

GCE

Religious Studies

Unit **G572**: Religious Ethics

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2015

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 2015

1. 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.

2. Subject-specific Marking Instructions

Handling of unexpected answers

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

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

AS Preamble and Instructions to Examiners

The purpose of a marking scheme is to ‘... enable examiners to mark in a standardised manner’ [CoP 1999 25.xiv]. It must ‘allow credit to be allocated for what candidates know, understand and can do’ [xv] and be ‘clear and designed to be easily and consistently applied’ [x]. The **Religious Studies Subject Criteria** [1999] define ‘what candidates know, understand and can do’ in terms of two Assessment Objectives, weighted for the OCR Religious Studies specification as indicated:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Question		Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>Candidates may begin by outlining the principle of Utility and explaining that Utilitarianism is a teleological theory looking for good consequences.</p> <p>They may then consider what counts as a good consequence when considering euthanasia and discuss the idea that happiness is pleasure and freedom from pain. They may explain that if a person's continuing existence brings pain and suffering, both to them and their family, then their life could be ended.</p> <p>They may apply Bentham's Hedonic Calculus to euthanasia in order to reach the correct decision. They may also argue that resources spent keeping the person alive could be better spent in other ways that would produce more happiness. They may consider applying QALYs to euthanasia.</p> <p>Responses may look at Mill's ideas of quality of pleasure, autonomy and the Harm Principle. They may also explain Mill's notion of victimless crime – there is no victim if the patient wishes to die. They may also consider the effects of euthanasia on society.</p> <p>Some responses may also consider the ideas of Singer and the importance of considering the preferences and interests of all involved, which may or may not lead to euthanasia.</p>	25	<p>Explain how Utilitarians might approach euthanasia.</p> <p>A candidate may choose to define euthanasia in terms of passive, active, voluntary and non-voluntary and credit should be given accordingly. Here, a candidate may also provide explanation by way of exemplification e.g. the case of Diane Pretty, Tony Bland.</p> <p>A candidate should be credited for reference to the overall secular, non-religious approach taken by Utilitarianism and the belief that the human person has no a priori, intrinsic value.</p> <p>Some candidates may choose to differentiate between weak and strong rule Utilitarianism in considering this approach to euthanasia.</p> <p>In explaining approaches to euthanasia, responses may explain the Utilitarian approach to euthanasia by reference to Bentham's equation of pleasure as being the greatest/only good and pain being the greatest/only evil.</p> <p>Consideration could be given to modern forms of Utilitarianism such as negative Utilitarianism if incorporated by the candidate.</p>

Question		Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
1	(b)	<p>Candidates may consider that for followers of religious ethics or those who take a Sanctity of Life argument it could be considered morally wrong to help someone to die whether or not they are terminally ill.</p> <p>On the other hand they may discuss whether life is an absolute good and whether there may be proportional reasons for helping someone to die once the dying process has begun so that they may achieve a 'good death'.</p> <p>They may also consider that issues of personal autonomy and Quality of Life outweigh issues of the Sanctity of Life. Candidates may also query those for whom the action of helping a terminally ill patient to die is morally wrong.</p> <p>They may discuss the 'slippery slope' argument. They may also refer to responses taken by the ethical theories studied e.g. Natural Law, Kantian ethics, and religious ethics.</p>	10	<p>'Helping a terminally ill patient to die is morally wrong.' Discuss.</p> <p>A candidate may define the terms 'terminally ill' through exemplification and should be credited accordingly. There may likewise be further definition of the term 'morally wrong'.</p> <p>In terms of the question asked, a candidate may legitimately conflate assisted suicide and euthanasia and this is acceptable.</p> <p>Discussion of the question through exemplification should be credited accordingly.</p> <p>A candidate may attempt to apply the Doctrine of Double Effect e.g. increasing dosages of diamorphine which relieve pain but which also shorten life.</p> <p>A candidate may make reference to the nature of the human person from a variety of secular and religious ethical perspectives and the effect this has on approaches to 'helping a terminally ill person to die'.</p>

Question		Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2	(a)	<p>Responses may consider whether the embryo has moral status and whether it is therefore a subject of moral duties and has any rights.</p> <p>Candidates could consider at what stage the embryo could be considered to be a person: at conception or at sometime before birth. They may discuss ideas of personhood such as those of Mary Ann Warren. They may discuss ideas of ensoulment such as those Aquinas. They may explain how these different approaches give different statuses to the embryo.</p> <p>They may explain the difference between potential life and life with potential. They may use the ideas of Glover.</p> <p>Responses may include a discussion of the Sanctity of Life and even the Quality of Life.</p>	25	<p>Explain why there are different ethical views about the status of the embryo.</p> <p>A candidate may write about the status of the zygote/embryo/foetus and any such reference should be credited.</p> <p>Responses may include reference to the status of the embryo being based on an a priori approach upholding its intrinsic nature, value and worth. By contrast, reference might also be made to the status of the embryo being entirely relative and dependent on the perception of the mother, father etc.</p> <p>In terms of 'different ethical views', responses may include reference to and explanation of why a particular stance is taken by Natural Law, Kantian Ethics, Utilitarianism and religious ethics.</p>

Question		Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2	(b)	<p>Candidates may discuss whether the statement applies to all life (e.g. non-human animal life) or just to human life.</p> <p>Candidates may argue in favour of the statement using the Sanctity of Life and the belief that each human life is created in the image of God for a purpose.</p> <p>They may use the ideas of Judith Jarvis Thompson on the right to life, and whether even if something is considered to be a life it need not be protected at all costs and need not take precedence over actual life. They may also consider whether in terms of human life the zygote, embryo or foetus could be seen as innocent or as an aggressor.</p> <p>They may use ethical theories such as Preference Utilitarianism to argue for the preferences of the mother as opposed to those of any potential life.</p> <p>They may discuss what is meant by harm and whether an embryo could be used in research etc. They may discuss the different approaches to this.</p>	10	<p>'Potential life should always be protected from harm.' Discuss.</p> <p>A candidate may define 'potential life' in a variety of ways being that of a zygote, embryo or foetus and should be credited accordingly.</p> <p>Responses may approach the question through a discussion of abortion and this should be credited.</p> <p>Responses may consider whether in terms of potential human life, exceptions should be made with regard to extreme cases e.g. a zygote, embryo or foetus which is the product of rape or incest, which is severely handicapped etc.</p> <p>A candidate may discuss whether the destruction of 'potential life' for an apparent greater good – e.g. embryo research – can be justified.</p> <p>Responses awarded a higher level may focus more closely on the trigger word in the question 'always' and discuss whether an absolutist or relativist approach should be taken.</p>

Question		Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
3	(a)	<p>Candidates might explain Kant's distinction between the Hypothetical and Categorical Imperative and their place in his ethical theory.</p> <p>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.</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.</p> <p>They may contrast the Categorical Imperative with the Hypothetical Imperative and highlight the deontological and absolute nature of the former and the teleological and relative nature of the latter.</p> <p>In explaining Kant's reasons for arguing in support of each of the forms of the Categorical Imperative they may use examples, possibly those that Kant gives.</p> <p>It is likely that candidates will make reference to the concept of the Summum Bonnum as the main aim of the moral life as identified by Kant.</p>	25	<p>Explain the main aims of Kant's ethical theory.</p> <p>A candidate may approach the word 'aims' in the question in a wide variety of ways and should be credited accordingly.</p> <p>It is expected that responses may vary in the use of exact terminology with regard to Kant's ethical theory and allowance should be made for this providing that the key components of the ethical theory are clear.</p> <p>Candidates may provide explanation through exemplification and should be credited accordingly.</p> <p>Responses awarded a higher level will be ones which give a holistic explanation regarding Kant's ethical theory.</p> <p>Some reference to the moral argument by a candidate may be credited.</p>

Question		Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
3	(b)	<p>Candidates may argue that Kant's understanding of universal maxims is practical as it gives clear criteria to know which actions are moral, it respects human life, and the idea of duty means that we will always do what is right and not be swayed by emotions and feelings.</p> <p>They may say that his rules are fair as they apply to everyone, and so minorities are protected.</p> <p>Candidates may argue that Kant's theory is abstract and not easily applied to ethical situations.</p> <p>On the other hand, candidates may consider that Kant's approach does not consider outcomes, that there are conflicts between duties and that there is no room for emotions, although they may add that for Kant himself these were advantages and not disadvantages.</p>	10	<p>'Kant's idea of universalisation does not work in practice.' Discuss.</p> <p>A candidate may approach 'universalisation' as being the key part of the Categorical Imperative or as the first formulation thereof. Examples may be used to discuss whether or not 'universalisation' works 'in practice'. The latter phrase may also be interpreted in a variety of ways.</p> <p>Responses may consider the absolute, deontological nature of Kant's ethical theory and whether this works as opposed to a relative, teleological approach. Responses may thus contrast Kant with, for example, Utilitarianism.</p>

Question		Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
4	(a)	<p>Candidates may approach the question from the perspective of a study of the ethics of the religion chosen by the candidate and should be credited accordingly.</p> <p>Candidates may explain Natural Law, Divine Command theory or even Situation Ethics.</p> <p>They may give an outline of these theories and explain how ethical decisions are made.</p> <p>For Natural Law they may consider the idea of purpose, the primary and secondary precepts. They may consider the importance of reason and the deontological nature of the primary precepts compared to the more flexible approach of the secondary precepts.</p> <p>For Situation Ethics they may consider the centrality of agape, or unconditional love, the four working principles and the six fundamental principles. They may explain that in practice Situation Ethics may be relativist.</p> <p>For Divine Command theory candidates may consider the importance of some of the laws in the Old Testament such as do not murder. They may consider the teachings of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount.</p> <p>Just War Theory may be used as a religious ethic by a candidate, as may the sanctity of life argument.</p>	25	<p>Explain one religious ethical theory.</p> <p>Candidates may approach this question in a variety of ways depending on their interpretation of the key words 'religious ethical theory' and should be credited accordingly.</p> <p>They may focus on one specific theory such as Divine Command Theory or on the overall theory provided by the religion studied.</p> <p>Candidates may legitimately present a range of religious ethical theories if these are justified as a holistic representation of one ethical viewpoint.</p> <p>Where candidates have presented a number of ethical theories without there being a specific link to an overarching ethical viewpoint, the candidate will have failed to respond to the specific question that has been asked and should be credited accordingly as per the levels of response.</p>

Question		Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
4	(b)	<p>Candidates may use Divine Command theory to argue both ways on this question. They may say that our moral intuition is innate and God-given, or that our conscience is simply the product of our society and up-bringing. They may argue that there would be no good without God and that God is the basis for our standard of goodness, using the ideas of Aquinas.</p> <p>They may argue that it is unacceptable for any religious belief to require unqualified obedience to God's commands if it means abandoning personal autonomy. They may say that the rightness or wrongness of an action comes from the action itself and is not dependent on God.</p> <p>They may use non-religious ethical theories such as Utilitarianism to argue that morality is separate from God.</p>	10	<p>'Morality is always dependent on God.' Discuss.</p> <p>A candidate may approach this question in a variety of ways. They may focus on the word 'always' and then discuss whether an absolute or relative approach should be taken.</p> <p>Responses may include reference to the Euthyphro dilemma and whether morality is dependent on God or whether God is constrained by pre-existing morality.</p> <p>Candidates may argue that morality is 'dependent' on a variety of other factors such as conscience, duty and those specific to the religion studied such as sacred texts or religious teachers.</p> <p>Responses may reject the overarching religious metaphysic implied by the question and reject the concept of God as an a priori.</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 • 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>	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 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	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 at using evidence to sustain an argument <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	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 2015

