

# **Critical Thinking**

Advanced GCE

Unit **F504**: Critical Reasoning

## **Mark Scheme for January 2012**

---

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, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2012















Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

**Annotations**

used in the detailed Mark Scheme (to include abbreviations and subject-specific conventions)

<b>Annotation</b>	<b>Meaning</b>
	Quality of reasoning Questioning
	Thinking deeply/clearly
	Judgement (conclusion). Justification
	Evaluation
	Accurate (eg accurate analysis of argument when element/structure accurately labelled/described)
	Level 1
	Level 2
	Level 3
	Level 4
	Counter/countering
	Response (to counter)
	Not answering question
	Unclear
	Additional/supplementary page seen

NB Examiners should use the above annotations to assist them in deciding their marks. They do not, however, have to use them to annotate every instance seen.

## Marking Grid for Question 1

Marks	Performance Descriptors
Level 4 Coherent and clear  9 – 10 marks	Clear expression of the main idea and a coherent summary of selected significant lines of reasoning which demonstrates <b>clear understanding of the reasoning</b> .
Level 3 Reasonable and general  6 – 8 marks	Reasonable expression of the main idea and a fairly coherent summary of most of the significant reasoning with perhaps key omissions or minor additions of detail which demonstrates <b>general understanding of the reasoning</b> .
Level 2 Gist and some understanding  3 – 5 marks	Expression of one important idea which captures some of its gist and a summary which captures some parts of the reasoning but with key omissions and/or significant additions of irrelevant detail and which demonstrates <b>some understanding of the reasoning</b> .
Level 1 Attempt and little understanding  1 – 2 marks	Attempted summary with major omissions and addition of significant irrelevant detail. <b>Little understanding of the reasoning</b> . There may be no expression of the main idea, or it may be inaccurate.
Level 0  0 marks	No creditworthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p><b>Possible main ideas</b>  Young men should take responsibility for the children they help to create.</p> <p>The government should encourage/force young men to take responsibility (instead of telling teenagers how babies are made) (and this might help eventually to reduce the teenage pregnancy rate).</p> <p>We shouldn't blame the teenage mothers for everything.</p> <p><b>Line of reasoning</b>  It takes two to make a baby.</p> <p>And young men have little awareness of the consequences of sex.</p> <p>And young men do not generally have to bear the consequences of sex.</p> <p>So we shouldn't make single mothers responsible for everything (either the baby or society's ills).</p> <p><b>Additional line of reasoning</b>  And we should improve the lives of the pregnant teen's children.</p> <p>ASSUMPTION: contact with the father is better for/would improve the lives of the pregnant teen's children.</p> <p>So we should encourage young men to become involved with their children. (supported by all of the above)</p> <p><b>Two further reasons not in lines of reasoning</b>  And we are all responsible as a society.  And there are ways for society/government to address this issue.</p>	10	<p>LOOK AT THE MARKING GRID.</p> <p>Assign a level first.</p> <p>Credit highly candidates who recognise the conflation of young men should take responsibility and young men should be made to take responsibility.</p> <p>Some candidates may think that the main idea is that 'it takes two to make a baby' and then consider the reasoning that follows from this. This can be credited.</p> <p>Accept variant reasonable interpretations of how the reasoning works.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Example L4 answer</b>                      Dickson’s main idea is that the government should focus its initiatives not only on pregnant girls but also on the fathers of these children. A main reason she uses to support her ideas is that many teenage pregnancies are the result of girls being pressured into sex by boys with ‘nothing to lose.’ She backs this up with evidence. Another reason she uses is that teenage pregnancies are rising as there is no restraint now as there was thirty years ago (‘threat of a shotgun wedding’), so she says that there has to be a way to get fathers involved with their families. Another reason used by Dickson is that she believes it is wrong to treat a pregnant teenager as a political football or a ‘poster girl for broken Britain’, therefore children are the responsibility of us all and it is the lives of the children we should be trying to improve. Her general view is that the problems should be getting solved not just pointed out.</p> <p><b>Example L3 answer</b>                      Dickson’s main idea for this article is, as the headline states, ‘It takes more than one to make a teenage pregnancy.’ However the point of the article is to highlight the lack of responsibility that teenage fathers have for their children, Dickson uses the evidence ‘only 2 per cent of fathers are involved fully with the baby nine months after the birth’ to show how little effect a child has on a father compared to the mother, she claims that ‘early parenthood’ ‘certainly defines’ a young mother’s life for they have to bring up the baby without help from the father. In paragraph 2 the author claims that there is a dangerous awareness gap between sex and its consequences, this is supported by the example of the ‘Nuts’ magazine being sold next to the Beano and how much boys are taught in the classroom about sex. Finally in paragraph 4 the author puts forward many ideas of how to get fathers more involved, these examples support the penultimate sentence of ‘responsibility can best be learned through example.’</p>		<p>This response expresses the main idea, selects most key lines of reasoning and summarises them succinctly. There is a strong understanding of how the reasoning works.</p> <p>This response separates the ‘main idea’ or starting point of the article from the ‘main point’ of the article. This was accepted. However, the response lacks the idea that the author wanted to change the situation and make fathers more responsible for their children.</p> <p>Some key lines of reasoning are referred to, although there is too much focus on the evidence and examples rather than on the lines of reasoning (ie additions of detail) and some omission of key ideas.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Example L2 answer</b>            In document one the main ideas that Dickson is trying to get across is that it is not just young girls who should be blamed for teenage pregnancies it is also boys who she believes do not get enough education on the matter and have no sexual responsibility. This she backs up using several reasons. To begin with in paragraph 2 she talks of the media (eg Nuts and the internet) stating that 'boys are growing up knowing about sex' but not about the 'natural consequences'. Further, Dickson states that in schools sexual responsibility is dinned into them and what sexual education that is taught isn't working half the time and this can be seen in paragraph three. Not only this she compares todays society with 30 years ago when 'shot gun wedding' imposed a measure of restraint as they were expected to take responsibility. Finally, after talking about the Welfare reform act, she discusses certain options for educating these fathers, which may or may not work, eg parenting courses which are compulsory and will show fathers how much time they would have to give up.</p> <p><b>Example L1 answer</b>            Dickson's main idea is that 'these children are the responsibility of us all.' Dickson uses a couple of intermediate conclusions like 'Responsibility can be learned and is best learned by example', and 'however much the notion of sexual responsibility is dinned into boys in the classroom and however many condoms are handed out at break time, it isn't working enough of the time.' Dickson applies some reasons, such as 'we still have the highest number of teenage pregnancies in Western Europe', 'If teenage girls are being pressured into unprotected sex, it's because teenage boys feel they have nothing to lose,' which is supported by evidence, 'where both parents are under 17, only 2 per cent of fathers are involved with the baby nine months after the birth'. Another strand of reasoning is that 'for unemployed fathers perhaps we should trial compulsory community service programmes where a proportion of the wage goes directly to the upkeep of the child' and 'required attendance at parenting courses for young fathers would, at best, promote the necessary skills for building a relationship with their child and their co-parent.'</p>		<p>The main idea here is a little confused, conflating blame and responsibility.</p> <p>The summary of the reasoning essentially tells us what the author said in each paragraph, picking out details rather than key ideas, and not focussing on reasoning, and not communicating the importance of particular ideas in the reasoning.</p> <p>This response does not demonstrate understanding of the main idea of the passage, but has picked on the last line.</p> <p>There is no summary of the main lines of reasoning, but some quotations labelled inaccurately as argument elements.</p>

## Marking Grid for Question 2

Marks	Performance Descriptors
Level 4 Reasonable, well supported  9 – 10 marks	<b>Reasonable judgement</b> about whether the document is an argument or not which is <b>well supported</b> by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• justified thinking about whether some or all parts of the reasoning (such as reasons, explanations, report, anecdote etc) give rationally persuasive support to a stated main conclusion <b>or not</b>, or, when appropriate, whether there might be an implied but unstated conclusion.</li> <li>• a clear and correct indication of what that conclusion might be (if appropriate).</li> <li>• justified thinking about what types of reasoning, such as explanation, report or a short argument as part of the whole document, are present in the document.</li> </ul>
Level 3 Mostly supported  6 – 8 marks	<b>Judgement</b> about whether the document is an argument or not which is <b>mostly supported</b> by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• thinking about whether some or all parts of the reasoning (such as reasons, explanations, report, anecdote etc) give rationally persuasive support to a stated main conclusion <b>or not</b>.</li> <li>• a clear and reasonable indication of what that conclusion might be (if appropriate).</li> <li>• some acceptable thinking about what types of reasoning, such as explanation or report, are present in the document.</li> </ul>
Level 2 Partly supported  3 – 5 marks	<b>Judgement, which may be implied or over-stated</b> , about whether the document is an argument or not which is <b>partly supported</b> by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• simple thinking about whether some parts of the reasoning (such as reasons or anecdotes) give rationally persuasive support to a stated main conclusion <b>or not</b>.</li> <li>• a reasonable although possibly inaccurate indication of what that conclusion might be (if appropriate).</li> <li>• simple thinking about what types of reasoning, such as background information, are present in the document.</li> </ul>
Level 1 Arbitrary, unsupported  1 – 2 marks	If a judgement is present, it is likely to be <b>arbitrary, unsupported or contradicted</b> . It may be accompanied by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• simplistic comments about whether some parts of the reasoning support a main conclusion <b>or not</b>.</li> <li>• an inaccurate and unreasonable indication of what that conclusion might be (even where this is inappropriate).</li> <li>• simplistic comments about elements of argument, such as 'it has reasons and a counter-argument.'</li> </ul>
Level 0  0 marks	No creditworthy material.



Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>This question tests the ability to distinguish argument from other types of reasoning. Candidates should be able to judge whether there are reasons which give rational grounds to persuade the audience to accept a conclusion. Candidates should be able to judge whether the whole or only part of a passage is an argument, and should be able to identify the different kinds of reasoning used, such as reporting, storytelling, explaining, opinion-giving etc.</p> <p>Either: The document is an argument with all parts supporting the conclusion that ‘we should begin encouraging a return to the days when extended families lived together’</p> <p>Or: The document as a whole is not an argument, but is an anecdotal article which contains opinion and a short argument to support the claim ‘we should begin encouraging a return to the days when extended families lived together.’</p> <p><b>Level 4 answer</b> Document 2 is an argument as it has a main conclusion supported by other elements. The main conclusion is ‘so we should begin encouraging a return to the days when extended families lived together.’ Whilst arguing this, she includes examples and anecdotes about her own situation with her elderly father, evidence such as ‘a third of us have a close friend or family member who we think is lonely’ and an analogy ‘it would be easier to negotiate peace in the Middle East’. Moreover, Parsons directly responds to a counter argument, put forward by some, that living with your extended family is not worth the hassle. She puts forward obvious counter points such as deciding on a TV programme and responds to these counter assertions with points like ‘it broadens their horizons.’ Furthermore, Parsons puts forward several reasons in support of her argument, such as the focus on having a responsibility to our family. So she is arguing, using argument techniques.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>It isn’t an argument, it’s a discourse on a theme which wants to persuade us that we should begin encouraging a return to the days when extended families lived together, but it does this through non-argument persuasion. It doesn’t give reasons to support this conclusion, but uses anecdotes about her father and about family life in Serbia to</p>	10	<p>LOOK AT THE MARKING GRID.</p> <p>There is no fixed answer. Candidates can reasonably interpret this document as an argument or as not an argument. Marks are given for the quality of the justification of the interpretation.</p> <p>This answer justifies the interpretation as an argument fairly well, and recognises anecdote, example, evidence, argument and counter. It uses the presence of a counter fairly well to justify the interpretation as an argument. This is an unusual answer in that it shows that the author is ‘arguing’ rather than showing the links of support which justify argument. Nevertheless it gains credit.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>persuade us. She also uses emotive persuasion, making us feel guilty about letting people be lonely and making us laugh about situations such as choosing a television programme, with exaggerated comparisons which aren't argument but might influence and persuade, such as 'deciding on something everyone wants to watch can make you feel it would be easier to negotiate peace in the Middle East.'</p> <p><b>Level 3 answer</b>                      Despite the large amount of opinion and personal anecdotes expressed in Document 2, I believe that it can be considered to be an argument as a clear conclusion is given in paragraph 3. The writer concludes that 'we should begin encouraging a return to the days when extended families lived together.' This conclusion is supported by a number of reasons throughout the document. In paragraph 1 the author uses an anecdote of her husband's father which helps to show the reader she has experience of the topic she is discussing. She also uses contextual evidence of her husband's Serbian background to support her reasoning in paragraph 2 that 'this is the way we used to live in Britain, but ... we have gradually lost the benefits of family and community.' This in turn supports the main conclusion as it is essentially an appeal to history, making the reader feel that there were many positives of families all living under one roof.</p>		<p>This response shows some awareness that the document could be considered either argument or not argument, and justifies its interpretation of the document as an argument. It has a clear expression of the main conclusion, and somewhat justifies how the anecdotes and opinions support this conclusion. However, some of this justification is weak, and other parts are merely stated.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p><b>Level 2 answer</b>  Document 2 is a very weak argument. I would say this simply based on the fact that the document has a main conclusion 'But taking on our family responsibilities also means more love,' that is supported by reasoning in paragraph 4, the author writes in paragraph 4 that 'living as an extended family' may mean 'mess, arguments, noise and compromise,' but she follows this brief counter argument with an anecdote of 'your mother watching the Simpsons' or 'your teenager watching opera' and concluding that it 'broadens everyone's horizons.' Paragraph 3 concludes that 'we should begin encouraging a return to the days when extended families lived together' which, with a large assumption, supports the main conclusion. The intermediate conclusion of paragraph 3 is in itself supported by an appeal to guilt or emotive persuasion (about lonely people). Overall the document could be perceived just as an article but the main conclusion and its supporting reasons, even if weak, make this document an argument.</p> <p><b>Level 1 answer</b>  It is an argument to support that 'taking on our family responsibilities also means more love.' This is supported by four in ten have felt depressed because of loneliness and this is because of the break up of extended families.</p>		<p>Initially this response seems to demonstrate some strong qualities – a recognition that any argument present is weak, and that the document could be regarded as 'just an article.' However, the identified main conclusion is inaccurate – the response identifies the unsupported last line as the main conclusion. The analysis of paragraph 4 is inaccurate.</p>

## Marking Grid for Question 3

Marks	Performance Descriptors
Level 4  16 – 20 marks	<p>Candidates come to a <b>reasonable judgement</b> about which document argues more effectively for the idea that we should be more responsible for our families <b>supported</b> by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• mostly well justified and perhaps occasionally insightful evaluation of <b>key</b> points, which may show understanding that a single point could be a strength interpreted in one light yet a weakness interpreted in another light.</li> <li>• effective weighing up of which document argues more effectively overall, which might include direct comparison and/or consideration of how significant a strength or weakness is.</li> </ul> <p>Inappropriate forms of evaluation may occur. The language is clear and mostly precise.</p>
Level 3  11 – 15 marks	<p>Candidates come to a <b>reasonable judgement (perhaps slightly too strongly stated)</b> about which document argues more effectively for the idea that we should be more responsible for our families, <b>mostly supported</b> by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• mostly relevant and mostly justified evaluative comments.</li> <li>• weighing up of which document argues more effectively overall, which perhaps lacks balance, but may attempt comparison or consideration of how significant a strength or weakness is.</li> </ul> <p>Inappropriate forms of evaluation may occur. The language is mostly clear.</p>
Level 2  6 – 10 marks	<p>Candidates come to a <b>judgement which may be overstated</b> about which document argues more effectively for the idea that we should be more responsible for our families, <b>partly supported</b> by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• some basic evaluative comments with an attempt at justification.</li> <li>• some attempt to weigh up which document argues more effectively overall, perhaps by comparing two points of limited significance or using simple phrases such as ‘this weakens the argument.’</li> </ul> <p>The language is simple and may lack precision.</p>
Level 1  1 – 5 marks	<p>Candidates <b>may</b> come to a judgement which <b>does not follow from</b> their reasoning or they may have reached no judgement at all. This may be <b>accompanied</b> by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• limited comment about the reasoning with little or no explanation, possibly consisting of stock, pre-learned phrases which are not applied to this reasoning.</li> <li>• any weighing up is assertive and unconnected to other points and may be contradictory.</li> </ul> <p>Answers may be descriptive or incoherent. The language does not always communicate candidates’ thinking.</p>
Level 0  0 marks	No creditworthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p><b>Key points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both have weak 'conclusions' so not much support required.</li> <li>• Role of emotional reasoning.</li> <li>• Neither argues strongly, but Doc 1 perhaps reasons more strongly with more reasoning and less anecdote, and the logical links are stronger (although still quite weak).</li> <li>• The example of choosing a TV programme trivialises the real problems involved when extended families live together - weak example / straw man (ignoring serious counters and knocking down a weak one). The analogy between choosing a TV programme and negotiating peace in the Middle East appeals to humour but is a weak analogy.</li> <li>• Doc 2 arguing from Serbia to UK, from past to present with little reasoning.</li> <li>• Doc 1 overstated for humour at times, but not as much as Doc 2.</li> <li>• Both are persuading us of something we think is right in the abstract, but Doc 2 seems more uncomfortable. Dad seeing children seems normal, extended families just seems uncomfortable. So Doc 2 might have to work harder to convince.</li> <li>• In Doc 2 fairly strong counter examples (eg rows) are not well answered, and many counter arguments are simply ignored.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 4 part answer</b></p> <p>Dickson's article on teenage pregnancies reasons much more effectively in support of the idea that we should be more responsible for our families than Parsons' piece does. This is not only because document 1 puts forward generally sound reasoning but it is also the result of distinct flaws in document 2.</p> <p>Dickson has a key advantage over Parsons even before she writes a word: her premise is much stronger. Very few people would argue that a father should not be involved in a child's life... On the other hand, Parsons' argument that relatives should live together is a much more controversial view. Many difficulties arise in individual cases relating to this issue: family fallouts, lack of money and so on...</p>	20	<p><b>LOOK AT THE MARKING GRID.</b></p> <p>Check that the candidate's reasoning supports the conclusion they have come to.</p> <p>The mark scheme cannot cover every possible reasonable point or interpretation that candidates might make so this mark scheme is not an exhaustive list of creditworthy material.</p> <p>Candidates can gain credit for responses which include interpretations and ideas not explicitly made in the mark scheme if they seem reasonable and are argued well. If unsure, contact your Team Leader or Principal Examiner.</p> <p>This response homes in on key strengths and weaknesses in the reasoning of the arguments, compares the reasoning and weighs up which is stronger to some extent. It is a little extreme, in that it only looks at the strengths of document 1 and the weaknesses of document 2, but it does evaluate at a high level.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>... this is sound reasoning as it is fairly plausible that many male teenagers would think twice about unprotected sex if there were initiatives in place ensuring that they would have a responsibility to any potential offspring...</p> <p>Perhaps the most vital weakness in document 2 is that its response to the counter argument is weak to say the least. Parsons implies that the only reasons that people don't want elderly relatives living with them are trivial things like TV disputes, or the house being slightly warmer. The actual reasons are often much more valid in many cases... Whilst the general sentiment that making elderly people happier is obviously a popular one, to suggest that everyone should live with their parents and so on is a flawed argument.</p> <p><b>Level 3 part answer</b></p> <p>Document 1 reasons more effectively than Document 2 in the sense that it takes a more serious approach through the suggested involvement with the government. Document 2 reasons more effectively than document 1 through its use of anecdotal evidence throughout... It is also a much more general article, stating that 'we are most responsible for those closest to home – our families.' It is therefore a relevant issue for every reader... however, the reasoning in document 1 could be considered to be weak due to the presence of a flaw in the form of a sweeping generalisation. The author focuses on the lack of knowledge teenage boys today have when it comes to the consequences of sex. However, this cannot be true of all teenage boys, as if it were, every sexually active young male in the country would find themselves in this situation – and this is simply not the case. The statistic given in Paragraph 3 – 'where both parents are under 17, only 2 per cent of fathers are involved with the baby nine months after the birth' could be seen to support the writer's claim that intervention is required. However, the source of this data is not given and neither is the year from which the data was taken. I therefore feel that it cannot fully support the writer's main idea.</p> <p>The reasoning in document 2 could be considered to have weaknesses also. There is a confusion between correlation and cause in paragraph 2 ... where it is implied that the elderly not speaking to anyone is because 'adult children are far away.' This is not necessarily the case – there are other people the elderly can talk to, they may have friends... Document 2 reasons more effectively overall as the flaw in the reasoning present does not impact the main conclusion as greatly as in document 1.</p>		<p>This response begins weakly with comments that are irrelevant to the quality of the reasoning. However, in later parts it provides some evaluation of parts of the reasoning, such as the generalisation and the use of evidence in Document 1, and the confusion between correlation and cause in Document 2. There is a consistent attempt to compare the quality of the two documents, and an attempt to evaluate the importance of the weaknesses. There is also an attempt to evaluate the impact of weaknesses. However, the points chosen are not key, the evaluation itself is fairly basic, and the impact points are not shown.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Level 2 part answer</b>                      Clear reasoning is evident in document 1 and has a stronger and effective strands such as responsibility... However document 1 does not clearly address a counter argument, weakening its argument by not successfully identifying and dismissing other potential hindering views...</p> <p>Document 2 is very poor with its reasoning and relies solely on a personal anecdote from the reader which contains an appeal to emotion in discussion of her mother's death. Initially weakening the argument... the main conclusion although perhaps clear is very weakly supported and without contributing strong strands of reasoning makes it unlikely the reader would be inclined to be persuaded by any call to action.</p> <p>Overall document 1 is stronger than document 2 at effective reasoning although relies on several assumptions such as growing up adequately teaches boys about sex. But has valid reasoning and main conclusion. Whereas document 2 is very weak with reasoning only using an emotive, flawed anecdote to support its main conclusion and readers would be more persuaded by Doc1 that we should be more responsible for our families.</p> <p><b>Level 1 part answer</b>                      In paragraph 1, Document 1 uses relevant examples, Nuts and pornography... A flaw of appeal to tradition has been used in paragraph 4 as Dickson has stated, 'the looming threat of a shotgun wedding ....' This is a flaw as the author uses something which was done 30 years ago to support his argument in males being responsible. It is something that was seen as tradition and everyone used to do many years ago therefore the argument is damaged due to an appeal to tradition.</p> <p>Document 2 paragraph 2 consists of an appeal to pity as it suggests 'I told my friends that my father was coming to live with us, the reaction from most of them was one of appalled horror, followed by the suggestion that I'm mad or a saint.' The author tries to convince the readers that he is right by using words like mad and saint in order for people to feel sorry for her.</p> <p>Overall, document 2 seem more effectively in support of the idea that we should be more responsible for our families, although many flaws were included to support the argument.</p>		<p>This response includes a great deal of simplistic or irrelevant attempts at evaluation – the presence of strands of reasoning or a counter argument is neither a strength nor a weakness in itself, but rather how well such things are used. However, the candidate does attempt to compare, and in the final paragraph of a rather long (only partly quoted) answer, some basic and accurate evaluative comments are made.</p> <p>This answer is simplistic, inaccurate, and the judgement about which document is stronger does not follow from the comments made.</p>

## Marking Grid for Question 4

Marks	Performance Descriptors
Level 4  16 – 20 marks	<p>Answers <b>must</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• answer the question which was asked with some precision and subtlety.</li> <li>• give generally strong support to this answer (their conclusion) using reasons and intermediate conclusions (although there may be some weaker parts to the argument).</li> </ul> <p>In doing so, answers <b>may</b> include some of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• accomplished argument structure using strands of reasoning.</li> <li>• questioning of key terms, such as responsibility; this questioning if present informs the argument, possibly qualifying the conclusion.</li> <li>• subtle thinking about the issue/relevant own ideas or examples about the issue/thoughtful use of ideas from resource booklet.</li> <li>• anticipation of key counter-arguments and effective response to these.</li> </ul> <p>The argument is written in clear, precise prose in language capable of dealing with complexity.</p>
Level 3  11 – 15 marks	<p>Answers <b>must</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• answer the question which was asked.</li> <li>• give support to this answer (their conclusion) using reasons and intermediate conclusions (although there may be some irrelevance or reliance on dubious assumptions).</li> </ul> <p>In doing so, answers <b>may</b> include some of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clear argument structure, which may be simple and precise or attempt complexity with only some success.</li> <li>• an attempt to question or define terms such as responsibility and possibly an attempt to use this questioning or definition in the argument.</li> <li>• clear (if perhaps one dimensional) thinking about the issue/own ideas or examples about the issue/reasonable use of ideas from the resource booklet.</li> <li>• anticipation of relevant counter-arguments and some response to these.</li> </ul> <p>The argument is written in prose in language which is clear and developing complexity.</p>



Marks	Performance Descriptors
Level 2  6 – 10 marks	<p>Answers <b>must</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• answer the general thrust of the question which was asked, possibly in an overstated or vague way.</li> <li>• give some support to this answer (their conclusion) using examples and reasons (although there may be considerable irrelevance and/or reliance on dubious assumptions).</li> </ul> <p>In doing so, answers <b>may</b> include some of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• either clear, straightforward, possibly simplistic arguments, or a discourse at length with a focus on the ideas and content but only basic structure of reasoning.</li> <li>• an attempt to define some terms, but this definition is used ineffectively if at all.</li> <li>• some thinking/own ideas about the issue/inclusion of ideas from the resource booklet.</li> <li>• inclusion of a counter-argument or counter-reason but any response to this is ineffective, possibly merely dismissive.</li> </ul> <p>The argument may be written as annotated bullet points rather than in coherent prose. The language may be either simple and clear or overly flowing, with little attention to meaning and precision.</p>
Level 1  1 – 5 marks	<p>Answers <b>must</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• attempt to answer the general thrust of the question, although there may be no stated conclusion.</li> <li>• attempt to support this answer, possibly using examples in place of reasoning (and there is likely to be considerable overstatement and reliance on very dubious assumptions).</li> </ul> <p>In doing so, answers <b>may</b> include some of the following characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• disjointed, incoherent reasoning with little structure, possibly a discourse or rant on the theme.</li> <li>• rhetorical questions and emotive language.</li> <li>• ‘reasons’ and ‘intermediate conclusions’ presented with no logical connection.</li> <li>• ideas which tend to be contradictory, asserted or derived largely from the stimulus material.</li> </ul> <p>The argument may be written as annotated bullet points rather than in coherent prose. Language is used in a vague, imprecise way.</p>
Level 0  0 marks	No creditworthy material.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p><b>Some possible lines of thinking:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Responsibility for individual action/families/communities/others/planet</li> <li>• Responsibility v rights v duty</li> <li>• Contrast west v east (not required but one possibility)</li> <li>• Contrast past v present (L2 = appeal to tradition)</li> <li>• What would it mean to take responsibility more seriously?</li> </ul> <p>Note that there are many possible areas which could be clarified or addressed here. They do not all have to be addressed for the candidate to score highly.</p> <p><b>Sample Level 4 part answer</b></p> <p>For this argument it is necessary to define the vague term of responsibility. For this argument responsibility will mean taking care of and being held accountable for your actions and belongings, and others in more desperate need are in some part belonging to you.</p> <p>Although it can be argued that as a society we are all individuals that must look after ourselves, and should therefore have less responsibility for others in this modern world, this is a claim that goes against the principles of how we have grown to becoming an advanced species on this planet. As going back to our primal instincts shows being part of a pack means helping each other and taking responsibility for both ours and our pack's decisions. It is therefore paramount that we keep this important philosophy in our behaviour...</p> <p>If firemen need to get to a fire and someone is relying on them to reach that building it is important that fireman reach that person to save their life, because that is partly the responsibility that their job entails. In most careers managers and staff are delegated tasks and things to take care of and these are their responsibilities. Therefore it is important that in the modern western world we take greater responsibility more seriously.</p>	20	<p>LOOK AT THE MARKING GRID.</p> <p>This part response considers different forms of responsibility. It reasons fairly effectively to support intermediate conclusions and responds fairly effectively to a relevant counter-argument.</p> <p>The response is not perfect, but has made a reasonable attempt at answering a big question in limited time.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>Sample Level 3 part answer</b>            Responsibility can be seen as a moral, social or financial duty to ourselves and to others, yet in the modern world many people discard personal accountability for their actions, such as parents who do not financially support their children. Some people say that it is unfair to generalise all parents who do not pay child maintenance fees to their children, because, despite living in the 'modern western world' not every person has the financial means to support others as well as themselves, and thus they are unable to take financial responsibility for their actions in giving birth to or fathering a child.</p> <p>However, responsibility cannot be limited to the financial world. People should respond to their own actions in the proper and respectful manner by doing their utmost to take care of children they produce...</p> <p>It is true we have laws in place to make people take responsibility for their crimes, but trying to formulate legislation for every responsibility on the planet would be like creating a trap for every mouse in Europe. We should rely on ourselves and take responsibility more seriously in the modern western world.</p> <p><b>Sample Level 2 part answer</b>            For the purpose of this argument, responsibility means taking the blame for things that have gone wrong... In terms of the modern western world, I will take this to mean countries who are more economically developed than others such as the UK and the USA who now have advanced technology and medicine but who are also facing many problems such as high teenage pregnancy, recession and a high unemployment rate...</p> <p>Teenage pregnancies are on the rise and this could be due to many factors. One factor could be that young girls are finding it hard to stay at home because of money or family issues, either way, being pregnant puts you at the top of the list for a council house, and, although these may not be ideal living conditions, they give you at least the basics. The Government therefore, need to help out teenagers, make sure they are able to get good living conditions without becoming pregnant and start looking into ways teenagers are prevented from becoming homeless in the first place.</p> <p>Recent studies have shown that the recession has caused a massive rate of unemployment to bloom. People are now finding it more and more difficult to get a job</p>		<p>This response attempts to think about different forms of responsibility. There is a counter-argument and a response, but the response is rather assertive.</p> <p>There are some links in the reasoning which work logically, and others where the logic wobbles.</p> <p>This answer starts well by trying consider what some key terms mean. The definition of responsibility as taking the blame seems a little narrow.</p> <p>However, the candidate then discusses what the government should do about teenage pregnancies, unemployment caused by the recession and (unquoted) unemployed school leavers. This is followed by a 'conclusion' which mentions responsibility again. This makes sense if we accept the rather large assumption that the</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>due to companies and organisations shutting down or simply not being able to afford more workers. This has put such a strain on the government. For example, people now have started claiming more benefits as they cannot get a job or find they are better off on the welfare state. In this sort of economic climate the government needs to be more aware of the poor systems in place currently...</p> <p>Therefore, in order to help us out of our economic crisis and to aid young people like single mothers and the unemployed, we must take responsibility more importantly in our modern world. Maybe then we can start helping out the rest of the world.</p>		government is to blame for the problems and must 'take responsibility' by sorting the problems out.

**APPENDIX 1****Principal Examiner's suggestion of possible ideas/approaches to Question 3 regarding use of emotive reasoning**

(NB This is **not** the expected level of candidate responses, for which see the levels part answers in the mark scheme.)

Neither document reasons very strongly. Both are opinion pieces which use a variety of reasoning strategies including emotive persuasion. But families are an emotive issue, so it might be reasonable for journalists to use emotional anecdotes about their fathers or shock tactics about boys reading porn but not knowing how to change a nappy to persuade people to take responsibility. For example, in document 1, the author uses an appeal to pity and guilt when she says, 'It's time we stopped treating the pregnant teenager as a political football and started thinking about the realities of her [the pregnant teenager's] children's lives.' This isn't entirely irrational, as there are good social reasons for improving the lives of children born in difficult circumstances, and one of the realities is that fathers are absent. This is a reason to take action, so the author is not using appeals to emotion entirely in place of rational thinking. Furthermore, because one of the main problems when dealing with teenage mothers is the negative emotions people feel about them, involving the reader's less unkind emotions is likely to have a more positive effect on the audience than a purely rational argument. In addition, this emotive strategy gives the reader a new perspective which it would be difficult to achieve through reasoned argument alone. Neither author is using ranting, threatening emotions to persuade as a racist troublemaker might. Trying to use a very rational argument to persuade us all to be responsible for our families might seem like telling us what to do about our private affairs. So both authors' persuasive techniques seem reasonable in arguing for family responsibility.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](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; 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 2012

