



**GCE**

**Critical Thinking**

Unit **F501**: Introduction to Critical Thinking

Advanced Subsidiary 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.

© OCR 2018

## Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Use a ✓ to indicate the separate marks given in <b>1(a), 1(c), 1(d), 2, 3(a), 3(b), 6, 7 and 8</b>
	<b>Use the following annotations in Q9 to indicate:</b>
<b>C++</b>	the credibility of the claim is assessed with explanation of what else you need to know
<b>C+</b>	the credibility of the claim is assessed
<b>C</b>	the credibility of the source is assessed
<b>J++</b>	a developed judgement <b>weighing up</b> why one credibility criterion is stronger or weaker
<b>J+</b>	an attempt to <b>justify</b> why one credibility criterion is more important without weighing up
<b>J</b>	A judgement <b>identifying but not explaining</b> the most important credibility criterion
	<b>Use the following annotations in Q10 to indicate:</b>
<b>C+</b>	strong credibility
<b>C</b>	weak credibility
<b>P+</b>	strong plausibility
<b>P</b>	weak plausibility
<b>F</b>	the side 'for' e.g. <b>CF, CF+, PF, PF+</b>
<b>A</b>	the side 'against' e.g. <b>CA, CA+, PA, PA+</b>
<b>J</b>	a judgement
<b>RJ</b>	a relevant judgement
	on pages 10 and 11 that these continuation sheets have been looked at

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)	<p><b>Conclusion</b> <b>2 marks</b></p> <p>An alternative sustainable way of producing meat is required.</p>	2	<p><b>Credit 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>either for a slight omission</b> e.g. leaving out “<i>alternative</i>” or “<i>sustainable</i>”</li> </ul> <p><b>Credit 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>for the addition of other argument elements</b> e.g. “<i>As this trend shows no sign of stopping and global data analysis shows that most people are not keen on a big reduction of meat in their diet.</i>”</li> <li>• <b>or for the assertion</b> “<i>It should also be one answer to the anticipated crisis in producing enough meat to feed the fast growing world’s population the argument with IVM.</i>”</li> <li>• <b>or for not creditworthy material</b></li> </ul>
1	(b)	<p><b>Reason against:</b></p> <p><b>2 marks</b></p> <p>(However, a newspaper health correspondent warns) “There could be unforeseen health consequences to eating lab-grown meat”</p>	2	<p><b>Credit 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>for either a slight omission</b> e.g. leaving out “<i>unforeseen</i>” or “<i>to eating lab-grown meat</i>”</li> <li>• <b>or a slight addition</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Credit 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>for the inclusion of other argument elements</b> e.g. “<i>amongst which could be allergies to some of the ingredients</i>”</li> <li>• <b>for the assertion</b> “<i>It was chewy and tasteless.</i>”</li> <li>• <b>or for no creditworthy material</b></li> </ul>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
1	(c)	<p><b>Evidence against:</b></p> <p><b>2 marks</b></p> <p>Newspaper photographs of demonstrations in Europe against genetically modified (GM) foods.</p>	2	<p><b>Credit 1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>for a slight omission</b> e.g. leaving out “<i>in Europe,</i>” or “<i>against GM foods.</i>”</li> <li>• <b>or a slight addition</b> e.g. the inclusion of “<i>should convince us of that</i>”</li> <li>• <b>or both of the above</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Credit 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>for evidence for IVM</b> e.g. “<i>Between 1961 and 2007, the consumption of meat by the British increased by 20%.</i>”</li> <li>• or for no creditworthy material</li> </ul>
1	(d)	<p>4 different argument indicator words + argument elements for each</p> <p><b>Credit 1 mark</b> each for any four of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• however – counter reason /any two words from: hypothetical counter assertion</li> <li>• if – <b>hypothetical</b> assertion/reasoning</li> <li>• so – conclusion</li> <li>• including – example</li> <li>• although – counter assertion /assertion that is countered</li> </ul>	4x1	<p><b>Credit 0 marks</b> for no creditworthy material</p> <p>NB Do not accept “claim”</p>
1	(e)	<p>1 Example + what is exemplifies</p> <p>Example – <b>allergies</b> (to some of the ingredients)</p> <p>Exemplifies – (unforeseen) <b>health consequences</b> (to eating lab-grown meat)</p>	1+1	<p><b>Credit 0 marks</b> <b>For the list in paragraph 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• saturated fats</li> <li>• polyunsaturated fats</li> <li>• nutrients</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• for no creditworthy material</li> <li>• wrong example with correct explanation</li> </ul>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
2	(a)	<p><b>Argument element:</b> <b>1 mark</b></p> <p>Example (of a vegetarian response to IVM)</p>	1	<p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>for evidence/support</li> <li>for no creditworthy material</li> </ul>
2	(b)	<p><b>Explanation of element:</b> <b>3 marks</b></p> <p>Where versions of all of the following points are included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>it is a specific instance</li> <li>used to aid understanding/illustrate</li> <li>with reference to the text</li> </ul> <p><i>Example of a 3 mark answer</i> It is a specific instance, ✓ which aids the understanding of ✓ what a vegetarian opposed to IVM might say. ✓</p>	1+1+1	<p><b>1 mark</b> For one of the points (see right hand column)</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> For no creditworthy material</p> <p><b>Up to 2 marks can be awarded for partial performance</b> <b>For a description of the structure:</b></p> <p>including the word “counter” or “goes against” (1) and a appropriate reference to support this.</p> <p>e.g. It goes against the main conclusion (1) which says “an alternative sustainable way of producing meat is required.” (1)</p> <p><b>OR</b> It goes against the (counter assertion) (1) when it says, “It might be claimed that IVM would save the lives of the billions of animals killed for food every year” (1)</p> <p><b>OR</b> It goes against the assertion (1) by saying that, “We have the choice of being vegetarian.” (1)</p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
3	(a)	<p><b>Representative weakness – increase consumption</b>  <b>2 marks</b>            For a correct assessment which is <b>explained</b>. A factor and a comparator are needed e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rise in meat consumption in Britain might be lower than in other countries, if meat is cheaper there.</li> <li>• The rise in meat consumption in Britain might be lower than in other countries if their lifestyles are changing rapidly (from poverty to wealth).</li> <li>• The rise in meat consumption in Britain might be lower than in other countries if an increase in vegetarianism in Britain is partially offsetting the increase in meat consumption.</li> <li>• The rise in meat consumption in Britain may be higher than elsewhere if meat costs more elsewhere.</li> <li>• The British trend may be unrepresentative if British people have more money to spend on meat than in other countries where disposable income is less.</li> <li>• The rise in meat consumption in Britain might be lower if there have been more health cares about consuming meat in Britain than elsewhere.</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Either for a correct assessment that only explains/develops one side</b>            e.g. in Britain there has been a rise in meat consumption because prices are low.            e.g. in other countries meat costs are high so they cannot afford to eat a lot of meat.</li> <li>• <b>Or for a correct assessment that simply identifies a factor using a comparator without an explanation/development.</b>            e.g. in other countries costs are higher.            e.g. in Britain meat is cheaper.            e.g. the British trend in meat consumption may be higher/lower than elsewhere.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meat is cheaper in Britain</li> <li>• In other countries people are vegetarians</li> <li>• For no creditworthy material</li> <li>• No statistics</li> <li>• We do not know</li> </ul>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
3	(b)	<p><b>Representative weakness – GM opposition</b>  <b>2 marks</b>            For a correct assessment which is <b>explained</b> e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The opposition to GM food in Europe may be greater than that elsewhere because they have a greater choice of affordable natural foods.</li> <li>In poorer countries/continents people may be prepared to accept GM foods more readily if it means they can feed their families.</li> <li>In many countries (most/many) people do not even know that GM food is being sold to them, so they are not in a position to oppose GM at all/as strongly as Europeans do.</li> </ul>	2	<p><b>1 mark</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Either for a correct assessment that only explains one side</b>            e.g. In other countries they do not know a lot about GM foods so are not likely to oppose them.</li> <li><b>Or for a correct assessment that simply identifies a factor using a comparator without development linked to more support/less opposition</b>            e.g. other countries know less about GM food.            NB candidates may be more speculative about other countries. Credit the answers where they are plausible.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b>            For no creditworthy material.            No evidence.</p>
3	(c)	<p><b>Evidence IVM cost – weakness</b>  <b>2 marks</b>            For a correct assessment which is <b>explained</b> e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The predicted production costs/price of IVM is speculative/may not be accurate – it is presented as an opinion of what might be the case in the future. However, this is dependent upon several variables which may not happen.</li> <li>This price may not be very plausible because the IVM process is new and complicated and so is likely to be expensive for a long time.</li> <li>Assumes sufficient demand for IVM to be produced at an economic rate.</li> <li>Assumes production costs are the same as costs to the consumer.</li> </ul> <p>Allow: The IVM researcher might have a vested interest to predict a low future price for IVM in order to make it sound more attractive, which makes the evidence less credible.</p>	2	<p><b>1 mark</b>            For a correct assessment that <b>states</b> rather than explains e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is only what one person thinks might happen.</li> <li>The IVM researcher might have a vested interest to say this</li> <li>Speculative</li> <li>No concrete evidence</li> <li>A generic answer</li> </ul> <p>NB candidates may be more speculative about the price. Credit answers where they are plausible.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For no creditworthy material.</li> </ul> <p>NB accept answers which refer to either production costs or buying price in the shops.</p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
4	(a)	<p><b>Assumption: PETA</b>  <b>3 marks</b>            For an accurate statement of an assumption e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IVM doesn't involve exploiting animals.</li> <li>• IVM doesn't involve killing animals.</li> <li>• IVM is actually 'meat'.</li> <li>• Assumes you can eat meat without killing animals.</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>2 marks</b>            For a less precise statement of the assumption e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IVM doesn't involve exploitation.</li> <li>• IVM doesn't involve killing.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b>            For the essence of an assumption expressed as a challenge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• e.g. just because IVM is produced in a factory doesn't mean that animals won't be exploited when they extract the stem cells.</li> </ul> <p>Too general</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• e.g. the exploitation of animals will not happen.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b>            For the statement of an incorrect assumption e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Animal Rights groups are against exploitation.</li> <li>• This development is a good thing.</li> </ul> <p>No creditworthy material.</p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
4	(b)	<p><b>Assumption: meat eaters</b>  <b>3 marks</b>  For an accurate statement of an assumption e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People cannot/should not be persuaded to reduce the amount of meat in their diet.</li> <li>• We should find ways of meeting people's desires for meat rather than trying to change these.</li> <li>• People should have their desires for meat met.</li> <li>• Meat cannot be produced naturally in a more sustainable way.</li> <li>• People will eat the alternative option i.e. the IVM.</li> <li>• Present methods of producing meat are not/could not be made sustainable</li> <li>• There is not enough meat for people to eat</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>2 marks</b>  For an inaccurate statement of the assumption e.g.  Overstatement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nobody can be persuaded to reduce the amount of meat in their diet.</li> </ul> <p>Generalisation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People should have their desires met.</li> <li>• People shouldn't have to do what they don't like.</li> <li>• Producing meat is not sustainable.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b> based on credibility only.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For an assumption of the quality/interpretation of the data used in the report.</li> <li>• The FAO has the capabilities/expertise to carry out/interpret the data analysis accurately.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b>  For the essence of an assumption expressed as a challenge e.g. Just because people don't want to reduce meat in their diet doesn't mean that we can't persuade them.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b>  For the statement of an incorrect assumption e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Everyone needs to eat meat.</li> <li>• IVM is not meat.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
5	<p><b>One reason:</b>  <b>3 marks</b>            For a reason that relates specifically to <b>farming/farms/farmers <u>AND</u> animals/meat.</b></p> <p><b>Example of 3 mark answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IVM could lead to farms that rear animals for meat production going out of business.</li> <li>• There will no longer be the market for farms to sell large quantities of meat stock/people won't buy so much farmed meat.</li> <li>• If farms can't sell their animals for meat, they will become less diverse.</li> <li>• Farms may find it difficult to find other ways of using their land to earn an income, if meat production is no longer earning them as much money.</li> </ul>	3	<p><b>2 marks</b>            For a reason that does not refer to the precise details i.e. of farm animals being kept to be sold for meat e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Farm workers will lose their jobs.</li> <li>• Farms won't be needed.</li> <li>• Meat will be cheaper.</li> <li>• Too extreme (e.g. implying all)</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b>            For an answer that goes beyond a reason (e.g. an argument):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IVM could lead to farms that rear animals for meat production going out of business, so a lot of land will be unused.</li> </ul> <p>or includes extra argument elements (e.g. an example):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IVM could lead to farms that rear animals such as cows, sheep and pigs for meat production going out of business.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b>            For no creditworthy material.</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
6	<p><b>Weakness - links between reasoning and conclusion</b></p> <p><b>Conclusion</b>  <b>1 mark</b> for <b>reference</b> to the correct conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(so) if our goal is to feed more people, encouraging vegetarianism is the way to go.</li> </ul> <p><b>Plus</b>  Either <b>3 marks</b> for a developed assessment of the link.</p> <p>Or  <b>2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>for an assessment of the reasoning</li> <li>for an assessment of the conclusion</li> <li>e.g. restricting the options</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>an assessment of the link without explanation e.g. they are not about the same thing.</li> </ul> <p>Or  <b>1 mark</b> for a challenge.</p>	4	<p>The reference to the text maybe brief. A full quote is not necessary.</p> <p>The reference to the text need not be indicated by speech marks.</p> <p><b>Examples of 4 mark answers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The conclusion is about the “goal” to “feed more people”. However, the reasoning given to support it is about the “meat eaten being unhealthy/wasting scientific talent and resources”. The conclusion therefore is weakened by the fact that there is no reasoning about the problem of food shortage or the necessity to feed more people.</li> <li>The conclusion is about encouraging “vegetarianism”. However, the reasons are about eating too much meat “reducing their level of health” and this doesn’t mean you should become a vegetarian, it means that you should eat less meat, so the conclusion doesn’t follow.</li> </ul> <p><b>Example of 3 mark answer</b>  The conclusion is about “encouraging vegetarianism”. The reason not needing meat is largely an assertion without development of why this is so.</p> <p><b>Examples of 2 mark answers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The reasoning about not needing meat is largely assertion without development of why this is so.</li> <li>Where assumptions are drawn only from the reasoning.</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of 1 mark answers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IVM is not a waste of scientific talent/resources because it could help feed the world.</li> <li>Vegetarianism isn’t any better for your health than eating meat.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
7	<p><b>Document</b> Award up to <b>3 marks</b> for each correct answer:</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> For a <b>correct developed justification</b> e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TED forum might have a vested interest to be non-selective (show neutrality) in the conversations that they post to accurately represent the public's opinions, <b>as if they were bias to one side those using the site might lose confidence in the forum and stop using the site.</b> (<i>developed justification ✓✓</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>or 1 mark</b> for a <b>correct limited justification</b> e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TED forum might have a vested interest to be non-selective (show neutrality) in the conversations that they post to protect their professionalism. (<i>limited justification ✓</i>).</li> </ul> <p><b>plus 1 mark</b> additional mark where the correct assessment is supported by a <b>relevant reference to the text</b> e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The TED forum might have a vested interest to be non-selective (show neutrality) in the conversations that they post to accurately represent the public's opinions, as if they were biased to one side, those using the site might lose confidence in the forum and stop using the site (<i>developed justification ✓✓</i>) <b>“So we’re building here a forum that offers ... a community of curious souls to engage with ideas and each other”</b> (<i>relevant reference ✓</i>)</li> </ul> <p><b>Other answers</b> may be based on e.g. Lack of members' expertise to give informed comment bias/vested interest with regard to specific issues NB the website is a forum, it does not write the posts but not lack of reputation for an individual.</p>	2x3	<p><b>A correct assessment of a source within the document</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>is capped at 1 mark</b> e.g. the credibility of the US or Australian contributor individually.</li> <li>However, if the individual source is used as an example to assess the credibility of the whole document it can access all 3 marks e.g. the credibility of document 3 is weakened by its use of the US contributor because of their probable lack of expertise ...</li> </ul> <p><b>Credibility criteria</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Credit only assessments related to <b>RAVEN</b> criteria not corroboration (<b>N</b>, includes its opposite, bias.)</li> <li>Assessments that relate to the <b>same</b> credibility criterion can only be credited if a different assessment is made e.g. vested interest that weakens and a different assessment of VI that strengthens credibility.</li> <li>If candidates choose <b>both bias and vested interest</b>, they can only be credited if the same material is not used twice.</li> <li>Accept <b>experience</b> as a version of <b>expertise</b>.</li> </ul> <p><b>Reference to the text</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This needs to be relevant to the assessment made and it needs to justify why credibility is e.g. strengthened by expertise rather than being an example of expertise.</li> <li>This need not be in quotation marks.</li> <li>It need not be a sentence – a relevant phrase or term may be adequate to support an assessment.</li> <li>The name of the website, <a href="http://www.ted.com/conversations">www.ted.com/conversations</a> can be used where relevant or a reference to 'forum'.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
8	<p><b>Consistent claim:</b> Credit either of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source:</b> Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO)</li> </ul> <p><b>Claim:</b> One or more parts of their claim: “most people are not keen on a big reduction of meat in their diet, (an alternative sustainable way of producing meat is required).”</p> <p>‘Between 1961 and 2007, the consumption of meat by the British public increased by 20%.’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Source:</b> US contributor</li> </ul> <p><b>Claim:</b> One or more parts of their claims: ‘Unless you belong to one of the privileged countries, you don’t have a choice. You need to eat what is there, and for many people that is meat.</p> <p>Is there a growing trend of people not eating meat? Arguably no. (Therefore, the world needs more meat).’</p>	2	<p><b>Credit 1 mark</b> for a correct source, if the correct claim is identified but recorded incorrectly e.g. through inaccurate paraphrase.</p> <p>NB <b>credit 1 mark</b> if the claim is given without the source</p> <p><b>Credit 0 marks</b> For a correct source with an inaccurate or missing claim.</p> <p><b>There are no other possible answers.</b></p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
(a)	<p>Assessing credibility of claim.</p> <p><b>C++</b> The credibility of the claim determined by the <b>comparison</b> (see below) is assessed with an explanation of what else you need to know.</p> <p><b>C+</b> The credibility of the claim determined by <b>EITHER</b> the similarity of the process <b>OR</b> a comparison of <b>IVM foods and GM/natural</b> is assessed.</p> <p><b>C+J</b> The credibility of part of the claim is assessed without reference to the comparison but with reference to <b>GM</b> or <b>IVM</b> or nature or process</p> <p><b>C</b> The credibility of the source is assessed.</p> <p><b>Examples of possible answers:</b></p> <p><b>C++</b> The credibility of his claim 'We use exactly the same process that happens in nature' is strengthened by his expertise as a professor in the front line of IVM research. (<i>Assessing the claim</i>). I would need to know that as a professor working in IVM research that he has been working in this field for a reasonable length of time to have gained the expertise (<i>what else you would need to know</i>) /that he has studied the natural processes and how these can be replicated in IVM in producing meat (<i>what else you would need to know</i>).</p> <p><b>C+</b> The credibility of his claim 'We use exactly the same process that happens in nature' is strengthened by his expertise as a professor in the front line of IVM research. (<i>Assessing the claim</i>).</p> <p><b>C+J</b> The credibility of his claim about 'IVM' is strengthened by his expertise as a professor involved in IVM. (<i>Assessing part of the claim without reference to the process</i>).</p>	13	<p><b>Use the following annotation in Q9:</b></p> <p><b>C++, C+, C+J, C see left hand side</b></p> <p><b>Level 4</b> 10-13 marks Clear assessment of the claim with reference to the comparison (see opposite), with an explanation of what else you need to know. 3 C++ <b>12 marks</b> 2 C++ <b>11 marks</b> 1 C++ <b>10 marks</b> plus <b>one</b> mark for strengthen/weaken in 1 assessment</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> 7-10 marks Clear assessment of the claim with reference to comparison. 3 C+ <b>9 marks</b> 2 C+ <b>8 marks</b> 1 C+ <b>7 marks</b> plus <b>one</b> mark for strengthen/weaken in 1 assessment</p> <p><b>Level 2 *</b> 4-7 marks Assessment of part of the claim without reference to the comparison. 3 C+J <b>6 marks</b> 2 C+J <b>5 marks</b> 1 C+J <b>4 marks</b> plus <b>one</b> mark for strengthen/weaken in 1 assessment</p> <p>* Cap at Level 2 i.e. an assessment of part of the claim cannot access the marks for 'what else you need to know'</p>

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
			<p><b>C</b></p> <p>The credibility of Dr Post (<i>assessing source</i>) is strengthened by what his experience as a professor in scientific research. (<i>Do not accept just 'experience as a professor' without justification</i>).</p> <p>Synonyms of strengthen or weaken should be credited e.g. <i>increases credibility. Accept positive/negative credibility strong/weak. Credible/not credible.</i></p> <p>Other possible assessments might include: As a professor at the forefront of research in IVM he will have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct ability to see how the processes work</li> <li>• A vested interest to point out the claim that IVM is natural as this could promote his research.</li> <li>• A vested interest to maintain his public standing by accurately presenting his research into the process of IVM.</li> <li>• Bias towards his own research into the process of IVM.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Level 1</b> 1- 3 marks</p> <p>Assessment of the source</p> <p>3 C <b>3 marks</b></p> <p>2 C <b>2 marks</b></p> <p>1 C <b>1 mark</b></p> <p><b>For no creditworthy material 0 marks</b></p> <p><b>Accept synonyms for process e.g. production/manufacture.</b></p>

Question		Answer	Mark	Guidance
9	(b)	<p><b>Weighing up the credibility criteria</b></p> <p><b>Identifying the most important CC</b>  <b>1 mark for:</b>  identifying the most important credibility criterion with reference to <b>at least one other credibility criterion</b> used in 9(a). (Credit if more than one criterion is identified as the most important.)</p> <p><b>Weighing up</b>  <b>2 marks for:</b>  a developed explanation that makes comparisons between assessments, i.e. <b>why</b> one credibility criterion is stronger and another is weaker/less strong</p> <p><b>Or</b>  <b>1 mark for:</b>  an attempted justification of one credibility criterion, without weighing up/comparison.</p>	3	<p><b>Example of a 3 mark answer:</b>  Although Dr Post might have a vested interest to exaggerate the natural process of IVM to promote his research which weakens the credibility of his claim, this might be outweighed by a more important consideration i.e. his expertise (<i>identify the most important credibility criterion ✓</i>) in IVM as a professor in the front line of research that would make him unlikely to misrepresent scientific research (<i>weighing up ✓✓</i>).</p> <p><b>Example of a 2 mark answer:</b>  Although Dr Post might have a vested interest to exaggerate the natural process of IVM to promote his research which weakens the credibility of his claim, this might be outweighed by a more important consideration i.e. his expertise (<i>identify the most important credibility criterion ✓</i>) in IVM as a professor in the front line of research (<i>Attempted justification ✓</i>).</p> <p><b>Example of a 1 mark answer:</b>  Expertise is more important than vested interest (<i>identifying the most important credibility criterion ✓</i>).</p> <p><b>Or</b>  Dr Post might have a vested interest to exaggerate the natural process of IVM to promote his research which weakens the credibility of his claim (<i>attempted justification without weighing up/comparison. ✓</i>).</p>

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance				
10	<p>Apply the following levels mark scheme:</p> <p><b>Level 3 Strong, relative, sustained assessment 11-16 marks</b> <b>4 areas 13 marks</b> <b>3 areas 11 marks</b> Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• direct <b>points of comparison</b> with <b>effective</b> reference to the text in <b>at least 2</b> areas</li><li>• clear and explicit <b>overall</b> judgement (RJ) <b>relating to whether or not people will eat/support IVM</b>, drawn from an assessment of <b>both</b> credibility and plausibility</li><li>• <b>coherent reasoning</b> - with effective use of specialist terms and argument indicator words. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are accurate.</li></ul> <p><b>Level 2 Partial or weak assessment 6-10 marks</b> <b>2 areas + and 1 weak 8 marks</b> <b>2 areas + 6 marks</b> Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>explicit relevant overall</b> judgement (J) <b>relating to whether or not people will eat/support IVM</b> and a reference to the text in at least two areas.</li><li>• <b>correct</b> use of specialist terms and grammar spelling &amp; punctuation are adequate.</li></ul> <p><b>Level 1 Basic assessment 1- 5 marks</b> <b>1 area + 3 marks</b> <b>At least 2 weak 1 mark</b> <b>1 or no areas weak 0 marks</b></p>	16	<p>In this question there are four areas and for each area, the assessment could be strong, weak or not covered. See below:</p> <table><tr><td><b>Credibility for IVM</b> Dr Post, IVM researchers, Dutch vegetarian society Chairman, PETA, DE (US)</td><td><b>Credibility against IVM</b> Newspaper Health correspondent, Russian TV journalist, DH (Aus), a member of the Dutch vegetarian society</td></tr><tr><td><b>Plausibility likely to eat</b> Healthier, safer, cheaper, may prove to be easier to preserve, countryside not overgrazed/desertification</td><td><b>Plausibility not likely to eat</b> Un-natural, potential allergies, tasteless, may end up more expensive, people reluctant to change</td></tr></table> <p><b>Use the following annotations in Q10:</b> <b>CF+, CA+ (strong)</b> Credibility is correctly assessed for <b>two</b> sources on one side.</p> <p><b>CF, CA (weak)</b> <b>Only one</b> source's credibility is correctly assessed on one side.</p> <p><b>PF+, PA+ (strong)</b> Either there is <b>one</b> completely new thought, or <b>one</b> or more points of the text are developed and discussed or strong synthesis.</p> <p><b>PF, PA (weak)</b> A relevant part of the text is re-stated specifically in relation to plausibility, but without development (this should refer to whether or not people will eat IVM).</p>	<b>Credibility for IVM</b> Dr Post, IVM researchers, Dutch vegetarian society Chairman, PETA, DE (US)	<b>Credibility against IVM</b> Newspaper Health correspondent, Russian TV journalist, DH (Aus), a member of the Dutch vegetarian society	<b>Plausibility likely to eat</b> Healthier, safer, cheaper, may prove to be easier to preserve, countryside not overgrazed/desertification	<b>Plausibility not likely to eat</b> Un-natural, potential allergies, tasteless, may end up more expensive, people reluctant to change
<b>Credibility for IVM</b> Dr Post, IVM researchers, Dutch vegetarian society Chairman, PETA, DE (US)	<b>Credibility against IVM</b> Newspaper Health correspondent, Russian TV journalist, DH (Aus), a member of the Dutch vegetarian society						
<b>Plausibility likely to eat</b> Healthier, safer, cheaper, may prove to be easier to preserve, countryside not overgrazed/desertification	<b>Plausibility not likely to eat</b> Un-natural, potential allergies, tasteless, may end up more expensive, people reluctant to change						

Question	Answer	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Plus credit 1 mark each for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• explicit judgement (J)</li> <li>• grammar, spelling and punctuation do not impede understanding.</li> </ul> <p><b>N.B.</b> Where no areas weak, award marks for the two bullets only, if present.</p> <p><b>0 marks for:</b> no creditworthy material.</p> <p><b>Reasoned case:</b> Answers might include some of the following comparisons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the relative credibility of both sides</li> </ul> <p>e.g. using expertise The side that points out the positive features of IVM includes, IVM researchers and Dr Post. They are all involved with IVM research and Dr Post is at the forefront of this research, so they are likely to have a great deal of expertise in the area to be able to speak in an informed manner about this process. Dr Post knows about its safety such as being a <i>“healthier meat”</i>; the others about its possible taste and about its production costs. This expertise therefore considerably strengthens the credibility of this side with regard to having the right information to make informed judgements.</p> <p>Those on the side that points out the negative features of IVM include a newspaper health correspondent, a TV journalist, a vegetarian and a member of TED conversations. The reporters have some experience but not necessarily expertise. The TV journalist actually experienced the taste of the meat, to be able to say in an informed manner that it was <i>‘chewy and tasteless’</i> and the</p>		<p><b>Judgement</b> <b>J</b> for a judgement. <b>RJ</b> for a judgement relevant to whether people will or will not eat IVM.</p> <p>The likelihood that most people would not eat IVM in their diets is however stronger, as the cost looks prohibitive. At <i>‘£6,200 per pound weight’</i> at present, it is unlikely that the economies of scale will be quickly established, as there has to be the demand for the product before this is possible. It was also shown by the global analysis figures that people <i>‘are not keen on a substantial reduction of meat in their diet’</i>, so any change of eating habits is likely to be a slow process. Therefore it is more likely that people will not be prepared to eat IVM in their diets soon to any great extent.</p> <p>Taken as a whole, the plausibility that people would probably not eat IVM for part of their diet for some time to come would over-ride the credibility of the claims of the experts, as no matter how attractive they made IVM, if the cost were not right people would be unlikely to eat it.</p>

Question			Answer	Mark	Guidance
			<p>newspaper correspondent who is in the area of health, would have the experience of other new products and the safety tests involved. This would increase the credibility of their claims, but it is unlikely that they are as informed as those in the field of research to make their claims. Therefore, using the criterion of expertise, it is more likely that those who point out the positive features of IVM have the greater credibility.</p> <p>The relative plausibility (likelihood) of conflicting outcomes. If the scientists are able to improve the taste of the meat so that it is more attractive by being able to '<i>customise it to taste</i>' and if they can perhaps market the taste by getting a famous chef to use it, people may be more prepared to take the step to try it out, especially if the scientists also perform the clinical tests to show that it is safe to eat. More people now are prepared to use other meat substitutes such as tofu, hummus and couscous so there is evidence that people's attitudes towards meat are not fixed. This would make it plausible that some people would begin to eat IVM.</p>		

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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; The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2018

 **Cambridge  
Assessment**

