

Religious Studies

Advanced GCE

Unit **G582**: 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

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.

NOTE: AO1 level must be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin, with the AO2 level used immediately below.

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.

A2 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.

At A level, candidates are required to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding, and their ability to sustain a critical line of argument in greater depth and over a wider range of content than at AS level.

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 A2, candidates answer a single question but are reminded by a rubric of the need to address both Objectives in their answers. Progression from Advanced Subsidiary to A2 is provided, in part, by assessing their ability to construct a coherent essay, and this is an important part of the Key Skill of Communication which ‘must contribute to the assessment of Religious Studies at AS and A level’.

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.

* Synoptic skills and the ability to make connections: these are now assessed at A2 as specification, due to the removal of the Connections papers.

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	<p>AO1</p> <p>Candidates will most likely begin by explaining the views of Butler, that conscience came from God and was a person's God-given guide to right conduct. They may explain that conscience is understood by Butler as harmonising self-love and benevolence and must be obeyed if we want to live a happy life. They may explain the issue of corrupting our conscience by self-deception, but that Butler saw Conscience as having supreme authority. Candidates may also discuss that Butler placed value on the process of reflection.</p> <p>Responses may also include the arguments of Aquinas and Newman and may connect these claims with the concept of innateness.</p> <p>The influence of sociologists and psycho-analysts may be introduced to oppose the idea of an innate sense of right and wrong, eg Freud and Fromm. They may explain that this idea is the result of social conditioning, environment etc.</p> <p>Some candidates may question the concept of an innate sense of right and wrong and argue that there is no substance to it. Explanations should not be overly historical.</p>	35	<p>A high level answer must have Butler as the focus and not just write a general conscience essay or focus solely on the idea of conscience as innate. They may also give specific criteria by which one can judge whether Butler's views are convincing.</p> <p>Some responses might focus on the view that conscience is a rational faculty and this is developed by Aquinas. Credit can also be given to other views on conscience e.g. McNamara, Kierkegaard.</p> <p>Some may contrast Butler's views with the view that conscience is a genetic predisposition.</p> <p>One common mistake is that innate means God given and this is not the case.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>AO2 This could be argued either way.</p> <p>Some candidates may claim that our sense of right and wrong is God-given and so innate but not infallible and requires training. Others may relate it to revelation.</p> <p>They may argue that conscience is the divine voice which tells us which actions are right and which are wrong, and so is innate.</p> <p>Others may prefer a Freudian case or a sociological explanation, arguing that our sense of right and wrong is not innate but learnt.</p>		

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>AO1 Candidates could explain and contrast different ethical theories: religious ethics; Natural Law; Utilitarianism; Kantian ethics; Virtue Ethics etc. and their approaches to ethical business practice.</p> <p>They may consider different aspects of business: the relationship between employers and employees, business and consumers, business and globalisation etc. Alternatively they may limit their discussion to applying ethical theories to one or two of these stakeholders and consider them in greater depth.</p> <p>They might consider the influences of society, environment, etc on business, and the influence business has on the environment.</p> <p>AO2 Candidates may consider the ethical theories helpful, or may simply conclude that they have nothing to do with business whose sole purpose is to make a profit i.e. the Shareholder Model.</p> <p>They may discuss whether there are any absolute principles that are binding in every business relationship and they may discuss whether ethical principles are in fact good for business, giving a better image and promoting profit.</p> <p>They could show how each of the ethical theories has its own advantages as far as business is concerned: Utilitarianism promoting good results for the majority; Kantian ethics promoting duty and not treating people as a means to an end and promoting universal ethical business practices such as no bribery; Virtue Ethics showing the role of business in society etc.</p>	35	<p>Answers from Kant may illustrate duty with his example of the dealer who does not overcharge his customers. They may consider that Kant is not so useful as he will not allow the sort of compromises that take place in business nor does he help with clashing duties – for example to shareholders v workers or other stakeholders etc.</p> <p>Answers from Natural Law may emphasise the societal role in the primary precepts and the idea of collective responsibility so that the purpose of business is not only to make a profit but also to maintain the social order.</p> <p>Answers may also give specific criteria to judge the idea of helpfulness.</p> <p>Some responses might suggest that ethical business practice means treating all stakeholders fairly rather than focusing exclusively on profit.</p> <p>Some candidates might use examples of business practice such as John Lewis and/or Nestle and apply ethical theories to these. Candidates may even contrast their examples and this would be a valid approach.</p> <p>Credit will be given to other approaches such as Situation Ethics.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>AO1 Candidates may begin by explaining the different approaches to meta ethics and explaining that ethical language can be seen as subjective or objective.</p> <p>The word <i>objective</i> can be taken to mean cognitive, factual or meaningful.</p> <p>Ethical Naturalists e.g. Bradley, may see that all ethical language has objective meaning.</p> <p>They may explain the views of Ayer who states that ethical statements cannot be objective but merely evince or express emotion, and so cannot be proved true or false.</p> <p>They may also consider the view of other non-cognitive approaches such as that of Stevenson or Hare's Prescriptivism which while it accepts that moral statements have a prescriptive meaning allow for moral principles to alter as we choose or as situations alter.</p> <p>They may contrast this with an intuitionist approach using scholars such as G. E. Moore and explaining that moral statements represent facts and are, therefore, objective.</p>	35	<p>Candidates may interpret the word objective as factual, cognitive or meaningful. Some may even interpret it in normative terms and show how normative ethical theories may see moral statements as being subjective or objective. These are a valid interpretation and will be credited.</p> <p>Some candidates may present a description of Meta-Ethical theories without making specific critical reference to objectivity (however it is interpreted) and this may be a good response. However, those answers which have focused more specifically on objectivity in some form are more likely to access the higher level.</p> <p>Some candidates may suggest that non-naturalists may see language as objective or argue that all knowledge is objective.</p> <p>Some candidates have used normative ethical theories to show how moral statements have objective meaning when used in practise. This is a valid approach.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>AO2 Candidates could assess the strengths of the claims of the different scholars, examining cognitive and non-cognitive approaches.</p> <p>They could assess that naturalistic fallacy and assess whether our moral intuitions come largely from social conditioning and vary from culture to culture, and, therefore, moral statements cannot have objective meaning.</p> <p>They may use the ideas of Wittgenstein to assess whether moral statements are objective as long as one understands and accepts the context.</p> <p>They could assess the strength of the claim in this question, and argue it either way. They may wish to compare ethical language with other forms of language.</p>		

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>AO1</p> <p>Candidates may recognise the question as a Kantian approach to the environment and may outline Kant's Categorical Imperative. They may explain that, for Kant, nature and animals have no intrinsic worth and the Categorical Imperative applies only to humans.</p> <p>Candidates may explain some environmental problems and why we have a duty and moral responsibility to the environment.</p> <p>Some responses may question whether we have moral imperative to care for the environment and where it comes from. They may consider a corporate or global sense of responsibility.</p> <p>Candidates may look at different ethical approaches to the environment and contrast their approaches to moral responsibility in this area. They may contrast anthropocentric approaches with those of deep ecology, and look at the different approaches of religious ethics.</p>	35	<p>It is possible for candidates to answer this from a variety of angles, not necessarily focusing on Kant. Some may even ignore Kant completely without undue prejudice.</p> <p>Candidates may consider that modern neo-Kantians such as Hepburn may extend the Formula of the End in itself to the natural world. They may consider Kant's awe for natural world and so would say that it should not be exploited to serve the needs of humans.</p> <p>Candidates may look at what sort of moral imperative we have – intrinsic, to the environment itself, or instrumental, for our benefit.</p> <p>Candidates could argue by using an example such as a development in the green belt or re-forestation and show why this would or would not be a moral imperative.</p> <p>Some may even turn the question around and ask whether the environment has a moral imperative to care for us. They could use the Gaia hypothesis in this or suggest that our moral imperative is to keep Gaia 'happy'.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>AO2</p> <p>This could be argued either way – either considering that we do have a moral imperative to care for the environment, whether this comes from God or society or neither. They may discuss whether just as it is wrong to treat people as a means to an end so it is wrong not to protect animals as it would be impossible not to include the environment in which people live as part of the ‘Kingdom of Ends’, or arguing that we only need to consider the needs of humans.</p> <p>Alternatively they may argue that we only have a moral imperative to look after the environment in so far as it benefits human needs, and that we not need to preserve species that do not benefit us. However, they may also argue that we have environmental obligations to future generations.</p> <p>Candidates may discuss why we need to be responsible for the environment – just for ourselves or also for animals, plants and even life itself.</p>		

APPENDIX 1 A2 LEVELS OF RESPONSE – G581–G589

Level	Mark /21	AO1	Mark /14	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"> little relevant material some concepts inaccurate shows little knowledge of technical terms <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L1</i></p>	1–3	very little argument or justification of viewpoint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> little or no successful analysis views asserted with no justification <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	6–9	A basic attempt to address the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> knowledge limited and partially accurate limited understanding might address the general topic rather than the question directly selection often inappropriate limited use of technical terms <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L2</i></p>	4–6	a basic attempt to sustain an argument and justify a viewpoint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some analysis, but not successful views asserted but little justification <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	10–13	satisfactory attempt to address the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some accurate knowledge appropriate understanding some successful selection of material some accurate use of technical terms <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L3</i></p>	7–8	the argument is sustained and justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some successful analysis which may be implicit views asserted but not fully justified <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	14–17	a good attempt to address the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> accurate knowledge good understanding good selection of material technical terms mostly accurate <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L4</i></p>	9–11	a good attempt at using evidence to sustain an argument holistically <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some successful and clear analysis some effective use of evidence views analysed and developed <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	18–21	A very good/excellent attempt to address the question showing understanding and engagement with the material <ul style="list-style-type: none"> very high level of ability to select and deploy relevant information accurate use of technical terms <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L5</i></p>	12–14	A very good/excellent attempt which uses a range of evidence to sustain an argument holistically <ul style="list-style-type: none"> comprehends the demands of the question uses a range of evidence shows understanding and critical analysis of different viewpoints <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

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

