

Religious Studies

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G572**: Religious Ethics

Mark Scheme for January 2013

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

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

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








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

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

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

© OCR 2013

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Level 1 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin
	Level 2 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin
	Level 3 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin
	Level 4 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin
	Level 5 – 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 eg 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	Mark	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>Candidates may begin by explaining how Mill developed Bentham's Utilitarianism.</p> <p>Candidates could explain the principle of utility and give an outline of Mill's version of Utilitarianism which is based on the quality of pleasure, thus also avoiding the minorities being treated badly. They may explain Mill's rejection of animalistic pleasures and give examples to illustrate this.</p> <p>They may explain that Mill saw that happiness was the fulfilment of higher ideals and that pleasure should be universalisable. They may also consider that Mill saw the need for general guidelines which would be easier to use than the Hedonic calculus of Bentham.</p> <p>They may explain that acting morally will be seen to generate the most happiness, so, for example when applied to abortion Mill would have to weigh up the pain caused by the abortion with the quality of pleasure gained by bringing up the child.</p> <p>Candidates may add that Mill is commonly linked with Rule Utilitarianism, though it was not a name that he himself used.</p>	25	<p>Explain how Mill's Utilitarianism might be used to decide the right course of action.</p> <p>Useful to decide right sense of action – some kind of application. More than a simple explanation of Mill's Utilitarianism for example applying Mill to an ethical situation such as abortion.</p> <p>Some candidates may explain Mill's Utilitarianism in comparison with Bentham's and this explanation is creditable as long as it is applied; to demonstrate how decisions are made.</p> <p>Some candidates may use Mill's harm principle or discuss how strong and weak rules are used by Mill in decision making.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
(b)	<p>In considering the question of the usefulness of Utilitarianism when making decisions about abortion, candidates may discuss for whom it is most useful. They may discuss whether the pain of the abortion is greater than the pain of bringing up an unwanted child etc.</p> <p>Candidates may point out that Utilitarianism may not consider the foetus to be a person so issues of Sanctity of Life are of no concern. They may point out that a Utilitarian is only concerned with the balance of pleasure and pain in any situation.</p> <p>They may discuss the approach of Utilitarianism to the parties involved – this may include the parents and other family and even the community at large.</p> <p>They may also consider the consequences for all involved, and the difficulty of predicting these consequences successfully.</p> <p>Candidates may contrast Utilitarianism with another ethical theory when considering its usefulness.</p>	10	<p>Assess the extent to which Utilitarianism is a reliable method of making decisions about abortion.</p> <p>Higher marks could be awarded to candidates that give a criteria for a “reliable method” and then compares Utilitarianism to that criteria.</p> <p>Some candidates might only evaluate Utilitarianism in general terms and this can still attract credit but it may not be considered to be excellent.</p> <p>A different but equally valid interpretation of the question is how reliable is the theory in contrast to other ethical theories such as Kantian Ethics or Natural Law.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>Candidates may begin by outlining Natural Law and the importance of a single purpose applicable to all humans. They may explain that God has instilled in humans an inclination to act so that we achieve good and avoid evil, and that we discover this by using our reason.</p> <p>Candidates may explain how the primary precepts reflect God's Eternal Law, and how the secondary precepts depend on our own judgement of what to do in any situation.</p> <p>Candidates may consider the nature and status of the embryo – whether it is a person or not, and God's plan for human life.</p> <p>They may also consider that Natural Law has the primary precept of self-preservation and from this can be inferred the secondary precept 'no human embryo research' as it destroys life.</p> <p>However, it could be argued that the research can be justified as it preserves life by curing diseases.</p> <p>Candidates may point to the link between sex and childbirth. They may point out that human beings are led by apparent 'goods' that tempt them away from Natural Law. They may consider that both the intention and the act are important.</p>	25	<p>Explain how a follower of Natural Law might respond to human embryo research.</p> <p>Candidates will need to apply all aspects of Natural law to this ethical issue to gain the highest credit e.g. The primary and secondary precepts as well as the concepts of interior and exterior acts and real and apparent goods.</p> <p>Some candidates will only use one primary precept, the concept of reason or just the synderesis rule which would not be sufficient to gain the highest marks.</p> <p>Natural Law may be against human embryo research as it does not allow the embryo to fulfil its final purpose.</p> <p>Candidates may attract higher marks if they explore human embryo research in detail rather than in general terms. For example they could discuss the difference between using human embryos to create new drug treatment and saviour siblings or designer babies.</p> <p>Marks may also be attracted by looking at the process by which embryos are generated and the problems this may create for a follower of Natural Law.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
(b)	<p>Candidates need to discuss and analyse the different approaches to embryo research.</p> <p>They may discuss the reasons for the research and how it may, in the long run, bring relief to sufferers and improve their quality of life. It may lead to curing diseases that were once thought incurable.</p> <p>On the other hand they may question whether the techniques used are always ethical and the destruction of spare embryos.</p> <p>They may discuss that some people find embryo research wrong as it interferes with nature. They may use Natural Law theory to back up this approach.</p>	10	<p>To what extent can human embryo research be justified?</p> <p>Candidates could demonstrate how it may and/or may not be justified and this could provide a better response than just giving a critique of human embryo research, although this view is equally valid.</p> <p>A discussion around personhood may also be a valid approach to this question.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>Candidates may explain the origins of Just War theory from Augustine and Aquinas and more modern approaches. They may explain that the original purpose of Just War theory was to restore peace and justice, to limit the conduct of war. They may explain that Augustine drew on the existing Roman idea of <i>justum bellum</i> and the Old Testament tradition where war on behalf of Israel was commanded by God.</p> <p>Candidate may refer to later versions of the JWT such as Hugo Grotius, Francisco de Vittoria and the twentieth century American Bishops</p> <p>They may explain that Just War theory defines the conditions in which violence may be used and attempts to defend innocent life. They may explain that for Aquinas war is still sinful as it is contrary to peace.</p> <p>They may explain the three parts of Just War theory: <i>Jus ad bellum</i> (justice in the decision to wage war), <i>Jus in bello</i> (justice in the conduct of war) and <i>Jus post bellum</i> (justice in the ending of the war).</p> <p>They may explain the requirements of each of these using examples from warfare. They may discuss the issues of just cause, legitimate authority, right intention, proportionality, non-combatant immunity etc.</p>	25	<p>Explain the purpose and principles of Just War theory.</p> <p>Need to explain the origins i.e. why are there the Just War rules and not just a simplistic explanation of the laws themselves (GCSE style). However, a detailed explanation of the principles without much on the purpose could still be regarded as a good answer. The purpose could also include the overriding aim for a just and lasting peace/ preserve life.</p> <p>From Aquinas this links to the general concept of Sanctity of Life and the primary precept of preserving innocent life specifically within war.</p> <p>Candidates may use examples and these will be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
(b)	<p>Candidates may discuss what is meant by modern warfare and whether Just War theory is unrealistic and just too simplistic in the face of weapons of mass destruction or smart bombs.</p> <p>They may also consider terrorism and conclude that Just War theory would not work as terrorists would break all the basic rules.</p> <p>On the other hand, they may argue that Just War theory is a flexible theory and can be developed to match the times. They may consider that any of the advantages of Just War could be just as easily be applied to modern warfare as the defenceless still need defending.</p> <p>Some candidates may argue that no war can be considered just and so there is no point in applying the theory.</p>	10	<p>'Just War theory cannot be applied to modern warfare.' Discuss.</p> <p>Most candidates will look at techniques of modern warfare such as smart bombs, drone aircraft, nuclear weapons, chemical or biological weapons, terrorism; rather than examples of modern wars. However, this would also be credited.</p> <p>Smart bombs could be used as an example of modern technology that supports JWT as avoiding loss of innocent lives. This could also provoke discussion on the concept of double effect.</p> <p>Another interpretation would be to question whether JWT is still relevant today and this too is credit-worthy.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
4 (a)	<p>Candidates could explain that moral absolutism considers that actions are right or wrong intrinsically, that consequences and circumstances have no bearing, and that moral commands are considered objectively and universally true.</p> <p>The answer could include reference to Divine Command Theory, or Kant's theory of ethics with a view to defining different types of absolutism. Some candidates may refer to the absolute nature of some interpretations of Natural Law.</p> <p>They may contrast moral absolutism with moral relativism.</p> <p>They may use examples to illustrate their answer, perhaps from the areas of medical ethics they have studied.</p>	25	<p>Explain the concept of absolute morality.</p> <p>Candidates could approach this question in a variety of ways.</p> <p>Candidates could explain absolute morality by defining it and using examples. However, an equally valid response is explaining absolute morality by using Kantian Ethics and/or the Primary Precepts of Natural Law.</p> <p>However, with this second approach candidates must show how/why the ethical theories are absolute rather than just explaining them as an example. Making use of relevant examples as part of their explanation would also be to their benefit.</p> <p>Candidates could contrast relativist theories with absolute ones and similarly with Consequentialism as part of their response.</p>
(b)	<p>Candidates may consider that we naturally consider consequences when deciding on the right course of action. They may say that considering consequences allows us to go beyond our personal point of view and consider the effects of our actions on others.</p> <p>However, they may say that consequences are always difficult to predict with any accuracy, and so cannot be more important than general ethical rules.</p> <p>Candidates may point to the need to have a universal truth that transcends cultures and history. They may refer to certain universal and unchanging principles such as 'do not murder'.</p> <p>They may refer to the need for a set of absolutes that apply to all people regardless of the consequences.</p>	10	<p>'Considering consequences is more important than following rules.' Discuss.</p> <p>Candidates who can see the issues involved in following rules will demonstrate the higher skills necessary for better responses.</p> <p>Candidates do not need to refer to any specific ethical theories in their response as long as they demonstrate a clear answer to the question.</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"> little relevant material some concepts inaccurate shows little knowledge of technical terms. <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L1</i></p>	1–2	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	6–10	a basic attempt to address the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> knowledge limited and partially accurate limited understanding selection often inappropriate might address the general topic rather than the question directly limited use of technical terms. <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"> some analysis, but not successful views asserted with 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	11–15	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>	5–6	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	16–20	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>	7–8	a good attempt to sustain an argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some effective use of evidence some successful and clear analysis considers more than one view point. <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"> 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>	9–10	A very good/excellent attempt to sustain an argument <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 2013

