

**GCE**

**Religious Studies**

Unit **G572**: Religious Ethics

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

**Mark Scheme for June 2014**

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 2014

## Annotations

| Annotation  | Meaning   |
|---|---|
|  | Blank Page – this annotation must be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response. |
|  | 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  |    | Guidance   |
|----------|-----|---|----|--|
| 1        | (a) | <p>Candidates may begin by explaining that Utilitarianism is a consequential theory, and perhaps explain the principle of Utility from Bentham. Responses may include explanations of the pleasure vs. pain principle.</p> <p>Responses may include an explanation of the teleological nature of the theory and the importance of good consequences.</p> <p>They may go on to explain the Hedonic Calculus and how it may be used to decide the quantity of pleasures. Responses may include the idea of weighing up each situation.</p> <p>They may explain Mill's approach to Utilitarianism, measuring the quality of pleasures, and that pleasure should be maximised. They may explain why Mill took this approach.</p> <p>Candidates may discuss Act and Rule Utilitarianism.</p> <p>They may also explain the Preference Utilitarianism of Peter Singer and how the preferences or interests of all those involved are to be considered.</p> <p>Candidates may give examples of how the greatest happiness principle can be applied.</p> | 25 | <p><b>Explain some of the different forms of Utilitarianism.</b></p> <p>A candidate can respond legitimately to the question using any combination of two or more utilitarian thinkers or principles. The key word in the question is 'some' indicating that a candidate who answers purely from one standpoint has not fully responded to the question and therefore has produced a general response to the question (level 2).</p> <p>The candidate does not necessarily always need to apply the system to a particular issue.</p> <p>A candidate may explain the system by using a compare and contrast approach between systems as well as / or by application. Either approach is equally valid.</p> |

| Question |     | Indicative Content  |    | Guidance  |
|----------|-----|---|----|---|
| 1        | (b) | <p>Candidates may discuss how Utilitarians would apply the pleasure/pain principle when considering the right to a child.</p> <p>They may discuss how Utilitarianism would measure the 'pain' of the unused embryos against the pleasure of the parents. They may say that Utilitarians may see rights as not something from God, but part of our human nature. They may explain the ideas of Bentham that rights are 'nonsense on stilts' and play no part in human happiness.</p> <p>They may consider whether Utilitarianism is best applied to issues surrounding the right to a child such as the age of the mother, sexuality, surrogacy etc.</p> <p>However, they may consider that Utilitarianism is not the best approach as the consequences are not guaranteed and so the money may be better spent on other health services.</p> <p>They may argue that another ethical approach such as Natural Law would give a clearer response and would protect the unused embryos from destruction.</p> | 10 | <p><b>Assess the view that Utilitarianism is the best approach to the right to a child.</b></p> <p>It is a valid approach for a candidate to discuss adoption without a specific focus on IVF or other forms of fertility treatment.</p> <p>Once approach could be to look at how this issue may create rules or laws which benefit or harm society.</p> <p>There should be a focus within the response on evaluating the application of Utilitarianism TO right to a child.</p> <p>Candidates can make their assessment of Utilitarianism from the internal strengths of the system and / or the weaknesses or they might legitimately compare Utilitarianism to another ethical theory.</p> |
| 2        | (a) | <p>Candidates may explain that all pacifists see the killing of the innocent as morally unjustifiable, and, no matter what the consequences, and many see the taking of human life as unjustified.</p> <p>Candidates may explain that religious pacifist views are rooted in Christianity and were very strong in the early Church. They may cite the teachings of Jesus. They may discuss particular religious pacifist views such as those of the Quakers and other religious groups. They may also explain that pacifist views are found across every Christian</p>  | 25 | <p><b>Explain the approaches of the religion you have studied to pacifism.</b></p> <p>There can be any reasonable interpretation of the question which may flow through from an appreciation of Christian Realism or Just War Theory as a Christian idea which does not agree with pacifism – however these must be related to the issue of Pacifism if the candidate is to be considered to be answering the focus of the question.</p>  |

| Question |     | Indicative Content  |    | Guidance  |
|----------|-----|---|----|---|
|          |     | <p>denomination. They may contrast this with Just War theory and explain that Christianity sees war as necessary, as a final resort, to protect innocent life. They may explain that Just War theory aims to return peace as soon as possible.</p> <p>They may explain the views on pacifism of any religion studied.</p>   |    | Some candidates might suggest that pacifism may be rejected by a Christian following other principles.  |
| 2        | (b) | <p>Candidates may discuss that many religious followers choose not to go to war. They may explain the Biblical basis for this.</p> <p>Candidates may discuss the approach of particular groups within Christianity such as the Quakers, and some may discuss the influence of mainstream Christians such as Thomas Merton and Walter Wink.</p> <p>They may also consider that religious followers consider that the protection of human life to be of the utmost importance and so sometimes not allowing war 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>They may discuss the fact that Just War theory is a religious approach to war.</p> <p>They may also consider that the Old Testament seems to justify war, and that the New Testament teaching is inconclusive and some teaching may only apply to individuals not to states.</p> <p>Candidates are free to argue either way using evidence from their studies.</p> | 10 | <p><b>“A true religious believer should not allow war.” Discuss.</b></p> <p>Some candidates may focus on the key term within the question of a ‘true’ religious believer. This may lead into a discussion of what it means to be a true religious believer however this must relate to the general of the question on allowing war.</p> <p>A candidate may legitimately use two different religious beliefs to respond to each part of the question. There is no necessity for the part B response to refer to the same belief system as referred to in the part A response.</p> <p>The term ‘allow’ from within the question may be interpreted in a variety of ways by the candidate. Any legitimate reading of the question that makes a viable response should be credited appropriately.</p> |

| Question |     | Indicative Content  |    | Guidance  |
|----------|-----|---|----|---|
|          |     |   |    | Candidates may argue from any religion studied.   |
| 3        | (a) | <p>Candidates might explain Kant's Categorical Imperative and its basis in his theory of ethics. They may explain that the Categorical Imperative applies to everyone, and the different forms it may take: the formula of the law of nature which universalises maxims without contradiction; the formula of end in itself which means that we should not treat others as a means to an end; and the formula of a kingdom of ends which means that we should act as if everyone is a free, autonomous agent. They may explain how the different formulations of the Categorical Imperative might be applied to the different ethical issues they have studied such as abortion, euthanasia etc.</p> <p>They might explain that, for Kant, moral precepts were rooted in rationality, were unconditional or categorical and presupposed freedom. They might explain the importance of a good will and doing one's duty. They may explain that the various formulations of the Categorical Imperative aim to enable the moral agent to know and fulfil his/her duty. This idea of duty could then be applied to any ethical issue.</p> <p>In explaining the various formulations of the Categorical Imperative they may use Kant's examples of ethical issues.</p> | 25 | <p><b>Explain how the various formulations of the Categorical Imperative might be applied to an ethical issue.</b></p> <p>Candidates may legitimately focus on one issue and work through the various formulations of the categorical imperative. Equally a candidate could use different ethical issues to demonstrate the application. Either approach is legitimate and should be credited as such.</p> <p>Some candidates may focus more closely on the application to an ethical issue of the formulations. Again, this is a valid approach however the response must clearly demonstrate an understanding of the formulations of the Categorical Imperative through their application if they do so.</p> <p>Candidates may not necessarily cover all three standard formulations of the Categorical Imperative and may refer to a variety of numbers of Imperatives depending on their learning and the resources used. A good response may still be obtained by having dealt with two or more of the formulations showing depth of understanding of the application of the concepts.</p> |

| Question |     | Indicative Content   |    | Guidance   |
|----------|-----|--|----|--|
| 3        | (b) | <p>Candidates may agree with the question, arguing that Kantian ethics are clear-cut and easy to apply. They may give examples to illustrate this.</p> <p>Also candidates may consider that doing one's duty means that ethical decisions are not influenced by feelings and inclinations, so that everyone is treated fairly.</p> <p>On the other hand candidates may consider that Kant's theory is too rigid, but does not tell us what to do in particular situations. They may discuss the question of the conflict of duties. They may say that Kantian ethics are difficult to apply to modern ethical issues which can be very complex.</p> <p>Also candidates may consider that motives and consequences are also important.</p>  | 10 | <p><b>'The Categorical Imperative has no serious weaknesses.' Discuss.</b></p> <p>The key term within the question is the concept of 'serious weakness' and as such the candidate should demonstrate this through their evaluation of the Categorical Imperative.</p> <p>Where the candidate has evaluated the strengths and weaknesses of the Categorical Imperative without stating the seriousness of the weakness this may still be implied through the structure of their reasoning, although at the highest response levels this must be explicit.</p>   |
| 4        | (a) | <p>Candidates may explain different approaches to relative morality such as cultural relativism and ethical subjectivism.</p> <p>Candidates may explain that moral relativism holds that moral truth varies depending on place, culture, time and religion and opposes absolutism which holds that moral truth is universal. They may explain the dependency thesis and the diversity thesis in cultural relativism.</p> <p>Moral relativism sees the morality of actions as subjective and relative to the situation. They could give examples to illustrate this.</p> <p>Some candidates may also refer to normative relativism such as Situation Ethics or Utilitarianism. Candidates may use the examples of scholars such as Barclay, or their own examples to illustrate this.</p> | 25 | <p><b>Explain what is meant by relative morality.</b></p> <p>Where ethical theories are used, the candidates need to show how they can be considered to be relative otherwise they will be described without being relevant to the question. As such, candidates need to make explicit the link between the system they are using and relativism – this could be in the form of a statement that the system is an example of relativistic ethics, or that they intend to respond to the question through the use of a particular ethical system.</p> <p>A candidate who responds using cultural relativism is producing a valid response to the question as there is no explicit demand for a demonstration of a normative ethical theory. Equally candidates may refer to subjectivism and / or consequentialism.</p> |

| Question |     | Indicative Content  |    | Guidance  |
|----------|-----|---|----|---|
| 4        | (b) | <p>They may argue that relativist ethics allow different countries, regions, religions etc to make their own decisions about genetic engineering. They may argue that this flexibility allows different approaches as scientific knowledge progresses.</p> <p>Candidates may say that relativism allows for different ethical responses to different kinds of genetic engineering.</p> <p>Alternatively candidates may discuss the problems of a relativist approach – it may allow too much and for the wrong reasons. They may consider that, without being completely absolutist, there need to be some rules and guidelines when considering genetic engineering.</p> <p>They may compare a relativist approach with a more absolutist one.</p> | 10 | <p><b>To what extent are relativist ethics the best approach to genetic engineering?</b></p> <p>Candidates may choose to focus purely on one element of genetic research rather than covering the whole area for example, they might refer purely to genetically modified foods, or the modification of humans and / or animals.</p> <p>If a candidate makes a response using the issue of IVF there must be an explicit link made to the modification or selection of genetic material within the embryo. If this is not made explicit the response should be considered as not addressing the focus of the question although there may incidentally be some valid arguments made.</p> |

## APPENDIX 1 LEVELS OF RESPONSE

| Level   | Mark /25     | AO1   | Mark /10    | AO2   |
|---|--------------|---|-------------|---|
| <b>0</b>  | <b>0</b>     | absent/no relevant material   | <b>0</b>    | absent/no argument  |
| <b>1</b>  | <b>1–5</b>   | 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>  | <b>1–2</b>  | 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 |              |   |             |   |
| <b>2</b>  | <b>6–10</b>  | 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> | <b>3–4</b>  | 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         |              |   |             |   |
| <b>3</b>  | <b>11–15</b> | 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>  | <b>5–6</b>  | 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         |              |   |             |   |
| <b>4</b>  | <b>16–20</b> | 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>  | <b>7–8</b>  | 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                 |              |   |             |   |
| <b>5</b>  | <b>21–25</b> | 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>  | <b>9–10</b> | 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 2014

