OCR
Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCE

Critical Thinking

Unit **F504:** Critical Reasoning

Advanced GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2018

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.

Annotations

	Stamp	Description
1	✔	Q 1 Use a ✓ to indicate each point credited
3	C	Q 2 Conclusion correctly identified Q 4 Supported conclusion
4	E	Q 2 Argument element correctly identified Q 4 Argument element used.
5	R	Q 2 Relationships between argument elements correctly identified
6	S	Q 3 Strength Q 4 Accurate use of source
7	XV	Q 3 Weakness
8	P	Q 3 Support for claim Q 4 Personal thinking
9	T	Q 2, Q 3 Supported judgement Q 4 Defining terms
10	I	Intermediate conclusion/inferential reasoning
12	[	Gap/error in reasoning
13	NAQ	Not answered question
14	?	Unclear
15	SEEN	Noted but no credit given
16	BP	Blank page

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	a	**Conclusion** of **counter**-argument (*accept* counter-claim, counter-assertion), countering (or countered by) the main theme, that societies should be more equal.	2	For each of answers a, b and c: **2 marks** for accurate identification of element **and** explanation in relation to text. **1 mark** for accurate identification of element **without** accurate explanation in relation to text. **or** partially accurate identification of element **and** accurate explanation in relation to text. **0 marks**: No correct content **or** partially correct identification of element without correct explanation in relation to text. Annotate each mark awarded with ✅ .
	b	**Evidence** supporting the claim that "greater equality within rich countries seems to lead them to adopt policies which are more helpful to poorer countries."	2	
	c	**Conclusion** to either the whole argument (= Main Conclusion) or para 3 (= Intermediate Conclusion).	2	

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	**Candidates may make any of the following judgements:** • **Yes this is an argument** Either the conclusion is stated in para 2 *In fact, inequality can be the price of the reduction of poverty through the creation of opportunities* Or the conclusion is stated in para 5 *Without inequality, there would be no incentive to spread these benefits and the world would lose the most exciting opportunity to increase its wealth and reduce poverty since the Industrial Revolution* Or the conclusion is stated in the title *Inequality can be a good thing* Or the conclusion is implied (in either para 2 or para 5) *e.g. "Inequality is not bad in itself"* or *"therefore inequality in the new knowledge economy should be welcomed"* • **No this isn't an argument** Because the conclusion is unstated however it is implied in either para 2 or para 5. **Candidates may use some of the following to support their judgement:** Para 1 sets the background for the reasoning. The second half of the first sentence may be regarded as a reported CA, to which para 2 responds. The second sentence consists of evidence, supporting the claims in the first sentence.	14	**Level 4 (12 - 14 marks):** **Accurate** and **thorough** analysis of the types of reasoning present in the document including some understanding of complexity. **Level 3 (8 - 11 marks):** **Clear** and **mostly accurate** analysis of the type of reasoning present in the document. **Level 2 (4 - 7 marks):** **Basic** analysis of the types of reasoning present in the document with **some accuracy**. **Level 1 (1 - 3 marks):** **Limited** analysis of the type of reasoning present in the document, with **much inaccuracy**. **Level 0 (0 marks):** No creditworthy material Annotate as follows: **C** Conclusion correctly identified. **E** Other argument element correctly identified. **R** Relationship between argument elements correctly identified. **T** Supported judgement. **Judgements may be either explicit or implied**

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		Para 2 may be regarded as the key part of the document, illustrated by two extended examples, namely China (para 3) and the "new knowledge economy" (paras 4 and 5). On that interpretation, the third sentence is either the MC of the passage or an IC leading to an implied MC, "Inequality is not bad in itself", in which case the title of the passage may be intended as the MC. **Alternatively**, para 2 and the example of China can be interpreted as leading up to paras 4 and 5, in which case the implied conclusion is, "Therefore inequality in the new knowledge economy should be welcomed." This conclusion can be inferred from the reasons stated in para 5 and the uncontroversial assumption that increasing the wealth of the world and reducing poverty are desirable. The first two sentences of para 2 respond to the reported CA in para 1, stating that recent writers have condemned inequality and suggested strategies for overcoming it. The extended example in para 3 consists of narrative and explanation. The two occurrences here of "because" indicate explanation, **not** reasons supporting a conclusion. Para 4 offers several examples to support the author's claim that "inequality can be the price of the reduction of poverty through the creation of opportunities."		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	**Support of Doc 3 for its claim** • Doc 3 is well targeted to the claim in the title. If that is intended as the MC, it is supported by a clear explanation and two extended examples of how inequality can be beneficial. **Support of Doc 4 for its claim** • **Doc 4 supports its claim the world is not as unequal as we might think, on the basis that we usually focus on financial inequality but there are other types of inequality that help to balance that out.** • Doc 4 weakly supports its claim as the reasoning relies upon discussing various kinds of inequalities to support the claim that the world is not as unequal as we think. **Strengths in Doc 3** • The example of China appears to support the hypothesis stated in para 2. • The graph shows a correlation between the reduction in poverty and an increase in the GINI index. • The examples cited in para 4 are likely to be well known and therefore persuasive to most readers. • Response to counter-argument. **Strengths of Doc 4** • The use of statistics in paras 4 and 5 make the argument stronger than it would be if it relied solely on assertion. • Uses a range of different measures of inequality to respond to counter-claim concerning global injustice. • He succeeds in showing that even wealthy countries include pockets of deprivation.	20	Allocate marks according to the grid of Level Descriptors (next page). To achieve each of the levels in the grid candidates need to satisfy all the characteristics in the grid for that level. Use the quality of the evaluation to determine where within the level the answer should be located. The **key** points of evaluation are the ones identified in the mark scheme. Annotate as follows: **P** Support for claim. **S** Strength **XV** Weakness **T** Supported judgement (weighing up)

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	Weaknesses in Doc 3 • If the example of China does support the hypothesis, it may have been cherry-picked for the purpose. • Using the proportion of the population earning $2 or less per day as a proxy for poverty may or may not be relevant, because if the cost of living rose at the same time, the apparent reduction of poverty depicted in the graph may be illusory. • The correlation in the graph is consistent with a causal relationship, but does not prove it. • The rise in the GINI index appears to be relatively small, but in view of the fact that "perfect equality" and "perfect inequality" are unlikely to exist in reality, small differences in a GINI index may be significant. **Weaknesses of Doc 4** • The reasoning in para 1 is obscure. If it refers to inequality of income, it would justify paying people **more** for doing unpleasant jobs, but that is not what happens. If it refers to inequality of potential, then that is a fact of nature, not the result of a policy. • The claims in the second half of para 2 and in para 4 that some relatively poor people are happier than inhabitants of rich countries relies crucially on the unusual and implausible definition of happiness adopted by the survey. **Weighing up** Both Doc 3 and Doc 4 support their claim fairly well. Both documents have significant weaknesses but the reliance of Doc 4 on the Happy Planet Index is a more fatal weakness, whereas, the evidence of the graph is ambiguous but not fatally so. Therefore, the reasoning is slightly stronger in Doc 3. *Other plausibly supported judgements should be credited.*		

Level Descriptors for Question 3

Level 4 (16-20 marks)	Candidates come to a **reasonable judgement** about which document supports its claim better, well supported by: • Justified evaluation of how effectively Doc 3 and Doc 4 support their respective claims. • Mostly well-justified and perhaps occasionally insightful evaluation of **key** parts of the reasoning in both documents, with reference to **both** strengths and weaknesses in **both** documents. • The language is clear and mostly precise.
Level 3 (11-15 marks)	Candidates come to a **fair judgement,** possibly overstated, about which document supports its claim better, mostly supported by: • Evaluation of how effectively Doc 3 and Doc 4 support their respective claims • Some sensible points of evaluation of parts of the reasoning in both documents, but **not necessarily** key parts, with reference to strengths and/or weaknesses. • The language is mostly clear.
Level 2 (6-10 marks)	Candidates come to a **judgement,** possibly overstated or implied**,** about which document supports its claim better, partly supported by: • Basic evaluative comments about how effectively Doc 3 and Doc 4 support their respective claims. • A few relevant points of simple evaluation of parts of the reasoning in both documents, but not necessarily giving equal weight to both. • The language is simple and may be imprecise.
Level 1 (1-5 Marks)	Candidates may or may not come to a **judgement.** • Some evaluative comments are made about how effectively Doc 3 and Doc 4 support their respective claims. **and/or** • Some relevant points of evaluation are made of parts of the **reasoning** in one or both of the documents. • The language is simple and mostly comprehensible.
Level 0 (0 Marks)	No creditworthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	*Indicative Content* It is important to differentiate between three different aspects of "inequality": of potential, of income and of wealth. Three rival concepts of fairness can also be distinguished, based on equality, need or desert. Inequality of potential is unavoidable, because it is a fact of nature, although policies can be adopted to mitigate its effects, such as quotas or financial inducements for employers to employ disabled people. The introduction of such policies can be considered to make a society fairer. Inequality of income is the key to economic progress. Most people would not be motivated to gain qualifications, work hard or come up with new ideas unless they expected to benefit financially from doing so. Both reason and experience show that if everyone's income is equal, it will be equally low, and one way in which the income of the poor will improve significantly is if the income of a few improves a great deal. There is a very important distinction between inequality based on fair criteria, such as "different skills and different work ethic and different priorities" and unfair inequality based on such factors as corruption. The latter has no advantages to society as a whole and should be eradicated.	20	Allocate marks according to the grid of Level Descriptors. Annotate as follows: **C** Supported conclusion **I** Intermediate conclusion/inferential reasoning **E** Argument element used **T** Defining terms **S** Accurate use of source **P** Personal thinking

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	The gap between rich and poor does not have to be excessive. It would be hard to justify the level of inequality recorded in Doc 1, and it would be good to reduce the inequality mentioned in Doc 4 between men in East Glasgow and inhabitants of other parts of the UK. A balance can be struck between the level of redistributive taxation which will and will not reduce the motivation to increase one's income. Similarly, the ability to save money and to pass it on to one's family (or other chosen beneficiary) is part of the reason for wanting to earn more, and thus part of the motivation to gain qualifications, work hard and develop new ideas. This is the root of inequality of wealth. But this motivation is probably not diminished by a fairly high level of inheritance tax. Further important types of inequality relate to the distribution of resources such as medical care and education. Frequent news stories in the UK refer to inequalities of these kinds, and it is generally taken for granted that inequalities should be reduced because they are unfair. But it is probably true in these cases as well that a desire for equality is the enemy of improvement. Within schools, for example, a policy that teachers must all teach to the same level, so that no students are advantaged compared to others, can prevent teachers from introducing worthwhile new techniques and resources.		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	A reasonable conclusion would be that making a society fair is a realistic aim, even if it cannot be fully achieved, and that, for the most part, the reduction of inequality contributes towards the achievement of this aim.		

Level Descriptors for Question 4

Marks	Performance Descriptors
Level 4 **16–20 marks**	**Nuanced** argument, displaying **most** of the following characteristics: • There is some well-judged consideration of the **definition** of key terms, especially "inequality" and "fair". • The reasoning has a **clear and complex structure.** The arguments are well organised, containing separate strands of reasoning with reasons and intermediate conclusions. • Other argument elements are used **effectively**: such as relevant analogies, hypothetical reasoning, apt examples, CA with RCA. • Coverage of the main strands of the argument is **thorough.** There may be questionable assumptions but they do not weaken the thrust of the argument. • The **conclusion is consistent** with the reasoning put forward. • The conclusion **refers** to both "inequality" and "fair". • Candidates use their **own ideas** as well as those drawn from the sources. • Use of sources is accurate, evaluative and developed. • The writing is **well-structured and precise.**
Level 3 **11–15 marks**	**Developed** argument, displaying **most** of the following characteristics: • There may be some consideration of the **definition** of key terms, especially "inequality" and/or "fair". • The argument has **clear structure.** The argument is supported by intermediate conclusions as well as reasons. Other argument elements may help to support, clarify or illustrate the reasoning. • The argument may have flaws and there may be some dubious assumptions. • The **conclusion** is consistent with **all or most** of the reasoning put forward. • The conclusion **refers** to both "inequality" and "fair". • Any candidate using ideas and evidence **from the sources alone** must be capped at top Level 3. • Use of the sources is accurate and includes some evaluation and/or development. • The writing is **clear and structured.**
Level 2 **6 –10 marks**	**Basic** argument, displaying **most** of the following characteristics: • The argument has a **simple structure with some reasons.** Other argument elements, if present, may add little of value to the reasoning. • Parts of the argument have **obvious weaknesses, flaws etc.** • The conclusion is consistent with all or most of the arguments presented, but may be overstated. • The writing is **generally clear**, but may lack structure. Answers presented in **bullet point or note form**, however detailed, must be capped at top Level 2. • Use of sources may include significant inaccuracies and be uncritical.

Level 1 **1–5 marks**	**Weak** argument, displaying **most** of the following characteristics: • The argument has **little structure.** • There are **obvious weaknesses** in the reasoning. • There is no final conclusion or the conclusion is **weakly justified** or **overstated**. • The writing is **simple**. It may be in bullet point or note form. • If sources are used there are significant inaccuracies.
Level 0	No creditworthy content.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

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