

**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY GCE  
CRITICAL THINKING**

Unit 1: Credibility of Evidence

**MONDAY 19 MAY 2008**

**F491**

Afternoon  
Time: 1 hour 15 minutes

Candidates answer on the question paper

**Additional materials (enclosed):** Resource Booklet F491/RB

**Additional materials (required):**  
None



Candidate  
Forename

Candidate  
Surname

Centre  
Number

--	--	--	--	--

Candidate  
Number

--	--	--	--

**INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES**

- Write your name in capital letters, your Centre Number and Candidate Number in the boxes above.
- Use blue or black ink. Pencil may be used for graphs and diagrams only.
- Read each question carefully and make sure that you know what you have to do before starting your answer.
- Answer **all** the questions.
- Do **not** write in the bar codes.
- Write your answer to each question in the space provided.

**INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES**

- The number of marks for each question is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part question.
- The total number of marks for this paper is **80**.
- You will be awarded up to 5 marks overall for the quality of your written communication.
- Additional answer space is available on the lined pages at the back of this book. Answers on these pages must be clearly numbered.

**FOR EXAMINER'S USE**

Section A	
Section B	
Section C	
QWC/5	
TOTAL	

This document consists of **12** printed pages.

The five documents in the Resource Booklet contain reports relating to the dispute as to whether disposable nappies are no worse for the environment than reusable nappies. Read these documents and then answer the questions that follow.

### Section A: Assessing the credibility of documents

- 1 There may be weaknesses in the credibility of reporting about the environmental impact of many products (other than nappies).

Explain **three** possible weaknesses in the credibility of such reporting.

1 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....[2]

2 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....[2]

3 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....[2]

- 2 Consider the data in the caption boxes to the images in Documents 3 and 4.

Referring to the data, assess which plan might be more effective.

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....[2]

- identify a relevant credibility criterion
- use this to assess the credibility of the documents
- make reference to the text to support your assessment.

1 .....[3]

2 .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....[3]

3 .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....[3]

3 .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....[3]

© OCR 2008

## Section B: Assessing the credibility of evidence

- 4 Consider the claim made by the UK Environment Agency in Document 1 about the way in which the study was 'carried out'.

(a) State what might be implied by this claim.

.....[1]

(b) The study looks at the environmental evidence of the impact of both disposable and reusable nappies. State **one** other factor that might influence parents when choosing which type of nappy to use.

.....[1]

- 5 Consider the former Waste minister's claim in Document 2 and WEN's claim in Document 4.

Assess the credibility of their evidence. For each of these sources make **two** points of assessment, each of which should:

- identify a claim made (you may assess the same claim twice)
- assess how this is strengthened or weakened by any relevant credibility criterion
- state what you must suppose to be true in order to reach your assessment.

### The Former Waste Minister's Claim

1 .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....[5]

2 .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....[5]

**Wen's Claim**

1 .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....[5]

2 .....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....[5]

- 6** Use **one** credibility criterion to compare the credibility of the former Waste minister's claim with that of WEN's claim.

.....

.....

.....

.....[2]

**Total Marks for Section B [24]**

**Section C: Coming to a reasoned judgement**

- 7** Come to a reasoned judgement as to how likely it is that disposable nappies are no worse for the environment than reusables.

In your answers you should refer to the individual sources **within** the documents.

- (a)** State **two** precise claims that are corroborated.

Support each of these with two references from the text.

1 .....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....[3]

2 .....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....[3]

(b) State **two** precise claims where conflict arises.

Support each of these with two references from the text.

1 .....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....[3]

2 .....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....[3]

(c) Identify **all** the individual sources within the documents on each side of the dispute.

Explain any source that does not fit easily onto either side.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....[4]



- (d)** State which side, if any, has the greater weight of evidence, supporting this with numbers of sources.

[2]

- (e) Using **three** different credibility criteria, assess the quality of evidence on each side of the above dispute.

[6]

- (f) State the judgement as to how likely it is that disposable nappies are no worse for the environment than reusables that results from your assessment.

.....[1]

**Total Marks for Section C [25]**

**Five marks are available for the quality of written communication** [5]

**PAPER TOTAL 80 Marks**

If you use the following lined pages to complete the answer to any question, the question number **must** be clearly shown.

[illegible]



**PLEASE DO NOT WRITE ON THIS PAGE**

---

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (OCR) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

OCR is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.