

# **L3 Lead Examiner Report 1906**

January 2019

**L3 Qualification in Animal  
Management**

**Unit 3: Animal Welfare and  
Ethics (31646H)**

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications website at <http://qualifications.pearson.com/en/home.html> for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at <http://qualifications.pearson.com/en/contact-us.html>

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson. Their contact details can be found on this link: <http://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-for-you/teachers.html>

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at <https://www.edexcelonline.com>

You will need an Edexcel Online username and password to access this service.

### **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your learners at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

June 2019

**Publications Code 31646H\_1906\_ER**

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## Grade Boundaries

### What is a grade boundary?

A grade boundary is where we set the level of achievement required to obtain a certain grade for the externally assessed unit. We set grade boundaries for each grade, at Distinction, Merit and Pass.

### Setting grade boundaries

When we set grade boundaries, we look at the performance of every learner who took the external assessment. When we can see the full picture of performance, our experts are then able to decide where best to place the grade boundaries – this means that they decide what the lowest possible mark is for a particular grade.

When our experts set the grade boundaries, they make sure that learners receive grades which reflect their ability. Awarding grade boundaries is conducted to ensure learners achieve the grade they deserve to achieve, irrespective of variation in the external assessment.

### Variations in external assessments

Each external assessment we set asks different questions and may assess different parts of the unit content outlined in the specification. It would be unfair to learners if we set the same grade boundaries for each assessment, because then it would not take accessibility into account.

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, are on the website via this link:

<http://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

### Animal Welfare and Ethics 31646H.

Grade	Unclassified	Level 3			
		N	P	M	D
Boundary Mark	0	15	24	33	43

## Introduction

This was the fifth series of the new specification for Animal Management and the third May paper, and as such, the fifth time that this mandatory unit has been assessed via an external assessment rather than via centre based internal assessment. This is the first time this paper has been assessed in the summer since the DfE changes to the assessment rules.

The part B task paper followed the format identified in the both the sample assessment material, the additional sample assessment materials and the 1706, 1801, 1806 and 1901 past papers published on the Pearson website. Changes have been made to the part A section of the task.

The paper had four activities. Each task was based on an area of the specification. Learners were required to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of a range of specification topics and to apply this knowledge to the specific task scenarios. The intention was to offer as broad coverage as possible for all areas of the unit content. Activities had varying weightings attached to them and these weighting were consistent with the sample assessment materials and the previous papers.

There was also a focus on the use of suitable technical and vocational language and terminology within each activity response.

A number of learners included their preparatory notes completed in part A with their scripts and centres are reminded these should be retained by the centre as per the assessment rules. Where the preparatory notes had been included in many cases the 2 sides of A4 were not filled and the lead examiner considers this a missed opportunity. In addition to this some of the notes contained more essay plan type notes rather than factual notes that learners could apply to the stimulus material.

## Introduction to the Overall Performance of the Unit

The overall performance of the paper and standard of the work produced was good and most of the activities performed as were expected, the activities allowed for good differentiation between pass, merit and distinction candidates.

# Individual Activities

## Activity 1

In this activity learners have been asked to review the information provided in the stimulus material booklet and conduct an appraisal of animal welfare. Within this they are asked to identify the welfare issues of the animals detailed in the stimulus material making relevant links to animal welfare legislation.

This activity provides an opportunity for learners to apply their knowledge and skills of animal welfare, care, husbandry, licensing requirements and legislation to the scenario. It is due to the application nature of this activity that led to on average good marks being achieved in this activity.

A surprisingly large number of learners failed to identify any legislation other than the Animal Welfare Act 2006.

A number of learners identified the Animal Boarding Establishments Act whilst a number identified the Licensing of Activities involving Animals. Both pieces of legislation were valid as whilst the new licensing is active some establishments still have valid licenses under the previous licensing.

A number of learners used a traffic light system to carry out their welfare appraisal, the idea behind this that they rank welfare issues red, amber or green as per the unit specification. However a large number of learners ranked the actual stimulus material and missing information as red, amber or green rather than the actual welfare issues that they identified.

On arrival the dogs that are being dropped off are not asked to fill in a form with any emergency contact details, any medical history or important information which helps with the safety of the animals if anything was to go wrong.

No clear fire exits are ~~labeled~~ <sup>shown</sup> or ~~shown~~ <sup>legislated</sup> which implies that there is no set fire procedure to be carried out in case of an emergency. That will come from the legislation Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, which clearly states that clear safety signs should be provided.

In a doggy day care or over night accommodation ~~staff~~ at least one staff member should have a level 3 qualification or above to even get a licence and only



Staff member has a level 1 qualification in Animal Care so technically they ~~shouldn't~~ should not have a licence because none of the staff know ~~a~~ appropriate care which puts the animals at risk because noone knows if what they are doing is right or wrong.

If a dog was to escape the building somehow and they had to call out for a dog warden and take them back or to contact the owners to let them know, they would scan the microchip and relevant information would come up but the doggy day care don't have that information which legally they should check before they get signed in. This is part of ~~the~~ The Microchipping of Dogs Act (England) regulations 2015.

The isolation ~~and~~ ~~quarantined~~ area should be a seperate building from all the other animals to control disease spread. At Shirevale the isolation is right next to the exercise area which is a breeding ground for disease which the puts the animals well being at risk, which then

Shows that the 5 Animal Needs are not being met as they are not protecting them from pain, suffering, injury and disease.

There is no access to indoor or outdoor pens which is legally required by the Pet Animals Act 1951 (Amended 1983). This also comes under the previous issue with isolation.

~~The food prep~~ The food prep room and storage of cleaning equipment should be separated. A small section of that room should be turned into a room separated by two doors with a lock containing the chemicals. This legal requirement comes under COSHH, Control of Substances Hazardous to Health regulations 2006. It states that correct storage of chemicals, dilution rates and dangerous chemicals should be locked away.

Putting food next to chemicals is an issue not only would that make the animals unwell and put their health at risk it could make staff members seriously ill.

The above response has identified a considerable amount of legislation, but have failed to comprehensively link these to any welfare issues not demonstrating an understanding of how these welfare issues breach animal welfare legislation and the implications of them. In addition to this a large amount of the legislation is health and safety and this activity is a welfare appraisal. Therefore are not demonstrating



knowledge and understanding of how the legislation is applied, the above response has therefore been awarded 8 marks.

(20)

The Quality of care given to animals housed at ~~Shirevale~~ Shirevale doggy day care is impacted ~~to~~ ~~negatively~~ negatively by the amount of animals they take on compared to how much/many rooms they have available, legislation clearly states that each dog should have ~~the opportunity~~ the opportunity to have its own room if the need occurs however there is only 10 sleeping areas but 20 dogs allowed to sleep there this is not meeting the 5 needs as it means that some of the animals are not being housed appropriately and their social/solitary needs are not being met, it is there for ~~going against~~ not complying with the animal welfare act 2006 or the animal boarding establishments act 1963, which either state that the freedoms need to be met or specifically animals should ~~be housed~~ have the opportunity to be housed alone.

It is hard to tell by the facility layout whether the need to be free from injury and disease is being met as i can't see any emergency ~~em~~ exits of back

entrances or fire escapes, by just looking at the layout given however this need is not being met as if there was an emergency like a fire there is not exit apart from the entrance which in an emergency is not a guaranteed escape route and would be hard to get 60 dogs out of one exit quick enough.

The need to be able to display natural behaviours is quite well thought about as they have 2 areas where dogs can exercise and play, however, I did notice that there is only one isolation room which isn't enough for 60 dogs as it's very likely that more than one dog will need to be isolated at one given time, for example if there is two sick dogs they would need to both be isolated and separate from each other, this doesn't fully fill the need to be housed appropriately for social and solitary needs or the need to be free from ~~injury~~ injury or disease and does there for not comply with the animal welfare act 2006.

The location of the ~~the~~ isolation room is not ideal either as it borders both the exercise areas so is likely to be very noisy which may cause a dog which is being isolated for any reason, to become more and more distressed.

It is also hard to tell whether they are being housed appropriately which is another need (the need to have appropriate accommodation) as the ~~stress~~ stress measurements are not given but considering how large the exercise



one looks next to the sleeping areas would suggest they are not very big certainly not for more than one animal, they are also ~~the same size~~ all the same size which isn't recommended as different dogs have different needs, so it's more cost and space effective if they have different sized kennels, these sleeping kennels look averagely sized and would probably be okay for the majority of dogs however it would be better to also accommodate for the minority so every animal's welfare can be upheld.

The Safety of the animals at the day care cannot be ~~to~~ ~~near~~ maintained considering how understaffed they are, there should be more than 2 staff members on at one time when dealing with 60 dogs most places would suggest that they should have at least 30 members of staff on when dealing with that number of dogs however at Shirevale the maximum amount of staff on in one day is 3 and the minimum is one this doesn't meet any of the animals needs and is putting them all in danger, there should be more staff as they at least need 1 per block and staff which are trained to deal with different situations which they do not have, this isn't complying with Work place Regulations 1992 the animal welfare act 2006, the animal boarding act 1963 or the animal activity

## Licensing Regulations 2018

in terms of the staff procedures<sup>on arrival</sup>, I think is well written and covers most areas but is also quite vague and doesn't go into enough detail however it conforms well with most legislation and doesn't endanger the dog that arrives, however it is common regulations that dogs should only be taken if microchipped so if something was to happen it can be identified and owner contacted, rather than this they have a password which is coded which doesn't seem like a very safe method of ensuring owners get reunited with their dogs.

The hygiene procedures although should be done more often do comply with legislation such as the controlled waste ~~regulation~~ Regulation 1992 as all faeces is collected and put into a bin designed and only used for dog faeces, and although they do not actually say it, it is assumed it is then taken away to be disposed off. The emergency procedures however put all dogs at risk and don't comply with a number of legislation, they have no plan in place to deal with any emergency scenario all they do is call the manager which suggest that they don't even have a vet they can call if a dog is sick or injured or a vet on site which they have in a lot of places, there doesn't seem to be an emergency evaluation plan incase the fire alarm goes, which is absolutely essential for a kennels and by not having one they are going against the animal welfare act as they are not kept safe and the animal boarding establishment act 1963 which says that they should be safeguarded in an emergency which they are not.

~~They do not following the HSE~~ in conclusion the quality of care is poor and the legislative and licensing acts

are not followed as there isn't enough staff, they are not properly trained and dogs are incorrectly housed.

The above response whilst not a perfect response has been structured around the five needs of the animal welfare act and is balanced outlining both negative and positive aspects of welfare. They have linked the welfare to legislation and given good application and reasoning, and as a result of this they have gained 17 of the 20 marks available for this activity.



### Activity 1 – Appraisal report

Assessment focus	Band 0	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4
Appraisal of animal welfare issues/factors based on information provided	<b>0</b>	<b>1-5</b>	<b>6-10</b>	<b>11-15</b>	<b>16-20</b>
	No rewardable material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generic statements or isolated elements of knowledge and understanding.</li> <li>• Welfare issues/factors identified link to some of the welfare needs and are supported by occasionally relevant examples.</li> <li>• Limited lines of reasoning evident in support of the welfare issues/factors identified which address either strengths or weaknesses.</li> <li>• A limited attempt to link issues/factors to relevant welfare legislation/policy.</li> <li>• A limited approach to scaling/ranking the issues/factors in terms of their impact is evident.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates generally accurate knowledge and understanding.</li> <li>• Welfare issues/factors identified link to all welfare needs supported by a few relevant examples.</li> <li>• Occasional lines of reasoning evident in support of the welfare issues/factors identified which address both strengths and weaknesses although there may be some imbalance.</li> <li>• Partially developed linkage of issues/factors to relevant welfare legislation/policy.</li> <li>• An adequate approach to scaling/ranking the issues/factors in terms of their impact is evident.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding</li> <li>• Welfare issues/factors identified link to all welfare needs supported by some relevant examples.</li> <li>• Lines of reasoning evident in support of the welfare issues/factors identified which address both strengths and weaknesses with a reasonable balance.</li> <li>• Developed linkage of issues/factors to relevant welfare legislation/policy.</li> <li>• An effective approach to scaling/ranking the issues/factors in terms of their impact is evident.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding.</li> <li>• Welfare issues/factors identified clearly link to all welfare needs through the sustained use of relevant examples.</li> <li>• Comprehensive lines of reasoning evident in support of the welfare issues/factors identified which address both strengths and weaknesses in a balanced way</li> <li>• Comprehensive linkage of issues/factors to relevant welfare legislation/policy.</li> <li>• A comprehensive approach to scaling/ranking the issues/factors in terms of their impact is evident.</li> </ul>

## Activity 2

This activity asked learners to identify to what extent was the information provided in the stimulus materials useful and what additional information would have allowed them to complete a more comprehensive appraisal. This activity not performed quite as well as expected with learners either continuing with activity 1 in this space rather than answering the question. Some learners failed to address 'to what extent was the information provided useful' and simply listed what other additional information that would have assisted the welfare appraisal.

The isolation unit needs to have a separate outdoor area so it can meet the five animal welfare needs and not break the Animal Welfare Act 2006 the reason is so that you can prevent any diseases and illness from spreading to the other dogs. Having more qualified staff can help maintain all of the dogs needs and pick out abnormal behaviour within the kennel. This is important as it can prevent fights and stress with the animals. Having the dogs own report card can help a lot because this can give you information about the dog, what it likes what it don't like and if they're on medication or different food and even the amount to give to the dog. The isolation unit should only really take a couple of days to do but having more qualified staff could take a couple of weeks but the report cards can take an hour to do maybe less. They need to have a different

emergency plan as well as owner collection. Only calling the manager when they're not even there can waste a lot of time. If there is an ill animal take them straight to the isolation and give them a full health check, if it's bad take them to the vet. Owner collection, having to confirm the password to get your dog back is irresponsible. This can be fixed with the report card of the dog, put owners name and address and there shouldn't be any reason to mix that up. Cleaning the equipment everyday is hygienic and safe for the dogs as it can prevent disease spread and sickness.

The above response has scored 3 marks as it doesn't state whether any of the stimulus material was useful for conducting the welfare appraisal or why. It is a continuation of activity 1 however it also briefly outlines some additional stimulus material in the form of records with some reasoning that would have allowed for a comprehensive welfare appraisal to be conducted but does not really expand on this information.



- No. of dogs
- Size of accommodation
- Records required
- Overnight plans.

Whilst the daily plan is a good tool for an appraisal it doesn't detail what time the dogs arrive and doesn't include information for the overnight boarding. To allow a more comprehensive appraisal we need to know details of how the overnight boarding is managed. However the daily plan is useful ~~as~~ during an inspection not all activities are witnessed and you do not get an idea of a full working day.

Additional information such as the number of dogs on each day to compare with the staff rota would also allow a more comprehensive appraisal as we would be able to assess whether the staff requirements are being met and if the dogs welfare needs can be met. A daily register <sup>of dogs</sup> would therefore be a useful material to have.

The floor plan was useful ~~to~~ to see what facilities are available and where they are in relation to each other. However, additional information such as measurements for the facilities, especially the kennels would allow us to evaluate whether all welfare needs are being met. For example the minimum accommodation size regulations.

The staff procedures state that a health <sup>will be carried out</sup> check, + Owners details will be recorded on arrival. It would be beneficial to have an example of the records in order to evaluate whether appropriate information such as the dogs vaccination records, breed, sex, veterinarian etc. ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> being recorded. Other procedures which would allow a more comprehensive appraisal include: Feeding, prevention of diseases, health + behaviour records etc. These would allow ~~as~~ a full <sup>at least</sup> or a more detailed appraisal evaluating the welfare of the ~~animals~~ <sup>dogs</sup> in more situations and addressing a wider range of aspects relating to their care.

The above response is a clear evaluation of the suitability of the information that has been provided in the stimulus material. This response has achieved 9 of the 10 marks available for this activity, as it is structured by each piece of stimulus material and outlines the usefulness of the information that has been provided and what it allowed them to discuss, then going on to outline what additional information would enhance the appraisal giving of evident lines of reasoning to support the need for additional information.



### Activity 2 – Evaluation of evidence provided

Assessment focus	Band 0	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4
Additional information necessary to complete the appraisal	<b>0</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<b>3-5</b>	<b>6-8</b>	<b>9-10</b>
	No rewardable material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited evaluation of the suitability of the information.</li> <li>• Additional information identified is of limited relevance and would only partially improve the appraisal.</li> <li>• Limited lines of reasoning evident in support of either the evaluation or additional information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A partially developed evaluation of the suitability of the information.</li> <li>• Additional information identified is generally relevant and would adequately improve the appraisal.</li> <li>• Occasional lines of reasoning evident in support of both the evaluation and additional information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A developed evaluation of the suitability of the information.</li> <li>• Additional information identified is relevant and would effectively improve the appraisal.</li> <li>• Lines of reasoning mostly evident in support of both the evaluation and additional information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A comprehensive evaluation of the suitability of the information.</li> <li>• Additional information identified is consistently relevant and would considerably improve the appraisal.</li> <li>• Comprehensive lines of reasoning evident in support of both the evaluation and additional information.</li> </ul>

### Activity 3

Activity 3 is linked to activity 1 as learners produce an action plan based upon the welfare issues that they have raised in activity 1. As seen in the previous series some learners identified new issues here and when this occurred, they were credited additional marks to activity 1 for this material. A significant number of learners produced an action plan that did not apply and priority or realistic timescales as a result of this scored limited marks. The learners that achieved the best marks in this activity paid attention to the structure of their response and these included drawing a table or the use of headings and subheading and due to the formatting, they outlined the action, why the action was required and a timescale and priority.

When issues identified throughout the Shirevale doggy day care is that I think there should be a veterinary facility available within Shirevale because animals are staying overnight, and if so I think there should be a vet there in case of a problem highlighted by any of the dogs.

The Food prep room and Storage of cleaning equipment must be separate because food is being prepared in there and equipment for cleaning shouldn't be mixed. As well as having separate rooms for a dog food prep room and a human food prep room / Staff room. This is so that dog food and human food do not contaminate each other, which could then further ~~more~~ cause a dog or human to become really ill.

~~Having a bar should be~~ I don't think

Isolation should be ~~not~~ <sup>away</sup> from the free exercise area and the training/lead exercise area because these areas ~~could~~ might be very noisy at times and that could be very stressful for these dogs in isolation trying to rehabilitate and get better.

Also from what I can see there is no double door system in place so I think that it ~~that~~ be beneficially and really helpful if that was to be put in place so that it can minimise the risk of any dog escaping.

I would say the time scale for completing all of these things is a maximum of 3 months, because of building time, creating more space extra rooms for human food prep and dog food prep, cleaning equipment, a separate area for isolation, creating some double door systems. And adding a toilet on to the facility.

The above activity scored only 4 marks of the 10 available as the learner had produced an action that whilst it addressed a good number of the welfare issues raised all of the suggested actions had the same timeframe. This action plan therefore, failed to demonstrate any differentiation between the issues and failed to show an understanding of the priorities and timescales for the actions and their link to the animal's welfare.



Action	Reason for action	Timescale
Add kennels into isolation blocks	The reason for this is because the dogs in isolation could be in there for different reasons, for example, the kennels may be too noisy for them and they are too anxious so they need some time in a quieter area, other dogs may be in there for an illness, if you put these dogs in isolation and are able to mix together, the anxious dog may catch the illness of the other dog.	To build new kennels in the isolation block i think that 3 - 6 months should be enough time to get this fixed.
Change daily plan to make sure that animals get more time to rest, and to make sure that they have atleast half an hours rest once theyve finished their food.	The reason for this is because in the daily plan it doesnt show me anywhere that the dogs get some time to relax and unwind. It is important that they get some time to do this because some dogs which arent as active as others may not want to be on the go all day, this means that the animals needs are not being met as they arent in a suitable environment.	As this is only a small change, i think they should have 1 day to fix this, the reason that they are getting a day isbecause they need to find somewhere to fit it into the routine and they also need to alert members of staff about the changes, this shouldnt take more than a day to complete.
Add a drainage system around the centre	I cant see a drainage system in the facility layout, it is important that they have this because otherwise around the centre the ground may get soggy in bad weather conditions and this wont make it look very presentable.	I am giving them 1 - 2 months to complete this task as they first need to find out ways to do it and they need to find the money to hire someone to put this in place.
Swap a few of the daily plan activities around	Move the dog walk to after they eat, this is important because it means they get to go to the toilet before going out to play again.	1 day to sort this as they only have to let staff know and re-write it.
Start dog walking around the outside of the centre	Since the whole centre is indoors its a good idea to walk the dogs outside, this will get them some fresh air and new surroundings to sniff around, it also allows the dogs to have some natural light rather than artificial lights all day.	1 day, this won't take long as they just have to organise a route to walk the dogs on.

Hire new staff	Uma, Seamus and Cathy do not hve the qualifications to care for animals properly. New staff need to be hired so that the dogs are recieving the correct care by people who are better experienced and have good qualifications, at a minimum, Level 2 Animal Welfare.	6 months - this may take some time to complete as they would have to start advertising and go through interviews and trials before getting permanent staff.
New staff rota	It is not fair that Nik has to work 6 out of the 7 days in a week, especially on tuesday when she is the only person who is working - on this day only 10 dogs would be allowed and she would be expected to complete all the daily plans and cleaning tasks by herself which isnt fair.	2 weeks so that staff are aware of changes and have time to work around the new changes.
Create another day plan for husbandry	They have given me a staff procedure document which shows me the hygiene procedures and daily cares, however it hasnt been organised so these jobs can be easily missed out, there should be an activity routine for the dogs and another routine for staff which shows husbandry jobs which should be done and when it should be done by, with a name so that one person gets at least one job to do, they shouldnt be left for just one person to complete.	I am giving them two weeks to do this new plan, the reason for this is because they will need to test out the routine to make sure it fits in with the rest of the activities, they may also need to change rotas around as these jobs cant all be left to one person, so they need time for staff to be aware about rota changes.
Make a fire assembly point and give new instructions for when there is a fire	There needs to be a weekly fire drill in place to make sure that staff know what to do incase of a fire, anyone in the building needs to leave immeditely and meet in a safe place outside of the building, which is where instructions on what to do next will be given.	This is really important because people's lives could be at risk if a fire broke out and everyone didnt leave immediately so they will be given 1 day to do this.

The above response has scored 9 of the 10 available marks as the action plan has been well formatted as the learner has put all of the information in a table as seen. Which has resulted every action having reasons, timescales and priority demonstrating a clear understanding of the reasons for priorities and timescales.



### Activity 3 – Action plan in response to issues identified

Assessment focus	Band 0	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4
Action plan in response to welfare factors/issues identified	<b>0</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<b>3-5</b>	<b>6-8</b>	<b>9-10</b>
	No rewardable material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested actions are limited in terms of addressing the issues/factors identified.</li> <li>• Limited lines of reasoning evident in support of the actions.</li> <li>• Actions are listed without an attempt to prioritise.</li> <li>• Limited attempt to apply realistic timescales to the actions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested actions are adequate in terms of addressing the issues/factors identified.</li> <li>• Occasional lines of reasoning evident in support of the actions.</li> <li>• Actions are listed with an attempt to prioritise.</li> <li>• Adequately applies realistic timescales to the actions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested actions are good in terms of addressing the issues/factors identified.</li> <li>• Lines of reasoning evident in support of the actions.</li> <li>• Effectively prioritises most actions identified.</li> <li>• Effectively applies realistic timescales to the actions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggested actions are comprehensive in terms of addressing the issues/factors identified.</li> <li>• Comprehensive lines of reasoning evident in support of the actions.</li> <li>• Comprehensively prioritises all actions identified.</li> <li>• Comprehensively applies realistic timescales to the actions.</li> </ul>

As per the usual structure of this paper learners are given an additional scenario for activity 4, they are to use their knowledge and understanding of the ethical issues outlined in the specification and apply this to the stated scenario, in this case showing pedigree animal.

As seen in the previous series a number of learners addressed the scenario with no reference to any of the ethical theories. Again, as seen in previous series many learners simply outlined the ethical theories without any application to the given scenario limiting their ability to gain significant marks in this activity.

Showing pedigree animals is unethical because as mentioned in the stem some 'animals may travel the length and breadth of the country'. This means that animals may spend many hours in vehicles or in travel/carry cases. This is an ethical problem because they ~~have~~ right to the 5 needs have been taken away, straight away the need to exhibit natural behaviours has been removed. This is clear because in a small confined space it is impossible for a dog to get a sufficient level of exercise. This is further continued because once they arrive at the show they have to wait even longer which again is denying the dog from being able to exercise. As well as denying the animals the <sup>need</sup> right to exhibit natural behaviours it is also denying the need for a suitable environment as it includes suitable ventilation, outdoor

and outdoor access which a motor vehicle and a waiting room do not have. Thus, it being unethical to show ~~dogs~~ animals.

Another reason for it being unethical to show pedigree dogs is that once they are at the show there is no free time or alone time for the animals they are in constant 'public view'. This is an issue as it can cause psychological harm towards the animals as they are always being watched. Again this is against the 5 needs that protect the animals from harm, injury and illness. This is further shown as made worse by the dogs being in an unfamiliar environment, this can cause animals to become anxious as they do not know where they are or where 'home' is. This is again causing mental harm to the animals as it causes unnecessary stress. Thus, making it unethical practice to show animals.

Another reason for ~~it~~ it to be unethical to show animals is that they often live highly 'restricted lifestyles'. This could be due to the owner not allowing the animals to be dirty by going outside or from just always travelling from show to show. This is again unethical because it restricts the amount of natural behaviours that an

animal can exhibit thus proving unethical. This is further shown as specifically show dogs must be aligned with kennel club standards. However, these standards only determine the standards based on appearance. This means that many breeds are internally deformed in order to 'look right'. ~~Therefore~~ this then proves further its unethical as it also allows harm to occur in order for a winning animal.

However, one ethical practice of pedigree shows is that it encourages lots of bonding between pet and owner as well as extra attention like grooming and health care. This is ethical as it refers to the need to be housed with others, this relates to the owner and animal bond. As well as this the large prize ~~sum~~ sum that is given to the winner can be used to further care for the animal ethically and to the highest welfare standard. Therefore this evidence shows that showing animals is ~~ethical~~ ethical and should be continued.

In conclusion, pedigree animal shows are highly unethical as they ~~do not~~ rarely meet any of the five needs from the Welfare Act 2006.



as the only need that is met is the need to have a suitable diet plus the need to be housed with or without others. Plus even when the pedigree dog shows may appear to be ethical often animals that stop winning are sold or abandoned plus the prize money can only help one animal out of the thousands that take part. Thus pedigree shows are highly unethical.

The above response only achieved 7 marks of the 20 marks available as although it raised some real welfare regarding the ethics of showing animals and it had a balanced approach it failed to discuss any of the ethical theories make connections between these and the scenario provided.

Pedigree animals are widely viewed as ideal by many pet owners. Pure breeding means that dogs or other animals of a certain breed keep the desired characteristics of desired pedigree breeds. Those characteristics, more often than not, are genetically designed for aesthetic purposes. Characteristics such as shortened faces or curled tails are appealing traits to have in showing competitions as they reflect beauty that an animal is a true pedigree. Despite the appeal of certain physical attributes as a pedigree animal may have, the welfare of the animal is often jeopardised.

For instance, certain breeds of dog are designed and genetically modified for competitions, rather than to aid a dog's survival. Pug breeds are examples of those genetically modified for aesthetic purposes. Pugs have short, flat faces and large eyes so that they are more appealing in show competitions. But <sup>these</sup> characteristics mean that the pug will have

difficultly breathing. So regrets to the ethical decisions behind breeding pups with facial disabilities for the purpose of entertainment, a modern consequentialist ~~he~~ may consider this a cruel act. Consequentialism deals with the consequences of actions. The ~~not~~ morally correct action has the best overall consequence. So this ethical theory highlights moral judgement, and whether something is right or ~~wrong~~<sup>is wrong</sup>. Breeding animals for characteristics that hinder its ability to lead a normal life would be morally wrong in the eyes of a consequentialist. The consequence of this adaptation means the animal will suffer physically, ~~which may lead to it~~. As a result of physical suffering, the animal may not be able to perform simple behaviours, such as walking, eating or breathing. If an animal is inhibited from exhibiting normal behaviours and actions required for its survival then it will not only suffer physically, but mentally also. The welfare of animals is not considered a priority within the show-competition business, which ~~is~~ ~~can~~ ~~to~~ by some, is considered ethically ~~was~~ wrong and unjust.

Furthermore to this, pedigree dogs are often inter-bred, meaning animals who share the same genetic information are often bred together.



difficultly breathing. So regrets to the ethical decisions behind breeding pups with facial disabilities for the purpose of entertainments, a modern consequentialist may consider this a cruel act. Consequentialism deals with the consequences of actions. The morally correct action has the best overall consequence. So this ethical theory highlights moral judgement, and whether something is right or ~~wrong~~<sup>is wrong</sup>. Breeding animals for characteristics that hinder its ability to lead a normal life would be morally wrong in the eyes of a consequentialist. The consequence of this adaptation means the animal will suffer physically, which may lead to it

As a result of physical suffering, the animal may not be able to perform simple behaviours<sup>and actions</sup>, such as walking, eating or breathing. If an animal is inhibited from exhibiting normal behaviours and actions required for its survival then it will not only suffer physically, but mentally also. The welfare of animals is not considered a priority within the show-competition business, which ~~is~~ ~~seen~~ ~~to~~ by some, is considered ethically ~~was~~ wrong and unjust.

Furthermore to this, pedigree dogs are often inter-bred, meaning animals who share the same genetic information are often bred together.

Inter-breeding can lead to genetic mutations in generations of animals. As a result of this, the animals can develop physical abnormalities and disabilities that will can hinder its life expectancy and wellbeing. To consider this in a ~~de~~ ~~set~~ deontological way of thinking, it is ethically and morally ~~was~~ wrong to subject an animal to a life of difficulty on the basis that the animal's rights are not considered. Deontological people will get to do the right thing, regardless of the consequence just because it is the right thing to do. For some, the right thing to do would be to not inter-breed animals that may lead to a family life of suffering. However, pedigree breeders may disagree as they believe the right thing to do is to inter-breed animals so their genetic line is pure.

The issue with moral judgement is that what people consider to be right or wrong is completely unique to each person. A person's upbringing, religion, political beliefs may determine what they class as wrong or right.

Another ethical issue presented in this scenario includes the fact that pedigree animals often have to travel for long periods of time before they are presented and shown at competitions.



The animal will require regular breaks so they can urinate / defecate and stretch their legs. The animal may be uncomfortable, or irritable at having its space restricted during travelling. Not only this, but the animal will be exposed to new and potentially frightening situations that ~~can~~ could stress the animal out and ultimately impact its welfare. Environmental ethics would question whether this situation is centered on humans, animals or the environment. The needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few so to speak, so is the need for prize money and reputation greater than the ~~need~~ animal's need for comfort during traveling, and privacy against the public view? This is an ethical issue due to the fact that the sentient beings needs are often outweighed by the human greed and materialistic gain. As a society, it can usually be agreed upon that any action taken that will result in a life being jeopardized is morally wrong, and that an action taken to improve the a life is morally right. So in conclusion, this scenario is ethically wrong due to the fact that the animals are put through stressful, and disabling scenarios for the benefit of humans.

The above response has scored all of the 20 marks available for this activity as it has demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of the ethical theories which have been linked to the scenario of showing pedigree animals giving examples and reasoning throughout the response.



### Activity 4 – Ethical issues

Assessment focus	Band 0	Band 1	Band 2	Band 3	Band 4
Exploration /discussion of ethical issues on basis of information provided	<b>0</b>	<b>1-5</b>	<b>6-10</b>	<b>11-15</b>	<b>16-20</b>
	No rewardable material	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generic statements or isolated elements of knowledge and understanding, with many irrelevant issues.</li> <li>• Only one viewpoint is considered.</li> <li>• Lines of reasoning are unsupported or unclear, with serious logical flaws in the arguments put forward.</li> <li>• There is a lack of structure to the response with little use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Displays a superficial discussion leading to a superficial judgement rarely supported through the application of relevant evidence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates generally accurate knowledge and understanding of ethical issues relevant to the scenario with some lapses supported by occasional examples.</li> <li>• Two contrasting viewpoints are explored with some consideration of how they are interrelated.</li> <li>• Some occasional linkages present so that lines of reasoning are partially supported though following the argument may sometimes be difficult.</li> <li>• There is a clear structure to the response and appropriate terminology is used.</li> <li>• Displays a partially developed discussion leading to a judgement occasionally supported through the application of relevant evidence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of ethical issues relevant to the scenario supported by some examples.</li> <li>• Several viewpoints are explored with some consideration of how they are interrelated.</li> <li>• Linkages present so that lines of reasoning are supported and clear.</li> <li>• There is an effective structure to the response and consistent terminology is generally used.</li> <li>• Displays developed discussion leading to a judgement supported through the application of relevant evidence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate and thorough knowledge and understanding of the ethical issues relevant to the scenario supported by sustained examples.</li> <li>• Several viewpoints are explored with sustained consideration of how they are interrelated.</li> <li>• Comprehensive linkages evidenced so that lines of reasoning are well supported, clear and concise.</li> <li>• There is a clear and logical structure to the response with thorough use of appropriate terminology.</li> <li>• Displays a comprehensive discussion culminating in a judgement that is fully supported throughout by sustained application of relevant evidence.</li> </ul>

## Summary

Based on these performances on this paper learners should:

- Identify accurate and appropriate legislation within their response and apply these to the stimulus material provided.
- Identify accurate welfare issues within the stimulus material and explain the implications of these issues
- Link their response to both the requirements of the legislation and licensing in addition to the issues found within the stimulus material provided
- Use the number of marks awarded as a guide to the depth of the response required and read the question and ensure it is addressed
- Know the different ethical theories and be able to apply them in different scenarios demonstrating understanding through the use of relevant examples

For more information on Pearson qualifications, please visit

<http://qualifications.pearson.com/en/home.html>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE



