may be assigned to either side (or both).

Weight [1] – the candidate should specify which side has the greater number of participants.

Weight must follow on from the candidate's expression of the balance.

Quality [3]

Candidates need to assess which side collectively has the greater credibility of evidence, which could include circumstantial points.

eg

for 3 marks: candidates should assess both sides adequately eg

for 2 marks: one side is assessed adequately

for 1 mark: isolated points of credibility

2 Accept candidates' answers in a variety of formats e.g. bullet points, headings, tables.

(a) **Conclusion:** We should **support the proposal** (that judges and barrister (in England and Wales) should no longer wear wigs). Accept any version of the first paragraph which clearly identifies **support the proposal**.

[AO1] [1]

(b) **Reasoning:**

- reasons do not need to be numbered or be in the order of the passage;
- they must be precise using either words emboldened or a clear paraphrase
- stated reasons that include substantial extra material cannot be credited.

Award 1 mark for each correct claim.

Professionals, (including lawyers), **should keep up with the times** (and get rid of outdated forms of dress).

Uniforms create a distance between professionals and their clientele.

There is little, (if any)/no, **evidence that lack of anonymity is a problem.**

(The aim of) **widening recruitment to the legal profession will not be achieved without getting rid of wigs** (and the prohibitive costs . . .).

The old-fashioned values/ wigs symbolise are (clearly) **the reason why women and members of ethnic minorities are under-represented** (in some professions).

[5 x 1]

[AO1, AO2] [5]

(c) **Assumptions:**

See grid on page 7.

By definition quoted/paraphrased text, or simple counter assertions cannot be awarded marks.

Candidates might 'rework' an assumption as a flaw (or vice versa). This is acceptable if the candidate develops the point sufficiently. However they should not be credited if they simply repeat the assumption.

Award 1 mark for each correct assumption.

[3 x 1]

Flaws:

See grid on page 7.

- counter assertions should not be awarded marks;
- explanation is necessary to gain marks;
- terminology saves time but is not required if the explanation is clear. However, if stated it should be correct.

Award 1 mark for each correct flaw.

[3 x 1]

[AO1, AO3] [6]

2 (c)

Para	ASSUMPTIONS	FLAWS
1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appeal to popularity – the wider public may not always be right.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumes lawyers wearing wigs also have old-fashioned attitudes. • Assumes that revealing/showing one's true personality is a good thing. • Assumes that something is bad simply because it is old-fashioned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General to specific – whilst it is true wigs are outdated generally this is not necessarily true of the particular case of the legal profession. • Appeal to modernity – a claim that the banning of wigs should go ahead simply because it is in keeping with times, which may not necessarily be right.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumes an intimidating atmosphere is inappropriate. • Assumes there should not be a distance between professionals and clientele. • Assumes new dress/lack of uniform is less intimidating. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generalisation – what is true of cases involving children might not be true of cases in general..
4		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Causation – it fails to recognise the possible causal connection between lack of trouble and anonymity. • Tu quoque – the fact that witnesses are not protected in this way does not give us grounds for believing judges shouldn't. Perhaps witnesses would benefit from remaining anonymous.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumes recruitment only a problem in those branches of legal profession where wigs are worn. • Assumes getting rid of wigs is the only solution to this problem of cost. • Assumes all lawyers wear wigs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restricting the options – there may be ways that wearing wigs could be made compatible with recruiting more people from poorer backgrounds e.g. a "wig allowance".
6		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient condition/post hoc – The author has failed to consider other reasons that may affect recruitment.

(d) Award maximum 4 marks for each further argument given.

One mark each for any of the following up to 3 marks

- relevant reason (this may be embedded in derivative or irrelevant material)
- supporting evidence.

[3]

Award a further mark if the candidate:

- relates the reasoning to the main conclusion

NB Allow arguments about counter-productive dress codes.

Allow maximum 1 mark for a further argument which is clearly derivative eg
Uniforms create a relationship of trust.

[1]**[2 x 4]****[AO5] [8]****Further arguments to support /against the conclusion eg**

R1 Wigs are extremely hot and uncomfortable

R2 Such discomfort affects concentration and performance

IC Lawyers would be more effective if they did not wear wigs

MC We should support the proposal that lawyers (in England and Wales) should not wear wigs

or

R1 Manufacturing wigs for legal use is an important aspect of the wig-making industry

R2 Without this trade, more people would be unemployed

R3 Many people benefit from the wearing of wigs e.g. people who have lost their hair due to cancer treatment

IC Supporting the proposal will mean such people will no longer be able to benefit

MC We should reject the proposal ...

Or

R1 or R2

with example

C

In each case the candidate's conclusion would be acceptable as an IC leading to the author's conclusion.

3 Structure (maximum 5 marks)

Gist – covering less than half the argument	(1 mark)
- covering most of the argument	(2 marks)
1 to 2 structural points	(3 marks)
3 to 4 structural points	(4 marks)
at least 5 structural points	(5 marks)

- CA Some may argue that cosmetics are essential as a means of expressing one's personality.
- C The trend towards young people not using cosmetics should be encouraged.
- IC The use of cosmetics has a number of negative effects on the individual and society.
- R1 Cosmetics are a means of concealing the true personality.
- R2 The cosmetics industry tests its products on animals.
- R3 The use of cosmetics is responsible for increasing people's exposure to **harmful** chemicals (used in the manufacture of many cosmetics).
- R4 The cosmetics industry is a **key** contributor to the decline in rare species (of plants and animals).
- R5 Expenditure on cosmetics is (a classic example of) **mindless** consumption.

Evaluation (6 x 1 marks)

- NB Credit combination of assumptions and flaws (not like question 2). Otherwise apply guidance as question 2(c).

Further Arguments (maximum 6 marks)

NB different from question 2(d).

One further argument that relates to the reasoning and has no conclusion	(1 mark)
One further argument that relates to the reasoning and has a conclusion	(2 marks)
One further argument that relates to the conclusion/IC and has no conclusion	(3 marks)
One further argument that relates to the conclusion/IC and has a conclusion	(4 marks)
Two further arguments that relate to the conclusion/IC and both have a conclusion	(5 marks)
Two further arguments that relate to the conclusion/IC, both have conclusion and one of these is developed	(6 marks)

If the candidate presents two further arguments, one relevant and one irrelevant, award marks for the relevant further only.

Further arguments**Examples of specific details:**

- R1 Many people are allergic to cosmetics.
- R2 There have been many cases where products are banned when they are a health risk.
- C The trend towards young people not using cosmetics should be encouraged.

Counter argument – against idea that cosmetics are an expression of personality.

- R1 The cosmetics industry supports many jobs.
- R2 Many of the objections made to the cosmetic industry could be made against other leisure industries.
- R3 This would cripple the economy.
- C We should not encourage the trend towards not using cosmetics.

Examples that could be further developed.

Issues relating to other environmental problems such as the rainforests, global warming etc. Issues relating to other worthwhile projects such as homelessness etc.

Examples of arguments which could be further developed

Cosmetics particularly exploit women.

Cosmetics further a culture of image, spin etc.

All cosmetics are a health risk.

PARA	ASSUMPTIONS	FLAWS
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumes that revealing one's personality is a good thing. 	
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumes the cosmetics industry does not produce over-riding positive effects. Assumes that revealing one's true personality is a good thing. 	<p>Relevance of analogy – inappropriate comparison of a "paint job" on a rusty car concealing damage, whereas cosmetics do not do this.</p> <p>Conflation – of make-up with cosmetics (paras 2 and 3)</p> <p>Inconsistency – the author says both that the true self cannot be concealed (revealed in what do and say) and that it can be concealed (by cosmetics)</p>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumes that the public is always right Assumes that animal testing is wrong. Assumes you cannot buy cosmetics/make-up not tested on animals. 	<p>Appeal to popularity – population not always right.</p>
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumes the manufacture of cosmetics requires the use of harmful ingredients. 	<p>Inconsistency: this is an objection to man-made cosmetics rather than cosmetics as such. The author seems to advocate the use of natural cosmetics for cosmetics purposes.</p> <p>Inconsistency: in paragraph 4 the author regrets the way the cosmetic industry is using up natural resources but is here suggesting that people use natural resources for cosmetic purposes.</p>
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumes ingredients being mined mainly for use by cosmetic companies. Assumes that the extinction of the Indian tiger is typical of other rare species of animals. 	<p>Causation: one cannot isolate the actions of the cosmetics companies as a sufficient condition for the tiger's extinction.</p>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assumes mindless consumption is a bad thing. Assumes spending money on things people don't need is a bad thing. 	<p>Clarification: it is not clear why the activities recommended are actually needed by people.</p> <p>Contradiction: in paragraph 4 the author concedes that people do need cosmetics even if they should learn to do without them.</p> <p>Begging the question – the author has not established that these alternatives are wise consumer choices.</p>

Quality of written communication (maximum 3 marks)

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar may be noticeable and intrusive.• There is little use of relevant material or specialist vocabulary.• Points are expressed tersely. <p>[1]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There may be occasional errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.• Not all the material used is clear or relevant. There is occasional use of specialist vocabulary.• Points exhibit some order. <p>[2]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• There will be few if any errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar.• Uses relevant material clearly and specialist vocabulary where appropriate.• Points are well ordered and fluently expressed. <p>[3]</p>
--	--	--

ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

Assessment Objectives	Marks			Q1	Q2	Q3
	% of papers 1 and 2	Marks available	Marks Used			
Identify the elements in a reasoned case	AO1	5%	5	5	(a) 1	(a) 2 (b) 2
Evaluate reasoning of different kinds	AO2	20%	20	20	(a) 8	(b) 6 (c) 6
Recognise and evaluate assumptions	AO3	5%	5	6	(a) 2	(c) 2 2
Clarify expression and ideas	AO4	5%	5	5	(a) 1	(c) 2 2
Present a reasoned case in a clear, logical and coherent way <i>Quality of Written Communication</i>	AO5	25%	25	24	(b) 8	(d) 8 8 <i>of which 3</i>
Total		60%	60	60	20	20 20

NB

This examination requires candidates to demonstrate their Critical Thinking skills as itemised in the Assessment Objectives above.

Answers should be credited on this basis and not be penalised if the use of English is clumsy or the response lacks fluency.

The use of bullet points, headings and diagrams etc may be used to aid understanding.

In Question 3 however, a well-planned, articulate and fluent response should receive additional credit through a high quality of language mark.

Report on the Units taken in June 2005

Report on the Units June 2005

Chief Examiner's Report

General Comments

The continued growth in the number of candidates for this subject is very gratifying. This growth reflects both an increase in the number of Centres and an increase in the number of candidates within existing Centres.

As many Centres already realise, Critical Thinking is a subject that demands a number of skills of candidates. These skills include:

- analysis of the structure of arguments;
- finding assumptions;
- evaluation of evidence and reasoning;
- judging the credibility of evidence;
- production of arguments.

Thus, a candidate needs to have been taught and had the opportunity to develop these skills before taking the examination.

Unfortunately, there was evidence that a number of candidates were insufficiently skilled, such that they were unable to demonstrate an understanding of basic terminology or an awareness of what is involved in assessing evidence and reasoning. Candidates who uncritically accepted what the author had said, without any attempt to consider that there might be problems with, say, the interpretation of evidence, were unable to access marks for evaluation. Centres should ensure that candidates are given plenty of opportunity to practise skills such as this.

However, there were Centres whose candidates demonstrated a pleasing ability to show their Critical Thinking skills. These were able to show a commendable creativity and subtlety in their handling of the range of skills being assessed.

Centres should note that examinations in this AS Critical Thinking specification (3821) will be offered for the last time in January 2006, which will also be the first assessment opportunity for the new AS Critical Thinking units (F491 and F492).

Principal Examiner's Report 2870/11/12

General Comments

Paper 1 has a structure that teachers and candidates should now find very familiar. The sixteen multiple-choice questions are based on categories that do not vary from one assessment to another. These are

Finding the main conclusion
Drawing a conclusion
Stating assumptions
Assessing the impact of additional evidence
Finding flaws
Clarifying meaning in context.

In that these categories are always represented (and no other is), candidates need to have practised answering questions in each of them. For example, they need to know what to consider when looking for the flaw in an argument.

The format of Section B and many of the question types should also be similarly familiar. Candidates who have learned (and practised) the skills of Critical Thinking should be able to apply them in their answers.

Weak candidates often saw the questions as asking for a combination of comprehension, description, paraphrase or even just a literal copy of what the author had written. Evaluation of evidence, for example, requires something very different from just repeating what the evidence is ('The author states that...'). When some candidates refer to the author's use of punctuation as a source of weakness in an argument, then there is a worry that such candidates do not understand the nature of the subject.

Other sources of weakness were not understanding some of the basic terminology (the most obvious being reasons and assumptions), and the use of seemingly technical terms in a vague or curious way ('the author makes assumptions that are subjective'; 'the argument is weak because it is objective').

As in previous years, candidates often wrote more than they needed to. This ranged from writing much more than the content of the reasons in Question 17 to commenting on an author's assumption when no such comment was required. Candidates should be reminded that if a question offers one mark for the identification of an assumption, no further mark is available for evaluation of that assumption.

Comments on Individual Questions

Questions 1 – 16

Most candidates answered questions 1, 2, 3, 8 and 14 correctly. Few candidates answered questions 15 and 16 correctly.

Questions 17-22

17 From previous papers, it can be seen that this question is a well-established one. Given that there were seven reasons to choose from, a candidate who understood the meaning of the term 'reason' should have had few difficulties in accessing the marks

Report on the Units taken in June 2005

available. It was encouraging to see candidates who produced two reasons, with no embellishment or development. Too often, however, candidates failed to access these marks, either by selecting the wrong part of the passage or by omitting important words in the reason (or by inappropriate paraphrasing). An example of the latter was to express the reason 'Children are already protected by the law from unreasonable physical punishment' as 'Children can't be smacked'.

18(a) Weaker candidates used a piece of evidence (that on Sweden) and quoted it, without indicating how this demonstrated an inconsistency. Stronger candidates were able to see that the inconsistency lay in the author's use of evidence on what the public do, even though the significance of public opinion had been dismissed earlier.

18(b) There were some useful responses here, focusing on the irrelevance of whether or not other forms of discipline led to aggression. Good candidates clearly focused on this point, sometimes also giving it as a *tu quoque* problem. Weak candidates simply agreed with the author.

19 There were many possible answers to this question. A useful number of candidates were able to see that changing the law in Sweden regarding smacking could have been at least part of the cause of the increase in recorded cases of child abuse, given a redefinition of the latter. Some picked up on the possible problems of the two timescales not being identical; others gave relevant changes in Swedish society as possible explanations for the evidence. The weakest candidates accepted the author's argument without question.

20(a) It was common for candidates to fail to distinguish between the facts provided by UNICEF and the author's interpretation of their significance. For example, UNICEF itself was commended by some candidates as being a trusted organisation, without these candidates seeing that the author has used the UNICEF evidence in a particular way. Good candidates were able to look behind the figures and do some evaluation of them, raising many of the issues given in the mark scheme.

20(b) Candidates often failed to access the mark here by giving incomplete answers. Many saw that not all parents smack gently, but failed to see that not all assaults are serious.

21(a) As with other questions, the weakest candidates did no more than agree with the author, stressing that the nappy example was conclusive. Stronger candidates were able to give answers that assessed the degree of success of the author in this part of the argument. Some used words such as 'exaggeration' and 'absurd' to highlight their point.

21(b) Weak candidates stressed that there would not be a problem in enforcing a ban in that Sweden had already banned smacking (even though the context of the problem was given in a Swedish context). Other weak responses stressed that children would not be disrespectful to their parents, so the problem would not arise. Stronger candidates highlighted either the point that most people obey the law anyway, so enforcement would not be needed, or the point that the justification of a ban on smacking is not affected by problems of enforcement.

22(a) In that the question asked for the identification of a weakness, most candidates sought to find one. Most went for *ad hominem* even though the author had done no more than misrepresent the argument of those who are opposed to smacking. There were candidates who saw this and expressed this issue of misrepresentation in a number of acceptable ways.

Report on the Units taken in June 2005

22(b) An encouraging number of candidates gave one of the two responses in the mark scheme, often with relevant development. Weaker candidates often criticised the use of the word 'obvious', reprimanding the author for being so certain about things.

Questions 23-28

23(a) Many candidates were able to access the mark for this question. Where candidates fell short, it was either due to lack of precision or through getting caught up with irrelevant issues. An example of the first problem was to use the word 'most' rather than something like 'relatively high'. An example of the second was to fret about the number of non-drinkers involved in road accidents.

23(b) Many candidates gave relevant answers to this. Those who fell short tended to ignore either the importance of referring to the appropriate age-group or the need to specify the sort of countries that would be relevant.

24(a) This was well done by many candidates, although finding an assumption that the author was making proved difficult for the weaker candidates. A familiar answer from such candidates was to suggest that both adverts for and those against alcohol had the same effect.

24(b) This was well done by many candidates, although the need to have to find an assumption that the author was making proved difficult for the weaker candidates. A familiar answer from such candidates was to suggest that both adverts for and those against alcohol had the same effect.

25 There were many candidates who were able to see the problem of over-generalisation in the author's use of the two football clubs as evidence. There were also many who saw that the words 'always happy to ignore' the code of practice were too strong. Some candidates got themselves distracted by wondering whether the alcohol companies' logos actually appeared on junior kits, and others wanted to know what the code of practice said.

26 Though many candidates were able to see that there might be a big difference between what alcohol advertisers do and what teenagers think they're doing, a sizeable number got themselves caught up with details on entry restrictions to clubs, the extent to which teenagers are concerned with sexual success, and the fact that older people are also concerned about this.

27 Many candidates could see that there were problems with the author's use of evidence to show causal relationships, but a surprising number took these relationships to have been conclusively demonstrated by the evidence. Where the relationships were seen as possibly problematic, marks were often not achieved because candidates focussed on the detail of either age-groups or time-period. However, an encouraging number of answers gave useful alternative explanations for the author's evidence.

28(a) Many candidates saw that the context of the argument was important to understand the meaning that the author intended. Weak candidates ignored this context and stressed that a positive effect is one that leads to young people not drinking alcohol.

28(b) The author's reference to indirect advertising in TV soaps was correctly seen by many candidates as a response to this question. A reference to tobacco advertising was the most common wrong answer.

Principal Examiner's Report

Critical Thinking Paper 2 2870/02

General Comments

Candidates engaged well with Question 1, defending their judgements about the sale of the car in a lively manner, although passion rather than reason sometimes prevailed amongst weaker candidates. Question 3 inspired a wealth of wide-ranging further arguments about cosmetics, which did not appear to be gender specific and often went beyond what was necessary for the marks available. Answers to Question 2 were more measured, candidates being quite clear about where their values lay in relation to tradition, culture, professionalism and the function of the courts.

There was a wide range of performance. Stronger candidates appeared to use key terms confidently and accurately, displaying a firm grasp of the basic skills, whilst weaker candidates often lost marks simply because they were performing the wrong task, for example: recounting the evidence in Question 1(a) instead of assessing it, summarising the passage in Questions 2 and 3 instead of identifying reasons; challenging the reasoning instead of assessing it; and producing further arguments in relation to the reasoning rather than in relation to the conclusion.

The distribution of marks was uneven, performance being skewed towards the lower end by some large entry Centres where answers indicated that candidates had not been prepared appropriately for the demands of the paper. Some candidates were not shy of stating their lack of preparation to the examiner, one claiming to have had only a few hours of preparation for the examination.

The vast majority of candidates divided their time well, completing all questions. Where Question 3 was curtailed or rushed, it was usually where candidates had engaged at length with Question 1. Other candidates left spaces for flaws and assumptions in Questions 2 and 3, but produced extensive further arguments and attempted little evaluation.

Strong candidates made good use of key terms and technical vocabulary to focus their analysis and evaluation effectively. The language of Critical Thinking was, however, lacking in some Centres' scripts, which made it more difficult for these candidates to express themselves precisely and quickly. Even some of the strongest candidates misspelt key terms, particularly 'argument' and 'corroboration', the latter occasionally appearing as 'collaboration'.

Answers from some Centres were so terse that their candidates were awarded no marks in Question 2(b), where the reasons were summarised briefly instead of being stated. Similarly in Question 1(a), there was often little reference to the actual passage, answers barely reaching one line in length. Whilst it is not simply the length of the answers that gains marks, the candidate needs to make sure that conciseness is not at the expense of the task required.

Overall, where candidates were aware of the demands of the tasks, there was a very pleasing engagement with the questions, which produced precise, perceptive answers.

Comments on Individual Questions

1 Candidates engaged fully with this question, often gaining their highest marks on the paper. Some candidates spent time constructing elaborate tables. The topic appeared accessible to all. Stronger candidates referred to the additional information on the MOT certificate relating to rust when they assessed (M)'s guilt, providing very persuasive arguments in Question 1(b). Whilst a few candidates did not understand the connotations of 'day release' and assumed that the mechanic had a prison record, the topic as a whole inspired much relevant assessment. Most candidates displayed a clear understanding of the situation, although there was some evidence of misunderstanding, for example that (G) was (M)'s employer.

1(a) Many candidates applied the relevant assessment criteria well, the strongest candidates achieving full marks. Most candidates used the RAVEN mnemonic or a variant to guide their answers, but some did not realise that it was not sufficient simply to put ticks or crosses next to the criteria against each name. The candidates from some Centres were unable to access many marks as they simply paraphrased the claims without assessment, whilst others did not make sufficient points for each participant.

It was encouraging that a greater number of candidates accessed marks by directing their assessment at a particular claim or by giving what must be supposed to be true to make their assessment, for example: '(C)'s claim that (M) was his best modern apprentice is strengthened by his expertise as a garage manager to know his staff unless the relevance of this is reduced by the other apprentices being of a very poor standard'.

Weaker candidates simply named the credibility criterion without applying it to the situation, for example: '(R) was neutral', which could not be awarded marks. Similarly the formulaic answers (S)/(C)/(M) 'had a vested interest which weakens their evidence' could not be credited. An explanation of why this was so, with reference to the situation presented, was required.

Candidates identified four experts in their field, (G), (M), (C) and (R), but this expertise was not always needed for the claims that they made, or if it was, the candidates did not make the link obvious. For example, '(G) was a garage manager and so was an expert' needed further explanation to gain a mark. However strong candidates made full use of (M)'s modern apprenticeship to point out that this might give him the knowledge to correctly assess the condition of a car, if he had completed enough training, or if the training was relevant to the conditions required by MOTs.

1(b) The strongest candidates included the key word 'knowingly' in their judgement, whilst the weakest simply blamed (M) for selling a rusty car, or (S) for allowing the rust to develop. Neither of the latter responses could be credited as they did not relate to the question, which focused upon (M)'s knowledge of the defective condition of the car.

Candidates found ample opportunity to identify points of corroboration and conflict, although some oversimplified the comments so that they no longer represented the claims of the text, for example stating that both (G) and (R) claimed that there was excessive rust on the car. However, according to the text, (G) had claimed that 'there was extensive corrosion to the underside of the car', such that it should not have passed

Report on the Units taken in June 2005

its previous MOT, whilst (R), although commenting on the amount of rust underneath, said that he 'wasn't aware of any immediate dangerous conditions'. Thus, although both acknowledged rust underneath the car, they interpreted the implications for safety differently. The weakest answers confused 'collaboration' with 'corroboration', often constructing a conspiracy theory involving (C) and (M).

Many candidates correctly identified the weight and balance of the evidence, although some felt that (S) was a neutral participant. It was noticeable that all candidates from some Centres failed to make a response to this element of the question, thus not accessing two relatively straightforward marks.

Candidates often used the quality of evidence element to give an impassioned response, the strongest of which linked vested interest on each side and contrasted this with the assumed neutrality of (R). The weakest responses did not apply the assessment skills, but either berated (M) for his exploitation of a poor and gullible student or admonished (S) for the irresponsible neglect of her car.

2 Many candidates gained least marks on this question, often because they did not perform the task required by the question.

2(a) About half of the candidates identified the conclusion successfully. Weaker candidates identified the first sentence in the last paragraph, perhaps led more by its position at the end of the passage than its function to follow logically from the reasons given.

2(b) Many candidates correctly stated reasons 2 and 5, whilst the stronger candidates were able to recognise that position was not the only indicator for reasons 3 and 4. Candidates in some Centres consistently lost marks either by adding extra information from the paragraph, or by summarising the text, suggesting that they were perhaps not clear about what was required.

2(c) Candidates as a whole scored least well in this element of the question. The assumption most frequently correctly given was that of something being bad simply because it was old fashioned. Some candidates also recognised that the gap between professionals and their clients might not be a bad thing.

Weaker candidates simply copied out three quotations or summarised the text as follows: 'it assumes that wigs are old fashioned' or 'wigs put off women'. In that an assumption is a gap in the reasoning, this perhaps indicates that these candidates were again unaware of the task required.

Candidates were more successful in explaining flaws, the most frequently given being an *appeal to popularity* in paragraph one and the *tu quoque* flaw in paragraph four. Those who used technical vocabulary were able to access the mark quickly, whilst those who did not, gained the mark after several sentences of explanation.

Many candidates phrased their answers as counter arguments, challenging the claims rather than assessing them, claiming for example, that in paragraph 4 the author is wrong in saying that witnesses do not have protection, pointing out the evidence of the witness protection scheme. Whilst this might be a correct challenge, it is not a flaw in the reasoning and as such cannot be credited.

2(d) The further arguments tended to be terse but adequate. Strong candidates produced two arguments relating to the conclusion, the majority dealing with culture, heritage, and professionalism, with a few candidates defending the role of the wig maker.

Report on the Units taken in June 2005

Weaker candidates struggled to give reasons related to discomfort, often claiming that wigs were a danger to health, although wigs being 'contagious' stretched the limits of understanding. A few complained that wigs were a waste of natural resources. This could be credited, though one would have to question the emotionally charged argument that these resources would be better used to make 'clothes for the starving children of Africa'. Whilst marks are given for the correct form of argument, the content has to make sense.

Candidates from some Centres fabricated statistics to support their reasoning, typically arguing about surveys where judges' opinions or those of the public had been sought in relation to wig wearing. This was entirely unnecessary, the marks being accessible by everyday examples of other areas where uniforms reflect professionalism or culture.

Oddly, many of those candidates who had not correctly identified the conclusion went on to produce further arguments that did support or challenge the proposal. The weaker responses were those that were related to the reasoning of the passage, often focusing upon intimidation. However they could be credited where reasons within this were original and related to the conclusion. Only the weakest responses were entirely derivative of the reasoning and of these, many lacked a conclusion. To recognise that an argument requires a conclusion is a basic skill required in Critical Thinking, which these candidates perhaps had not had time to acquire.

- 3** This topic caused more direct involvement than Question 2. The strongest candidates often scored full marks on the structure, correctly identifying the conclusion and all five reasons. Very few however identified the counter argument, even though it was heralded by 'Some may argue'. Even fewer identified the intermediate conclusion, even though again it was flagged up by reference to a number of benefits or negative effects.

Some candidates looked to the end of the passage and wrongly identified the conclusion as 'should spend their money more wisely'. Others identified where the reasons were, but included too much extra material to be awarded marks.

Weaker candidates often presented structural points embedded amongst challenges to claims that had often not actually been made by the author. With this approach it was difficult to work out where further arguments began, if they began at all. Some simply expressed their personal disagreements or treated the question as a discursive essay.

Many evaluative points were made, but close attention to the text was needed to achieve correct responses. For example, many claimed that not all cosmetics are tested on animals. This was a challenge rather than a flaw, but even when expressed as a flaw, claiming a generalisation that all cosmetics are tested on animals, this was too strong a criticism considering the reasoning in the passage.

Another common mistake was to claim a generalisation from one example, the Indian tiger. This would have been correct if it had been phrased as an assumption, that this example was typical of the extinction of other rare species of animals.

Many candidates claimed that the analogy did not compare 'similar things', some pointing out that bodies are biological whereas cars are mechanical. However this missed the focus of the comparison which was concealment, the difference being that make-up is often used to enhance features rather than conceal defects.

Report on the Units taken in June 2005

Further arguments were often impassioned and relevant, with the majority of candidates not forgetting the conclusion. This led to a pleasing number of candidates gaining full marks for this element of the question. However, where responses lacked a conclusion, candidates could access no more than 3 of the 6 available marks. Stronger candidates commonly chose arguments concerning disfigurement, self esteem, the theatre, media or anorexia; weaker candidates failed to access many marks by relating their arguments to the reasoning, arguing about the need or not to conceal one's personality or presenting long and involved arguments about animal rights.

The majority of candidates could be awarded two Quality of Language marks, whilst a healthy number demonstrated precise language and a structured relevant approach, thus achieving full marks for Quality of Language.

Report on the Units taken in June 2005

**Advanced GCE AS Critical Thinking (3821)
June 2005 Assessment Session**

Unit Threshold Marks

	<i>Unit</i>	Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2870/11	Raw	16	11	9	8	7	6	
2870/12	Raw	24	11	9	7	5	4	
2870/02	Raw	60	34	30	26	22	19	

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3821	300	240	210	180	150	120	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3821	8.33	20.81	39.09	60.48	76.76	100.0	15,996

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Information Bureau

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@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 2005



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

