



**GCE**

**Critical Thinking**

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

Advanced GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2018**

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 2018

## Annotations

<b>Stamp</b>	<b>Description</b>
	Key point
	Gap or flaw in reasoning. In combination, unsuccessful attempt at.....
	Page seen but no other annotation used
	Page with no candidate response
<b>Question 3</b>	
	Criterion
	Evaluation of criterion
	Recognition of ambiguity
	Intermediate conclusion
	Hypothetical reasoning, example, evidence, analogy, counter argument/assertion with response
<b>Question 4</b>	
	Principle
	Evaluation of principle
	Relevant use of source
	Evaluation of source
	Alternative
	Conclusion (Resolution of issue)
	Intermediate conclusion
	Hypothetical reasoning, example, evidence, analogy, counter argument/assertion with response

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
1	<p><b>Examples of 2 mark answers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Wealth:</b> Most of the people who are educated at private schools are the children of rich parents. It may be the money, rather than the quality of their education, which helps them to reach the top.</li> <li>• <b>Selection procedures:</b> In order to become a student at most private schools, it is necessary to pass an entrance exam, which ensures that such students are, on average, more intelligent than students at state schools. This higher intelligence may be more significant than the quality of their education in helping people to reach the top.</li> <li>• <b>Inherited abilities:</b> Many rich and powerful parents are more talented than average, and to some extent their children are likely to have inherited their talents. These talents may be more significant than the quality of their education in helping people to reach the top.</li> <li>• <b>Peer network:</b> Students at private schools make friendships which continue into adulthood. Former school-mates who become rich and powerful tend to help their friends to become rich and powerful, too.</li> </ul>	3x2	<p>Up to 2 marks each for up to 3 answers. 2 marks for a valid answer. 1 mark for an incomplete, vague or marginal answer.</p> <p><b>Examples of 1 mark answer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most of the people who are educated at private schools are the children of rich parents.</li> <li>• Students whose parents have money are likely to get good jobs.</li> </ul>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2	<p><b>Examples of 3 mark answers</b></p> <p><b>Definition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The word “merit” is crucial to this proposal, but it is not defined. It could refer to objective achievements (e.g. in an entrance examination) or to potential (in which case background of relative advantage or disadvantage could be taken into consideration).</li> <li>The noun “means” in the first sentence could have a range of meanings, including possessions, invested capital, salary or disposable income, and this might affect who would be included.</li> <li>The adjective “wealthiest” in the second sentence could have a range of meanings, including possessions, invested capital, salary or disposable income, and this might affect who would be included.</li> </ul> <p><b>Implementation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal as described does not state who will make up the shortfall for those who “pay partial fees” or “pay nothing”. There are obvious problems with any of the sources of funding, namely the Government (may be considered unfair or too expensive), the schools themselves (may not have the resources), or the parents who can afford to pay (may increase their fees excessively).</li> </ul>	2x3	<p><b>3 marks</b> Clear explanation of a specific weakness</p> <p><b>2 marks</b> Vague or incomplete explanation of a specific weakness</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> Explanation of a generic or marginal weakness or challenge</p> <p><b>0 marks</b> No correct content.</p> <p><b>Example of 2 mark answer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The word “merit” is crucial to this proposal, but it is not defined.</li> <li>The proposal as described does not state who will make up the shortfall for those who “pay partial fees” or “pay nothing”.</li> </ul> <p><b>Example of 1 mark answer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The word “partial” is not explained it does not state what proportion of fees should be paid.</li> <li>Those paying the full fee will complain (challenge)</li> </ul>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
3	<p><b>c = Criteria: Application and evaluation of selected criteria to choice</b></p> <p><b>Suitable choices</b> are listed in the question, but credit other valid choices.</p> <p><b>Suitable criteria</b> which might be used to evaluate these choices include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• fairness</li> <li>• cost to the public</li> <li>• benefit to the economy</li> <li>• social mobility</li> <li>• equality of opportunity</li> </ul> <p>Other valid criteria should be credited.</p> <p><b>Examples of 3 mark answers:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The choice of removing charitable status from private schools unless they can demonstrate that they are benefiting less advantaged people satisfies the criterion of fairness, because subsidizing school fees for people who can afford them is not a charitable aim. However, since tax-payers who choose to send their children to private schools are also paying their share of the costs of state education, without benefiting from it, it may be unfair to remove the existing subsidy (<i>ambiguity</i>).</li> <li>• The choice of providing free places at private schools for the most talented children irrespective of ability to pay satisfies the criterion of benefit to the economy, because the most able children are the country's most valuable asset, and providing the best education</li> </ul>	3x3 +3	<p><b>c = 9 marks: 3 marks for each of 3 answers</b> <b>q = 3 marks</b></p> <p><b>Criteria:</b> <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 e.g.</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><b>0 marks</b> Very weak attempt at assessment of stated choice or issue by criterion e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entirely speculative assessment.</li> <li>• Invalid/marginal/trivial assessment by reference to invalid criterion.</li> </ul>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>available irrespective of ability to pay will maximise their potential. However, subsidising places at private boarding schools will be very expensive, and there may be cheaper ways of obtaining equivalent benefits (<i>ambiguity</i>).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The choice of providing free places at private schools for the most talented children irrespective of ability to pay satisfies the criterion of benefit to the economy, because the most able children are the country's most valuable asset, and providing the best education available irrespective of ability to pay will maximise their potential. This is an important criterion for the government to consider, because maximising the national prosperity is an essential part of the government's responsibilities (<i>evaluation</i>).</li> </ul> <p><b>Examples of 2 mark answers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The choice of removing charitable status from private schools unless they can demonstrate that they are benefiting less advantaged people satisfies the criterion of fairness, because subsidizing school fees for people who can afford them is not a charitable aim.</li> <li>The choice of providing free places at private schools for the most talented children irrespective of ability to pay satisfies the criterion of benefit to the economy, because the most able children are the country's most valuable asset, and providing the best education available irrespective of ability to pay will maximise their potential.</li> </ul> <p><b>Example of 1 mark answer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keep the present system because it's fair for everyone</li> </ul> <p><b>Example of 0 mark</b></p>		<p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in RM Assessor, i.e.:</p> <p><b>3c1</b> (Criterion 1)  <b>3c2</b> (Criterion 2)  <b>3c3</b> (Criterion 3)</p> <p>and enter a mark out of <b>3</b> for each of three Criteria answers.</p>

Question			Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No creditworthy material</li> </ul> <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. <b>or</b> 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>3q</b> and enter a mark out of <b>3</b> for Quality of Argument.</p>



Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
4	<p><b>p = Identification and Application of Relevant Principles</b></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 <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> <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>• People are entitled to use their money to buy advantages for themselves and their loved ones.</li> <li>• The only organisations which should be able to claim tax relief as charities are those which genuinely fulfil charitable functions.</li> <li>• Governments should encourage social mobility.</li> </ul>	36	<p><b>p = 12 marks</b></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><b>Level 4 – 10-12 marks</b> Identification and developed application of at least 3 contrasting plausible ethical principles/theories.</p> <p><b>Level 3 – 7-9 marks</b> Identification and developed application of 2 ethical principles/theories. <b>or</b> Identification and accurate application of at least 3 relevant ethical principles/theories.</p> <p><b>Level 2 – 4-6 marks</b> Identification and developed application of 1 relevant ethical principle/theory. <b>or</b> Identification and accurate application of 2 relevant principles/theories.</p> <p><b>Level 1 – 1-3 marks</b> Identification and accurate application of 1 relevant principle/theory. <b>or</b> Basic application of 1 or more principles/theories to the issue. <b>or</b> An unsuccessful or unsupported attempt to identify at least 1 principle/theory and to apply it to the issue.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Many answers are likely to appeal to two or three of the following ethical principles and theories, which are susceptible of fuller development.</p> <p><b>Simple Consequentialism</b> seeks to identify the choice which will bring about the greatest good of the greatest number. In theory, this might be achieved by re-distributing the financial, physical and human assets of private schools, but in practice such distribution would deprive some people of privilege while not benefiting anyone to a significant extent. However, some candidates might legitimately argue (like the author of Doc 2) that if all children had to attend state schools, the rich and powerful would ensure that the standard of education at such schools would be improved.</p> <p><b>Hedonistic Utilitarianism</b> seeks specifically to maximise happiness and minimise unhappiness. The abolition of private schools would make a few people happy, but it would distress a significant minority of people. Including more scholarships for children who were talented but poor would make some families happy, but it is difficult to calculate whether this happiness would outweigh the distress caused to rich families whose children were rejected in order to make room for children on scholarships.</p> <p>Most people would probably like power and riches for themselves and their families, but these preferences cannot be fulfilled for everyone. More realistically, the preference of most parents is for their children to be employed in a job that will fulfil their potential and support an acceptable standard of living. So <b>Preference Utilitarianism</b> might support the policy set out by the Sutton Trust in Doc 6.</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, i.e. <b>4p</b>, and enter a mark out of 12 for Identification and Application of Relevant Principles.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>This issue can also be expressed as a <b>conflict of rights</b>. Candidates may set the right of using one's own resources to benefit oneself and one's family (an aspect of the right of private property) against the rights to education and equality of opportunity.</p> <p>Candidates who approach the issue from the perspective of duty may appeal to Kant's <b>Categorical Imperative</b>. A strict interpretation of the first version, "<b>Act according to that maxim which you can will to be a universal law</b>" could be used in opposition to private schools, on the grounds that not everyone would be able to afford to educate their children at private schools. However, a modern Kantian could reasonably argue that everyone who can afford to educate their children privately should be able to do so. The second version, <b>that we should always treat persons as ends, and not as means only</b>, is consistent with any policy on private schools which candidates are likely to propose, since they almost certainly do treat some people as means, but also as ends.</p> <p>Any candidate who referred to W D Ross's <b>theory of prima facie duties</b> could legitimately use the duties of Justice, Beneficence or Self-improvement to support extending the benefits of private schools to talented poor students.</p> <p>This issue is too specific and too modern to be addressed explicitly by the foundation texts of the major religions, but the Jewish Scripture/Christian Old Testament does include laws intended to offset the natural tendency for the rich to become richer and the poor poorer. This teaching</p>		

Question			Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
			<p>implicitly supports any policy which reduces the ability of rich parents to buy privilege and success for their children.</p> <p>Propagation is a fundamental principle of <b>Natural Law</b>, especially in relation to the family. Part of the duty of parents is to educate their children. Natural Law also supports doing the best for one's children. For these reasons, and because Natural Law tends to be politically conservative, this approach probably supports the existence of private schools, although not necessarily the current system of tax benefits.</p> <p>Theories of <b>Social Contract</b> could possibly be used in support of the abolition of private schools, on the basis that parents cannot realistically educate their own children to the level required by modern life, and they therefore cede to the state all the duties and rights connected to education.</p> <p>Behind Rawls's <b>Veil of Ignorance</b>, one might be rich and talented, rich but untalented, poor but talented or poor and untalented. Those who do not know which of these descriptions apply to themselves or their children might choose to preserve private schools, while allocating a significant number of places to exceptionally talented children whose families could not afford the fees.</p>		

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p><b>s = Use and Critical Assessment of Sources</b></p> <p><b>Document 1</b> The authors of this document have a vested interest to emphasise the benefits of private schools, but they also are in a position to know of the benefits and are unlikely to make claims which are not at least plausible. However, some of the claims are true of state schools, too. The final claim includes an explanation, which may or may not be the true explanation. The generalization about teachers in private schools being “better” is probably true in some cases but not necessarily in others.</p> <p><b>Document 2</b> Because the student website is open to anyone (or at least anyone claiming to be a student) who joins it, there is no reason to suppose the author has expertise. The analogy in para 3 begs the question. The claim that abolishing private education would not harm “all” ignores the fact that it would harm some. The description of increased social unity ignores the fact that some schools would be based in areas of expensive housing and others in poorer areas.</p> <p><b>Document 3</b> As an official commission, the source of these statistics has good ability to see. The possible vested interest to highlight current inequality may have influenced the selection of the statistics quoted, but is unlikely to have caused the source to change or misrepresent them.</p> <p><b>Document 4</b> The authors of this document have a strong vested interest to emphasise – and perhaps even exaggerate – the benefits of private education. Most of the figures quoted</p>		<p><b>s = 8 marks</b></p> <p><b>Level 4: 7-8 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant and accurate use of sources to support reasoning.</li> <li>• Sustained and persuasive evaluation of sources to support reasoning.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 3: 5-6 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant and accurate use of sources.</li> <li>• Some evaluation of sources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 2: 3-4 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some relevant and accurate use of sources, which may be uncritical.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 1: 1-2 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very limited, perhaps implicit, use of sources.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 0: 0 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No attempt to use sources.</li> </ul> <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>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>are estimates, some of which seem implausible. However, the statistics are attributed to Oxford Economics, which is unlikely to have any motive to misrepresent the situation and does have a vested interest to be seen to be accurate. The fact that some people who create and receive and receive great wealth were educated privately does not imply that they would not have been equally successful if they had been educated at a state school.</p> <p><b>Document 5</b> The article reports both the views of the Labour Party's Shadow Education Secretary and responses from critics but gives more weight to the latter. The account by Mr Lenon of the politician's proposal is emotive and inaccurate.</p> <p><b>Document 6</b> The vested interest of the Sutton Trust "to improve social mobility through education" would <b>not</b> constitute a reason to make false claims about any policy designed to achieve that goal. The claims about private schools in the early part of the document are not restricted to day schools: so the support they offer to a proposal relating only to day schools is much weaker than it appears. The proposal and the document ignore the cost of boarding, which would be prohibitive in opening up the best-known private schools on the basis of ability alone. The proposal ignores the fact that many potential candidates for this scheme do not live within reach of a high-performing private day school.</p>		<p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, i.e. <b>4s</b>, and enter a mark out of 8 for Use and Critical Assessment of Sources.</p>

Question			Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
			q = Quality of Argument		<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> <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, i.e. <b>4q</b>, and enter a mark out of 8 for Quality of Argument.</p>

Question			Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
			<b>r = Resolution of Issue</b>		<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></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No discussion of the issue.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for one choice based on reasoned rejection of one or more genuine alternative: <b>7 or 8</b> marks</li> <li>Support for one choice + rejection of genuine alternative: usually <b>6</b> marks</li> <li>Support for one choice + mention of alternative: usually <b>5</b> marks</li> <li>Support for one choice without consideration of alternative: maximum <b>4</b> marks</li> <li>General discussion: maximum <b>3</b> marks</li> </ul> <p>Ensure that the correct item is highlighted in the marks column in scoris, i.e. <b>4r</b>, and enter a mark out of 8 for Resolution of Issue.</p>



## APPENDIX

**PE's answer** (1052 words)

I support the choice of withdrawing charitable tax status from private schools unless they make a significant proportion of places (e.g. 20% or 25%) available free of charge to highly talented children whose families cannot afford to pay the fees. By supporting this policy, I am rejecting the current system, whereby such schools have to do very little to earn their charitable status. I also reject the extreme option of abolishing private schools.

The background for the policy I am advocating is that a better quality of education is available in private schools than in schools provided by the state. The benefits are listed in Doc 1, which – despite bias and vested interest to make the most of the benefits – would be unlikely to make claims which could be shown to be false. Doc 3 shows how people benefit in later life from being educated at private schools, although - as my answer to q 1 indicates - this is not necessarily just because the standard of education is better.

This policy is similar to the proposals of the Sutton Trust in Doc 6, but it goes even further. Although The Trust is entirely and explicitly committed to the cause of social mobility, it would have no vested interest to claim that a particular policy would contribute to this aim unless it believed the claim to be true. Presumably for reasons of finance and political acceptability, the Trust's proposals refer to day schools only, but most private schools are residential, and I am arguing in favour of a policy which would include them.

One reason for not abolishing private schools is that people have a *prima facie* right to spend their money as they wish. This follows from the right to private property, which is identified as a human right in several statements, such as the UN Declaration. The whole point of money is to provide for yourself and your loved ones benefits which are denied to other people. If you could not do this, then there would be no point in earning money – or at least not more than enough to pay the basic costs of subsistence. Parents (and grandparents) who can afford to buy a better education for members of their family than the standard which the state would provide should not be prevented from doing so. So private schools should not be abolished.

Even though the figures in Doc 4 seem based on guesses, and may well be seriously exaggerated because of the vested interest of the authors to portray their own work in the most favourable light, it is presumably true that private schools do make a significant contribution to the economy of the UK, and this is a further reason not to abolish them.

The reasons why governments give tax advantages to charities are presumably partly to support and encourage their altruistic activities and partly so that voluntary contributions from members of the public are received at their full value. From those motives follows the principle that the tax advantages given to charities should apply only to organisations which really do perform charitable functions. Providing a superior education for wealthy families is not recognisable as such a charitable function. So the current system, under which schools may claim charitable status just for educating the rich, is not defensible. However, if a private school were to allocate a significant number of free places to talented pupils whose parents could not afford the fees, that would be a genuinely charitable function. So private schools should be given a choice between surrendering their favourable tax status or justifying it by performing genuine and significant (not negligible) charitable activities.

These charitable activities should be much more significant than what was being proposed by the Shadow Education Minister, as described in Doc 5, because – as the opponents reported in Doc 5 make clear – it is not likely that private schools would be able to do much to benefit state schools. Despite coming from a newspaper with pronounced political views, Doc 5 does report the views of each side.

Simple Consequentialism requires governments to promote policies which will improve economic and social well-being – in other words, which will produce the greatest good of the greatest number. If young people with the most potential are given a superior education, it is highly likely that they will subsequently contribute more to the good of the country than they would have done if they had experienced the same standard of education as everyone else. In addition, the country also benefits if rich people are able to give advantages to their children, because that motivates them to work as hard as they can and to achieve as much as possible. Of all the policies regarding private schools which a government could adopt, the one which is overall most likely to produce the greatest good for the greatest number, by enhancing the prosperity and happiness of the society, is the one which I am supporting.

Another way of identifying the policy which should produce the greatest good for the greatest number is by means of John Rawls's "veil of ignorance". Rich people are likely to support policies which favour the rich, and the parents of talented children would probably argue that admission to the best schools should be based on talent only, but if we hypothetically did not know how rich or poor we were, or how bright or untalented our children, we might choose a policy whereby wealth would buy some privileges for one's children, but the most talented children would have access to the finest education irrespective of wealth. This approach therefore favours the policy I am advocating.

Consideration of plausible moral principles, together with human rights, Simple Consequentialism and the Veil of Ignorance, supports two *prima facie* opposite conclusions, namely that rich people should be able to buy for their children a better education than the state would give them, and that exceptionally talented children should receive the best education irrespective of their parents' income. Both these goals can be achieved by means of a policy which gives charitable tax status to private schools only if they make a significant proportion of places available free of charge to highly talented children whose families cannot afford to pay the fees.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**The Triangle Building**  
**Shaftesbury Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB2 8EA**

**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; The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA**  
**Registered Company Number: 3484466**  
**OCR is an exempt Charity**

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**Head office**  
**Telephone: 01223 552552**  
**Facsimile: 01223 552553**

© OCR 2018

 **Cambridge  
Assessment**

