

# **Religious Studies**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G572**: Religious Ethics

## **Mark Scheme for June 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: A02 material in A01 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 could explain that Kant's theory of duty is deontological and focussed on the idea of a moral law. They might explain Kant's understanding of good will and duty and the link between them.</p> <p>They may explain the need to follow duty rather than emotions when deciding on the right course of action.</p> <p>Candidates might explain that Kant saw moral statements as categorical and explain the Categorical Imperative with its various formulations.</p> <p>They might contrast the Hypothetical and Categorical Imperatives.</p> <p>Some responses might refer to Kant's examples – promise keeping, suicide, waste of talent and helping others – and explain how Kant rejected consequentialism.</p>  | 25   | <p>The question specifically asks for examples therefore it is important that candidates give valid examples of real and / or hypothetical ethical issues to illustrate their answer rather than simply explaining Kant's ethical theory.</p> <p>A candidate may produce a good response to the question by focusing on different interpretations of the individual's duty within different situations and by providing sufficient exemplar material to support.</p> <p>A full explanation of duty would place the concept within the wider context of Kant's ethical theory as a whole, for example the Good Will, Moral Law, the Hypothetical and Categorical Imperatives, reason, etc.</p> |
|          | (b) | <p>Candidates may discuss how duty overrides feelings or inclinations and so will always lead to the right action. They may explain that this approach can be seen as the most important part of Kant's ethical theory as it treats everyone fairly and justly.</p> <p>On the other hand, they may argue that duties are not always clear and can conflict. They may say that the three formulations of the Categorical Imperative are more important and more encompassing than doing one's duty.</p> <p>They may consider that happiness, consequences and emotions are also important in ethics. They may argue that it is only natural to consider consequences, but also that duty might be the safer option as consequences cannot always be predicted with any accuracy.</p> | 10   | <p>Candidates may build their response from within Kantian ethics itself or may use other ethical approaches as contrast, for example Utilitarianism or Relativist Ethics.</p>  |

| Question |     | Indicative Content  | Mark | Guidance  |
|----------|-----|---|------|---|
| 2        | (a) | <p>Candidates may use any of the six major world religions that they might have studied in responding to this question.</p> <p>Candidates may explain what is meant by infertility and whether it is an illness which can be treated, or a malfunction of nature which can either be accepted or rectified using technology.</p> <p>Candidates may consider two possible solutions to infertility: surrogacy and IVF.</p> <p>They may explain that religious ethics would say that surrogacy goes against the Sanctity of Life and the idea that a child is a gift not a right. They may also say that some liberal Christians may say that surrogacy is an act of agape.</p> <p>Candidates may also explain that a strong Sanctity of Life ethics would be against IVF because of the destruction of embryos. The possible involvement of a third party and the methods used to obtain the sperm and the egg which do not involve normal sexual intercourse are contrary to the Natural Law Sanctity of Life principle.</p> <p>However, they may also explain that AIH poses fewer ethical problems as there is no third party involved.</p> | 25   | <p>It would be a valid response for a candidate to focus on infertility treatments themselves and the issues that these would then raise for religious believers.</p> <p>Candidates may respond to the question by using the principles and concepts of Natural Law Theory as an ethical system a religious believer might employ.</p> <p>Similarly, a valid response may be made from a purely biblical ethical standpoint without use of an ethical system.</p> <p>Candidates may use Situation Ethics by Joseph Fletcher as a valid additional system although not specifically named on the syllabus.</p> <p>Candidates may use a range of viewpoints from within a single Christian denomination to show varieties in interpretation of teachings and texts.</p> |

| Question | Indicative Content  | Mark | Guidance  |
|----------|---|------|---|
| (b)      | <p>Candidates may consider whether reproduction is a right, or whether a child is a gift. They may contrast right and duties. They may say that a child cannot be a right as life is a sacred gift and IVF etc interferes with nature. They may argue that reproductive technologies can cause problems of identity for the child and considering a child to be a right simply makes it a commodity.</p> <p>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>There are a wide variety of ways in which a candidate might approach this question, for example they may make a valid response through a focus on the right to a child as the right to fertility treatment. They might then explore the issues raised from this viewpoint such as age of the mother and suitability of the parent.</p> <p>Candidates may legitimately build their response to this question around the concept of human rights and human rights legislation.</p> <p>Candidates may make a distinction between theoretical rights to a child and the right to a child in practice which would involve fertility treatment.</p>  |
| 3        | (a)   | 25   | <p>Candidates need to make clear that they understand what Quality of Life is within the response. There is some expectation that the candidate will be able to tease out the issues involved in Quality of Life as a concept.</p> <p>Candidates may look at Utilitarianism as an example of a system that might endorse the Quality of Life stance but must not focus exclusively on this in their response. (Other ethical theories that might endorse the Quality of Life stance could include some religious and Relativist Ethics, and not from the specification, Situation Ethics and Virtue Theory).</p> <p>There is a possibility that a candidate could produce a valid response to the question without reference to Sanctity of Life.</p> |

| Question | Indicative Content  | Mark | Guidance  |
|----------|---|------|---|
| (b)      | <p>Candidates may support the issue and claim that the Sanctity of Life upholds the value of human life as a gift from God and not ours to dispose of as we wish.</p> <p>They may argue that allowing some form of euthanasia will be morally confusing as who is to decide whether a life is worth living or not. They may say that the concept of the Sanctity of Life gives clear guidelines.</p> <p>On the other hand, candidates may discuss whether promoting the Sanctity of Life can lead to more suffering and loss of dignity. They may say that autonomy or Quality of Life is a more important consideration.</p> <p>Alternatively they may argue that euthanasia needs to be considered on a case by case basis rather than treating all cases the same.</p> | 10   | <p>Deontological approaches should not automatically be associated with Sanctity of Life.</p> <p>For example, Kant should not be taken as an example of Sanctity of Life, whereas Natural Law does support this approach to the individual and would be valid as an exemplar.</p> <p>Kant does reject suicide from the standpoint that it cannot be willed without contradiction which could be mentioned.</p>  |
| 4        | (a)   | 25   | <p>The specification states that the classical forms of Utilitarianism come from Bentham and Mill. Candidates therefore will not gain credit for information on Peter Singer but it will not adversely affect the marking of the remainder of the response.</p> <p>Candidates should give the Hedonic Calculus in full and not rely on just using a mnemonic device or list of the seven factors. Better responses will exemplify how the hedonic calculus might be used in arriving at a moral decision.</p> <p>Candidates would improve their response by use of exemplification to illustrate how the systems work in practice.</p> <p>There is an expectation that there will be a balance present in the response between the concepts from Bentham and those presented by Mill.</p> |

| Question | Indicative Content   | Mark | Guidance   |
|----------|--|------|--|
| (b)      | <p>Candidates may consider the fact that we cannot accurately predict the future, and can, therefore, make mistakes. They may argue that there is potential to justify any act and so there is no defence for minorities.</p> <p>Some candidates may consider that it is impractical to calculate the morality of each choice, and so people simply will not bother. They may argue that having general rules based on the principle of utility would be a better approach.</p> <p>On the other hand, candidates might consider that Utilitarianism is democratic and practical, and so can deal with most moral situations.</p> | 10   | <p>There are many valid responses that a candidate may make to this question.</p> <p>They may choose to respond entirely from within Utilitarianism or they might effectively contrast with other ethical systems and approaches such as Natural Law Theory or Kantian Ethics.</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>selection often inappropriate</li> <li>might address the general topic rather than the question directly</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 with 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 to sustain an argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some effective use of evidence</li> <li>some successful and clear analysis</li> <li>considers more than one view point.</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 2013

