

# OXFORD CAMBRIDGE AND RSA EXAMINATIONS Advanced Subsidiary GCE

CRITICAL THINKING F491

UNIT 1: Credibility of Evidence

Friday 13 JANUARY 2006 Afternoon 1 hour 15 minutes

Candidates answer on the question paper. Additional materials: Resource Booklet

Candidate Name	Centre Number	Candidate Number

#### **TIME** 1 hour 15 minutes

#### **INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES**

- Write your name in the space above.
- Write your Centre number and Candidate number in the boxes above.
- Answer all the questions.
- Write your answers, in blue or black ink, in the spaces on the question paper.
- Read carefully each question and document and make sure you know what you have to do before starting your answer.
- You are advised to spend about 15 minutes reading through the Resource Booklet and question paper before attempting to answer the questions.

#### INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

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

FOR EXAMINER'S USE		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
TOTAL		

Documents 1, 2 and 3 in the Resource Booklet contain reports concerning the Apollo 11 moon landing on 20 July 1969. Read these documents and then answer the questions which follow:

## Section A: Assessing the credibility of documents

Ex suc	ch reporting:
	1
	2
	3
	nsider the photographic evidence and captions in Document 1 and Document 3.
Th	
Th on	nsider the photographic evidence and captions in Document 1 and Document 3.  ese may be intended to provide support for the claims that Apollo 11 astronauts dic
Thon	nsider the photographic evidence and captions in Document 1 and Document 3.  ese may be intended to provide support for the claims that Apollo 11 astronauts dic the moon.
Thon	nsider the photographic evidence and captions in Document 1 and Document 3.  ese may be intended to provide support for the claims that Apollo 11 astronauts dic the moon.  plain <b>four</b> weaknesses in that support.
Th on Ex	nsider the photographic evidence and captions in Document 1 and Document 3.  ese may be intended to provide support for the claims that Apollo 11 astronauts dic the moon.  plain <b>four</b> weaknesses in that support.
Th on Ex	nsider the photographic evidence and captions in Document 1 and Document 3.  ese may be intended to provide support for the claims that Apollo 11 astronauts did the moon.  plain <b>four</b> weaknesses in that support.
Theon Ex	nsider the photographic evidence and captions in Document 1 and Document 3.  ese may be intended to provide support for the claims that Apollo 11 astronauts diction the moon.  clain <b>four</b> weaknesses in that support.
Theon Ex	nsider the photographic evidence and captions in Document 1 and Document 3.  ese may be intended to provide support for the claims that Apollo 11 astronauts did the moon.  plain <b>four</b> weaknesses in that support.
Theon Ex 1	nsider the photographic evidence and captions in Document 1 and Document 3.  ese may be intended to provide support for the claims that Apollo 11 astronauts diction the moon.  clain <b>four</b> weaknesses in that support.

**3** Consider the credibility of Documents 1, 2 and 3.

For each document make **two** points of assessment, each of which should:

- identify a relevant credibility criterion;
- use this to assess the credibility of the document;
- refer to the text to support your assessment.

#### **Document 1 – The History Channel**

Criterion:	
Assessment:	
	[3]
Criterion:	
Assessment:	
	[3]
Document 2 – American Patriot Friends Network	
Document 2 - American Fathor Friends Network	
Criterion:	
Criterion:	
Criterion:  Assessment:	
Criterion:  Assessment:	
Criterion:  Assessment:	[3]
Criterion:  Assessment:	[3]
Criterion:  Assessment:  Criterion:	[3]
Criterion:  Assessment:  Criterion:	[3]

## Document 3 - Science@NASA

Criterion:
Assessment:
[3]
Criterion:
Assessment:
[3]

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

# Section B: Assessing the credibility of evidence

4

Consider Document 2.

(a)	Suggest how the footage shown by Julian Scheer (JS), might be interpreted to avoid inference of government deception.
(b)	Refer to the final paragraph headed 'photographic oddity'. State the intended inference raised and suggest what alternative explanation could be given.
Cor <b>(a)</b>	
	Assess the support given to the evidence by the comparison with a tent post in the paragraph.
	Assess the support given to the evidence by the comparison with a tent post in the
	Assess the support given to the evidence by the comparison with a tent post in the paragraph.
	Assess the support given to the evidence by the comparison with a tent post in the paragraph.
	Assess the support given to the evidence by the comparison with a tent post in the paragraph.
(a)	Assess the support given to the evidence by the comparison with a tent post in the paragraph.
(a)	Assess the support given to the evidence by the comparison with a tent post in the paragraph.
(a)	Assess the support given to the evidence by the comparison with a tent post in the paragraph.
(a)	Assess the support given to the evidence by the comparison with a tent post in the paragraph.
(a)	Assess the support given to the evidence by the comparison with a tent post in the paragraph.

6 Consider Ralph Rene (RR) in Document 2 and Dr David McKay (DM) in Document 3.

Assess the credibility of evidence relating to them.

For each person make **two** points of assessment, each of which should:

identify a claim made;

Ralph Rene

- 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.

Claim 1
[4]
Ralph Rene
Claim 2
Claim 2

# **Dr David McKay Dr David McKay** Claim 2 Use one credibility criterion to demonstrate which source, Ralph Rene (RR) or Dr David McKay (DM), is more credible than the other.

7

Total Marks for Section B [25]

# Section C: Coming to a reasoned judgement

a)	State <b>three</b> precise points of corroboration. Support these with references from the
o)	State <b>three</b> precise points of conflict. Support these with references from the text
၁)	
၁)	
<b>o</b> )	State <b>three</b> precise points of conflict. Support these with references from the text
o)	State <b>three</b> precise points of conflict. Support these with references from the text
o)	State <b>three</b> precise points of conflict. Support these with references from the text
o)	State <b>three</b> precise points of conflict. Support these with references from the text
o)	State <b>three</b> precise points of conflict. Support these with references from the text
<b>o</b> )	State <b>three</b> precise points of conflict. Support these with references from the text
o)	State <b>three</b> precise points of conflict. Support these with references from the text

(c)	Identify the individual sources on each side of the dispute. Explain any problematic sources.
( <b>q</b> )	Explain the weight of evidence.
(4)	Explain the weight of evidence.
(e)	Assess of the quality of evidence.
(0)	7.03000 of the quality of evidence.
	[6]

alked	f) State your reasoned judgement as to how likely it was that Apollo 11 astronauts wal on the moon and collected rocks.
[1]	
[25]	Total Marks for Section C

nust be clearly shown.

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.