

## **Religious Studies**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G572**: Religious Ethics

### **Mark Scheme for June 2012**

---

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2012

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Level one – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level two – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level three – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level four – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level five – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Highlighting a section of the response that is irrelevant to the awarding of the mark.
	Point has been seen and noted, e.g. where part of an answer is at the end of the script.

## Subject-specific Marking Instructions

## Handling of unexpected answers

If you are not sure how to apply the mark scheme to an answer, you should contact your Team Leader.

NOTE: AO2 material in AO1 answers must not be cross-credited and vice-versa.

**AS Preamble and Instructions to Examiners**

The purpose of a marking scheme is to ‘... enable examiners to mark in a standardised manner’ [CoP 1999 25.xiv]. It must ‘allow credit to be allocated for what candidates know, understand and can do’ [xv] and be ‘clear and designed to be easily and consistently applied’ [x].

The **Religious Studies Subject Criteria** [1999] define ‘what candidates know, understand and can do’ in terms of two Assessment Objectives, weighted for the OCR Religious Studies specification as indicated:

All candidates must be required to meet the following assessment objectives.

Knowledge, understanding and skills are closely linked. Specifications should require that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the content and skills prescribed.

- AO1:** Select and demonstrate clearly relevant knowledge and understanding through the use of evidence, examples and correct language and terminology appropriate to the course of study.
- AO2:** Sustain a critical line of argument and justify a point of view.

The requirement to assess candidates’ quality of written communication will be met through both assessment objectives.

In order to ensure the marking scheme can be ‘easily and consistently applied’, and to ‘enable examiners to mark in a standardised manner’, it defines Levels of Response by which candidates’ answers are assessed. This ensures that comparable standards are applied across the various units as well as within the team of examiners marking a particular unit. Levels of Response are defined according to the two Assessment Objectives; in Advanced Subsidiary, the questions are in two parts, each addressing a single topic and targeted explicitly at one of the Objectives.

**Positive awarding:** it is a fundamental principle of OCR’s assessment in Religious Studies at Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced GCE that candidates are rewarded for what they ‘know, understand and can do’ and to this end examiners are required to assess every answer by the Levels according to the extent to which it addresses a reasonable interpretation of the question. In the marking scheme each question is provided with a brief outline of the likely content and/or lines of argument of a ‘standard’ answer, but this is by no means prescriptive or exhaustive. Examiners are required to have subject knowledge to a high level and the outlines do not attempt to duplicate this.

Examiners must **not** attempt to reward answers according to the extent to which they match the structure of the outline, or mention the points it contains. The specification is designed to allow teachers to approach the content of modules in a variety of ways from any of a number of perspectives, and candidates’ answers must be assessed in the light of this flexibility of approach. It is quite possible for an excellent and valid answer to contain knowledge and arguments which do not appear in the outline; each answer must be assessed on its own merits according to the Levels of Response.

**Key Skill of Communication:** this is assessed at both Advanced Subsidiary and A2 as an integral part of the marking scheme. The principle of positive awarding applies here as well: candidates should be rewarded for good written communication, but marks may not be deducted for inadequate written communication; the quality of communication is integral to the quality of the answer in making its meaning clear. The Key Skill requirements in Communication at Level 3 include the following evidence requirements for documents about complex subjects, which can act as a basis for assessing the Communications skills in an examination answer:

- Select and use a form and style of writing that is appropriate to your purpose and complex subject matter.
- Organise relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.
- Ensure your text is legible and your spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate, so your meaning is clear.

**Levels of Response:** the descriptions are cumulative, ie a description at one level builds on or improves the descriptions at lower levels. Not all the qualities listed in a level must be demonstrated in an answer for it to fall in that level (some of the qualities are alternatives and therefore mutually exclusive). There is no expectation that an answer will receive marks in the same level for the two AOs.

Question		Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>There are a variety of responses to this question and it is not necessary that candidates cover every aspect.</p> <p>Candidates may explain the issues of obtaining sperm by masturbation and the issue of possibly involving a third party and divorcing reproduction from the sexual act.</p> <p>Candidates may explain the fundamental questions of when human life begins and what the status of the embryo is. This may involve considering whether human life only starts at implantation in the uterus.</p> <p>They may explain about the spare embryos that may be kept for up to fourteen days for experimentation or which may be stored or destroyed.</p> <p>They may explain that the screening of embryos before implantation means that any imperfections can be weeded out and whether this will lead parents to choose to remove undesirable traits and who decides what is undesirable.</p> <p>Responses may also consider whether older women, past child-bearing age, will be able to have children.</p> <p>They may also explain that IVF means that a quick, if not easy, fix has been found to the problem of infertility and miscarriages, so there is less research into the causes of infertility with a view to prevention.</p> <p>They may also explain that IVF is not very successful. It is expensive and the hormone drugs used to increase fertility are potentially dangerous.</p>	25	<p>The issues <b>surrounding</b> the right to a child are listed on page 18 of the specification on the right hand side.</p> <p>Some candidates approach this through ethical theories e.g. Natural Law, Kantian ethics, Utilitarianism and Religious Ethics – this is fine so long as the ethical issues are raised, but is NOT necessary.</p> <p>Some candidates approach the question looking at what rights are and where they come from.</p> <p>Some look at who has rights: older women? Same sex couples? etc.</p> <p>Some look also at issues surrounding IVF – spare embryos, cost, surrogacy etc. This is often approached through ethical theories but does not need to be.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Candidates may say that a child cannot be a right, as life is a sacred gift. They may also consider whether IVF etc interferes with nature.</p> <p>Candidates may consider whether a child is a gift, or whether a reproduction is a right. Candidates may also consider whether everyone should have the right to a child and reference could be made to IVF and surrogacy.</p> <p>Some candidates may argue that the right to a child is relative depending on cost. However, they may also say that infertility is a condition that can be treated and that couples have a right to treatment so that they have a child that belongs to them biologically.</p>	10	<p>Candidates can use the information from 1(a) but need to evaluate.</p> <p>Some discuss where rights come from and who decides and whether having a child is in fact a right.</p> <p>Some seem to consider that having a child as a right is a given, but this needs to be evaluated.</p> <p>The question of the child as a gift is linked to religious views and implies a gift from God.</p>
2	(a) <p>There are many approaches that can be taken to this question and it is not necessary for candidates to cover all of them.</p> <p>Candidates may consider the different types of euthanasia active, passive, voluntary, involuntary – though this is not necessary.</p> <p>They may explain the concept of the Sanctity of Life and how it applies to euthanasia. They may also explain personhood and question how this concept applies to a person in PVS. They may explain a proportionalist position.</p> <p>Candidates may also explain issues of personal autonomy and discuss the question of maintaining life at all costs. They may explain the reasons why people might choose to end their own life.</p> <p>They may consider James Rachels' distinction between killing and letting die.</p>	25	<p>The issues surrounding euthanasia are listed on page 18 of the specification on the right hand side.</p> <p>Sanctity of Life linked to religious views – 'image of God' and the value of human life.</p> <p>Examples often used to explain the idea of Quality of Life e.g. Diane Pretty, Daniel James, Tony Bland.</p> <p>Personhood – they may discuss whether someone in PVS is still a person or a 'diminished person'</p> <p>Candidates may consider the issue of palliative care and whether this is a good use of resources.</p> <p>Candidates may consider the slippery slope argument and whether euthanasia is the thin edge of the wedge.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Responses may also explain that euthanasia is against Natural Law, but death can seem to be allowed by the Doctrine of Double Effect. They may explain that a person may refuse treatment if it will not enhance their life expectancy.</p>		<p>Candidates do not have to talk specifically about voluntary euthanasia, but might explain the issues surrounding passive euthanasia, DNR, acts and omissions.</p> <p>They may discuss the Hippocratic Oath and the Quality of Life.</p>
(b)	<p>Candidates may support the statement by discussing the Sanctity of Life and how all life is God-given and valuable.</p> <p>They may consider the effect of euthanasia on society and doctor/patient relationships were Quality of Life to be the deciding factor. They may say the quality of a person's life cannot only be measured medically and also includes their value to the wider community.</p> <p>On the other hand candidates may argue that the quality of a person's life is the most important factor. They may use the arguments of Peter Singer or Situation Ethics to support this view.</p> <p>They may also consider the use of medical resources which may not improve the Quality of Life.</p>	10	<p>Candidates can use the information from 2(a) but need to evaluate.</p> <p>Some candidates discuss how the Quality of Life might be manipulated and so Sanctity of Life and personhood are more important.</p> <p>Dying with dignity may be discussed.</p> <p>They may look at the fact that the Quality of Life is a relative concept.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>They may approach this answer using the ethics of any religion studied e.g. the Lesser Jihad in Islam and Ahimsa in Hinduism.</p> <p>Candidates may explain teachings from religious texts such as the Bible or Qur'an, using perhaps the concept of Holy War or Lesser Jihad.</p> <p>Candidates may discuss the <i>jus ad bellum</i> criteria of Just War Theory – explaining just cause, legitimate authority, right intention, likelihood of success, proportionality and last resort. They may consider the teachings of scholars such as Augustine of Hippo, Thomas Aquinas, Francisco de Vitoria, Francisco Suarez, and Hugo Grotius.</p> <p>They may give examples from actual wars to illustrate their answers.</p> <p>Candidates may also explain the pacifist approach and how some followers of religion would never decide to go to war.</p> <p>Some answers may even consider a Christian Realist approach to war such as that of Niebuhr.</p>	25	<p>Some answers consider the Situation Ethics approach that war can be justified for a loving outcome.</p> <p>Buddhism would not justify going to war. Judaism would use both scriptural and rabbinic justification.</p> <p>Some answers may use a Natural Law approach and discuss the primary precepts of preservation of life and living in society.</p> <p>There is no expectation for candidates to evaluate all the different religious positions on going to war.</p>
(b)	<p>Candidates may discuss that many religious followers choose to be pacifist, as were the early Christians. They may explain the Biblical basis for this.</p> <p>A Buddhist approach might agree with this statement but needs to contain an evaluative argument.</p> <p>Candidates may discuss the approach of particular groups within Christianity such as the Quakers, and some may discuss the influence of main stream Christians such as Thomas Merton and Walter Wink.</p>	10	<p>Biblical arguments for pacifism could be included such as 'turning the other cheek' which could be contrasted with <i>lex talionis</i>.</p> <p>Some discuss the fact that religion is also concerned with justice, and pacifism may allow evil to triumph.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>They may also consider that religious followers consider that the protection of human life to be of the utmost importance and so sometimes pacifism is not the right approach as it does not allow for the protection of the innocent, or self-defence as Elizabeth Anscombe pointed out.</p> <p>Candidates are free to argue either way using evidence from their studies.</p>		
4	<p>(a)</p> <p>This is a general question and a variety of approaches may be used. Candidates may refer to ethical theories (but this is not necessary) which could be considered deontological or teleological, or they may give examples of the different approaches.</p> <p>Candidates may begin by explaining that deontological approaches to ethical decision making look at whether the action itself is right or wrong, whilst teleological approaches consider the consequences of an action.</p> <p>They may explain that deontological theories are often more absolute and take account of motives and intentions, whereas teleological theories may be more relative and consider outcomes and purpose.</p> <p>Candidates may use examples of deontological approaches to ethics such as Kantian ethics or Divine Command theory. Candidates may use examples such as lying or killing.</p> <p>Candidates may use Utilitarianism as an example of teleological ethics and explain how actions are judged good by bringing the best consequences to all.</p> <p>Some candidates may consider that some ethical approaches have elements of both deontology and teleology such as Natural Law and the prima facie duties of W. D. Ross.</p>	25	<p>Candidates must explain the differences between deontological and teleological approaches and not just outline.</p> <p>The differences might be explained in the beginning and concluding paragraph with examples in between, and this should be credited.</p> <p>Most answers consider Utilitarianism, Kant or Natural Law and use examples.</p> <p>Candidates might introduce other relevant ethical theories such as Situation Ethics and even Virtue Ethics.</p> <p>Many candidates will link teleological approaches to relativism and deontological approaches to absolutism and this should not be discounted.</p> <p>Some candidates might distinguish that relativism and absolutism are not exclusively linked to teleology and deontology such as Natural Law.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>Candidates may agree with this statement as long as a good result is obtained.</p> <p>Candidates may also argue that we cannot predict the consequences of our actions. They may say that personal responsibility for our actions is more important and there is no way that the ends justify the means as we cannot be sure of achieving those ends.</p> <p>They may say that the statement allows bad actions e.g. torture, so long as the right result is obtained. They might show that the probability of obtaining this result would need to be considered.</p> <p>They may also argue that it is only natural to consider the consequences when making ethical decisions. They may say that the actions themselves are ethically neutral and can only be judged on the results they achieve. This may mean that the end justifies the means so that teleological ethics may give good results even if the means are not so good – e.g. killing a tyrant to free a people from his despotic rule.</p>	10	<p>Some responses discuss the idea that morality is not necessarily focussed on expediency.</p> <p>Some look at pragmatic considerations e.g. killing a tyrant may be wrong but many lives may be saved and so is justified. Ideas of lesser evils may be introduced.</p>

## APPENDIX 1

## AS Levels of Response

Level	Mark /25	AO1	Mark /10	AO2
0	0	absent/no relevant material	0	absent/no argument
1	1–5	almost completely ignores the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>little relevant material</li> <li>some concepts inaccurate</li> <li>shows little knowledge of technical terms</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L1</i></p>	1–2	very little argument or justification of viewpoint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>little or no successful analysis</li> <li>views asserted with no justification</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L1</i></p>
Communication: often unclear or disorganised; can be difficult to understand; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate				
2	6–10	A basic attempt to address the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>knowledge limited and partially accurate</li> <li>limited understanding</li> <li>might address the general topic rather than the question directly</li> <li>selection often inappropriate</li> <li>limited use of technical terms</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L2</i></p>	3–4	a basic attempt to sustain an argument and justify a viewpoint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some analysis, but not successful</li> <li>views asserted but little justification</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L2</i></p>
Communication: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts – spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate				
3	11–15	satisfactory attempt to address the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some accurate knowledge</li> <li>appropriate understanding</li> <li>some successful selection of material</li> <li>some accurate use of technical terms</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L3</i></p>	5–6	the argument is sustained and justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some successful analysis which may be implicit</li> <li>views asserted but not fully justified</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L3</i></p>
Communication: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts – spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate				
4	16–20	a good attempt to address the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>accurate knowledge</li> <li>good understanding</li> <li>good selection of material</li> <li>technical terms mostly accurate</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L4</i></p>	7–8	a good attempt at using evidence to sustain an argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some successful and clear analysis</li> <li>some effective use of evidence</li> <li>views analysed and developed</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L4</i></p>
Communication: generally clear and organised; can be understood as a whole – spelling, punctuation and grammar good				
5	21–25	A very good/excellent attempt to address the question showing understanding and engagement with the material <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>very high level of ability to select and deploy relevant information</li> <li>accurate use of technical terms</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L5</i></p>	9–10	A very good/excellent attempt to sustain an argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>comprehends the demands of the question</li> <li>uses a range of evidence</li> <li>shows understanding and critical analysis of different viewpoints</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L5</i></p>
Communication: answer is well constructed and organised – easily understood; spelling, punctuation and grammar very good				

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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**Education and Learning**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

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

© OCR 2012

