

**GCE**

**Religious Studies**

Unit **G582**: Religious Ethics

Advanced 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 <b>must</b> 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.

NOTE: AO1 level must be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin, with the AO2 level used immediately below.

## 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.

### A2 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.

At A level, candidates are required to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding, and their ability to sustain a critical line of argument in greater depth and over a wider range of content than at AS level.

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 A2, candidates answer a single question but are reminded by a rubric of the need to address both Objectives in their answers. Progression from Advanced Subsidiary to A2 is provided, in part, by assessing their ability to construct a coherent essay, and this is an important part of the Key Skill of Communication which ‘must contribute to the assessment of Religious Studies at AS and A level’.

**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.

\*

Synoptic skills and the ability to make connections: these are now assessed at A2 as specification, due to the removal of the Connections papers.

**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	<p><b>AO1</b></p> <p>Candidates could assess the tensions between individual conscience and moral absolutes, religious teaching or laws, and consider whether conscience is vital when making moral decisions.</p> <p>Candidates could explain the different approaches to conscience e.g. Aquinas, Butler and Newman as opposed to Freud, Fromm and Piaget. They could examine how each scholar argues for the need, or not, to use conscience, or the reasons for following it.</p> <p>They may say that using ethical theories such as Utilitarianism are more important when making ethical decisions and give examples to illustrate this.</p> <p><b>AO2</b></p> <p>Analysis could compare and contrast the different reasons for following or ignoring conscience.</p> <p>Candidates could look at the reliability of conscience and factors that undermine it, for example, a conscience formed by ignorance, erroneous ideas, parents or authority.</p> <p>They could examine the possibility of a developing conscience and the influence of guilt.</p> <p>They may also assess the possibility that conscience could be used to justify any actions (Aquinas' idea of apparent goods), or that people when faced with a moral dilemma will use conscience to justify different courses of action.</p>	35	<p><b>To what extent is conscience vital when making moral decisions?</b></p> <p>Some answers may begin by defining the key term in the question 'vital' i.e. essential, necessary, of overriding importance.</p> <p>Some candidates in discussing the vital use of conscience might consider whether it is reliable as a source of moral decision making.</p> <p>However a candidate may produce a very good / excellent response without considering either of the above.</p> <p><b>AO2</b></p> <p>Candidates could state that conscience is less or more vital than using an ethical theory in moral decision making. Alternatively they might argue that one view of conscience is more effective than others, for example by contrasting the view of Butler with that of Freud.</p> <p>Candidates may use a variety of examples to illustrate cases where the conscience has been used by an individual to justify actions that would be considered to be wrong by the majority of society such as Peter Sutcliffe or the killers of Pvt Lee Rigby.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2	<p><b>AO1</b></p> <p>Candidates might explain Utilitarianism perhaps in terms of Bentham, Mill, Singer, and the main types of Utilitarianism e.g. Act, Rule, Preference. They may explain Utilitarianism as consequentialist and democratic.</p> <p>Candidates may include any of the issues surrounding sexual ethics such as premarital and extramarital sex, contraception and homosexuality. They may focus on one sexual issue or consider more than one in order to assess how useful Utilitarianism may be when making decisions.</p> <p>They may consider that Utilitarians would weigh up the harm or pain (including the emotional harm that could arise) caused and the pleasure gained from consensual sex.</p> <p>They are likely to examine various ethical theories in order to assess the usefulness of Utilitarianism in contrast to different approaches to sexual ethics e.g. Kantian ethics, Natural Law, etc.</p> <p>They may consider whether sexual morality is a private affair.</p> <p><b>AO2</b></p> <p>Candidates may say that it depends on what aspect of sexual ethics is being debated as to whether Utilitarianism may offer any help, for example they may compare the approach of Utilitarianism to homosexuality and to extramarital affairs.</p>	35	<p><b>Critically assess the view that Utilitarianism is of no use when making decisions about sexual ethics.</b></p> <p>Some candidates may begin by discussing their understanding of the meaning of the key term 'use' within the framework of the question.</p> <p>They might also consider who the system is useful for – whether for the individual or the society as a whole.</p> <p>Candidates may consider the term 'use' as meaning how easy the system is to use in terms of practical moral decision making on sexual ethical questions, for example, quick, reliable, straight forward, long-winded, consistent in the responses given.</p> <p>When discussing Mill, candidates may concentrate their responses on examining his concept of the harm principle.</p> <p>Some candidates might explore the use of utilitarianism towards areas of sexual ethics that are not specified on the syllabus. These examples should be credited equally.</p> <p><b>AO2</b></p> <p>Some candidates may build their evaluation of the usefulness of Utilitarianism around the limitations inherent within a consequentialist ethical system.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Candidates may introduce the idea of private versus public morality. They may wish to consider how far sexual morality affects the lives of others. They may consider for whom Utilitarianism might be useful – the individuals concerned or society as a whole, some might refer to Mill’s harm principle in this context.</p> <p>They may assess the usefulness of the various ethical theories when considering the rights and wrongs of Utilitarianism as an approach to sexual ethics.</p> <p>They may wish to compare Utilitarianism with a religious view or consider the role of conscience.</p>		<p>Candidates may effectively compare the relative merits and limitations of the different Utilitarian approaches to the issue, for example by discussing the differences in application between Bentham and Mill / Singer or other utilitarian thinkers they might have studied.</p>
3	<p><b>AO1</b></p> <p>Candidates could discuss what is meant by upbringing and social conditioning, and whether it means we are not free to make ethical decisions. They may consider the views of Darrow and the court case of Leopold and Loeb he defended that depended upon genetic inheritance and upbringing.</p> <p>They may consider the views of psychologists such as Piaget and Kohlberg who argue that it is our moral development, linked to our up-bringing and the society in which we live, that leads us to make ethical decisions. They may also discuss the ideas of the behaviourists such as Pavlov and Skinner.</p> <p>Candidates will also be given credit for a consideration of the views of Freud.</p>	35	<p><b>‘Our moral choices are completely determined by our upbringing and social conditioning.’ Discuss.</b></p> <p>The key terms upbringing and social conditioning may be approached by candidates in a variety of legitimate ways. Some candidates may conflate the terms upbringing and social conditioning and still produce a very effective response. Candidates should not be penalised for conflating the two terms or for concentrating on one or the other.</p> <p>Candidates may legitimately refer to any one or more of exemplar cases where upbringing and social conditioning have been used as a defence for criminal actions, for example Leopold and Loeb, Mary Bell, the Jamie Bulger killing, etc.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>They could compare a determinist view with libertarianism and compatibilism (soft determinism) and discuss whether we can make free ethical decisions.</p> <p>Some candidates might consider theological determinism, such as Calvin's teaching on predestination and religious teachings on free will.</p> <p><b>AO2</b></p> <p>Candidates may consider the implications for ethics if our ethical decisions are all the result of our social conditioning and so are never really freely made.</p> <p>They could consider the implications of the above statement in terms of human accountability and responsibility. If we are not free then how does this impact on our system of reward and punishment.</p> <p>They might consider whether we are free or just feel free and the idea that freedom is just apparent – we may feel free but we are not.</p> <p>They may introduce the teaching of Kant: to be moral we must be free, and make decisions using our reason, as determinism does not apply to acts of the will. Freedom, he argues, is the postulate of practical reason.</p>		<p><b>AO2</b></p> <p>Candidates may legitimately interpret the analogy by John Locke of the man in the locked room in a variety of ways so that he may be held as an example of both hard determinism and compatibilism.</p> <p>Some candidates may consider the implications of recent discoveries in cognitive neuroscience such as the veto effect, or any other valid interpretations of the origins of free will such as DNA, memes, etc.</p> <p>Candidates may consider different views of freedom such as spontaneity, indifference, freedom from and / or freedom to.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
4	<p><b>AO1</b></p> <p>Religious moral duties will depend upon the religious moral approach taken by the individual candidate, for example biblical moral duties may originate in Divine Command Theory, or Natural Law Theory or Situation Ethics. They may also originate in specific biblical texts.</p> <p>Candidates may consider that profit is considered good by Christians, in fact, the Protestant Work Ethic, a concept that Max Weber based on the teaching of Calvin, considers hard work to be part of one's calling, and worldly success a sign or result of personal salvation. They may even discuss the Prosperity Theology movement among the evangelical churches of the USA which sees personal wealth as a sign of God's favour and hard work by employees considered important to contribute to this. However, they may also explain the view of Friedman that businesses exist to make a profit for their shareholders and to act in their best interests.</p> <p>They may then go on to explain the responsibility of business towards the other stakeholders – the employees, the consumers (customers, the suppliers, the local community and environment etc.)</p> <p>They may consider the role of law in protecting the rights of employees and the religious teaching on how others should be treated. They could consider the religious teachings of stewardship as applying to business, the might also discuss fair treatment of the poor as highlighted by Amos, Psalms, Isaiah and James, and apply this to the question of fair wages or the use of sweatshops.</p>	35	<p><b>Critically assess the view that businesses have a religious moral duty to put their employees first.</b></p> <p>Candidates must focus their response on the key term within the question of religious moral duty rather than other concepts of duty such as that expressed by Kant within his ethical system.</p> <p>Reference to the Summum Bonnum within Kantian ethics may be legitimate, provided the candidate has specifically applied a religious understanding of the concept to business ethics and the moral duty of a business towards their employees.</p> <p>Candidates may make reference to Roman Catholic social teaching and relevant papal encyclicals.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
	<p>They may use religious ethical theories such as Natural Law or Situation Ethics to decide who should take priority. They may explain that different approaches may consider whether businesses have the same duties to all the stakeholders.</p> <p>They may use examples to illustrate their answer, such as companies that give their employees shares such as the John Lewis Partnership.</p> <p>Any reference to relevant thinkers should be credited.</p> <p><b>AO2</b></p> <p>In assessing this question candidates may consider the different aspects of corporate responsibility such as that used by Crane and Matten, assessing the different responsibilities to the different stakeholders.</p> <p>They may argue that: employees want fair wages and good working conditions, shareholders expect a good return on their investment and consumers want good products at reasonable prices. Therefore each has a claim to be put first, or given equal consideration.</p> <p>Candidates could assess the various merits of these stakeholders when deciding whether businesses should always put the needs of their employees first. They may also assess the importance of businesses acting ethically within society and helping the community.</p>		<p><b>AO2</b></p> <p>Candidates may use Ross' <i>prima facie</i> duties to show how decisions can be made of ethical dilemmas: fidelity; reparation; gratitude; non-maleficence; justice; beneficence; and self-improvement. They may discuss how these <i>prima facie</i> duties may even contradict one another and are not all-inclusive. In any given situation, any number of these <i>prima facie</i> duties may apply. However, these are not religious moral duties and should not be referred to as such by the candidate.</p> <p>Some candidates may refer to the Kantian concept of duty in comparison with religious ethical responses to the moral responsibility held by businesses towards their employees.</p>

## APPENDIX 1 A2 LEVELS OF RESPONSE

Level	Mark /21	AO1	Mark /14	AO2
0	0	absent/no relevant material	0	absent/no argument
1	1-5	almost completely ignores the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>little relevant material</li> <li>some concepts inaccurate</li> <li>shows little knowledge of technical terms</li> </ul> <b>L1</b>	1-3	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> <b>L1</b>
Communication: often unclear or disorganised; can be difficult to understand; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate				
2	6-9	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> <b>L2</b>	4-6	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> <b>L2</b>
Communication: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate				
3	10-13	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> <b>L3</b>	7-8	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> <b>L3</b>
Communication: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate				
4	14-17	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> <b>L4</b>	9-11	a good attempt at using evidence to sustain an argument holistically <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> <b>L4</b>
Communication: generally clear and organised; can be understood as a whole; spelling, punctuation and grammar good				
5	18-21	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> <b>L5</b>	12-14	A very good / excellent attempt which uses a range of evidence to sustain an argument holistically <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> <b>L5</b>
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

