



GCE

Critical Thinking

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

Advanced GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2017

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, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2017

Annotations

Stamp	Description
✓	Key point
〔	Gap or flaw in reasoning. In combination, unsuccessful attempt at.....
Question 3	
C	Criterion
E	Evaluation of criterion
A	Recognition of ambiguity
I	Intermediate conclusion
Q	Hypothetical reasoning, example, evidence, analogy, counter argument/assertion with response
Question 4	
P	Principle
E	Evaluation of principle
S	Relevant use of source
V	Evaluation of source
A	Alternative
C	Choice/Conclusion (Resolution of issue)
I	Intermediate conclusion
Q	Hypothetical reasoning, example, evidence, analogy, counter argument/assertion with response
BP	Blank Page – this annotation must be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.
SEEN	Page with no other annotation seen

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>Valid evaluative points</p> <p>Strengthened:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By expertise in ethics, because he is a professor of Ethics. • But his argument uses concepts derived from everyday discourse, ie not based on expertise. • His expertise in ethics leads him to approach the issue of world poverty from the perspective of individual action. <p>Weakened:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He appears to lack expertise in economics, which weakens his argument because he does not consider the economic consequences of his proposal. • If his proposal were to be generally adopted, the consumerist system of the rich nations would collapse, and everyone would be worse off. • <i>Allow:</i> His commitment to Utilitarianism has led him to overlook the significance of the Principle of Moral Proximity in relation to his argument. <p>Example of a Level 3 answer</p> <p>Peter Singer is a Professor specialising in Ethics. The subject of charitable giving is an ethical issue. So his argument is strengthened by his expertise in Ethics. However, his argument appears to be aimed at the intelligent general reader, and neither requires nor appeals to his expertise. Although Singer interprets the issue in terms of personal ethics, it has other important dimensions, especially economic. Singer does not claim to have any expertise in</p>	6	<p>Annotate with  to indicate where marks are awarded and  to indicate material which is not being credited.</p> <p>Level 3 5 - 6 marks a balanced conclusion, well supported by reference to more than one aspect of expertise</p> <p>Level 2 3 - 4 marks a partial conclusion, supported by reference to more than one aspect of expertise</p> <p>Level 1 1 - 2 marks a one-sided conclusion based on a valid comment about expertise OR some valid comment related to expertise.</p> <p>Level 0 0 marks no valid comment related to expertise.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>economics, which weakens his argument.</p> <p>Example of a Level 2 answer Peter Singer is a Professor specialising in Ethics. The subject of charitable giving is an ethical issue. So his argument is strengthened by his expertise in Ethics. However, his argument appears to be aimed at the intelligent general reader, and neither requires nor appeals to his expertise.</p> <p>Example of a Level 1 answer Peter Singer is a Professor specialising in Ethics. The subject of charitable giving is an ethical issue. So his argument is strengthened by his expertise in Ethics.</p>		

Question		Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2	a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The word “necessities” is subjective, based on value judgments, on which opinions may legitimately vary between individuals, between countries and over time. It is also circumstantial, since some expenditure (such as running a car) is necessary to people in some situations and unnecessarily luxurious to people whose circumstances are different. The two categories, “necessities” and “luxuries”, are not discrete, but on a continuum. 	2+2	<p>Annotate with  to indicate where marks are awarded and  to indicate material which is not being credited.</p> <p>For each of two answers in part (a) and one answer in part (b):</p> <p>Credit 2 marks For a clear explanation of the problem.</p> <p>Credit 1 mark For a vague explanation of the problem.</p>
	b	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The author literally intends the word “generous” to refer to a proportion of income. But the impact of the claim relies partly on its ambiguity, since “generous” can refer alternatively to the amount which is given or to what alternative expenditure the giver has to give up in order to make the gift. Generosity can refer to more than just money. People may also give of their time and talents. 	2	<p>Credit 0 marks For nothing worthy of credit. (eg criticism of the relevant word for being “vague”)</p> <p>In part (a), credit two answers if present, even if they are not presented separately.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>c = Criteria: Application and evaluation of selected criteria to choice</p> <p>Appropriate choices for evaluation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give a fixed proportion of income to the relief of world poverty • Give a fixed proportion of income to charity, including but not limited to the relief of world poverty • Give a fixed proportion of disposable income to charity, including but not limited to the relief of world poverty • Give as much as you can afford to the relief of world poverty • Give in response to specific appeals for the relief of world poverty, such as Comic Relief • Give nothing to the relief of world poverty. <p>Equally acceptable are more specific choices (eg stating a specific percentage of income) and more complex choices (eg give as much as you can afford, but not less than 10% of income). Choices which do not explicitly refer to the relief of world poverty are inadequate.</p> <p>Suitable criteria which might be used to evaluate the choice include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • effectiveness • justice/fairness • ease of implementation • cost 	12	<p>Use annotations listed in section 11.</p> <p>c = 9 marks – 3 marks for each of 3 answers: q = 3 marks for quality of reasoning</p> <p>c = 9 marks – 3 marks for each of 3 answers:</p> <p>3 marks Valid assessment of stated choice by reference to a valid criterion including awareness of ambiguity and/or valid evaluation of criterion.</p> <p>2 marks Valid simple assessment of stated choice by reference to a valid criterion.</p> <p>1 mark Weak or marginal assessment of stated choice or issue by valid or inaccurately-stated criterion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valid simple assessment of issue (not a specific choice) by reference to a valid criterion. • Valid simple assessment by reference to a valid criterion of a specific choice not referring to world poverty. • Valid simple assessment of a specific choice by reference to an inaccurately-stated criterion. • Largely speculative assessment by reference to a valid criterion. • Largely repetitive assessment by reference to a different valid criterion. • Invalid/marginal/trivial assessment of stated choice

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • effect on/cost to the economy • family welfare. <p>Examples of 3-mark answers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness is an essential criterion, because there is no point in depriving oneself if doing so does no one any good. The choice of giving 10% of one's income to relieve world poverty fails to satisfy the criterion of effectiveness, because world poverty is such a large-scale problem that 10% of most people's income will not make a significant difference. <i>(evaluation)</i> • 10% of the income of most people in the affluent West is a significant amount of money, which could provide basic food for a person or even a family in a poor country, subsidize the digging of a well in a village, or pay school fees to help someone escape poverty and perhaps in the future return to help their own village. So giving 10% of one's income to relieve world poverty satisfies the criterion of effectiveness. However, such help is a drop in the ocean, because world poverty is such a large-scale problem that 10% of most people's income will not make a noticeable difference. In that sense, this choice fails to satisfy the criterion of effectiveness. <i>(ambiguity)</i> • The choice of giving nothing to the relief of world poverty satisfies the criterion of family welfare in the case of parents and grandparents, because money which might have been given away to 		<p>by reference to a valid criterion.</p> <p>0 marks Very weak attempt at assessment of stated choice or issue by criterion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entirely speculative assessment. • Invalid/marginal/trivial assessment by reference to invalid criterion. <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in RM Assessor, ie:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">4c1 (Criterion 1) 4c2 (Criterion 2) 4c3 (Criterion 3)</p> <p>and enter a mark out of 3 for each of three Criteria answers.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>strangers can instead be spent on meeting the needs of family members. A world in which grandparents, for example, were discouraged from acting generously towards their grandchildren would be a harsh, unfeeling world, and by weakening family ties would risk harming families. (<i>evaluation</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The choice of giving nothing to the relief of world poverty satisfies the criterion of family welfare in the case of parents and grandparents, because money which might have been given away to strangers can instead be spent on meeting the needs of family members. However, it also fails to satisfy this criterion, inasmuch as the money which might have been given to the relief of world poverty would have enabled parents in other countries to provide for their children. (<i>ambiguity</i>) <p>Examples of 2-mark answers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The choice of giving 10% of one's income to relieve world poverty fails to satisfy the criterion of effectiveness, because world poverty is such a large-scale problem that 10% of most people's income will not make a significant difference. The choice of giving nothing to the relief of world poverty satisfies the criterion of family welfare in the case of parents and grandparents, because money which might have been given away to strangers can instead be spent on meeting the needs of family members. 		

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

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>p = Identification and Application of Relevant Principles</p> <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 applying identified principles to the issue in order to produce a reasoned argument that attempts to resolve it. Candidates are not 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> <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"> • "If it is in our power to prevent something bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance, we ought, morally, 	36	<p>Use annotations listed in section 11.</p> <p>p = 12 marks</p> <p>To be located in level 4, the use of principles must normally be all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contrasting (in approach and/or outcome) • Plausible (supported by reasoning and/or generally accepted) • Applied (not necessarily at great length, but more than a brief summative judgment). <p>Level 4 – 10-12 marks Identification and developed application of at least 3 contrasting plausible ethical principles/theories.</p> <p>Level 3 – 7-9 marks Identification and developed application of 2 ethical principles/theories. or Identification and accurate application of at least 3 relevant ethical principles/theories.</p> <p>Level 2 – 4-6 marks Identification and developed application of 1 relevant ethical principle/theory. or Identification and accurate application of 2 relevant principles/theories.</p> <p>Level 1 – 1-3 marks Identification and accurate application of 1 relevant</p>

	<p>to do it." (quoted from Doc 1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Generosity towards people in need is an aspect of the virtuous life.• Humans should regard themselves as members of one family.• We have greater moral responsibility to people who in some sense cross our path than to those who are distant ("the Principle of Moral Proximity"). This principle contradicts Act Utilitarianism, but can be defended in terms of indirect Utilitarianism.• Charity begins at home.• People are entitled to use in any way they choose the money which they receive as wages, or acquire in other lawful ways. <p>Candidates are quite likely to refer to the Principles of Need (that resources should be distributed on the basis of need), Equality (either that people should be treated equally or that resources should be distributed in such a way as to achieve equality) or Desert (that resources should be distributed on the basis of deserving).</p> <p>Many answers are likely to appeal to two or three of the following ethical principles and theories, which are susceptible of fuller development. However, this topic provides a basis for evaluating some ethical theories, and some candidates may take this approach.</p> <p>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</p>		<p>principle/theory.</p> <p>or Basic application of 1 or more principles/theories to the issue.</p> <p>or An unsuccessful or unsupported attempt to identify at least 1 principle/theory and to apply it to the issue.</p> <p>Level 0 – 0 marks No use of principles.</p> <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, ie 4p, and enter a mark out of 12 for Identification and Application of Relevant Principles.</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>number". This is likely to lead to a heroic policy, since presumably greater happiness is caused by saving someone from starving to death than by spending the same amount of money on any form of self-indulgence. Yet that somehow seems counter-intuitive: so perhaps this is an indication of a weakness in Utilitarianism. Of the criteria in Bentham's Hedonic Calculus, propinquity is of particular importance, because a choice may need to be made between providing a starving person with food or campaigning for economic changes. Some candidates may use or challenge the Utilitarian claim that allowing someone to die (eg by not giving them food) is morally equivalent to killing them, because the consequences are the same.</p> <p>This issue can also be expressed as a conflict of rights. Candidates may set the right to life against the right of individuals to use their own money as they think fit (an aspect of the right to property).</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 argue against heroic charitable giving, on the grounds that if everyone were to give their money to famine relief instead of spending it on self-indulgence, the consequences of the reduced demand on the economy would be catastrophic. Alternatively, this line of reasoning could be used to criticize the principle. The second version, that we should always treat persons as ends, and not as means only, could be used to argue in favour of</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>generous charitable giving, on the grounds that rich people/ Western nations are rich only because others are poor, which means the latter are being treated as means only.</p> <p>Of the <i>prima facie</i> duties identified by W D Ross, the duty of beneficence is of particular relevance to this issue.</p> <p>The content of any appeal to Divine Command ethics would vary according to which religion such commands were drawn from, but Doc 4 shows that most religions encourage charitable giving.</p> <p>Natural Law can be used to support a generous policy, because preventing people from starving promotes their survival. This is a priority, since survival is the precondition for other goods. Feeding the hungry is traditionally the first item in lists of acts of mercy or charity. But developed Roman Catholic Natural Law teaches that various needs of people who have a claim on someone (such as members of their family) are at least as important as the subsistence needs of strangers.</p> <p>Behind Rawls's Veil of Ignorance, one might be any of (amongst others): a relatively wealthy person in the West, a relatively poor person in the West, a person in a poor country who would be saved from starvation by a donation, or someone who would not receive a donation and would therefore starve to death.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>s = Use and Critical Assessment of Sources</p> <p><i>Document 1</i></p> <p>The significance of this document lies in its ideas, not in its credibility, but the interpretation of world poverty as a matter of personal ethics distorts the issue, by not considering the effects of personal economic choices not to buy 'luxuries' on a materialistic economy. The pros and cons of the author's expertise have been discussed in the answer to q 1.</p> <p>The argument relies on the plausibility of the emotive example of a child in danger of drowning. However Singer's use of this example overlooks its tacit reliance on the Principle of Moral Proximity.i.e the duty to help those nearest to you. Helping the boy nearby does not parallel the duty to help the world poor who are at a distance.</p> <p>The conclusion about not spending money on luxuries is stronger than justified by his principle and example.</p> <p><i>Document 2</i></p> <p>As a college handout, this document probably summarizes Hardin's views accurately, but it is the</p>	<p>s = 8 marks</p> <p>Level 4 – 7-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant and accurate use of sources to support reasoning. • Sustained and persuasive evaluation of sources to support reasoning. <p>Level 3 – 5-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant and accurate use of sources. • Some evaluation of sources. <p>Level 2 – 3-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some relevant and accurate use of sources, which may be uncritical. <p>Level 1 – 1-2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very limited, perhaps implicit, use of sources. <p>Level 0 – 0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to use sources. <p>Except at Level 1, credit references to sources only if they support reasoning.</p> <p>Maximum level 2 for Use and Critical Assessment of Sources for uncritical use of sources.</p> <p>Typical indicators of L4 (any two of which normally locate an answer in L4):</p>
--	--	---

	<p>ideas which matter, not the accuracy of the source. The argument relies almost entirely on the analogy, which is good, but not perfect, inasmuch as the capacity of the lifeboat is presumably unalterable, whereas it is feasible that improvements in agriculture or technology might enable poor countries to sustain a larger population.</p> <p><u>Document 3</u></p> <p>Since the aim of the organization is to encourage giving, the reasons against giving are presumably quoted in order to be countered. So it may have chosen objections which can be easily and effectively countered, while ignoring more powerful one.</p> <p><u>Document 4</u></p> <p>The sources of this information are unknown, but the claims could easily be checked and are therefore unlikely to be wildly inaccurate. It is unlikely that anyone other than members of the respective religions will be influenced by this guidance.</p> <p><u>Document 5</u></p> <p>This report comes from a quality newspaper. Although the source of the statistics is not stated, this newspaper would presumably not have based an article on them if they were not accurate. However, it is not clear whether the statistics are objective or based on self-reporting; it is also not clear whether the percentages are calculated from the whole cohort or only from those who give (or claim to give) to charity. Beth Breeze clearly has expertise in this issue. The description and analysis of trends does not include or imply any guidance for people's</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• More than 2 evaluative references to sources• Nuanced evaluation• Strong support to reasoning <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in RM Assessor, ie 4s, and enter a mark out of 8 for Use and Critical Assessment of Sources.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>behaviour.</p> <p><u>Document 6</u></p> <p>As indicated in the description of the source, these statistics come from very reliable sources. The categories are quite vague. No evaluation of the analysis of giving or recommendation for future actions is attempted.</p> <p>q = Quality of Argument</p>		
		<p>q = 8 marks</p> <p>Level 4 – 7-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Claims well supported by clear and persuasive reasoning.• Consistent use of intermediate conclusions.• Reasoning supported by relevant use of some of: hypothetical reasoning, counter argument/assertion with response, analogy, evidence, example.• Few errors, if any, in spelling, grammar and punctuation. <p>Level 3 – 5-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Claims supported by clear reasoning.• Few significant gaps or flaws.• Generally clear and accurate communication.• Few errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation. <p>Level 2 – 3-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Claims mostly supported by reasoning.• Some significant gaps and/or flaws.• Some effective communication.• Fair standard of spelling, grammar and punctuation, but may include errors. <p>Level 1 – 1-2 marks</p>	

					<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Little coherent reasoning.• Perhaps significant errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar. <p>Level 0 – 0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No discussion of the issue. <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in RM Assessor, ie 4q, and enter a mark out of 8 for Quality of Argument.</p> <p>r = 8 marks</p> <p>Level 4 – 7-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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• Perhaps an awareness that the resolution is partial/provisional. <p>Level 3 – 5-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clear identification of a choice.• Consideration of at least one alternative.• Some attempt to resolve the issue. <p>Level 2 – 3-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Basic discussion of the issue, including support for one choice. <p>Level 1 – 1-2 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited discussion of the issue. <p>Level 0 – 0 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No discussion of the issue. <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					column in RM Assessor, ie 4r , and enter a mark out of 8 for Resolution of Issue.
--	--	--	--	--	--

APPENDIX

PE's answer (1150 words) **NB** This does **not** represent the standard of response expected from candidates.

I am going to defend the choice that individuals should give at least 10% of their income to charity, including but not exclusively overseas aid, and as much more as they can afford.

In Doc 1, a noted philosopher persuasively argues on the basis of some expertise that “If it is in our power to prevent something bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance, we ought, morally, to do it.” As Singer explains, a clear implication of this principle is that those who earn more than they require in order to support a reasonable quality of life for themselves and their families should give generously to people who need help.

Singer himself restricts such help to the relief of world poverty, but as Docs 2 and 3 explain, there are serious objections to giving as heroically towards the relief of world poverty as described in Doc 1. Even though the objections cited in Doc 3 have presumably been chosen in order to be countered, they still have some plausibility. In addition, there are other needs, and the Principle of Moral Proximity suggests that individuals should give priority to those which impinge directly on them. The example Singer uses in Doc 1 tacitly relies on this principle for part of its appeal, although he does not recognise this. The Principle of Moral Proximity can be defended on the basis of indirect Utilitarianism: in other words, even if particular applications of the principle do not necessarily produce the greatest happiness of the greatest number, the principle can be argued to do so overall. Charitable giving should, therefore, include help for the relatively poor in one’s own country, even if people in some other parts of the world are worse off in absolute terms.

In addition, some indirect help can do more good than short-term aid, and so charitable giving should include support for charities undertaking community development, medical research and political campaigning on behalf of marginalized groups and individuals. This addresses the weakness of Hardin’s argument in Doc 2, namely that – unlike a lifeboat – the capacity of a poor country to sustain a population may be increased by means of improvements in agriculture, technology and economics.

Another principle supporting these kinds of giving is the widely accepted recognition that generous giving to the needy and defending the victims of oppression are two characteristics of a just person. Ross’s *prima facie* duty of beneficence also implies that those who can afford it should devote a significant proportion of their wealth and their income to helping people less fortunate than themselves.

It is difficult to calculate – as recommended by Hedonistic Utilitarianism - the net increase of happiness likely to be created by the different uses to which individuals can put their income and their wealth. Since Singer is a Utilitarian, he presumably thinks the greatest amount of happiness will be created by sacrificial giving of the kind he describes. In view of the uncertainties about the

benefits of giving to alleviate world poverty, however, one's own (more certain and more immediate) happiness deserves greater consideration, and more moderate generosity is therefore preferable.

The advantage of adopting a percentage – such as 10% - of income as the minimum is that if one's income is small, the percentage is small, too. If people subsequently become better off, they should increase their giving to a higher proportion. It is, however, also people's duty to provide for themselves, their families and their future, in addition to which there is nothing wrong with spending some of one's income or wealth on enjoyment. So the proportion of giving does not need to be quite as drastic as described at the end of Doc 1. There is also something to be said for the principle implied by the description of Islamic teaching in Doc 4, that people with very few resources should not be expected to give any of it away.

I reject the choice of giving to overseas aid all one's income except for what is spent on the necessities of life, as stated in para 6 of Doc 1. Neither the principle stated by Singer in para 3 of Doc 1 nor his example of a child in danger of drowning supports such an extreme application. A life consisting only of necessities would be unrewarding and dehumanizing and would have far-reaching consequences; for example, if everyone cut out everything except necessities from their life, all professional orchestral players would become redundant, because no one would attend their concerts. In addition, parents and grandparents have a duty to support and be generous to members of their families, and this is therefore a legitimate call on their resources. This is another application of the Principle of Moral Proximity.

Even in relation to the proportion of people's income which they do intend to give to charity, there are many other worthy causes which they may want to support, in addition to the relief of world poverty. Since they earned the money, they have the right to use it how they please, and they can therefore choose charities which do work of which they approve or in which they have an interest. Practising members of particular religions should support their churches or equivalent organizations: for example, practising members of the Church of England should follow the guidance reported in Doc 4 of giving 5% of their income to their church and 5% to other charitable causes. If they can afford to give away more than 10% in total, they can according to that guidance legitimately use their own discretion in deciding where to give it. Doc 6 (using data from two very reliable institutions) indicates a range of worthy causes, and focusing on only one (relief of world poverty) would be unfair on the others.

I also reject the choice of giving only in response to special appeals, of the kinds described by an expert in Doc 5 as being typical of givers in the UK. People should not need to be entertained in exchange for their gift, and someone's likelihood of being helped should not rely on chance or on their use of advertising agencies. One's giving should be a rational, moral decision.

I have shown that many moral principles lead to the conclusion that individuals should be generous towards people in need. I have given reasons for rejecting the heroic level of giving recommended by Peter Singer and for directing the focus of one's giving more widely than the relief of world poverty. Finally, I have explained why a fixed percentage of income should be taken as the minimum for

giving, but that people should give more if they can afford to do so. Taken together, these arguments support my choice that individuals should give at least 10% of their income to charity, including but not exclusively overseas aid, and as much more as they can afford.

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

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 2017

