

GCE

Religious Studies

Unit **G572**: Religious Ethics

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2016

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 2016

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.

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.

Q No	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
1 a	<p>Explain why a follower of the religion you have studied might object to abortion. [25]</p> <p>Candidates may explain that for many followers of religious ethics the foetus is considered to be a person from moment of conception, and so killing a foetus could be considered as murder.</p> <p>Candidates may give an account of the ‘Sanctity of Life’ teaching in which life is considered special or sacred or ordained by God.</p> <p>Those using Christian ethics might use biblical teachings such as such as Genesis 1:26-28, which talks about man being in the image of God, Exodus 20:13 – the command against murder, Job 1:21 which suggest that only God may take life. Psalm 139 which suggests that God puts a person together in the mother’s womb.</p> <p>They may explain that killing is forbidden by God. They may use the arguments of Natural Law to explain that abortion is against the primary precept of the preservation of life.</p> <p>They may consider the idea of proportionate need and the necessity to consider terminating a pregnancy, using the doctrine of double effect, if the mother’s life is in danger but without the intent to kill.</p> <p>Candidates may answer from the perspective of any religion studied.</p> <p>Thus in traditional Buddhism abortion is viewed as breaking the first of the four precepts which forbids killing or injuring living human beings and Buddhists teach that life begins at conception. Also Buddhists believe that the foetus carries the kammic identity of someone who has recently died. A monk who assists at an abortion would be expelled from the monastic sangha. As suffering is part of life a Buddhist would be unwilling to accept abortion even in cases of rape or where a foetus is disabled.</p> <p>Hindu teaching is based on the principle of ahimsa (non-violence) and the foetus is considered a human from the implantation of the atman at conception. Abortion would deprive the foetus of the possibility of good karma.</p> <p>Judaism does not have clear arguments against abortion as the foetus is not considered a human being. In Islam all life is the creation of Allah and so abortion is generally viewed as a crime, however, there are differences of opinion between Shi’ites who forbid abortion from conception and Sunnis who hold different opinions.</p>	25	<p>Candidates might explain that for many followers of religious ethics, the foetus is considered to be a person at some stage between conception and full term and that therefore killing a foetus is killing a human life or potential human life.</p> <p>Candidates could answer the question from the point of view of Natural Law Theory or Situation Ethics where they apply the religious ethical theory to the question of abortion and how a religious follower may use this to object to the issue.</p> <p>Candidates may legitimately use a variety of religious ethical theories and doctrines in responding to the question and may switch between systems to show different modes of thought.</p>

Q No	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
1 b	<p>‘Only religious people believe in the principle of the Sanctity of Life.’ Discuss. [10]</p> <p>Candidates are likely to consider abortion, but could discuss other life/death issues such as euthanasia.</p> <p>Candidates might support the issue and claim that the Sanctity of Life has as an a priori assumption the existence of God or a religious metaphysic and therefore has to be religious.</p> <p>Candidates might argue that Sanctity of Life upholds the value of human life as a gift from God – given by God and made holy by God - and is therefore not for humans to dispose of as they might wish.</p> <p>They might argue that even non-religious people will support a secular form of Sanctity of Life or the unique and special quality of human life. Some may suggest a secular form of Sanctity of Life provides absolutist criteria and clear guidelines which avoid giving too much discretion to doctors as to whether a foetus should or should not be brought to term due to other factors such as disability etc.</p> <p>On the other hand, candidates might argue that even religious people put limits on the concept of Sanctity of Life. They might consider that promoting the Sanctity of Life can lead to more suffering due to the birth of children with life-threatening illnesses, or to the birth of unwanted babies. They might say that the Quality of Life is of equal or even more important consideration than Sanctity of Life. They might consider that the religious virtue of compassion or the religious idea of abortion being the lesser of two evils might be applied rather than the Sanctity of Life.</p> <p>Candidates might discuss strong v weak Sanctity of Life arguments and introduce the idea of proportionality which is held by some religious believers. They might argue against an absolutist approach and hold the relativist position that life/death issues need to be considered on a case by case basis rather than treating all cases the same.</p> <p>Candidates might discuss that even for religious people there could be a conflict of duties which arise from a belief in the Sanctity of Life – which life is more sacred that of the mother or that of the foetus.</p>	10	Candidates may legitimately respond to this question using any life or death issue, or may choose to simply focus on the concept of sanctity of life itself.

Q No	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2 a	<p>Explain how the Preference Utilitarianism of Singer might be applied to ethical decisions. [25]</p> <p>Candidates might explain how Peter Singer refines the Utilitarianism of Bentham and Mill by focussing on criteria of the Hedonic Calculus such as the number of people who will be affected by any pleasure or pain arising as a result of the act in question; and stating that they all need to be considered.</p> <p>Candidates might define what is meant by 'Preferences' in terms of what an individual or group believes satisfies its best interests, hopes, and future goals.</p> <p>Candidates might refer to Singer's rejection of speciesism and his inclusion of non-human animals within the orbit of ethical consideration due to the fact that they can feel pleasure and pain.</p> <p>They may demonstrate the focus placed by Singer on the avoidance of pain towards sentient beings of all types and how this may affect the preference of individuals.</p> <p>Candidates might then distinguish a Preference Utilitarian approach such as that of Singer as being one that judges right and wrong according to whether it fits the rational preferences of all the individuals involved. Thus happiness/pleasure is maximised by allowing individuals to satisfy as many of their own preferences as possible.</p> <p>They might explain Singer's approach to be that of the impartial spectator with all preferences counting as equal so that everyone involved is considered. This means that there is strict equality for all in the weighting of preferences. They might say that for Singer the best consequences have to be what is in the best interests of all involved. The Principle of Equal Consideration of Interests means that everyone's interests should be regarded equally when making decisions.</p> <p>Candidates might explain that Singer considered that sacrificing relatively little of an individual's interests satisfies the interests of many to a much greater degree. They may also include the concept proposed by Singer of 'Trade-Offs' of preferences.</p>	25	<p>Some candidates may choose to contextualise the work of Singer within the broader family of Utilitarian theories.</p> <p>Candidates might use any of the ethical issues they have studied in order to apply Singer's Utilitarianism and/or they might consider his arguments about speciesism. However candidates should not use the exemplification of the theory through issues at the expense of the actual theory itself.</p> <p>It is legitimate for candidates to imply the application of Singers theory to specific issues without fully discussing these where they are showing the application of the theory to ethical decision making.</p>

Q No	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2 b	<p>‘Mill’s Utilitarianism is a much better guide to making ethical decisions than Singer’s version.’ Discuss. [10]</p> <p>Candidates might agree with this statement pointing out that Mill differentiates between higher and lower pleasures and states that the higher pleasures are always to be preferred.</p> <p>They might discuss the problems with this approach and the difficulties of differentiating between pleasures. They might also discuss the problem with the greatest happiness principle itself: that happiness is not the only thing with intrinsic worth and that other values such as love, truth, justice, freedom etc. are of equal value and worth.</p> <p>Candidates might consider that Singer, on the other hand, thought that preferences are more important than happiness and that the preferences of all need to be considered. They might argue that Mill failed to satisfactorily address the issue of the happiness of the minority.</p> <p>Candidates might then argue that even with our preferences we all differ and so it would be difficult to come to an agreement, additionally some such as new born babies and those suffering from mental disability are not able to express a preference.</p> <p>Candidates might consider the importance of the harm principle for Mill, but also consider Singer’s value of considering everyone’s preferences as equal.</p> <p>Candidates might come to support one side rather than another, but they might also conclude that neither approach is a ‘much better’ guide as they both suffer from the major weaknesses of Utilitarianism, such as being unable to predict consequences and its lack of consideration for motives.</p>	10	

Q No	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
3a	<p>Explain how Kantian ethics might be applied to war and peace. [25]</p> <p>Candidates might begin by explaining Kantian ethics as being deontological and absolutist rather than teleological and relativist. They might explain the importance of duty and the Categorical Imperative including the various formulations of the Categorical Imperative.</p> <p>They might consider Kant's focus on the Good Will which requires there to be a right intention rather than a focus on consequences when going to war and they might link this to the Just War criteria.</p> <p>Candidates might point out the difficulty of applying the Categorical Imperative to issues of war and peace. They might consider the duty and autonomy of the soldier and the duty of the ruler who sends the soldier to war. They might consider that the soldier has to obey commands and so is not a free moral agent. They might consider the importance of duty in war which could lead to acts of great heroism.</p> <p>They might point out that in order to achieve the Kingdom of Ends it might be necessary to wage war in order to achieve a lasting peace, and they might point out that this stress on peace and peaceful resolutions is a strength of his approach.</p> <p>Candidates might explain that the Second Formulation of the Categorical Imperative – treating humanity as ends and not means – would be applicable in terms of how combatants are regarded and how those being fought against are treated. They might point to Kant's concept of the respect due to the rational, intelligent, free and autonomous moral agent.</p> <p>Candidates might answer using Kant's writing <i>Towards Perpetual Peace</i> where he recommended a federation of states dedicated to peace and mutual commerce which would work towards a universal kingdom of ends. They might point out that war might be necessary to attain this peace and that when it comes to war Kant can be seen as both deontological and teleological.</p>	25	<p>Candidates may use the hypothetical imperative from within Kantian theory as war is a human activity based on experience and aiming towards a specific outcome.</p> <p>They might illustrate the difficulties of legitimising war within Kantian ethics as waging war would be a contradiction of will as you would not wish for everyone to die – effectively it cannot be universalised as a broader concept in will.</p>

Q No	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
3b	<p>‘Kant’s ethical theory has serious weaknesses.’ Discuss. [10]</p> <p>Candidates might argue that Kant’s ethical has some serious weakness or that any supposed weaknesses are outweighed by its strengths.</p> <p>Candidates might refer to inflexibility and the conflict of duties. They might use examples, such as whether to tell a lie or save a life, and they might use real issues to illustrate this. They might consider that doing one’s duty can lead to wrong actions.</p> <p>Candidates might counter this argument with Kant’s taxonomy of duties which means that duty is not to be followed blindly, but that some duties are vital such as respecting others and valuing their autonomy. Some candidates may expand on this using the <i>prima facie</i> duties expounded by Ross.</p> <p>Candidates might argue that Kantian ethics ignores consequences, and question whether it is in reality possible to ignore them. They may consider that many consequences are predictable anyway and so this might not necessarily be a serious weakness.</p> <p>On the other hand they might point to Kant’s underlying logic and the need for universal moral principles which show that moral actions cannot be unjust in one society and just in another.</p> <p>They might point out the objectivity of Kant’s theory, and how the emphasis of treating people as ends in themselves underpins human rights, and treats people as autonomous beings with the freedom to act morally.</p> <p>Candidates might refer to Kant’s removal of anything apart from reason in making ethical decisions and argue that making humans automatons in this regard is a source of serious weakness.</p> <p>Candidates might argue Kantian ethics shares both the strengths and weaknesses of any deontological and absolutist ethical approach.</p>	10	Some candidates may choose to illustrate the relative weaknesses of Kantian ethics by referring to other ethical systems.

Q No	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
4a	<p>Explain the main features of Aquinas' Natural Law theory. [25]</p> <p>Candidates might highlight that Aquinas' Natural Law is a religious ethical theory which depends on an overarching religious metaphysic. They may explain the four types of law and how Natural Law mirrors Divine Law and Revealed Law and how it should in turn be mirrored in Human Law.</p> <p>Candidates might consider that Aquinas developed a theory of Natural Law that could be considered absolute and deontological, from the ideas of Aristotle and the 'telos' or 'purpose' of all things, and that it states that certain acts are intrinsically right or wrong.</p> <p>The main features might include the key precept of synderesis (do good and avoid evil) the primary precepts (preservation of life, ordering of society, worship of God, education of children, reproduction) and innumerable secondary precepts based on and derived from the primary precepts.</p> <p>They might explain how the primary precepts lead to secondary precepts and how these might be applied to ethical issues to decide the right course of action. They might give examples to illustrate this. They might explain that the secondary precepts are less absolute than the primary precepts but that at the same time they never contradict the primary precepts.</p> <p>Candidates might include the importance of reason given to humans as they are created in the image of God. They might refer to the importance of intentionality, interior and exterior acts, real and apparent goods and vincible and invincible ignorance.</p> <p>Candidates might explain that Natural Law directs people to their divine purpose, and can be deduced through reason, and so has a teleological aspect. Good acts are those which enable humans to fulfil their purpose, and are in accordance with the primary precepts.</p> <p>Candidates might explain how ethical decisions might be made by choosing real as opposed to apparent goods. They might say that the primary precepts of Natural Law allow a person to follow basic principles common to all people and that the secondary precepts allow for some measure of flexibility.</p> <p>They might explain that ethical decisions can be made using Natural Law as it not only involves reason, but also imagination, emotions and practical wisdom.</p> <p>Candidates might refer to and explain with examples the Doctrine of Double Effect as being</p>	25	<p>A valid response by a candidate may not necessarily include every element of Aquinas' theory without writing an exhaustive response.</p>

Q No	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>a main feature of Natural Law theory in providing a mechanism by which otherwise insoluble ethical dilemmas might be resolved.</p>		
4b	<p>Assess the view that the idea of purpose is the most important aspect of Natural Law. [10]</p> <p>Candidates might argue that purpose is the most important aspect of Natural Law as it stresses the goal of human life.</p> <p>They might refer to the Aristotelian framework within which Aquinas operated. They might also refer to the religious dimension provided by Aquinas with his belief that the ultimate purpose would lie in being with God after death.</p> <p>Candidates might point out that the concept of purpose is universal and applies to all, giving an important counterbalance to the hedonistic and materialistic goals of 21st century society. They might also emphasise the importance of social harmony in achieving this common good through the ordering of society.</p> <p>Candidates might posit that other aspects of Natural Law are of more importance than the idea of purpose. They might highlight the focus on reason or all or some of the primary precepts. They might highlight its focus on the common good or the religious framework behind Natural Law as being its most important aspect.</p> <p>Candidates might focus on the concept of a shared and common humanity being the most important aspect of Natural Law.</p> <p>On the other hand they could consider that the idea of deducing this divine purpose through reason ignores the importance of God's revelation, as suggested by Barth who rejects any idea of Natural Law.</p> <p>Candidates may also consider the ideas of Kai Neilson who argued that the centrality of purpose, and Natural Law as a whole, assumes that all humans are similar.</p> <p>They may argue that Aristotle's idea of eudaimonia is more suited to our secular society than Aquinas' idea of union with God.</p>	10	<p>Some candidates may choose to exemplify the concept of purpose through reference to a specific ethical issue.</p>

APPENDIX 1 - AS Levels of Response

Band	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>a.c.i.q</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>v lit arg</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>b att</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>b att</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>sat att</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>sust/just</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>g att</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>g att</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>vg/e att</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>vg/e att</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 2016

