

Critical Thinking

Advanced GCE **F493**

Unit 3: Resolution of Dilemmas

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils 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 2010

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

Preamble

The Unit 3 paper sets out to assess candidates' critical thinking skills in the context of decision-making. To be successful, in general terms candidates need to be able to demonstrate the ability to handle key terms and concepts such as choice, criteria and dilemma and to come to judgments in the context of situations determined by a set of resources. The term "dilemma" is to be understood here in a broad sense as **a situation where a choice must be made between mutually exclusive options, each of which has good reasons against it.**

Assessment by Specification

		Qn 1	Qn 2	Qn 3	Qn 4
5.3.1	Understand and apply the language of reasoning				✓
	Clarify expressions and ideas				
	Recognise and evaluate different kinds of claim	✓		✓	✓
	Recognise and evaluate special kinds of reasoning			✓	✓
5.3.2	Assess arguments		✓	✓	✓
	Understand, interpret and draw conclusions from forms of statistical and numerical representation appropriate to informed citizens		✓		
	Develop and present relevant arguments			✓	✓

Assessment Objectives [AOs] and Allocation of Marks

The total mark for the paper is 80, allocated as follows:

- AO1 **Analysis** of the use of different kinds of reasoning 8 marks
- AO2 **Evaluation** of different kinds of reasoning 26 marks
- AO3 **Communication** of developed arguments 46 marks

This weighting is reflected in the different types of questions asked and in the application of the markscheme.

Question	AO1	AO2	AO3	Total
1	2	2	4	8
2	4	2	2	8
3		12	12	24
4a		2	2	4
4b	2	8	26	36
Total	8	26	46	80

Guidelines for Annotating Scripts

All markers will be required to use the following conventions. No annotation will be used except what is agreed at the Standardization meeting.

Mark in **right** margin of answer booklets, as follows. No other annotations to be made in the right margin.

- 1 two numbers between 0 and 4
total for question 1 ringed and transferred to cover.
- 2 two numbers between 0 and 4
total for question 2 ringed and transferred to cover.
- 3 number between 0 and 24 (calculated from levels) ringed and transferred to cover.
- 4 (a) number between 0 and 4.
- 4 (b) number between 0 and 36 (calculated from levels).
total for question 4 ringed and transferred to cover.

At the end of question 3, state three levels. At the end of question 4b, state four levels.

The following annotations may be made in the **left** margin in questions 3 and 4b:

- C Reference to criterion
- EC Evaluation of criterion
- D Relevant use of document
- E Evaluation
- ED Evaluation of document
- P Use of principle
- Q Quality of argument
- R Resolution of dilemma

Quality of Argument

- IC Intermediate conclusion
- HA Hypothetical argument
- CA Counter-argument
- RCA Response to counter-argument
- An Analogy
- Ex Example
- Ev Evidence

Salient points may be underlined and contributory marks may be written in the body of the script.

Question 1 8 marks [AO1 = 2; AO2 = 2; AO3 = 4]

Read Documents 1 and 2.

With reference to Document 1 and/or 2, identify and briefly explain two factors which might affect people's opinions about the sale of intensively-farmed chicken. [8]

For each answer:

4 marks for identifying a relevant factor, referring to the Document and giving a developed explanation.

3 marks for identifying a relevant factor and **either** referring to the Document and giving an undeveloped or vague explanation **or** giving a developed explanation without reference to the Document.

2 marks for identifying a relevant factor and **either** referring to the Document **or** giving an undeveloped or vague explanation.

1 mark for identifying a relevant factor.

0 for nothing worthy of credit.

A "developed explanation" must state whether the factor would lead people to oppose or support the sale of intensively-farmed chicken.

Indicative content

Professions:

- People who have a professional commitment to improving the quality of food may be inclined to oppose the sale of intensively-farmed chicken
- Farmers who are trying to make a living may be inclined to support the sale of intensively-farmed chicken.

Family income:

- People who can afford to pay more for their food may be inclined to oppose the sale of intensively-farmed chicken
- People who have to feed families on limited incomes may be inclined to support the sale of intensively-farmed chicken.

Political commitment:

- People who have concerns for animal rights (including animal-rights activists) may be inclined to oppose the sale of intensively-farmed chicken.

Publicity:

- People who have watched the programmes recently broadcast by Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall and others may be inclined to oppose the sale of intensively-farmed chicken.

Other valid answers should be accepted.

Example of 4-mark answer

Both documents refer to television programmes presented by television chefs. People who have watched these programmes are likely to oppose the sale of intensively-farmed chicken, either because of the information and pictures they contain or because they admire the chefs and allow their opinions to be influenced by them.

Question 2 **8 marks** [AO1 = 4; AO2 = 2; AO3 = 2]**Read Document 4.**

With reference to Document 4, identify and briefly explain two problems in using this document to estimate the public support for the campaign against intensively-farmed chicken. [8]

For each answer:

4 marks for identifying a relevant problem, referring to the Document and giving a developed explanation.

3 marks for identifying a relevant problem and **either** referring to the Document and giving an undeveloped or vague explanation **or** giving a developed explanation without reference to the Document.

2 marks for identifying a relevant problem and **either** referring to the Document **or** giving an undeveloped or vague explanation.

1 mark for identifying a relevant problem.

0 for nothing worthy of credit.

Indicative content

The source of the document – the NFU – has a vested interest to encourage consumers to buy British and to persuade supermarkets to pay higher prices to producers, which gives them a motive to present the statistics in a way favourable to themselves, eg the repeated use of the adjective “healthy” to describe intensively-farmed chicken and the claim in para 4 that “buying British is the primary influencing factor.”

The NFU’s aims are different from the issue of free range versus intensively-farmed chicken: so the report is biased in favour of buying British (eg second sentence). It is not stated why obtaining supplies from overseas would be such a bad thing.

Para 4 of the article points out that the results of opinion polls are unreliable because they do not correspond to buying habits. So the statistic in para 1 is not credible.

Because it is not stated whether the research referred to in para 4 took place before, during or after the television campaign, it is unclear whether the conclusions drawn from them are valid.

Other valid answers should be accepted.

Because the question asks for “problems”, positive evaluative comments must **not** be credited.

Partial Performance

Answers which correctly identify a problem **stated** in the document, instead of a problem in **using** the document may be awarded 1 mark (maximum 2 x 1).

Question 3 **24 Marks** [AO2 = 12; AO3 = 12]

Select **one** of the choices given in the Choices box. Evaluate this choice as a course of action for a **supermarket**. You should refer closely and critically to **at least three** of the criteria in the Criteria box **and** to the documents in the Resource Booklet. [24]

Mark by levels, according to the following table. Answers which fulfil all three descriptors of a level will receive a mark at the top of that level, while answers which satisfy only one or two of the descriptors will receive a correspondingly lower mark.

Level	Application and evaluation of selected criteria to choices AO2+AO3	Use and critical assessment of evidence in the Resource Booklet AO2	Communication and development of argument AO3
L4: 19-24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound and perceptive application of at least 3 criteria to one of the listed choices. • Firm understanding of how criteria might support and weaken the case for the selected choice and/or some evaluation of criteria. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceptive, relevant and accurate use of resource material. • Sustained and confident evaluation of resource material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cogent and convincing reasoning, very well structured to express/evaluate complex ideas/materials. • Few, if any, errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation.
L3: 13-18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of how at least 3 criteria might support and/or weaken the case for one of the listed choices or clear understanding how 2 criteria might support and weaken the case for one of the listed choices and/or some evaluation of criteria. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant and accurate use of resource material. • At least some evaluation of resource material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective and persuasive reasoning. • Some clarity in expression of complex ideas. • Relatively few errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation.
L2: 7-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic understanding of how at least 2 criteria might support and/or weaken support for one of the listed choices or clear understanding how 1 criterion might support and weaken the case for one of the listed choices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant and accurate use of resource material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basic presentation of reasoning, including relevant points and conclusion(s). • Written communication fit for purpose, but containing significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation.
L1: 1-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one criterion applied to a choice or to the issue in a limited/simplistic manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very limited, perhaps implicit, use of resource material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasoning is sketchy and unstructured. • Communication may lack coherence and contain significant errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
L0: 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No application of criteria to issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No use of resource material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No discernible reasoning.

Maximum Level 1 overall if criteria are not used to evaluate a choice.

Maximum level 2 for “Use and critical assessment of evidence in the Resource Booklet” if sources are used uncritically.

Quality of Argument

Typical indicators of Level 3 are:

- use of intermediate conclusions
- use of hypothetical reasoning.

Consistent and well-supported use of intermediate conclusions and/or hypothetical reasoning is an indicator of level 4.

In addition to the indicators of Level 3, typical indicators of Level 4 are some of:

- use of relevant counter-argument with persuasive response
- use of relevant analogy
- use of relevant examples or evidence.

Indicative content

The choices range from the least to the most favourable with regard to intensively-farmed chicken.

Stop selling intensively-farmed chicken

This option is the most favourable to animal welfare, but may not have much effect, since customers who cannot buy cheap meat at their usual shop may simply buy it elsewhere. If some families experience more difficulty in buying food they can afford, this will have an adverse effect on their welfare. This option would limit consumer choice, although customers do have the choice of shopping elsewhere, which would indirectly harm profits for the supermarket. The statistics about public opinion and actual buying patterns provided in Document 4 show that there would be little support for this extreme option.

Reduce the price of free range chicken to below the cost of production

This option would enhance consumer choice, by making it easier for people to buy free range chicken if they wanted to; a likely reason why people's buying habits do not match the answers they give to opinion polls (public opinion) is that they feel they cannot afford to shop as ethically as they would like to. It would improve animal welfare to some extent, by encouraging customers to buy meat which had been produced more humanely. Although this option would reduce supermarket profits in the short term, it might enhance them in the long term if it encouraged wealthier customers to do their shopping in the supermarket instead of in a high-class emporium. It would not harm human welfare, since families who need to feed their families on cheap meat would continue to be able to do so; in fact, if they were not too poor, they might be able to afford more nutritious food.

Encourage the sale of free range chicken by means of advertising

This option would satisfy the criterion of consumer choice, since both types of meat would continue to be available, although some people may feel that choice influenced by advertising is illusory; it might cause the actual buying habits of customers to approximate more closely to the claims they make in response to opinion polls. It would help animal welfare to some extent, by increasing the proportion of free range meat sold, albeit probably not by a huge amount. Since intensively-farmed chicken would continue to be available at realistic prices, the welfare of poor families would not be harmed by this option, although it might make them more discontented at having to make do with an inferior product and some might say that eating a lot of this meat does not meet the criterion of human welfare. If the money spent on advertising affected the choice of product, rather than increasing the overall amount of sales, it would not increase the supermarket's profits and would, in effect, reduce them.

Stock quantities of chicken of both kinds corresponding to consumer demand

This is in effect the "no action" option, which responds to consumer choice without trying to influence it; it responds to the actual opinion of the public, rather than the answers they give to surveys. This option probably maximises profit for the supermarkets, although many unknown variables make it difficult to be sure. Since many consumers choose on the basis of cost, large numbers are likely to continue to buy intensively-farmed chicken, making this option rather unfavourable to animal welfare. The ability of poor people to feed their families is not harmed by this option, since they can continue to buy intensively-farmed chicken cheaply, but some would say that eating a lot of this meat does not meet the criterion of human welfare.

Maintain the price of intensively-farmed chicken at below the cost of production

According to Documents 1 and 3, this is the current position. As the second half of Document 3, in particular, shows, this is the least favourable option to animal welfare, since it encourages the sale of meat produced through inhumane treatment of hens. This option benefits poor families, despite encouraging them to eat food which may not be very nutritious. Although this directly reduces the profits of supermarkets in the short term, presumably their reason for selling meat at a loss is to encourage poorer people to shop in their supermarket, which will increase their profits in the long term. This option does allow for consumer choice, although people who would like to buy humanely-produced meat may find it difficult to justify the extra expense if intensively-farmed meat is sold so cheaply; however, if Document 2 is right to suggest that most people want to be able to buy cheap chicken, this option favours the actual choices made by consumers.

Example of L4 answer (289 words)

Maintain the price of intensively-farmed chicken at below the cost of production. According to Documents 1 and 3, this is the current position. Despite the vested interest of the RSPCA to present information in favour of their campaigns, they would be unlikely to risk their high reputation by giving wrong facts.

As the second half of Document 3, in particular, shows, this is the least favourable option to animal welfare, since it encourages the sale of meat produced through inhumane treatment of hens and thereby increases the amount of such treatment. Document 3 should be reliable, since it comes from a Government source and a university department (good reputation, lack of vested interest to misrepresent the situation); it is also based on expertise and ability to see. The information is also supported in Document 1 by the RSPCA, which has a good reputation, expertise and ability to see.

This option benefits poor families, despite encouraging them to eat food which may not be very nutritious, and thereby on balance contributes to human welfare.

Although this choice directly reduces the profits of supermarkets in the short term, presumably their reason for selling meat at a loss is to encourage poorer people to shop in their supermarket, which will increase their profits in the long term.

This option does allow for consumer choice, although people who would like to buy humanely-produced meat may find it difficult to justify the extra expense if intensively-farmed meat is sold so cheaply. If Document 2 is right to suggest that most people want to be able to buy cheap chicken, this option favours the actual choices made by consumers, and the Manchester Evening News is unlikely to have a vested interest to misrepresent the facts.

Evaluation of Resource Documents: Indicative Content for Use in Qns 3 and 4b

Document 1

Because meatinfo.co.uk is the website of the Meat Trades Journal, it has a vested interest in favour of meat producers; however, there is no hint of such a bias or vested interest in this document. The RSPCA has a good reputation, but has a vested interest to present information to favour its campaigns (and to elicit funds from the public). Dr Marc Cooper presumably has expertise and ability to see, but he shares the vested interest of the RSPCA. The document is not neutral.

Document 2

The Manchester Evening News probably has a good reputation. It is unlikely to have a bias or vested interest on this matter. It presents several sides of the story, and should therefore be considered neutral. The chicken farmer has expertise and ability to see, but has a vested interest to present matters in his own favour.

Document 3

The Ecologist presumably has expertise, ability to see and a vested interest to present information in favour of certain “green” policies. DEFRA and the University of Bristol (including Dr Toby Knowles) have expertise, neutrality and a vested interest to present information accurately. DEFRA’s vested interest to support farmers would work against publicising problems with intensive farming, which increases the credibility of their report. CIWF and Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall have expertise and ability to see but strong vested interest to present the evidence in favour of their own campaigns and no neutrality.

Document 4

The National Farmers Union has a good reputation, expertise and ability to see, but is clearly (and rightly) biased in favour of British farmers, which gives it a vested interest to present data in their favour. The statistics cited from DEFRA are presumably reliable.

Question 4 (a) 4 marks [AO2 = 2; AO3 = 2]

(a) **Consumers** who wish to eat chicken have to decide whether to eat intensively-farmed chicken or free range chicken. Explain why this decision is a dilemma. [4]

1 mark for stating that a dilemma is a choice in which each alternative has good reasons against it and/or that it is impossible to choose both options or neither.

0 mark for failing to state this explicitly.

+

3 marks Clear statement of undesirable consequences of both alternatives.

2 marks Clear statement of benefits of **both** alternatives
or
Clear statement of benefits **and** undesirable consequences of **one** alternative
or
Clear statement of undesirable consequences of **one** alternative
or
Vague statement of benefits/undesirable consequences of **both** alternatives.

1 mark Vague statement of benefits/undesirable consequence of **one** alternative.

0 Nothing creditable.

Indicative Content

In this examination, a dilemma is understood as a situation where a choice must be made between mutually exclusive options, each of which has good reasons against it. In some cases, these reasons consist of failing to achieve the benefits of the alternative.

The main disadvantage of buying intensively-farmed chicken is the indirect harm it causes to animal welfare; the **connexion** between buying intensively-farmed chicken and the harm to animal welfare must be made explicit for 4 marks. Candidates may legitimately refer to reduced nutritional value and increased risk of disease for humans, although they are not mentioned in any of the resource documents.

The main disadvantage of buying free range chicken is the increased cost. Some families would be unable to afford to buy this kind of food regularly, or might have to pull back on other necessary expenditure.

Question 4 (b) 36 marks [AO1 = 2; AO2 = 8; AO3 = 26]

(b) Write an argument that attempts to resolve this dilemma. In your argument you should:

- **identify some relevant principles (these may be ethical principles);**
- **assess the extent to which these principles are helpful in terms of resolving the dilemma;**
- **support your argument with critical use of the evidence in the Resource Booklet.**

[36]

Mark by levels, according to the following table.

Principles

General principles have implications that go beyond the case in point. Different kinds of principle a candidate can refer to might include legal rules, business or working practices, human rights, racial equality, gender equality, liberty, moral guidelines.

Candidates may respond to the dilemma by explaining and applying relevant ethical theories. This is perfectly acceptable, provided the result is not merely an exposition of ethical theories with little or no real application to the problem in hand. Candidates are not required to identify standard authorities such as Bentham or Kant, or even necessarily to use terms such as Utilitarianism etc. Candidates who deploy a more specific knowledge of ethical theories will be credited only for applying identified principles to the dilemma in order to produce a reasoned argument that attempts to resolve it. The specification for this Unit does, however, provide examples of principles/ethical theories/values that could be applied to any dilemma, including need, desert, right, deontology, egalitarianism, consequentialism, elitism, prudentialism, egoism, altruism, hedonism, but not all of these could convincingly be applied to this particular issue.

Quality of Argument

Typical indicators of Level 3 are:

- use of intermediate conclusions
- use of hypothetical reasoning.

Consistent and well-supported use of intermediate conclusions and/or hypothetical reasoning is an indicator of level 4.

In addition to the indicators of Level 3, typical indicators of Level 4 are some of:

- use of relevant counter-argument with persuasive response
- use of relevant analogy
- use of relevant examples or evidence.

Level	Treatment of a relevant dilemma AO3	Identification, explanation and application of relevant principles AO3	Use of resource material AO1 + AO2	Quality of argument AO3
L4: 28-36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confidently-expressed resolution of a clearly-focused dilemma on the basis of a persuasive account of the arguments in favour of both sides. Perhaps an awareness that the resolution is partial/provisional. Clear and valid judgments made in coming to an attempted resolution. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Skilful and cogent treatment and application of at least 3 principles or at least 2 major ethical theories. Clear and purposeful exposition of how the principles might be more or less useful in resolving the dilemma. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perceptive, relevant and accurate use of resource material. Sustained and confident evaluation of resource material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cogent and convincing reasoning. Well-developed suppositional reasoning. Communication very well suited to handling complex ideas. Meaning clear throughout. Frequent very effective use of appropriate terminology. Few, if any, errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation.
L3: 19-27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally confident and developed treatment of a sufficiently focused dilemma. Some awareness of the arguments in favour of both sides of the dilemma. Clear indication of an attempt to resolve the dilemma, perhaps concluding that it cannot be resolved. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 2 relevant principles accurately identified, explained and applied. Clear exposition of how the principles might be more or less useful in resolving the dilemma. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant and accurate use of resource material. Some evaluation of resource material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effective and persuasive reasoning. Some suppositional reasoning. Clear and accurate communication. Frequent effective use of appropriate terminology. Few errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation.
L2: 10-18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least a basic understanding that a dilemma involves making difficult decisions involving unfavourable consequences whatever is decided or a basic discussion of the issue not expressed as a dilemma. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At least 2 relevant principles identified or a well-developed discussion of 1 principle. Basic application of principles to the dilemma/issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant and accurate use of resource material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited ability to combine different points of view in reasoning. Perhaps some suppositional reasoning. Some effective communication. Some use of appropriate terminology. Fair standard of spelling, grammar, punctuation, but may include errors.

Level	Treatment of a relevant dilemma AO3	Identification, explanation and application of relevant principles AO3	Use of resource material AO1 + AO2	Quality of argument AO3
L1: 1-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited discussion of the issue. Little or no awareness of what is meant by a dilemma. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some attempt to identify at least one principle and to apply it to the dilemma/issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very limited, perhaps implicit, use of resource material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited ability to produce coherent reasoning. Little evidence of effective use of specialist terminology. May contain significant errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
L0: 0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No discussion of the issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No use of principles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No use of resource material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No discernible reasoning.

Maximum Level 1 overall if principles are not used.

Maximum of Level 2 for “Use of Resource Material” for answers which use resources uncritically.

To achieve Level 3 or above for “Treatment of a relevant dilemma”, candidates must **both** give at least one argument in favour of each side of the dilemma **and** attempt a resolution. In relation to some issues, it is easy to argue in favour of both sides, but harder to attempt to resolve the dilemma; in other cases, candidates may find it easy to make a choice, but harder to defend more than one side.

Answers which fulfil all four descriptors of a level will receive a mark at the top of that level, while answers which satisfy fewer of the descriptors will receive a correspondingly lower mark.

Indicative Content

Credit must be given to any argument based on a principle in the sense outlined in the preceding notes. Principles of that kind in relation to this issue may consist of, or be based on, judgments about the moral status of animals, eg:

- Animals have equal moral standing with humans;
- Animals have a lower moral standing than humans, but are not morally negligible;
- Animals have no moral standing and humans can therefore treat them as they like;
- Humans may kill animals for food but must not cause them gratuitous suffering.

Other principles include:

- The duty of parents to feed their children;
- The duty of farmers to treat their stock humanely.

The best answers are likely to appeal to two or three of the following ethical principles and theories, which are susceptible of fuller development.

Probably the most likely principle to which appeal may be made is the Utilitarian slogan, “[we should aim to produce] the greatest good of the greatest number”. Bentham himself included animals within the moral community, on the principle,

The question is not, Can they reason? nor, Can they talk? but, Can they suffer? Why should the law refuse its protection to any sensitive being?

Peter Singer argues on a similar basis that animals should be brought within the “expanding circle”, and he accuses those who discriminate against animals of “speciesism”. Mill’s version of Utilitarianism is slightly different: because he included quality of happiness as well as quantity, he claimed that the pleasure or pain of humans is intrinsically more important than those of animals. Overall, Utilitarianism is the only moral theory which really takes animal welfare seriously.

Dilemmas relating to this subject can also be expressed as a conflict of rights. Candidates may set the human right to affordable food (derived from the right to life) over against animals’ right to freedom from gratuitous suffering.

Kant’s Categorical Imperative strongly favours the interests of humans, since Kant himself considered that the only duty which persons have towards animals is an indirect one (inasmuch as we may be likely to treat persons in the way that we treat animals). The first version, “Act according to that maxim which you can will to be a universal law” could conceivably be used on either side of the debate, although Kant himself did not discuss meat prices. The second version, that we should always treat persons as ends, and not as means only, specifically excludes other species, but answers which apply it to animals must be credited (because someone **could** adopt that principle, even though Kant happens not to have done).

The content of any appeal to Divine Command ethics would vary according to which religion such commands were drawn from, but both Jews and Christians might be influenced by the principle from the Old Testament/Jewish Bible that God has set humans as stewards (managers) of the environment, including all other species (Genesis 1:26-28). Genesis 9:3 legitimates meat-eating, but several laws (such as Exodus 23:19b) are designed to prevent abuse of animals which are used for food. Some Buddhists are vegetarians, but the principle of not-harming would lead even those who do eat meat to try to avoid mistreating the animals.

Candidates who appeal to Natural Law in relation to this subject are likely to argue that humans have a higher moral standing than animals but the treatment of animals is a moral issue.

Any attempt to apply Rawls's theory to intensive farming, on the grounds that the Original Position and the Veil of Ignorance include ignorance of what species one belongs to, should be credited. Although a Western mind may find it impossible to imagine that one might have been a member of a different species, Hindus, Buddhists and some other people believe not only that we could have been members of other species, but that we actually have been.

Example of L4 answer (522 words)

An intuitive principle regarding animals is that they have a lower moral standing than humans, without being morally negligible. It follows from this that humans may kill animals for food but must not cause them gratuitous suffering. Christian and Jewish Divine Command ethics also take this view, since the Old Testament specifically allows humans to eat meat, but forbids abusing the animals who are to be killed for food (eg the prohibition of boiling a kid in its mother's milk, which is regarded as barbaric). This implies that consumers should avoid intensively-farmed chicken.

This dilemma can be expressed in terms of rights. The human right to life is widely recognised as the most fundamental right, and a right to affordable food can be derived from it. From this point of view, it is good that cheap chicken is available and consumers have a right to buy it; Document 2 is sympathetic to this point of view, but has no apparent vested interest to misrepresent the facts. However, this right can be set against the right of animals not to be caused gratuitous suffering. Although Documents 1 and 3 are biased in favour of one side of the debate, they come from institutions with good reputations, experience and ability to see, and they make it clear that intensively-farmed chicken is treated inhumanely. The only moral justification for these practices would be if they were necessary.

Utilitarianism is the only moral theory which really takes animal welfare seriously. Bentham himself claimed that the Utilitarian slogan, "[we should aim to produce] the greatest good of the greatest number" included animals, on the grounds that animals can suffer. Mill's version of Utilitarianism is slightly different: because he included quality of happiness as well as quantity, he claimed that the pleasure or pain of humans is intrinsically more important than those of animals. In relation to the dilemma, it is necessary to balance the benefits to humans of being able to buy cheap meat against the gratuitous suffering caused to animals by intensive farming.

One of the most prominent writers in the modern campaign in favour of animal welfare is Peter Singer. He approaches the topic from a Utilitarian perspective. Singer claims that animals should be brought within the "expanding circle" of ethical concern, and he accuses those who discriminate against animals of "speciesism". On this basis, he strongly criticises the conditions under which animals intended as food are kept, and he would certainly judge that consumers should not buy intensively-farmed chicken. The final paragraph of Document 3 (which is likely to be reliable) could be used to support Singer's views.

All three of these ethical principles – the moral status of animals, rights and different versions of Utilitarianism – lead to a similar conclusion, namely that although animals may be used for food, they should not be caused any more suffering than necessary. This implies that consumers should buy free range chicken. Any people who really could not afford to feed themselves and their family nutritious meals without using intensively-farmed chicken would constitute an exception, but very few people in this country, if any, would satisfy this stringent criterion.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

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