

Religious Studies

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G572**: Religious Ethics

Mark Scheme for January 2012

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, OCR Nationals, 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 2012

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Annotations used in the detailed Mark Scheme (to include abbreviations and subject-specific conventions)

Only use annotations emboldened in the Levels of Response.

As scripts may be returned to centres, you should use the minimum of comments and make sure that these are related to the award of a mark or marks and are matched to statements in the mark scheme.

Do not include general comments on a candidate's work.

Record any annotation in the body of the answer, or in the margin next to the point where the decision is made to award, or not award, the mark.

Recording of marks

- Record numerical marks for responses to part-questions **unringed** in the right-hand margin. Show the total for each question (or, in specific cases, for each page) as a single **ringed** mark in the right-hand margin at the end of each question.
- Transfer ringed totals to the front page of the script, where they should be totalled.
- Show evidence that you have seen the work on every page of a script on which the candidate has made a response.
- Cross through every blank page to show that you have seen it.

Handling of unexpected answers

The Standardisation meeting will include discussion of marking issues, including:

- consideration of the mark scheme to reach a decision about the range of acceptable responses and the marks appropriate to them
- comparable marking standards for optional questions
- the handling of unexpected, yet acceptable, answers.

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

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.

Practical application of the Marking Scheme

General administrative information and instructions are issued separately by OCR.

Apart from preliminary marking for standardisation purposes, which must be carried out in pencil, the first marking of a script should be in red ink. There should be a clear indication on every page that it has been read by the examiner, and the total mark for the question must be ringed and written in the margin at the end of the script; at A2 the two sub-marks for the AOs must be written here as well. Half-marks may not be used.

To avoid giving the impression of point-marking, ticks should not be used within an answer. Examiners should not write detailed comments on scripts; the marks awarded make the assigned Levels of Response completely explicit.

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.

MARK SCHEME

Principal Examiners – please read 'Writing the Mark Scheme using the OCR template' then:

Start here:

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
1 a	<p>Candidates may explain how Mill tried to improve on the Utilitarianism of Bentham and use this as a starting point to explain the differences. Alternatively they may explain their different approaches to the principle of Utility – pleasure (Bentham) and happiness (Mill).</p> <p>They may examine the difference between a quantitative and a qualitative approach, and how Mill considered Bentham's Utilitarianism to be merely seeking animalistic pleasures.</p> <p>Candidates may discuss the use of the Hedonic Calculus in Bentham's Utilitarianism compared to the more straightforward approach of Mill.</p> <p>They may explain that Bentham focussed on the individual and Mill on the common good. Some answers may consider whether Bentham is more of an Act Utilitarian and Mill considered to be a Rule Utilitarian.</p>	25	
1 b	<p>Candidates may consider what is meant by 'superior in every way' and whether this means that Mill's version has few, if any, weaknesses.</p> <p>Candidates may discuss the ease of application of Mill's Utilitarianism, compared to the use of the Hedonic Calculus. They may consider the quality of pleasure to be superior to the quantity.</p>	10	

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>However, they may also explain that neither version is able to predict the consequences of our actions with any accuracy and may give examples to illustrate this. They may consider that Mill's Utilitarianism is superior in that it attempts to protect minorities, even though it fails to do so completely.</p> <p>They may consider that neither version considers duty and discuss the prima facie duties of Ross. They may also discuss the lack of consideration of motive, personal responsibility and individual rights.</p> <p>Candidates may also discuss the importance of happiness, consequences and say that both approaches have both advantages and disadvantages.</p>		
2 a	<p>Candidates may explain the various concepts of personhood and whether this applies to a foetus. They may give various definitions of personhood, such as genetic structure, consciousness, self-awareness, ability to reason etc.</p> <p>Candidates may explain the criteria of Mary Anne Warren or the analogy of the violinist from Judith Jarvis Thompson.</p> <p>The idea of ensoulment might be explained, and actuality versus potentiality could be discussed. They may discuss at which stage a foetus becomes a person.</p> <p>Candidates might then explain how these ideas of personhood might influence the approaches of followers of different ethical theories such as Natural Law or Utilitarianism. They may explain that the concept of personhood would influence religious ethics and the approach of Natural Law, but have little impact on the approach of Utilitarianism, while it is unsure whether Kant would consider the foetus a person or not.</p>	25	

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2b	<p>Candidates may discuss whether potential life has any rights and whether a fertilised egg has a right to be born.</p> <p>They may consider the arguments surrounding the Sanctity of Life and compare these to the arguments surrounding the Quality of Life. They may also discuss the application of the Doctrine of Double Effect.</p> <p>Candidates may discuss whether the right to life of the mother or that of the foetus is the most important and whether the embryo has the right to use the mother's body and resources to sustain its own life.</p> <p>Candidates may also discuss the importance of happiness, consequences and say that both approaches have both advantages and disadvantages.</p>		
3a	<p>Candidates may explain that the Sanctity of Life is key to religious ethical approach to genetic engineering. They may use specific examples of genetic engineering to explain that any technique which does not treat life as having intrinsic worth is wrong – this includes any form of genetic engineering that destroys embryos.</p> <p>However, they may explain that religious ethics may not have the same concerns about the genetic engineering of animals or plants. Candidates may also discuss the subject of using adult stem cells.</p> <p>Candidates may take a Natural Law approach to the value of human life, but may also consider the value of genetic engineering to help individuals and society whilst still respecting human life.</p>		

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Candidates may consider the teachings of different Christian churches on this subject or may approach the issue from the point of view of any religion studied.</p>		
3b	<p>Candidates could approach this question either way. They may argue that the stress on the preservation of life from conception means that genetic engineering that uses foetal material is not allowed. However, they may point to the advances in science and how much genetic engineering now uses adult stem cells so religious ethics would not prevent progress.</p> <p>They may also discuss what is meant by progress and whether religious ethics act as important brakes on genetic engineering by considering the person, the effects on the environment and on how we treat animals and plants.</p>		
4a	<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 that it states that certain acts are intrinsically right or wrong. They may explain that Natural Law directs people to their divine purpose, and can be deduced through reason. Good acts are those which enable humans to fulfil their purpose, and are in accordance with the primary precepts.</p> <p>They may explain how the primary precepts lead to secondary precepts and how these may be applied to ethical issues to decide the right course of action. They may give examples to illustrate this. They may explain that the secondary precepts are less absolute than the primary precepts.</p> <p>Candidates may explain how the right course of action may be followed by choosing real as opposed to apparent goods.</p>		

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>They may 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 . They may explain that the right course of action can be chosen using Natural Law as it not only involves reason, but also imagination, emotions and practical wisdom.</p>		
4b	<p>Candidates may consider all the advantages of Natural Law - how it is simple and clear cut in its establishment of common rules. It avoids the problems of minorities and unforeseen consequences while concentrating on human character and its potential for goodness and flourishing.</p> <p>However, candidates may also discuss the impossibility of defining what is good, the uncertainty of any divine purpose or single human nature common to all.</p> <p>Some candidates may suggest that consideration of both the act and the intention make Natural Law the best approach to ethical decision making, while others will argue for an alternative approach that is more focussed on the consequences such as Utilitarianism.</p> <p>Candidates may use examples of ethical decisions to illustrate their answer.</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 <i>a.c.i.q</i>	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 <i>v lit arg</i>
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 <i>b att</i>	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 <i>b att</i>
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 <i>sat att</i>	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 <i>sust/just</i>
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 <i>g att</i>	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 <i>g att</i>
Communication: generally clear and organised; can be understood as a whole; spelling, punctuation and grammar good				
Band	Mark /25	AO1	Mark /10	AO2
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 <i>vg/e att</i>	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 <i>vg/e att</i>
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 2012

