

# Critical Thinking

Advanced GCE

Unit **F503**: Ethical Reasoning and Decision-Making

## Mark Scheme for January 2012

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates 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 2012

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](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Criterion (q 4) Conclusion/resolution of issue (q 5)
	Principle (q 5)
	Relevant use of document ("source")
	Recognition of ambiguity (q 4) Alternative (q 5)
	Intermediate conclusion
	Quality of Argument features
	Weakness/Unsuccessful attempt (used alone or in combination with an annotation above)
	Evaluation of ... (used in combination with an annotation above)
	Blank page/additional page seen
	Mark awarded (qs 1, 2, 3)

NB Examiners should use the above annotations to assist them in deciding their marks. They do not, however, have to use them to annotate every instance seen.

## Subject-specific Marking Instructions

**Preamble**

This paper sets out to assess candidates' critical thinking skills in the context of making decisions using principles and evidence. 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 principle and to come to judgments in the context of situations determined by a set of resources.

**Assessment by Specification**

Candidates should be able to....		Qn 1	Qn 2	Qn 3	Qn 4	Qn 5
3.3.1	Evaluate a range of source material and select appropriate ideas, comments and information to support their reasoning and analysis of complex moral and ethical problems.	✓	✓			✓
	Identify and evaluate conflicting ideas and arguments within a range of source material.					✓
	Explain how ideas and arguments presented in the source material may be influenced by a range of factors.	✓				✓
	In addition to those common patterns of reasoning developed in Units 1 and 2, identify, analyse and apply hypothetical reasoning.					✓
	Demonstrate understanding of the idea that there may be a range of different possible responses to complex moral and ethical problems, and that there may be many different criteria that can be applied in assessing the value and effectiveness of different solutions to complex moral and ethical problems.				✓	
3.3.2	Demonstrate understanding of the nature of a dilemma.					
	In response to real issues, construct their own arguments.					✓

**Extended Writing**

Question 5 requires candidates to produce a piece of extended writing.

**Stretch and Challenge**

Level 4 of Question 5 is the stretch and challenge element of this examination.

**Assessment Objectives [AOs] and Allocation of Marks**

The total mark for the paper is 60, allocated as follows:

- AO1 **Analyse** argument 15 marks
- AO2 **Evaluate** argument 19 marks
- AO3 **Develop** own arguments 26 marks

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

<b>Question</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>1</b>		3		<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	3			<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	3	3		<b>6</b>
<b>4</b>	4	5	3	<b>12</b>
<b>5</b>	5	8	23	<b>36</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>60</b>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Answers are likely to focus on either representativeness or causation. Other valid answers should be credited.</p> <p>Examples of 3-mark answers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 29-year-old woman's use of a sunbed was extreme; this case does not suggest that moderate use is harmful. (Representativeness)</li> <li>• The fact that Denise van Outen "blamed" her use of sunbeds for causing pigmentation scars does not prove that it caused them. Other things could have caused her scars. (Causation)</li> </ul> <p>Examples of 2-mark answers: (incomplete)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 29-year-old woman's use of a sunbed was extreme.</li> <li>• Denise van Outen's "pigmentation scars" may have been caused by sun-bathing on foreign beaches.</li> <li>• "Pigmentation scars" are not a major problem.</li> </ul> <p>(partially significant)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fact that Denise van Outen had problems after using a sunbed at the age of 18 does not support a proposal to restrict sunbed usage by under-18s, because it would not have applied to her.</li> <li>• The fact that the 29-year-old woman died of skin cancer after using a sunbed excessively does not prove that the sunbed caused the cancer. Some other factor may have caused the cancer.</li> </ul> <p>Example of 1-mark answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The case of the 29-year-old woman is a single example, which cannot be generalized. Other people may react differently.</li> </ul>	3	<p>3 marks Clear explanation of a specific and significant weakness</p> <p>2 marks Vague or incomplete explanation of a specific weakness <b>or</b> clear explanation of a specific and partially significant weakness</p> <p>1 mark Explanation of a generic or marginal weakness</p> <p>0 marks No correct content.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>Answers are expected to come to a judgment on 'the extent to which' the statistics support the introduction of legislation.</p> <p>Example judgment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The statistics are of some use, but not much.</li> </ul> <p>Points may include:</p> <p><u>Table 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a small increase in the occurrence of melanoma over the period surveyed.</li> <li>• There is no evidence about the use of sunbeds;</li> <li>• even if there were, it would not prove that the use of sunbeds/rise of tanning salons had caused the rise in melanoma,</li> <li>• but the data are consistent with that hypothesis/the link is plausible.</li> <li>• There are other possible causes of the rise, such as more people taking foreign holidays/the hole in the ozone layer.</li> </ul> <p><u>Table 2</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Melanoma constitutes a small proportion of the cases of cancer; so it is not a major problem,</li> <li>• but 3% is a significant number/it is listed as a "common" cancer.</li> </ul> <p>Other valid answers should be credited.</p>	3	<p>3 marks    Balanced judgment, well supported by developed point(s)</p> <p>2 marks    Judgment (may be implied or over-stated), supported by at least one point</p> <p>1 mark     One valid point made</p> <p>0 marks    No correct/relevant content.</p> <p>3 marks: There was a small increase in the occurrence of melanoma between 1996 and 2006. It is plausible that this was caused by the rise in use of sunbeds, but it is impossible to be sure, because there are no statistics given about sunbed use.</p> <p>3 marks: There was a small increase in the occurrence of melanoma between 1996 and 2006. It is plausible that this was caused by the rise in use of sunbeds, but it is impossible to be sure, because there are other possible causes, such as increased number of foreign holidays.</p> <p>2 marks: There was a small increase in the occurrence of melanoma between 1996 and 2006. It is impossible to know whether this rise was due to the use of sunbeds, because there are no statistics given about sunbed use.</p> <p>2 marks: These statistics do not support a change in the law very well, because although Table 1 shows an increase in cases of melanoma between 1996 and 2006, Table 2 shows that melanoma is quite a small proportion of cases of cancer.</p> <p>1 mark: Table 1 shows an increase in cases of melanoma between 1996 and 2006.</p> <p>0 marks: Table 1 shows that in the last year for which statistics were available there were 15 cases of melanoma for every 100,000 people in the UK.</p> <p>0 marks: The last year for which statistics are given is 2006. The situation may have changed since then.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	(a)	<p>Answers are expected to explain the vested interest and how this might affect the credibility of DB's argument.</p> <p>Example explanation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DB owns health clubs and makes money from people using sunbeds on their premises;</li> <li>• So he has a vested interest to oppose restrictions on the use of sunbeds/defend the use of sunbeds/his health clubs/the health club industry.</li> </ul> <p>Examples of the effect on the credibility of his argument:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• So he has a vested interest to select/represent evidence in such a way as to</li> <li>• minimise the risk involved in using sunbeds and/or to emphasise the superiority of responsible operators such as himself.</li> </ul>	3	<p>3 marks Vested interest stated or implied with developed explanation of effect on credibility</p> <p>2 marks Vested interest stated or implied with partial explanation of effect on credibility</p> <p>1 mark Vested interest stated or implied</p> <p>0 marks No correct content.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Example judgments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DB's vested interest causes him to emphasize the facts in favour of health clubs, without denying the allegations which have been made against sunbed use.</li> <li>• DB's vested interest has some impact on his reasoning.</li> </ul> <p>Points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In para 2, DB admits that the programme succeeded in gaining use of a sunbed for an under-age girl, but he emphasizes the extenuating factors.</li> <li>• In para 3, he admits the estimate of deaths from sunbed use, but he points out that the CMAR itself admits that the statistics are unreliable</li> <li>• and he emphasizes the possible differences between health clubs and less reputable institutions</li> <li>• and makes the estimate seem smaller by comparing it with deaths due to smoking.</li> <li>• In para 4, he describes the responsible behaviour of his clubs.</li> </ul>	3	<p>3 marks    Balanced judgment, well supported by developed point(s)</p> <p>2 marks    Judgment (may be implied or over-stated), supported by at least one point</p> <p>1 mark     One valid point made</p> <p>0 marks    No correct content.</p> <p>Answers are expected to come to a judgment on the extent to which DB's vested interest has influenced his reasoning.</p> <p>Maximum 2 marks if only one side is covered.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p><b>c = Criteria: Application and evaluation of selected criteria to choice</b></p> <p><u>Examples of 1 mark</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Valid simple assessment of issue (not stated choice) by reference to a valid criterion.</li> <li>• Valid simple assessment of stated choice by reference to an inaccurately-stated criterion.</li> <li>• Largely speculative assessment by reference to a valid criterion.</li> <li>• Largely repetitive assessment by reference to a different valid criterion.</li> <li>• Invalid/marginal/trivial assessment of stated choice by reference to a valid criterion.</li> </ul> <p><u>Examples of 0 marks</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entirely speculative assessment.</li> <li>• Invalid/marginal/trivial assessment by reference to invalid criterion.</li> </ul> <p>The choice to be evaluated is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ban sunbed businesses from allowing anyone under the age of 18 to use a sunbed on their premises.</li> </ul> <p>Suitable criteria which might be used to evaluate this choice include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ease/cost of implementation/enforcement</li> <li>• public health</li> <li>• freedom of choice</li> <li>• beauty/attractiveness/aesthetics.</li> </ul> <p>Other valid criteria should be credited.</p>	12	<p><b>c = 9 marks – 3 marks for each of 3 answers:</b></p> <p><b>3 marks</b> Valid assessment of stated choice by reference to a valid criterion including awareness of ambiguity and/or valid evaluation of criterion.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> Valid simple assessment of stated choice by reference to a valid criterion.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> Weak or marginal assessment of stated choice or issue by valid or inaccurately-stated criterion.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> Very weak attempt at assessment of stated choice or issue by criterion.</p> <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, ie:  <b>4c1</b> (Criterion 1)  <b>4c2</b> (Criterion 2)  <b>4c3</b> (Criterion 3)  and enter a mark out of <b>3</b> for each of three Criteria answers.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>c = Criteria: Application and evaluation of selected criteria to choice – Examples of 3 mark answers</b></p> <p><i>Criterion 1: Public health</i>  As the documents indicate, health officials are more concerned about the risks of sunbeds to teenagers than to other age groups. So this option goes some way towards meeting this criterion. However, older people can continue to use tanning salons without restriction and no one can stop under-18s from using sunbeds at home. Overall, therefore, this option will only partly succeed in preserving public health. (eg 4c1 = 3 marks)</p> <p><i>Criterion 2: Freedom of choice</i>  This policy reduces the freedom of choice of people under the age of 18, but arguably that can be justified, since many would claim that children below the age of majority should be protected from making choices which may endanger them in later life. Because children of any age are able to use sunbeds at home (subject to parental oversight), their freedom of choice in this respect is not entirely over-ridden. So although this choice admittedly does not satisfy the criterion of freedom of choice, it does not wholly fail to satisfy it, either. (eg 4c2 = 3 marks)</p> <p><i>Criterion 3: Ease of enforcement</i>  It will be possible to enforce this choice, because Trading Standards officers already check up on similar age limits for the purchase of certain products and teenagers already have reliable ways of proving that they are over the age of 18 for other purposes, such as purchase of alcohol. But such enforcement will be fairly expensive and some customers and establishments will probably succeed in breaking the law without being caught. So this change in the law will be possible, but not easy, to enforce. (eg 4c3 = 3 marks)</p>		<p><b>c = 9 marks – 3 marks for each of 3 answers</b></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>c = Criteria: Application and evaluation of selected criteria to choice – Examples of 2 mark answers</b></p> <p><i>Criterion 1: Beauty</i> This choice fails to satisfy the criterion of beauty, because many of the people who consider that an artificial tan would make them look more beautiful are probably under 18 and are prevented from using tanning salons by this policy. (eg 4c1 = 2 marks)</p> <p><i>Criterion 2: Freedom of choice</i> This choice gives adults freedom of choice, because it is only people below the age of majority who are banned. (eg 4c2 = 2 marks)</p> <p><i>Criterion 3: Ease of enforcement</i> This choice will be fairly easy to enforce, because teenagers already have reliable ways of proving that they are over the age of 18 for other purposes, such as purchase of alcohol. (eg 4c3 = 2 marks)</p>		<p><b>c = 9 marks – 3 marks for each of 3 answers</b></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>q = Quality of Argument</b></p>		<p><b>q = 3 marks</b></p> <p><b>3 marks</b> Evaluations well-supported by reasoning.</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> Evaluations generally supported by reasoning.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> Evaluations clearly stated but largely unsupported. <i>or</i> Reasoning contains significant gaps or flaws.</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> Evaluations not clearly stated or not related to criteria.</p> <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, ie: <b>4q</b> and enter a mark out of <b>3</b> for Quality of Argument.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
5	<p><b>p = Principles: Identification and Application of Relevant Principles</b></p> <p>Maximum level 1 for Identification and Application of Relevant Principles for anyone who <b>only</b> re-cycles criteria from question 3 as principles.</p> <p>To be located in level 4, the use of principles must normally be <b>all</b> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contrasting (in approach and/or outcome)</li> <li>• Plausible (supported by reasoning and/or generally accepted)</li> <li>• Applied (not necessarily at great length, but more than a brief summative judgment).</li> </ul> <p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are likely to respond to the issue by explaining and applying relevant ethical theories. This is an appropriate approach, provided the result is not merely a list or even exposition of ethical theories with little or no real application to the problem in hand. Candidates who deploy a more specific knowledge of ethical theories will be credited only for <b>applying</b> identified principles to the issue in order to produce a reasoned argument that attempts to resolve it. Candidates are <b>not</b> required to identify standard authorities such as Bentham or Kant, or even necessarily to use terms such as Utilitarianism etc, although they may find it convenient to do so; the word “however” is likely to deserve more marks than the word “deontological”.</p>	36	<p><b>p = 12 marks</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 – 10-12 marks</b> Accurate identification and developed application of at least 3 contrasting plausible ethical principles or at least 2 contrasting major ethical theories.</p> <p><b>Level 3 – 7-9 marks</b> Accurate identification and application of at least 2 relevant ethical principles or theories.</p> <p><b>Level 2 – 4-6 marks</b> Identification of at least 2 relevant principles <b>or</b> developed discussion of 1 principle. Basic application of principles to the issue.</p> <p><b>Level 1 – 1-3 marks</b> Some attempt to identify at least one principle and to apply it to the issue.</p> <p><b>Level 0 – 0 marks</b> No use of principles.</p> <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, ie: <b>5p</b> and enter a mark out of <b>12</b> for Principles.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Credit must be given to any argument based on a principle in the sense outlined in the preceding note. Principles of that kind might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Young people should be able to make themselves look as attractive [to potential sexual partners] as possible.</li> <li>• People should not behave in such a way as to put their own health at risk.</li> <li>• The Government has a moral and legal duty to protect people under the age of 18 from making unwise choices.</li> </ul> <p>The best answers are likely to appeal to two or three of the following ethical principles and theories, which are susceptible of fuller development.</p> <p>Probably the most likely principle to which appeal may be made is – as usual – the simple consequentialist slogan, “[we should aim to produce] the greatest good of the greatest number”. In this case, the short-term benefits of increased self-esteem and improved chances of attracting a sexual partner must be weighed against the long-term slightly increased risk of serious illness and death.</p> <p>This issue can also be expressed as a conflict of rights. The right of autonomy/freedom of choice may be set against the right to health. From the right to marry and found a family it might be possible to derive a right for young people to make themselves look attractive to potential sexual partners.</p> <p>Candidates who approach the issue from the perspective of duty may appeal to Kant’s Categorical Imperative. The first version, “Act according to that maxim which you can will to be a universal law” could be used to support a complete</p>		<p><b>p = 12 marks</b></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>ban on the manufacture, sale and use of sunbeds, rather than prohibiting only tanning salons or imposing an age limit. The second version, that we should always treat persons as ends, and not as means only, could be used to argue in favour of a ban or age restriction on tanning salons, on the grounds that the proprietors are using customers as a means to their end of making a profit, while disregarding the harm the activity may cause them.</p> <p>Any candidate who referred to W D Ross's theory of <i>prima facie</i> duties could legitimately make use of the duty of non-maleficence to justify imposing some restrictions on tanning salons. A weak case might be made out in favour of artificial tans on the basis of the duty of self-improvement.</p> <p>The content of any appeal to Divine Command ethics would vary according to which religion such commands were drawn from, but Christians and Muslims (at least) would agree that true beauty is inward, not skin-deep, and that appropriate adornment is by virtues rather than by an artificial tan.</p> <p>A simple argument from Natural Law would support prohibition or rigorous regulation of sunbeds, since artificial suntans are obviously unnatural. A more profound argument of this kind, however, would be that for young people to make themselves as attractive to the opposite sex as they can is a natural instinct, and necessary for the propagation of the species. (On that basis, perhaps there should be an <i>upper</i> age limit for the use of sunbeds, rather than lower.) One authority on Natural Law (G Grisez) has argued that the use of cosmetics is permitted, but cosmetic surgery (a "face-lift") is not: so perhaps it depends on which of these two the use of a sunbed resembles more closely.</p>		<p><b>p = 12 marks</b></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Candidates are likely to draw a contrast between paternalism and the principle of liberty in relation to this issue. Such a discussion would most probably support imposing an age limit on the use of sunbeds, since according to Mill, adults should be free to risk harm to themselves if they choose to do so, whereas the freedom of action of children can legitimately be restricted if it might cause them harm.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>s = Sources: Use and Critical Assessment of Sources</b></p> <p>Except at Level 1, credit references to sources <b>only</b> if they support reasoning.</p> <p>Maximum level 2 for Use and Critical Assessment of Sources for <b>uncritical</b> use of sources.</p> <p>Typical indicators of L4 (any <b>two</b> of which normally locate an answer in L4):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More than 2 evaluative references to sources</li> <li>• Nuanced evaluation</li> <li>• Strong support to reasoning.</li> </ul> <p><i>Document 1:</i> NHS Direct has considerable expertise and ability to see. Its credibility may perhaps be diminished slightly by its strong vested interest to encourage responsible behaviour which will reduce the incidence of ill health in the population and thereby the calls on the health services.</p> <p><i>Document 2:</i> As a popular newspaper, the Daily Mail has a vested interest to raise issues in such a way as to increase its own sales. A few candidates might know that this particular paper has a reputation for exaggeration when raising concerns about various products which might increase or reduce the risk of cancer. The appeal to authority of the well-respected Cancer Research UK is used in support of only a very minor part of the report. The charity Sunsmart is clearly not neutral on this issue, although it has no apparent vested interest.</p>		<p><b>s = 8 marks</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 – 7-8 marks</b> Relevant and accurate use of sources to support reasoning. Sustained and persuasive evaluation of sources to support reasoning.</p> <p><b>Level 3 – 5-6 marks</b> Relevant and accurate use of sources. Some evaluation of sources.</p> <p><b>Level 2 – 3-4 marks</b> Some relevant and accurate use of sources, which may be uncritical.</p> <p><b>Level 1 – 1-2 marks</b> Very limited, perhaps implicit, use of sources.</p> <p><b>Level 0 – 0 marks</b> No attempt to use sources.</p> <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, ie: <b>5s</b> and enter a mark out of <b>8</b> for Sources.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><i>Document 3:</i> The source of these statistics is very well-respected and expert, with outstanding ability to see.</p> <p><i>Document 4:</i> The source of this document clearly has a strong vested interest to minimise the dangers and emphasize the alleged benefits of artificial tanning, which seriously reduces the credibility of the document. The reasoning is also distinctly weak.</p> <p><i>Document 5:</i> The footnote to this article makes no secret of the author's vested interest. When referring to this document in answering question 5, candidates should avoid implicitly contradicting their answers to question 3.</p>		<p><b>s = 8 marks</b></p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>q = Quality of Argument</b></p> <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, ie:</p> <p><b>5q</b> and enter a mark out of <b>8</b> for Quality of Argument.</p>		<p><b>q = 8 marks</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 – 7-8 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Claims well supported by clear and persuasive reasoning.</li> <li>• Consistent use of intermediate conclusions.</li> <li>• Reasoning supported by relevant use of some of: hypothetical reasoning, counter argument/assertion with response, analogy, evidence, example.</li> <li>• Few errors, if any, in spelling, grammar and punctuation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 3 – 5-6 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Claims supported by clear reasoning.</li> <li>• Few significant gaps or flaws.</li> <li>• Generally clear and accurate communication.</li> <li>• Few errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2 – 3-4 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Claims mostly supported by reasoning.</li> <li>• Some significant gaps and/or flaws.</li> <li>• Some effective communication.</li> <li>• Fair standard of spelling, grammar and punctuation, but may include errors.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1 – 1-2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Little coherent reasoning.</li> <li>• Perhaps significant errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 0 – 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No discussion of the issue.</li> </ul>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>r = Resolution of Issue</b></p> <p>Support for one choice based on reasoned rejection of one or more genuine alternative: 7 or 8 marks</p> <p>Support for one choice + rejection of genuine alternative: usually 6 marks</p> <p>Support for one choice + mention of alternative: usually 5 marks</p> <p>Support for one choice without consideration of alternative: max 4 marks</p> <p>General discussion: max 3 marks</p>		<p><b>r = 8 marks</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 – 7-8 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resolution of the issue on the basis of a persuasive account of the arguments in favour of the stated choice and developed consideration of at least one alternative.</li> <li>• Perhaps an awareness that the resolution is partial/provisional.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 3 – 5-6 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear identification of a choice.</li> <li>• Some consideration of at least one alternative.</li> <li>• Some attempt to resolve the issue.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2 – 3-4 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Basic discussion of the issue.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1 – 1-2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited discussion of the issue.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 0 – 0 marks</b> No discussion of the issue.</p> <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, ie: <b>5r</b> and enter a mark out of <b>8</b> for Resolution of Issue.</p>

**Principal Examiner's suggestion of possible ideas/approaches to Question 5**

(NB This is **not** the expected level of candidate responses.)

The policy I support has two elements: the Government was right to prohibit the use of tanning salons by people under the age of 18, but in addition all tanning salons should be required to display notices drawing the attention of potential clients to the health risks of exposure to sunbeds. The proprietors of any premises found in breach of either rule should be punished.

All of the arguments in favour of imposing any restrictions on the use of sunbeds depend crucially on the claim that such use, especially at a young age, increases the likelihood that the user might subsequently develop skin cancer. Although Doc 2 asserts this, its evidence and reasoning are quite weak and the Daily Mail may be scaremongering in order to improve its circulation. The fact that the incidence of skin cancer has risen at about the same time as tanning salons have entered the High Street does not prove a causal relationship. Doc 1 has greater reliability, but even NHS Direct has its own vested interest, which has probably at least caused selection of data and perhaps exaggeration.

It is generally agreed that governments have a duty of care towards children, which in the UK is defined as anyone under the age of 18. Although the health risks in using tanning salons are relatively slight, the duty of care justifies the government in prohibiting the use of tanning salons by anyone under that age. However, the risk is not so strong as to justify over-riding the autonomy of adults by prohibiting tanning salons altogether; nor is it great enough to justify the invasion of privacy which would be involved in restricting the use of sunbeds in people's homes. The requirement to display warning notices does not infringe the right of autonomy, and is an appropriate expression of the government's duty of care towards all citizens.

Hedonistic Utilitarianism supports whatever policy is likely to maximise happiness. In this case, the calculation does not have many elements, but it is uncertain. The immediate pleasure given to teenagers by feeling good and their increased chances of entering a joy-giving sexual relationship have to be weighed against the increased risk of developing skin cancer at some time in the future. Although the source of Doc 4 clearly has strong vested interest to emphasize the alleged benefits of artificial tanning, some of the points it makes are valid. The calculation is complicated by many uncertainties, including the possibility that some potential sexual partners may find artificial tans unattractive, but even so the short-term gain in happiness is much more probable than the pain caused by premature death or serious illness. However, the amounts of pleasure or pain are so disproportionate the other way round that the use of sunbeds may be an unwise choice. Since the calculation is so uncertain, a government would hardly be justified in prohibiting the use of sunbeds altogether, but in view of the balance of possibilities it is justifiable to ban teenagers from using them, especially in view of the warnings issued by NHS Direct in Doc 1; not only is that a reliable source (with excellent reputation, expertise and ability to see), but the Government arguably has a duty to act on its claims because NHS Direct is a government agency. It is more certain that excessive use of sunbeds causes more pain than pleasure: so requiring tanning salons to display warning notices is consistent with the Utilitarian calculation.

In any issue concerning possible restrictions on people's freedom of action, the Principle of Liberty is of prime importance. This principle states that the liberty of sane adults may legitimately be restricted only in order to prevent harm to others; danger to themselves is not a justification. On the

basis of this principle, it would not be justifiable to prohibit tanning salons completely, but warning people of the dangers and denying access to children are both acceptable.

I have shown that neither a complete ban on sunbeds or tanning salons nor a laissez-faire policy can be justified by reference to rights, duties or the maximising of happiness. The discussion confirms my view that the Government was right to impose an age limit on access to tanning salons. It might be suggested that 16 would have been a more appropriate age limit for this purpose than 18, and it does admittedly seem anomalous that a 16-year-old should be considered mature enough to consent to sexual intercourse but not to use a sunbed. However, the age of majority is fixed at 18, and because young people are accustomed to having to prove that they have passed that age for various purposes, it will be easier to enforce than a younger age limit.

All of these considerations reinforce my contention that the Government is right to prohibit the use of tanning salons by people under the age of 18 and should also require such premises to display prominent notices explaining the dangers of over-use.

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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

© OCR 2012

