

# OCR

**OXFORD CAMBRIDGE AND RSA EXAMINATIONS**  
Advanced Subsidiary GCE

**CRITICAL THINKING**  
PAPER 2

**2870/2**

**MARK SCHEME**

Monday                      **10 JANUARY 2005**                      Morning                      1 hour 30 minutes

**Post-Standardisation Version**  
Finalised by PE 14 January 2005

---

**This mark scheme consists of 15 printed pages and 1 cover sheet.**

For many question papers there will also be subject or paper specific instructions which supplement these general instructions. The paper specific instructions follow these generic ones.

## **1 Before the standardisation meeting**

Before the standardisation meeting you must mark a selection of at least 10 scripts. The selection should be drawn from several Centres. The preliminary marking should be carried out **in pencil** in strict accordance with the mark scheme. In order to help identify any marking issues which might subsequently be encountered in carrying out your duties, the marked scripts must be brought to the meeting. (*Section 5c, page 5*)

## **2 After the standardisation meeting**

- a) Scripts must be marked in **red**, including those initially marked in pencil for the standardisation meeting.
- b) All scripts must be marked in accordance with the version of the final mark scheme agreed at the standardisation meeting.

### **c) Annotation of scripts**

The purpose of annotation is to enable examiners to indicate clearly where a mark is earned or why it has not been awarded. Annotation can, therefore, help examiners, checkers, and those remarking scripts to understand how the script has been marked.

#### **Annotation consists of:**

- the use of ticks and crosses against responses to show where marks have been earned or not earned;
- the use of specific words or phrases as agreed at standardisation and as contained in the final mark scheme either to confirm why a mark has been earned or indicate why a mark has not been earned (e.g. indicate an omission);
- the use of standard abbreviations e.g. for follow through, special case etc.

Any comments should be kept to a minimum and should always be specifically related to the award of a mark or marks and be taken (if appropriate) from statements in the mark scheme. General comments on a candidate's work must be avoided.

Where annotations are put onto the candidates' script evidence, they should normally be recorded in the body of the answer or in the margin immediately adjacent to the point where the decision is made to award or not award the mark.

d) **Recording of marking: the scripts**

- i) Marked scripts must give a clear indication of how marks have been awarded as instructed in the mark scheme.
- ii) All numerical marks for responses to part questions should be recorded unringed in the right-hand margin. The total for each question (or, in specified cases, for each page or section) should be shown as a single ringed mark in the right-hand margin at the end of the question.
- iii) The ringed totals should be transferred to the front page of the script, where they should be totalled.
- iv) Every page of a script on which the candidate has made a response should show evidence that the work has been seen.
- v) Every blank page should be crossed through to indicate that it has been seen.

*(Section 8a – d, page 7)*

e) **Handling of unexpected answers**

The standardisation meeting will include a discussion of marking issues, including:

- a full consideration of the mark scheme with the objective of achieving a clear and common understanding of the range of acceptable responses and the marks appropriate to them, and comparable marking standards for optional questions;
- the handling of unexpected, yet acceptable answers.

*(Section 6a, bullet point 5, page 6)*

There will be times when you may not be clear how the mark scheme should be applied to a particular response. In these circumstances, a telephone call to the Team Leader should produce a speedy resolution to the problem.

*(Appendix 5, para 19, page 25)*

- 1 (a) **The candidate needs to assess the credibility of EACH participant's/source's evidence against the relevant criteria:**

[AO1, AO2, AO3, AO4]

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

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

Award up to 2 marks in relation to each participant/source named in the mark scheme. If a participant/source is omitted, those 2 marks cannot be accessed in any other way. **[5 x 2 marks]**

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

Award no marks eg

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

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

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

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

**[12]**

1 (a)

<b>C</b> Caterer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reputation/VI -w</li> <li>• Ability to see -w</li> <li>-w</li> <li>-w</li> <li>• Vested Interest -w</li> <li>• Experience -s</li> <li>• Expertise -s</li> <li>• Motive -w</li> </ul>	<p>to blame (H) to avoid the stigma of his food outlet being associated with food poisoning does not have the ability to see whether (H) moved the tureen from the fridge or not he does not offer firm evidence to support his hypothetical reasoning relating to (H) / may be depending upon the credibility of (V)'s evidence</p> <p>his claim that he was there when the tureen was about to be taken out of the fridge conflicts with / weakens his earlier claim that the tureen had earlier been taken out of the fridge</p> <p>to blame (H) to divert attention from (W) if she were negligent, as guilt would involve prosecution/fine/suspension.</p> <p>as an employer training staff for 6 years to support (W)'s competence, assuming ownership started with training programme.</p> <p>as a caterer to know the causes/risks of food poisoning - to speculate the cause of the food poisoning in this instance.</p> <p>to lie about (W)'s actions to defend her as an employee.</p>
<b>V</b> Van driver	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to see -w</li> <li>-w</li> <li>-w</li> <li>• Vested interest -w</li> <li>• Motive/Bias -w</li> </ul>	<p>Not present to know whether (H) did take out the tureen / the claim is based on the assumption that the champagne was served chilled, / and excludes the possibility of alternative methods of chilling - more ice could have been added.</p> <p>to defend (C) as he might lose his job if (C) goes out of business</p> <p>as a colleague to lie about the water to take possible blame away from (W)/(C).</p>
<b>P</b> Photographer/ Photograph	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to see -s/w</li> <li>-w</li> <li>-w</li> <li>• Experience/ know -s/w</li> <li>• Neutral/Bias -s</li> <li>-w</li> <li>-w</li> </ul>	<p>The strength of his accusation against (W) depends upon whether he noticed when the food was taken out.</p> <p>Photograph - it depicts a snapshot in time but, unless the time can be established from the sequence of the photographs or camera data, it does not rule out the tureen being taken out by (H).</p> <p>Photograph - it also does not indicate how long the tureen was out. It may have been put on the table temporarily.</p> <p>the accusation also depends upon his knowledge/experience that this length of time 'too early' would put the food at risk.</p> <p>No motive to lie as he is independent of both (H) and (W)</p> <p>/unless he felt the need to blame (W) because she had complained about the photographs disrupting the schedule</p> <p>/or to defend (H) as the person employing him.</p>
<b>W</b> Waitress	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reputation/ Expertise -s</li> <li>-w</li> <li>• Ability to see/ Know -w</li> <li>• Trustworthy -s</li> <li>• Vested Interest -w</li> <li>• Relevance -w</li> <li>• Expertise -s</li> <li>• Neutral -s</li> <li>• Bias -w</li> <li>-w</li> </ul>	<p>as given by (C) to know the risks of seafood poisoning (depends upon the credibility of (C)'s evidence)</p> <p>/ weakened if (W) was not one of those with a certificate as (C) uses the word 'encourage'</p> <p>(H) would not be able to see from the tureen if the food carried food poisoning as there would be no change in taste or smell -</p> <p>- His comment re freshness would not guarantee food safety.</p> <p>VI to blame (H) to avoid blame but does not, perhaps indicating belief in her innocence.</p> <p><i>Candidates may treat the EHO report as a separate source</i></p> <p>to lie if guilty - that she had waited to take the food out - to avoid blame and to protect her job and (C)'s business</p> <p>The compliance refers to general working practice not the conditions at the wedding buffet</p> <p>of the EHO to correctly assess compliance with food safety regulations</p> <p>would have no motive to lie, and a VI to tell the truth to preserve the credibility of the EHO.</p> <p>(W) quotes from the EHO report - may have selected the most positive comments to support her case.</p> <p>possible because of loyalty to (C)</p>
<b>H</b> Host	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reputation -w</li> <li>• Ability to see -s/w</li> <li>• Vested Interest -w</li> <li>-w</li> <li>• Motive -w</li> <li>-s</li> <li>• Expertise -w</li> <li>-w</li> </ul>	<p>as given by (C) (depends upon the credibility of (C)'s evidence) as not understanding food safety having cost in mind.</p> <p>His claim does not indicate how long the food had been set out. The process may just have been completed.</p> <p>to infer (W)'s guilt if he had taken out the tureen, as he would be seen to be guilty.</p> <p>to lie about his own innocence if guilty, to avoid the negative consequences.</p> <p>if champagne is warm to remove tureen and put champagne in fridge instead</p> <p>to avoid risks of food poisoning as his family and friends might be put at risk</p> <p>His initial reluctance to hire fridges might demonstrate that perhaps he did not fully understand the health risks. This may weaken his claim that he would not put his guests health at risk.</p> <p>as a "lay person" / non-caterer may not be fully aware of risks</p>

w = Weakens s = Strengthens credibility of evidence

- 1 (b) The candidate needs to come to a reasoned judgement as to who caused the seafood to become a health hazard:

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

**Corroboration / Conflict [2]**

- no marks should be awarded where candidate simply says that two participants agree/conflict;
- there needs to be a statement of what they agree / disagree about.

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

ie C V W versus H P.

**Weight [1]** – the candidate should specify the number of participants on each side, or which side has more or less.

ie Therefore the weight of evidence lies with C / three on one side; two on the other.

**Quality [3]**

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

for 3 marks: candidates should assess both sides adequately

for 2 marks: 1 side is assessed adequately / both sides assessed to a limited extent

for 1 mark: isolated points of credibility

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

**(a) Conclusion:**

- this must be precise including any qualifying words;
- if the answer includes any of the reasoning it cannot be credited.

**The EU directive (banning sale of health supplements) ought to be supported.**

[AO1] [1]

**(b) Reasoning:**

- these do not need to be numbered or be in the order of the passage;
- they must be precise including those qualifying words which, if omitted, would alter the meaning e.g. probably, mostly;
- stated reasons that include substantial extra material cannot be credited.

Award 1 mark for each correct reason.

- (Research shows) health supplements are damaging health / (This shows how) much damage these health supplements do to people's health.
- The EU directive would help to prevent (the nightmare of) pills replacing food (becoming a reality).
- People (already) take too many pills (instead of adopting a healthier life style).
- Opposing the EU Directive would mean beneficial measures (like this / seat belts) will be threatened.
- (If people cannot buy these banned health supplements,) sales of fruit and vegetables will increase (which will be good for the British economy and good for the people).

[5 x 1]

[AO1, AO2] [5]

**(c) Assumptions:**

See grid on page 8.

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

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

Award 1 mark for each correct assumption.

[3 x 1]

**Flaws:**

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

Award 1 mark for each correctly identified flaw.

[3 x 1]

[AO1, AO3] [6]

## 2 (c)

PARA	ASSUMPTIONS	FLAWS
2	<p>Assumes that Vitamin C will be one of the banned supplements.</p> <p>Assumes Vitamin C supplements are typical of (these) health supplements.</p> <p>Assumes that Vitamin C supplements at over 500 mgrams per day are typical.</p> <p>Assumes one cannot consume damaging levels of Vitamin C through consuming natural foodstuffs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Causation</b> – ‘post hoc’ flaw in assuming causal connection between the high Vitamin C dosage and the development of cancer. They could already be ill.</li> <li>• <b>Generalisation</b> – from Vitamin C to all health supplements.</li> <li>• <b>Ad hominem</b> - dismisses evidence on basis of who is presenting it.</li> </ul>
3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Irrelevance</b> – illustration is not appropriate as the EU directive is about pills as food <i>supplements</i>, not about pills as food <i>replacements</i>.</li> <li>• <b>Begging the question</b> – the author has not established it is a ‘nightmare’.</li> </ul>
4	<p>Assumes there has not been a change in the consumption of painkillers since 1998.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Irrelevant example</b> – food supplements are about the <i>prevention</i> of ill health rather than <i>alleviating effects</i> of ill health.</li> <li>• <b>Restricting the options</b> – to either taking pills or leading a healthy lifestyle.</li> <li>• <b>Conflation</b> – unhealthy life style and pill taking are taken to be the same thing/whereas pills may be necessary to sustain health e.g. aspirin to prevent heart disease.</li> <li>• <b>Conflation</b> – painkillers with food supplements</li> </ul>
5	<p>Assumes establishing something legally automatically justifies it.</p> <p>Assumes preventing people from taking health supplements is in their best interests.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Tu quoque</b> – the citing of another example of the law intervening on personal freedom doesn’t make it right i.e. citing another example of paternalism does not make paternalism right.</li> <li>• <b>Inappropriate parallel</b> – seat belt law involves the well being of others not just the welfare of the individual e.g. rear passengers harming front passengers.</li> <li>• <b>Generalisation</b> – opposing this particular directive does not mean that one opposes all such measures.</li> </ul>
6	<p>Assumes people will substitute fruit and vegetables for health supplements.</p> <p>Assumes increases in fruit and vegetable sales will outweigh loss of food supplement sales.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Contradiction/inconsistency</b> – passage suggests we should welcome the EU directive because of concern about too high dosages of health supplements but here it is suggested one cannot get too much in the way of vitamins and minerals.</li> </ul>



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

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

- relevant reason
- supporting evidence

Award a further mark if the candidate relates the reasoning to the main conclusion.

**[2 x 4]**

**[AO5] [8]**

**Further arguments supporting/against the conclusion eg**

R1

R2

IC

C

**or**

R1

R2

R3

C

**or**

R1 or R2

with example

C

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

**Further arguments to support the conclusion**

- Relevant statement –

**Health supplements are very expensive.**

1 mark

- Limited supported supporting evidence/embellishments

**For the cost of a bottle of Vitamin C, one could buy several kilos of fruit and vegetables.**

1 mark

- Developed reasoning (here additional dependent reasoning)

**People on below average incomes would get far more benefit to health through buying fruit and veg than buying health supplements.**

1 mark

- The above points related to either

**IC The EU directive would lead to more efficient expenditure on health on the part of low income families.**

or

**MC The EU directive ought to be supported.**

1 mark

***Arguments that could be further developed***

Strengthens the power and influence of the EU/Europe.

Advertising for health supplements exploits /creates unnecessary feelings of anxiety.

**Further arguments against the conclusion**

- Relevant statement –

**People benefit psychologically from taking health supplements.**

1 mark

- Limited supported supporting evidence/embellishments

**Studies suggest many health supplements make people feel better rather than having any actual effect on the condition.**

1 mark

- Developed reasoning (here additional dependent reasoning)

**If people feel healthier they will act more positively in day to day life.**

1 mark

- The above points related to either

**IC People will feel less positive if they cannot buy health supplements.**

or

**MC The EU directive ought NOT to be supported.**

1 mark

***Arguments that could be further developed***

Strengthens power and influence of the EU/Europe

Economic effects on health supplements industry – unemployment – stress/ill health

Vagueness of definition of 'health supplement' – when does a substance become a health supplement rather than a food? e.g. use of herbs, garlic.

- 3 Where a candidate's performance is erratic, unpick the grid and award each part separately:

**Structure (maximum 5 marks)**

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

**C It is a good thing that many towns and cities have developed 'out of town' shopping centres / out of town shopping centres are good.**

**IC Out of town shopping (is a development that) has a number of beneficial effects for society.**

**Reasons:**

**Out of town shopping centres –**

**R1 make significant contribution to the preservation of ancient buildings.**

**R2 City centres become pleasanter places for tourist.**

**R3 solve problems of traffic congestion.**

**R4 make an important contribution to providing full employment.**

**Counter argument – against idea that out of town shopping centres 'kill off' town centres**

**Evaluation (6 x 1 marks)**

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

**Further arguments (maximum 6 marks)**

NB different from question 2(d).

One further argument that relates to the reasoning and has no conclusion (1 mark)

One further argument that relates to the reasoning and has a conclusion (2 marks)

One further argument that relates to the conclusion and has no conclusion (3 marks)

One further argument that relates to the conclusion and has a conclusion (4 marks)

Two further arguments that relate to the conclusion and both have a conclusion (5 marks)

Two further arguments that relate to the conclusion, both have conclusion and one of these is developed (6 marks)

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

**Further Arguments Which Support The Conclusion**

- Relevant statements (s)
  - many shops require bulk deliveries.
- Limited supporting evidence / embellishment
  - for example many supermarkets require constant deliveries of large amounts of goods day and night in order to meet demand.
- Developed reasoning (here additional dependent reasoning)
  - The number of such deliveries disrupts the lives of residents.

MC: It is a good thing that many towns and cities have developed OTSCs / OTSCs are a good thing.

**Examples of arguments which could be further developed**

Building process less disruptive to city centre  
Easier for shops to expand if demand increases

**Further Arguments Which Challenge The Conclusion:**

- Relevant statement
- **Only very large well-established companies can afford operations on the scale needed in out-of-town shopping centres.**
- Limited supporting evidence/embellishment

**If, for example, a company like B and Q opens a store they are well enough known to attract trade on their name alone.**

- Developed reasoning (here additional dependent reasoning)

**This gives such firms an over-dominant position and contributes to the process where all towns become the same with the same shops.**

- The above points related to:

Either Opposing the intermediate conclusion i.e. this is **not** a beneficial effect for society.

Or Opposing the main conclusion i.e. OTSCs are a good thing.

***Examples of arguments which could be further developed***

Encouragement of a mindless shopping culture

The impact on other functions of the city centre when a key function like shopping is taken out of it.

**Quality of written communication (maximum 3 marks)**

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

**Examples of specific details:** see Question 2 (d)

3

PARA	ASSUMPTIONS	FLAWS
2	<p>Assumes most people can access out-of-town shopping without going through city centre.</p> <p>Assumes pollution from out of town traffic is not a threat to ancient buildings.</p> <p>Assumes ancient buildings are only found in the city/town centres.</p> <p>Assumes there is no other possible explanation than traffic pollution for Wells Cathedral needing less restoration than York Cathedral.</p> <p>Assumes medieval cathedrals are typical of ancient buildings.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Insufficient evidence</b> - the conclusion that out of town shopping centres are a contribution to protecting ancient buildings is drawn without any consideration of the environmental impact of the building of out of town shopping centres on these buildings e.g. increased traffic polluting atmosphere for many miles around.</li> <li>• <b>Casuation</b> - there may be other effects of out of town shopping which negate this. E.g. decline of interest in city centres therefore more difficult to raise funds to preserve ancient buildings</li> <li>• <b>Causation</b> - post hoc flaw; there may be other reasons why Wells is in better state of restoration.</li> <li>• <b>Generalisation</b> - from medieval cathedrals to all ancient buildings whereas they might not be typical of such buildings.</li> </ul>
1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ad hominem</b> - attacking the association of Small Businesses rather than their reasoning</li> </ul>
3	<p>Assumes tourists and shoppers are two distinct groups.</p> <p>Assumes numbers of tourists will not increase.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Relevance</b> - reasoning does not apply to cities which do not attract tourists.</li> <li>• <b>Generalisation</b> - from cities like Florence to all cities.</li> </ul>
4	Assumes people do not shop in both OTSCs and towns and cities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Insufficient evidence</b> - the author needs to establish that the cars going to the shopping centres are going there <i>instead</i> of the city centre.</li> </ul>
5	<p>Assumes jobs gained in OTSCs are not balanced by jobs lost in town and city centres.</p> <p>Assumes group mentioned represent a significant proportion of the total numbers of people seeking employment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Insufficient evidence</b> - author cannot conclude that OTSCs make a major contribution to full employment unless the effects of businesses closing down in the city centre is considered.</li> <li>• <b>Relevance</b> - part time job opportunities do not necessarily adequately provide 'full employment'.</li> </ul>

## ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES

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

**NB**

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

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

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

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