

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE  
GCE CRITICAL THINKING**

## F501 QP

Unit F501: *Introduction to Critical Thinking*

**Specimen Paper**

Morning/Afternoon

Time: 1 hour 30 minutes

Additional Materials: Resource Booklet



### INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

- Answer the questions in the space provided.
- Answer **all** the questions.

### INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

- The number of marks for each question is given in brackets [ ] at the end of each question or part of question.
- The total number of marks for this paper is **75**.
- You are advised to spend about 35 minutes of the examination time on Section A and about 40 minutes on Section B.
- Marks are available for the quality of written communication in your answers.
- Read each passage in the Resource Booklet before starting to answer the questions.

This document consists of **7** printed pages and 1 blank page.

**Section A - The language of reasoning**

Answer **all** questions.

Read the documents in the Resource Booklet carefully before answering **all** questions.

**Read document 1 “Degrees of value”, and answer questions 1 to 10.**

**1** Identify the **main conclusion** of the argument presented in the passage.

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

**2 (a)** Identify the reason in paragraph 2 that is given to support the main conclusion.

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

**(b)** Identify the reason in paragraph 4 that is given to support the main conclusion.

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

**3** Identify the hypothetical reasoning used in paragraph 4.

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

**4** In paragraph 6 the author states:

“Some have argued that the planned increases in vocational degrees will result in higher status for degrees”

**(a)** Identify what component of the argument this is.

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

**(b)** Explain your decision

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

**5** Assess the evidence in paragraph 2 about graduate salaries and debt by suggesting **three** ways in which this evidence may not be representative of all students.

1..... [1]  
2..... [1]  
3..... [1]

**6** In paragraph 3, the author uses the results of research conducted on 16,000 university students.

**(a)** Explain one way in which this could be a good piece of evidence.

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

**(b)** Explain one way in which this might be a weak piece of evidence

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

**7 (a)** To support the reasoning in paragraph 4 what must the author assume about the subjects covered by degree courses?

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

**(b)** Assess the assumption you have given in part (a). Explain whether this is a reasonable assumption to make, referring to material in the passage.

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

8 In paragraph 5, the author uses evidence about the numbers of students taking management degrees.

What must the author **assume** about the entry requirements of management courses to support his argument that degrees have been devalued?

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

9 Give **one** reason that would support an argument in favour of taking a degree course.

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

10 In paragraph 3, the author argues that degrees do not lead to better employment prospects.

Does the reasoning in this paragraph support the author's overall argument? Explain your answer.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
..... [6]

**Section A Total [35]**

**Section B - Credibility**

Answer **all** questions.

**Read Document 2: “Car makers blame drivers’ over CO<sub>2</sub>, and answer questions 11 to 19.**

**11** Assess how far the document “Car makers blame drivers over CO<sub>2</sub>” is a credible report.

You should make **two** points, identifying and explaining relevant credibility criteria.

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

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

**12** Look at the graph in Document 2. Explain whether this graph is relevant to the discussion in document 2?

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

**13 (a)** Assess the credibility of Christopher MacGowan, the chief of the industry body The Society of Motor Manufacturers Ltd (SMMT).

You should make **two** points, referring to credibility criteria in your answer and explaining how these may strengthen or weaken his credibility.

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

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

(b) What else would you need to know in order to reach a judgement about the credibility of Christopher MacGowan’s statement? You should make **one** detailed point.

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

14 Assess the credibility of Roger Harrabin, BBC Environmental analyst.

You should make **two** points, referring to credibility criteria in your answer and explaining how these may strengthen or weaken his credibility.

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

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

15 In paragraph 4 Mr MacGowan claims that *“We have proven that we are doing our bit by hitting interim targets of our voluntary agreement”*.

Identify **one** piece of evidence that supports this claim.

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

16 There is agreement that the EU strategy to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from new cars will lead to cars costing more.

Identify **two** of the claims that support this idea.

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

17 In paragraph 4, Christopher Will claims that “*the easy improvements are behind us, and progress is now at an even slower rate.*”

Give **one** reason that would support this claim.

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

18 In paragraph 3, Stavros Dimas claims that ‘the extra capital cost of making cars more fuel efficient will be more than offset by the fuel savings over the car’s lifetime.’

Assess the reasonableness of this claim, with reference to material from the passage.

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

19 You should make an informed judgement about whether Christopher MacGowan **or** Roger Harrabin is the more credible. You should make **two** developed points that *contrast* the relative credibility of the two men.

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
..... [6]

**Section B Total [40]**

**Paper Total [75]**

BLANK PAGE

SPECIMEN



The maximum mark for this paper is 75.

SPECIMEN

Section A - The Language of reasoning		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
1	<p><b>Identify the main conclusion of the argument presented in the passage.</b></p> <p>(There are now many reasons why) Degree level qualifications are of very little value and are not worth having.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> - for precisely identifying the main conclusion with paraphrase of single words.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> - for less accurate statement of the main conclusion which has the correct meaning but lacks precision and/or contains additional information.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> - For inaccurate statement of conclusion</p>	[2]
2(a)	<p><b>Identify the reason in paragraph 2 that is given to support the main conclusion.</b></p> <p>Graduate salaries no longer match the crippling costs of getting a degree.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – For precisely identifying the reason.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – For a reasonable precise statement of the reason which includes paraphrases of single words.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – For less accurate statement of the main reason which has the correct meaning but lacks precision and/or contains additional information.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – For inaccurate statement of the reason.</p>	[3]
2(b)	<p><b>Identify the reason in paragraph 4 that is given to support the main conclusion.</b></p> <p>Degrees are not reflecting the needs of the economy.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> – For precisely identifying the reason.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – For a reasonable precise statement of the reason which includes paraphrases of single words.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – For less accurate statement of the main reason which has the correct meaning but lacks precision and/or contains additional information.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – For inaccurate statement of the reason.</p>	[3]

Section A - The Language of reasoning		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
3	<p><b>Identify the hypothetical reasoning used in paragraph 4.</b></p> <p>If we want our young people to go onto have marketable skills, (then) we must ensure that we give them all the information they need about future employment prospects</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – for precisely identifying the hypothetical reason/ with paraphrase of single words.  <b>1 mark</b> – for less accurate statement of the hypothetical reason which has the correct meaning but lacks precision and/or contains additional information.  <b>0 marks</b> – for inaccurate statement of hypothetical reason.</p>	[2]
4	<p><b>In paragraph 6 the author states:</b>  <b>“Some have argued that the planned increases in vocational degrees will result in higher status for degrees”</b></p> <p><b>4(a) Identify what component of the argument this is.</b></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – for stating that it is the conclusion of the counter argument/it is part of a counter argument.  <b>1 mark</b> – for counter assertion/counter reason.  <b>0 marks</b> – for no credit-worthy material</p> <p><b>4(b) Explain your decision</b></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – because it states the opposite point of view to that of the author and is supported by a reason.  <b>1 mark</b> – for: it states the opposite point of view.  <b>0 marks</b> – for no credit-worthy material</p>	[2]  [2]
5	<p><b>Assess the evidence in paragraph 2 about graduate salaries and debt by suggesting three ways in which this evidence may not be representative of all students.</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – for each reasonable point about the evidence.  <b>0 marks</b> – for no credit-worthy material</p> <p>Possible examples:  The number of students surveyed may not have been big enough for the average to be representative.  It is an average which may not apply to all students.  Debts of up to £15000 means that most students will have smaller debts  We do not know the time frame – salaries may have risen</p>	[3x1]

Section A - The Language of reasoning		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
6	<b>In paragraph 3, the author uses the results of research conducted on 16,000 university students.</b>	
6(a)	<p><b>Explain one way in which this could be a good piece of evidence.</b></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – for a precise and relevant point, for example. The sample size is very large which increases the chance of the results representing the views/outcomes for all students.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – for answers that lack precision and accuracy, for example: Large sample size</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – for an irrelevant point</p>	[2]
6(b)	<p><b>Explain one way in which this might be a weak piece of evidence</b></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – for a precise and relevant point, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 16,000 may only be a very small percentage of the total number of students at degree level</li> <li>• The students interviewed could have been from one university so the results cannot be relied upon to be accurate</li> <li>• What the students think might not happen is not an accurate guide to what will actually happen</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – for answers that lack precision and accuracy, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough students were interviewed</li> <li>• The students were from the same university</li> <li>• The students didn't tell the truth</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – for an irrelevant point</p>	[2]
7(a)	<p><b>To support the reasoning in paragraph 4 what must the author assume about the subjects covered by degree courses?</b></p> <p>The author must assume that the majority of degree courses are not courses in construction and engineering.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – for an accurate statement of the assumption.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – for a less precise statement of the assumption.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – for an inaccurate statement of the assumption</p> <p>Example of 1 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People don't do courses in construction or engineering;</li> <li>• There are no degrees in construction or engineering.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	[2]
7(b)	<p><b>Assess the assumption you have given in part (a). Explain whether this is a reasonable assumption to make, referring to material in the passage.</b></p> <p>Students can argue either way. Mark on the basis of the answer given in part a).</p>	

Section A - The Language of reasoning		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
7(b) cont'd	<p><b>2 marks</b> – for a well expressed, detailed and relevant point, for example.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a very reasonable assumption to make. The majority of degree courses cover academic subjects such as History or Law rather than vocational subjects like Engineering.</li> <li>• This is a very reasonable assumption to make. More students go to university to study more traditional or academic subjects like science or humanities than go to study construction and engineering.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b> – for answers that make a relevant point, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is reasonable. There are more courses covering academic subjects</li> <li>• This is reasonable. There are more people studying courses other than construction and engineering.</li> </ul> <p><b>0 marks</b> – for an irrelevant or inaccurate comment</p>	[2]
8	<p><b>In paragraph 5, the author uses evidence about the numbers of students taking management degrees.</b></p> <p><b>What must the author assume about the entry requirements of management courses to support his argument that degrees have been devalued?</b></p> <p>The author must assume that entrance qualifications for management degrees are lower than for Physics and/or Chemistry/or traditional courses</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – for an accurate statement of the assumption.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – for a less precise statement of the assumption.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – for an inaccurate statement of the assumption</p> <p>Example of 1 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management courses have lower entry requirements than other courses (no mention of tradition courses or Physics and/or Chemistry)</li> <li>• Management courses are easier to get on than Physics and Chemistry</li> <li>• An answer that refers to lower grades (rather than entry requirements)</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	[2]
9	<p><b>Give one reason that would support an argument in favour of taking a degree course.</b></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> – for a relevant, well-expressed and detailed reason.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> – for reason of limited relevance and/or with little detail.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> – for a reason of no relevance/no credit worthy material</p> <p>Example of 2 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A degree course may be worth while because of the enjoyment of being at university.</li> </ul> <p>Example of 1 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They might get you a job.</li> </ul>	[2]

Section A - The Language of reasoning		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
10	<p><b>In paragraph 3, the author argues that degrees do not lead to better employment prospects.</b></p> <p>Does the reasoning in this paragraph support the author's overall argument? Explain your answer.</p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> - for a detailed and accurate and well-expressed explanation using material from the passage. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are good.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> - for a reasonably expressed explanation that uses material from the passage. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are adequate.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> - for an attempted explanation. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are poor.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> - for an answer that does not explain the link.</p> <p>There are many ways that candidates could tackle this question. One key issue is whether or not employment prospects are an important/major/only factor in judging the worth of a degree course. Another issue is whether or not the reasoning in the paragraph does actually support the author's position that degree courses do not lead to better employment prospects: candidates might argue that the reasoning in the paragraph does not support the overall conclusion because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the figure of 11% in sales and customer support does not tell us whether the remaining 89% have or have not achieved graduate level jobs.</li> <li>• The 11% working in sales and customer support may actually be engaged at graduate level (e.g. well paid or important role).</li> <li>•</li> </ul>	[6]
<b>Section A</b>		<b>30</b>

Section B - Credibility			
Question Number	Answer		Max Mark
11	<p><b>Assess how far the document “Car makers blame drivers” is a credible report.</b>  <b>You should make two points, identifying and explaining relevant credibility criteria.</b></p> <p><b>3 marks</b> - for a relevant point, which is both well expressed &amp; detailed.  <b>2 marks</b> - for a relevant point, which is well expressed <i>or</i> detailed.  <b>1 mark</b> - for a relevant point but which has neither good expression or detail.  <b>0 marks</b> - for an irrelevant or inaccurate point / no creditworthy material.</p>		<b>[3x3]</b>
	Reputation	<p>BBC news has a reputation to uphold as reliable and informative source of news. If they were found out to have given a distorted account they would not be seen as trustworthy and this would damage their credibility</p> <p>BBC journalist has reputation to uphold as a reliable journalist. If he was found out to have given a distorted account he would not be seen as trustworthy and this would damage their credibility</p>	
	Neutrality	<p>It attempts to be neutral by giving a balanced account, which includes opposing points of view – the Head of SMMT and the Environmental Commissioner, rather than relying on single or selective sources.</p> <p>It quotes a neutral commentator – BBC Environmental Analyst Roger Harrabin</p>	
12	<p><b>Look at the graph in Document 2. Explain whether this graph is relevant to the discussion in document 2?</b></p> <p><b>3 marks</b> - for a relevant explanation, which is both well expressed &amp; detailed.  <b>2 marks</b> - for a relevant explanation, which is well expressed <i>or</i> detailed.  <b>1 mark</b> - for a relevant explanation but which has neither good expression nor detail.  <b>0 marks</b> - for an irrelevant or inaccurate explanation / no creditworthy material.</p> <p>Example of 3 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The diagram is not relevant because it doesn't demonstrate whether producing more fuel-efficient cars will be more costly. Instead it shows that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions have fallen as the weight and power of cars have increased.</li> </ul> <p>Example of 2 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The diagram is not relevant because it doesn't demonstrate whether producing more fuel-efficient cars will be more costly.</li> </ul>		

Section B - Credibility										
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark								
12 cont'd	<p>Example of 1 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not relevant as it's not about costs.</li> </ul>	[3]								
13(a)	<p><b>Assess the credibility of Christopher MacGowan, the chief of the industry body The Society of Motor Manufacturers Ltd (SMMT). You should make two points, referring to credibility criteria in your answer and explaining how these may strengthen or weaken his credibility</b></p> <p><b>3 marks</b> - for a relevant point, which is both well expressed &amp; detailed.  <b>2 marks</b> - for a relevant point, which is well expressed <i>or</i> detailed.  <b>1 mark</b> - for a relevant point but which has neither good expression nor detail.  <b>0 marks</b> - for an irrelevant or inaccurate point / no creditworthy material.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Expertise</td> <td>As chief of the industry body SMMT Christopher MacGowan would have relevant expertise to talk about issues regarding the development of cars which have lower emissions</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vested Interest</td> <td>As chief of the body looking after the interests of Motor Manufacturers Christopher MacGowan would have a vested interest to protect his member's interests as manufacturing cars which will meet these targets for lower emissions may cost his members more</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reputation</td> <td>As chief of an industry body Christopher MacGowan has a reputation to maintain both for himself and the industry body. If they were found to have distorted the issue, then their opinion might not be taken as seriously in future discussions</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Bias</td> <td>By being the chief of an industry body that represents the motor industry Christopher MacGowan position would dispose him to supporting the motor industry reluctant to agree to meet EU targets on car emissions</td> </tr> </table>	Expertise	As chief of the industry body SMMT Christopher MacGowan would have relevant expertise to talk about issues regarding the development of cars which have lower emissions	Vested Interest	As chief of the body looking after the interests of Motor Manufacturers Christopher MacGowan would have a vested interest to protect his member's interests as manufacturing cars which will meet these targets for lower emissions may cost his members more	Reputation	As chief of an industry body Christopher MacGowan has a reputation to maintain both for himself and the industry body. If they were found to have distorted the issue, then their opinion might not be taken as seriously in future discussions	Bias	By being the chief of an industry body that represents the motor industry Christopher MacGowan position would dispose him to supporting the motor industry reluctant to agree to meet EU targets on car emissions	[6]
Expertise	As chief of the industry body SMMT Christopher MacGowan would have relevant expertise to talk about issues regarding the development of cars which have lower emissions									
Vested Interest	As chief of the body looking after the interests of Motor Manufacturers Christopher MacGowan would have a vested interest to protect his member's interests as manufacturing cars which will meet these targets for lower emissions may cost his members more									
Reputation	As chief of an industry body Christopher MacGowan has a reputation to maintain both for himself and the industry body. If they were found to have distorted the issue, then their opinion might not be taken as seriously in future discussions									
Bias	By being the chief of an industry body that represents the motor industry Christopher MacGowan position would dispose him to supporting the motor industry reluctant to agree to meet EU targets on car emissions									
13(b)	<p><b>What else would you need to know in order to reach a judgement about credibility of Chrisopher MacGowan's statement?. You should make one detailed point.</b></p> <p><b>3 marks</b> - for a relevant point, which is both well expressed &amp; detailed. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are good.  <b>2 marks</b> - for a relevant point, which is well expressed <i>or</i> detailed. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are adequate.  <b>1 mark</b> - for a relevant point but which has neither good expression nor detail. Grammar, spelling and punctuation may be inadequate.  <b>0 marks</b> - for an irrelevant or inaccurate point / no creditworthy material.</p>									



Section B - Credibility								
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark						
13(b) cont'd	<p>Example of 3 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would need to know whether his opinion is representative of the majority of motor manufacturers or just that of some manufacturers.</li> <li>• We would need to know whether he has referred to technical expertise in order to properly understand the technical issues involved in producing more fuel efficient cars.</li> <li>• We would need to know how the SMMT was funded in order to know the extent of a likely vested interest to represent his members interests.</li> <li>• We would need to know that he had properly researched the opinions of motorists to be able to claim that they will not pay the higher prices.</li> </ul> <p>Example of 2 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We would need to know whether other motor manufacturers agree with him.</li> <li>• We would need to know that his comments are backed up with technical expertise.</li> </ul> <p>Example of 1 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All motor manufacturers agree with him</li> </ul>	[5]						
14	<p><b>Assess the credibility of Roger Harrabin, BBC Environmental analyst.</b>  <b>You should make two points, referring to credibility criteria in your answer and explaining how these may strengthen or weaken his credibility.</b></p> <p><b>3 marks</b> - for a relevant point, which is both well expressed &amp; detailed:  <b>2 marks</b> - for a relevant point, which is well expressed <i>or</i> detailed  <b>1 mark</b> - for a relevant point but which has neither good expression nor detail.  <b>0 marks</b> - for an irrelevant or inaccurate point / no creditworthy material</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Expertise</td> <td>As BBC Environment Analyst Roger Harrabin would have expertise in knowing how the emission from cars might affect the environment</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neutrality</td> <td>As a journalist, with no known connections to either the motor industry or the EU he would be neutral in claiming that the motor industry might want to exaggerate the cost of new legislation</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Reputation</td> <td>As a BBC analyst he will have a reputation for being a reliable journalist which he would not want to risk damaging by distorting the truth about the cost of cars with lower fuel emissions</td> </tr> </table>	Expertise	As BBC Environment Analyst Roger Harrabin would have expertise in knowing how the emission from cars might affect the environment	Neutrality	As a journalist, with no known connections to either the motor industry or the EU he would be neutral in claiming that the motor industry might want to exaggerate the cost of new legislation	Reputation	As a BBC analyst he will have a reputation for being a reliable journalist which he would not want to risk damaging by distorting the truth about the cost of cars with lower fuel emissions	[3x3]
Expertise	As BBC Environment Analyst Roger Harrabin would have expertise in knowing how the emission from cars might affect the environment							
Neutrality	As a journalist, with no known connections to either the motor industry or the EU he would be neutral in claiming that the motor industry might want to exaggerate the cost of new legislation							
Reputation	As a BBC analyst he will have a reputation for being a reliable journalist which he would not want to risk damaging by distorting the truth about the cost of cars with lower fuel emissions							

Section B - Credibility		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
15	<p>In paragraph 4 Mr MacGowan claims that “<i>We have proven that we are doing our bit by hitting interim targets of our voluntary agreement</i>”.</p> <p><b>Identify one piece of evidence that supports this claim.</b></p> <p>The car industry had achieved a 14% fall in average CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to 160g per kilometre by 2005</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> - for precisely identifying the evidence  <b>1 mark</b> - for basic statement of the evidence.  <b>0 marks</b> - for an inaccurate statement of the evidence</p>	[2]
16	<p><b>There is agreement that the EU strategy to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from new cars will lead to cars costing more. Identify two of the claims that support this idea.</b></p> <p>There are 3 claims that support this:  Christopher MacGowan: ‘...result in less choice for the motorist and higher prices on the dealer forecourt.’  Renault spokesman: ‘Each car would be 3,000 Euros more expensive to make if the industry is to meet the Commission’s proposed requirement.’  Stavros Dimas: ‘Our analysis holds that the extra capital cost of making cars more fuel efficient.....’</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> - for each claim quoted with reasonable accuracy.  <b>0 marks</b> - for claims extensively paraphrased.  (N.B. If candidate offers more than two claims, mark them all and credit the best)</p>	[2]
17	<p>In paragraph 4, Christopher Will claims that “<i>the easy improvements are behind us, and progress is now at an even slower rate.</i>”</p> <p><b>Give one reason that would support this claim.</b></p> <p><b>2 marks</b> - for a relevant and detailed reason  <b>1 mark</b> - for reason of limited relevance and/or with little detail.  <b>0 marks</b> - for a reason of no relevance/no credit worthy material.</p> <p>Example of 2 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The technology required for further improvements is still in its infancy.</li> <li>• Further improvement will require new technologies that need more research and development.</li> </ul> <p>Example of 1 mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We don’t have the technology</li> </ul>	[2]

Section B - Credibility		
Question Number	Answer	Max Mark
18	<p><b>In paragraph 3, Stavros Dimas claims that ‘the extra capital cost of making cars more fuel efficient will be more than offset by the fuel savings over the car’s lifetime.’</b></p> <p><b>Assess the reasonableness of this claim, with reference to material from the passage.</b></p> <p><b>4 marks</b> - for a detailed and thorough assessment that makes good use of material from the passage.</p> <p><b>3 marks</b> - for a detailed assessment that makes use of material from the passage.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> - for some assessment of the issue and refers to the passage.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> - for an attempted answer.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> - for answers that have no relevance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be possible for candidates to support or counter this claim in their assessment.</li> <li>• On the one hand, the reduction in CO2 of 18% seems quite small and it is likely that the reduction in petrol costs might be similarly small, meaning that the increase in cost of the car might well be very significant. In this sense the claim made is not reasonable.</li> <li>• There is the issue of the lifetime of the car and the amount of mileage done. The claim might well be reasonable for a high mileage user where the small gains in petrol economy may well outweigh the initial purchase costs. Similarly if the car lasts a long time.</li> <li>• However, for a lower usage car, the extra costs may not be outweighed by small gains in fuel economy.</li> <li>• The claim may be very reasonable set against a backdrop of rising fuel costs. A 18% reduction in emissions could be related to quite significant cost savings on fuel.</li> </ul>	[4]
19	<p><b>You should make an informed judgement about whether Christopher MacGowan or Roger Harrabin is the more credible. You should make two developed points that <i>contrast</i> the relative credibility of the two men.</b></p> <p><b>5-6 marks</b> - A well expressed and relevant answer that compares/contrasts the credibility of the two people, showing which of the factors is more important in making a judgement. Two detailed points are made. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are good.</p> <p><b>3-4 marks</b> - A relevant answer that compares/contrasts the credibility of the two people, suggesting which of the factors is more important in making a judgement. Two points are made, one of which may be more detailed than the other. Grammar, spelling and punctuation are adequate.</p> <p><b>1-2 marks</b> - A relevant answer that compares/contrasts the credibility of the two people. An attempt is made to assess the relative importance of the factors involved. Grammar, spelling and punctuation may be inadequate.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> - for an irrelevant or inaccurate comment</p>	

<b>Section B - Credibility</b>		
<b>Question Number</b>	<b>Answer</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>
<b>19 cont'd</b>	<p><b>N.B. Candidates who merely repeat their answers to Q13a and Q14 without further analysis should also be awarded 0 marks.</b></p> <p>Students can argue for any of the people making claims in the document so long as their answer is relevant</p> <p>Possible answer:</p> <p>Roger is the most credible source. As an Environmental analyst he has expertise of the effect of environmental legislation and the cost implications of this for car manufacture. This expertise is at least equal to that of Christopher who may have greater technical knowledge about cars, but less expertise overall. Roger, in addition, has the also benefit of being a neutral source and he has nothing to gain from the outcome of this new legislation. This is a very significant point in an issue that potentially involves huge sums of money. In contrast, Christopher Macgowen has expertise as the chief of an industry body on the impact of this legislation on the cost of manufacturing cars, but limited expertise on environmental issues. His clear vested interest, as the chief of SMMT, to protect the car manufacturing industry to additional costs has a very significant impact on his credibility.</p>	<b>[6]</b>
<b>Section B Total</b>		<b>[40]</b>
<b>Paper Total</b>		<b>[75]</b>

## Assessment Objectives Grid (includes QWC)

## Section A

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
1	2			2
2a	3			3
2b	3			3
3	2			2
4a	2			2
4b		2		2
5		3		3
6a		2		2
6b		2		2
7a	2			2
7b		2		2
8	2			2
9			2	2
10			6	6
<b>Totals</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>35</b>

## Section B

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
11	2	4		6
12		3		3
13a	2	4		6
13b			3	3
14	2	4		6
15	2			2
16	2			2
17			2	2
18			4	4
19			6	6
<b>Totals</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>40</b>

SPECIMEN