

PMT Mock Paper Set A

Answers - Section 3

Task 1

This question could be approached in a number of ways. One could be to consider the issue of **foreign aid**, where distance can distort the view of the problem to the point where it looks a lot more simple than it actually is. In this instance, idealism can disregard the complexity of the problem, making foreign aid much less effective than intended. Nonetheless, it could also be argued that by having an idealistic idea of what we want to reach, it makes us achieve greater things than if we did not have this goal - a sort of “reach beyond your grasp”. For example, even though it is an idealistic goal to make the whole population healthy, it drives us to find **cures** for more and more diseases rather than simply stop when we have cured a certain proportion.

Example essay ideas

- Introduction
 - Explain the quote: the more separated and distant you are from a problem, the simpler you might imagine the solution to be (so more idealistic).
- Arguments for
 - Idealism can lead to problems being solved “halfway”, which can itself lead to further issues.
 - **Example:** Foreign aid can often seem like a simple solution to fix a country’s lack of resources, but it is often forgotten that maintenance will be needed.
 - **Example:** From a political perspective, the general public can perceive a problem to be easier to solve than it is in reality, due to their lack of political knowledge.
 - First world countries trying to help those fighting war in e.g. low income countries, tend to be removed both by physical distance and also because the concept of war to them is so foreign without experiencing it first hand. This mental distance and idealistic hopes of world peace may not be as useful to them as using factual information to achieve a more realistic outcome.
- Arguments against
 - A little bit of idealism can be helpful as motivation or as a final goal.
 - **Example:** It is idealistic to think that we will manage to cure everyone in the country of their respective illnesses, but this “ultimate goal” drives us to find more cures for more diseases. We do not simply stop once we have cured a certain proportion of diseases.
 - Without idealism, we may sink into pessimism and never solve the problem at all as it appears too complex.



- **Example:** It could be argued that medicine is somewhat based on idealism - we might give a patient a drug that has a small chance of working but will take that chance over doing nothing.
 - Positive thinking tends to lead to better results.
 - **Example:** In terms of wars, if people had a negative view about the outcome, then they may never attempt to try to help those in need. Organisations such as Unicef and the British Red Cross may not exist.
 - Idealism or the wish for a perfect world may cause somewhat unrealistic expectations, but this may mean they strive harder to make them a reality. Which would potentially mean they are more likely to achieve their final result.
- Conclusion
 - We need to be realistic about the problems that we approach and not simply decide that the solution is simple based on a superficial examination of the issues surrounding it.
 - **However**, idealism, when recognised for what it is, can serve as a motivator to help us achieve things we may not have thought possible before.

Task 2

Potential answers could include references to the **duties of a doctor** as important principles, and how these must be followed to maintain a patient's dignity and respect. Nonetheless, it can be argued that these should not remain inflexible as this disregards the **context** of the situation - for example, patient autonomy in times where the patient is incapacitated. Should this principle remain inflexible, the doctor may be prevented from acting in the patient's best interests as they have not received explicit patient consent. However, medical perspectives are not the only valid examples, others could include **human rights** such as **freedom of speech**, which, it could be argued, should be supported only to the extent that it does not become a hate crime.

Example essay ideas

- Introduction
 - Explain the quote: for important principles to maintain their integrity, they must not be changed or adjusted, but respected as they are.
- Arguments for
 - If we allow important principles to be subject to change, it sets a precedent that they do not necessarily need to be followed.
 - **Example:** Racism should not be tolerated under any circumstances, and even in the face of free-speech arguments it is inflexible.
 - In medicine, we have the 4 pillars of medical ethics that guide us and that should be followed by all doctors.



- Important principles should be inflexible in all fields, companies included.
- **Example:** Freedom of speech should not be limited by the state **or** a company - it is unethical for a company to prevent workers from speaking against it.
- People would never follow laws if they perceive them and the principles they represent to be flexible.
- **Example:** currently sexual assault can result in a sentencing, but could this be overturned in the future such as when homosexuality was decriminalised?

- Arguments against
 - The context of the situation should be considered otherwise the subtleties of the issue can lead to the principle being applied inappropriately.
 - **Example:** Patient autonomy is one of the most important principles, yet even this can be overturned if the patient is incapacitated.
 - Sometimes we must value the safety of others over some of these important principles.
 - **Example:** Freedom of speech is important but cannot be tolerated when it becomes hate-speech.
 - If laws are never allowed to be changed, then this would mean we can never advance with our views on what is acceptable and fair in society.
 - **Example:** Death penalties would therefore still exist in most countries as punishment and we could never improve on previous laws.

- Conclusion
 - Generally, important principles should be respected in order to maintain their integrity
 - **However**, we cannot ignore the subtleties involved in situations, so on occasions they must be flexible to prevent harm.

Task 3

This question can be expected to produce answers centering around **patient autonomy**. It is complicated by the fact that the choice of the child is given to the parent, and that therefore by not vaccinating their child they are risking infection. Answers may also reference **herd immunity**, either that compulsory vaccination would optimise this, or that it enables unvaccinated children to not be at such high risk of contracting the disease. Candidates could potentially reference **non-maleficence** with regards to the wider society - by not making vaccination compulsory, herd immunity within the society is not as strong so people could be harmed.



Example essay ideas

- Introduction
 - Explain the statement: Children should be vaccinated by law, regardless of their parents' wishes/opinions.
- Arguments for
 - Vaccination undoubtedly produced results, so having compulsory vaccination could lead to eradication of more diseases.
 - **Example:** Polio has been eradicated in the UK.
 - Vaccination of more people makes herd immunity stronger. To not vaccinate children could be considered to go against the principle of nonmaleficence since it puts other members of the public at risk.
 - **Example:** With the spreading of the inaccurate study that MMR vaccines cause autism, fewer parents vaccinated their children and therefore the prevalence of these diseases rose.
 - Some children are at higher risk of contracting diseases because their parents chose not to have them vaccinated. It could be said that this takes away the choice of the child to be protected?
 - Every year it prevents many childhood illnesses that potentially could have been fatal. Vaccinations can also be used as a preventative treatment in terms of vastly reducing the risk of cervical cancer.
 - Medical organisations, pharmaceutical companies and peer reviewed journals are all in agreement that vaccinations are safe and will cause no harm to people who take them, so there is no reason for them to not be mandatory.
- Arguments against
 - Taking away the choice undermines autonomy.
 - **Example:** Parents make choices about their child's treatments until the child is deemed to have the capacity to make their own decisions. Many of the vaccinations are given to infants, who cannot make decisions yet.
 - While rare, there are still instances where vaccines can have adverse effects. It is unethical to submit patients to this.
 - **Example:** Some patients may have allergic reactions, or even anaphylactic shock in response to some vaccines.
 - Taking away the choice from patients, could undermine the trust that patients put in the medical profession, and make them view it with hostility.
 - 'Live' vaccinations could pose a risk for children who are immunocompromised, for example have HIV.
 - **Example:** Any of the common side effects such as a mild fever could be much worse and more dangerous in these patients.
 - Everyone requiring vaccinations may violate some religious or cult beliefs.



- Conclusion
 - Compulsory vaccination would have health benefits which cannot be ignored - fewer people would die from preventable diseases.
 - **However** it does undermine autonomy and have serious consequences in terms of patient hostility towards the medical profession.



General Marking Criteria for All Questions

(Taken from Admissions Testing, you can find the original [here](#).)

Quality of Content

In arriving at the score, you should consider:

- Has the candidate addressed the question in the way demanded?
- Have they organised their thoughts clearly?
- Have they used their general knowledge and opinions appropriately?

Scores are awarded on a scale from 1 to 5.

Score 1

An answer that has some bearing on the question but which does not address the question in the way demanded, is incoherent or unfocussed.

Score 2

An answer that addresses most of the components of the question and is arranged in a reasonably logical way. There may be significant elements of confusion in the argument. The candidate may misconstrue certain important aspects of the main proposition or its implication or may provide an unconvincing or weak counter proposition.

Score 3

A reasonably well-argued answer that addresses ALL aspects of the question, making reasonable use of the material provided and generating a reasonable counter proposition or argument. The argument is relatively rational. There may be some weakness in the force of the argument or the coherence of the ideas, or some aspect of the argument may have been overlooked.

Score 4

A good answer with few weaknesses. ALL aspects of the question are addressed, making good use of the material and generating a good counter proposition or argument. The argument is rational. Ideas are expressed and arranged in a coherent way, with a balanced consideration of the proposition and counter proposition.

Score 5

An excellent answer with no significant weaknesses. ALL aspects of the question are addressed, making excellent use of the material and generating an excellent counter proposition or argument. The argument is cogent. Ideas are expressed in a clear and logical way, considering a breadth of relevant points and leading to a compelling synthesis or conclusion.

An answer judged to be irrelevant, trivial, unintelligible or missing should be given a score of **0**.



Quality of English

In arriving at your score, you should consider:

- Have they expressed themselves clearly using concise, compelling and correct English?

Scores are awarded on a scale from A to E.

Band A - Good use of English.

- Fluent
- Good sentence structure
- Good use of vocabulary
- Sound use of grammar
- Good spelling and punctuation
- Few slips or errors

Band C - Reasonably clear use of English.

There may be some weakness in the effectiveness of the English.

- Reasonably fluent/not difficult to read
- Simple/unambiguous sentence structure
- Fair range and appropriate use of vocabulary
- Acceptable grammar
- Reasonable spelling and punctuation
- Some slips/errors

Band E - Rather weak use of English.

- Hesitant fluency/not easy to follow at times
- Some flawed sentence structure/paragraphing
- Limited range of vocabulary
- Faulty grammar
- Regular spelling/punctuation errors
- Regular and frequent slips or errors

Where candidates have crossed out sections or added information, the essay should be judged on the quality of the resulting use of English (i.e. crossed out text ignored, and inserted text read as if it were originally in place).

An essay that is judged to be below the level of an E will receive an X.

