



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2019

**AS
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - COMPONENT 3
AN INTRODUCTION TO RELIGION AND ETHICS
B120U30-1**

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2019 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

Marking guidance for examiners, please apply carefully and consistently:

Positive marking

It should be remembered that candidates are writing under examination conditions and credit should be given for what the candidate writes, rather than adopting the approach of penalising him/her for any omissions. It should be possible for a very good response to achieve full marks and a very poor one to achieve zero marks. Marks should not be deducted for a less than perfect answer if it satisfies the criteria of the mark scheme.

Exemplars in the mark scheme are only meant as helpful guides. Therefore, any other acceptable or suitable answers should be credited even though they are not actually stated in the mark scheme.

Two main phrases are deliberately placed throughout each mark scheme to remind examiners of this philosophy. They are:

- “Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.”
- “This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.”

Rules for Marking

1. Differentiation will be achieved on the basis of candidates' response.
2. No mark scheme can ever anticipate or include every possible detail or interpretation; examiners should use their professional judgement to decide whether a candidate's particular response answers the question in relation to the particular assessment objective.
3. Candidates will often express their ideas in language different from that given in any mark scheme or outline. Positive marking therefore, on the part of examiners, will recognise and credit correct statements of ideas, valid points and reasoned arguments irrespective of the language employed.

Banded mark schemes

Banded mark schemes are divided so that each band has a relevant descriptor. The descriptor provides a description of the performance level for that band. Each band contains marks. Examiners should first read and annotate a candidate's answer to pick out the evidence that is being assessed in that question. Once the annotation is complete, the mark scheme can be applied. This is done as a two stage process.

Banded mark schemes stage 1 – deciding on the band

When deciding on a band, the answer should be viewed holistically. Beginning at the lowest band, examiners should look at the candidate's answer and check whether it matches the descriptor for that band. Examiners should look at the descriptor for that band and see if it matches the qualities shown in the candidate's answer. If the descriptor at the lowest band is satisfied, examiners should move up to the next band and repeat this process for each band until the descriptor matches the answer.

If an answer covers different aspects of different bands within the mark scheme, a 'best fit' approach should be adopted to decide on the band and then the candidate's response should be used to decide on the mark within the band. For instance if a response is mainly in band 2 but with a limited amount of band 3 content, the answer would be placed in band 2, but the mark awarded would be close to the top of band 2 as a result of the band 3 content.

Examiners should not seek to mark candidates down as a result of small omissions in minor areas of an answer.

Banded mark schemes stage 2 – deciding on the mark

Once the band has been decided, examiners can then assign a mark. During standardising (at the Examiners' marking conference), detailed advice from the Principal Examiner on the qualities of each mark band will be given. Examiners will then receive examples of answers in each mark band that have been awarded a mark by the Principal Examiner. Examiners should mark the examples and compare their marks with those of the Principal Examiner.

When marking, examiners can use these examples to decide whether a candidate's response is of a superior, inferior or comparable standard to the example. Examiners are reminded of the need to revisit the answer as they apply the mark scheme in order to confirm that the band and the mark allocated is appropriate to the response provided. Indicative content is also provided for banded mark schemes. Indicative content is not exhaustive, and any other valid points must be credited. In order to reach the highest bands of the mark scheme a learner need not cover all of the points mentioned in the indicative content, but must meet the requirements of the highest mark band.

Awarding no marks to a response

Where a response is not creditworthy, that is it contains nothing of any relevance to the question, or where no response has been provided, no marks should be awarded.

AS Generic Band Descriptors

| Band | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions 25 marks</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching</i> <i>influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies</i> <i>cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice</i> <i>approaches to the study of religion and belief.</i> |
|----------|--|
| 5 | <p style="text-align: center;">21-25 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. An extensive and relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. The response demonstrates extensive depth and/or breadth. Excellent use of evidence and examples. Thorough and accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. |
| 4 | <p style="text-align: center;">16-20 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. A detailed, relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples. Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. |
| 3 | <p style="text-align: center;">11-15 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mainly accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. A satisfactory response, which generally answers the main demands of the question set. The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth in some areas. Satisfactory use of evidence and examples. Mainly accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. |
| 2 | <p style="text-align: center;">6-10 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Basic level of accuracy and relevance. A basic response, addressing some of the demands of the question set. The response demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth, including limited use of evidence and examples. Some accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. |
| 1 | <p style="text-align: center;">1-5 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Low level of accuracy and relevance. A very limited response, with little attempt to address the question. The response demonstrates very limited depth and/or breadth. Very limited use of evidence and examples. Little or no reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. <p>N.B. A maximum of 2 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'</p> |
| 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No relevant information. |

| Band | Assessment Objective AO2- Part (b) questions 25 marks <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i> |
|-------------|---|
| 5 | <p>21-25 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue. • A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set. • Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. |
| 4 | <p>16-20 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue. • The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed. • The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. |
| 3 | <p>11-15 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue. • Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed. • Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. |
| 2 | <p>6-10 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue. • A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed. • A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. |
| 1 | <p>1-5 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue. • An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set. • Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence. • Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary. |
| 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant analysis or evaluation. |

Component 3: An Introduction to Religion and Ethics

MARK SCHEME

To be read in conjunction with the generic level descriptors provided.

Section A

1. (a) **Explain Fletcher's four working principles as a means of assessing morality.** [AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Situation ethics is a consequentialist theory therefore moral decisions are assessed by considering the individual situation and the consequences of a particular action rather than by considering rules or moral norms.
- Fletcher believed that decisions should be made based on a single principle of agape (Christian love) as outlined by the Six Fundamental Principles.
- In order to put this into practice, the four working principles – pragmatism, relativism, positivism and personalism are used to test the most loving action in a given situation.
- Pragmatism deals with whether the action works in a given situation towards the most loving outcome. The solution to an ethical dilemma has to be practical; there is no point in following an ideal action if it will not result in love in the particular circumstance. Candidates may illustrate this point with appropriate examples which may or may not be drawn from the issues listed for application.
- Relativism means that there are no absolute moral rules or laws, everything is relative to the law of love.
- Positivism entails acting out of faith in a loving God rather than relying on perceived natural laws. The principles of Christian love should be used when making all value judgements.
- Personalism involves valuing the people in a situation more highly than moral rules and seeking a loving outcome for all involved. Candidates may choose to illustrate this point with appropriate examples.
- The role of personal responsibility is important when applying the working principles and while individuals may consider the basic ethical rules of their community, these may be put to one side if it serves love best to do so.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

(b) 'Situation Ethics does not work.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Situation Ethics may be seen to work because it encourages people to consider the consequences of their actions before they take them and it is only the consequences that have a real effect on human well-being.
- However, humans struggle to accurately predict the consequences of their actions which means that the theory will not work.
- Situation ethics allows a person to perform certain actions which others may regard as wrong if they lead to a more loving outcome, for example, lying to save the life of another. The relativist approach allows for different actions to be correct in different circumstances.
- Many would claim that the relativism of Situation Ethics may not work as it gives too much freedom to the individual to decide what action to take. Humans are prone to making mistakes or being influenced by personal gain rather than unconditional love. Indeed, in response to John Robinson's comment that Situation Ethics was for 'the man come of age', William Barclay pointed out that the problem is that 'man had NOT come of age'.
- Another line of argument is that Situation Ethics works because it allows people the individual freedom to make decisions for themselves, which is better than enforcing strict rules which people might find difficult to understand or accept.
- Situation Ethics is flexible and practical as it takes into account the complexities of human life (the situation) and can take tough decisions where, from a legalistic perspective, all actions seem wrong.
- However, some people may prefer to have greater guidance/a set of rules to live by as they find this gives a clearer way to make decisions.
- Some people would argue that certain actions are 'right' or 'wrong' in themselves and you cannot use relativism or consequentialism to argue against this. William Barclay challenged Fletcher's work and argued that laws were simply the collected wisdom and 'distillation' of past applications of agape.
- Religious believers may argue that all should follow divine law as God is the ultimate source of moral authority and a theory that is not based on God's law cannot work.
- They may also point out that Fletcher's examples to illustrate Situation Ethics are based on extreme circumstances and that the outcome in these cases could not guarantee to be loving (Barclay). It would be better in the vast majority of cases to stick to moral norms and rules.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

2. (a) **Examine the role of 'agape' (selfless love) in Fletcher's Situation Ethics.**
[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Agape is chosen by Fletcher as the 'middle way' between legalism and anti-nomianism. It serves as an alternative to restrictive laws while offering a distinctively Christian approach to moral decision making based on Jesus' teaching 'you shall love your neighbour as yourself.' (Mark 12)
- Agape may be defined in contrast to other forms of love such as *philia* and *eros*. It is an unconditional love which Fletcher sees as an act of will rather than an emotion or feeling.
- Agape fits in with the 'liberal era' of the 1960s but the role of selfless love in the theory has a strong theological basis and is not simply a reaction to the social context.
- Agape forms the 'boss principle' of Situation Ethics and all other considerations come second to this guiding principle, which allows for flexibility and a response to real human situations which are complicated and not 'black or white decisions' (Fletcher)
- The use of agape is based on the approach used by Jesus in the Bible (Luke 10:25-37) and puts into action the teachings of St Paul (1 Corinthians 13)
- Agape forms the basis of the six fundamental principles, which explain how the concept can be understood in the context of Christian moral decision making:
 - Only love is intrinsically good
 - Love is the ruling norm of Christian decision making
 - Love and justice are the same
 - Love wills the good of others regardless of feeling
 - A loving end justifies the means
 - Decide situationally not prescriptively
- Agape is also at the heart of the four working principles:
 - Pragmatism – the action must work in practice and lead to a loving outcome.
 - Relativism – everything is relative to the law of agape – there are no other moral absolutes.
 - Positivism – act out of faith in a loving God and use the principles of Christian love as justification for all decisions.
 - Personalism – put what is loving for the people involved before strict adherence to the law.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

(b) 'Agape should replace religious rules.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Some would agree with this claim as it has a pure motivation – the ideal of Christian love (1 Corinthians 13).
- It is modelled on the teaching of Jesus – 'Love thy neighbour' (Luke 10) – and moves away from the Pharisaic legalistic approach to ethics which Jesus rejected.
- However, it could be argued that Christians should not reject absolute moral laws like the Ten Commandments as St Paul said that love is the fulfilling of the Law – (Romans 13v10).
- Another line of argument is that the idea of putting people first, 'personalism', is in keeping with the miracles performed by Jesus as recorded in the New Testament. Application of agape rather than rules is part of living a responsible Christian life in relationship with Jesus.
- However, ordinary humans may be seen as incapable of acting out of agape – humans are too prone to selfishness to apply the principle unconditionally. They may use these principles as an excuse for immoral behaviour.
- It could be argued that, as some denominations like the Quakers and some within the Anglican and Methodist churches use this theory to make ethical decisions on issues such as abortion, the statement is already being put into practice.
- However, others would argue that it does not consider religious tradition or the teachings of Church leaders. For example, Pope Benedict stated that abortion is always wrong. Several Popes have rejected the relativistic approach taken by Situation Ethics as it allows people to make their own decisions, but rejects God as the ultimate source of authority
- Also, St. Paul stated that love is not the only desirable quality "...the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, self-control; against such there is not law." (Galatians 5v22-23)
- Candidates may choose to consider whether agape should replace the religious rules of non-Christian religions, arguing for or against the statement from the perspective of a different religion. For example, they may choose to argue that this statement closely mirrors the approach taken by some Buddhists who put *metta* at the heart of their morality.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

Section B

3. (a) Explain Ethical Egoism.

[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Ethical Egoism is a normative theory (i.e. it directs / guides ethical action). It claims that an action is moral if it is based on the self-interest of the agent. It assumes that it is right for a person to pursue their own self-interests.
- This could be contrasted with altruism in order to make the definition clear.
- Psychological Egoism is non-normative but purely descriptive. It observes that human nature is such that all our actions are motivated by self-interest.
- Ethical Egoism suggests how humans *should* act; Psychological Egoism observes how humans do in fact act.
- In Ethical Egoism moral decisions should focus on the long-term rather than short-term interests of the agent, which may involve doing actions which appear altruistic, but which ultimately benefit the agent. Candidates may offer a range of examples to illustrate this idea.
- Ethical Egoism is not the same as being purely selfish – there is a clear difference between the character trait of selfishness and the ethical theory of Egoism as the right way to act.
- Max Stirner rejects the concept of Ethical Egoism based purely on material gain (as defined by capitalism), as greed is only one part of the ego. An action is moral if it serves the interests of the individual in the broadest sense and does not restrict this to one aspect of the ego.
- Max Stirner rejects the notion that Psychological Egoism presents because he thinks that we are all slaves to some ideology or abstract social construct (spook).
- He sees each individual as unique, and claims that in order to develop one's unique nature one should seek to be free of all spooks.
- Ultimately the individual seeks 'ownness' (eigenheit) and becomes a person free from social constraints. A person can then appreciate their own uniqueness (einzig) and can be truly free to act.
- Stirner argues for a 'union of egoists' in which each would cooperate with others out of mutual self-interest. A moral action would therefore be one in which the individual cooperates freely with others because of their mutual interests.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

(b) 'All so-called moral actions are ultimately selfish.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Stirner would argue that all moral actions should ultimately be self-interested as an action can only be moral if it contributes in the broadest sense to the self-interest of the agent. Candidates may choose to debate whether self-interest is the same as 'selfishness.'
- Following this line of argument, Stirner would argue that our current understanding of 'self-interest' may be correlated with a spook, but that genuine self-interest based on understanding ourselves as unique is truly moral as it is based on a true vision of self and is not 'selfish' in terms of a character trait.
- Candidates may agree with the statement and argue that actions such as love or self-sacrifice for the benefit of others, are ultimately only moral because they satisfy the moral agent themselves.
- Psychological egoists may argue that those who claim to act altruistically are deluding themselves as it is part of human nature to be motivated purely by self-interest, hence the 'so-called' statement in the question.
- However, it could be argued that many moral actions do not benefit the agent in any way. Examples of self-sacrifice such as Maximillian Kolbe could be given to support this point.
- These examples could be interrogated to establish whether there is any benefit to the agent in the action or as to whether they are truly moral.
- One approach may be to argue that, while there may be some benefit to the agent, it is not this benefit that makes the action moral but the consequences for others involved.
- Utilitarianism could be used to suggest that an action is moral if it produces the greatest happiness for the greatest number. This does not rule out benefit to the agent themselves but looks beyond the purely selfish in order to define morality.
- Alternatively, the approaches of Natural Law or Situation Ethics may be used to argue that moral actions are not selfish but rather based on unconditional love or on fulfilling one's natural purpose. Both of these are followed out of love for God and a desire to do the right thing rather than out of self-interest.
- A counter-argument here could be that the promise of eternal reward in both theories is selfish and therefore justifies the claim made in the question. Candidates could consider whether a selfish motivation would lead to eternal reward and whether it is possible to be aware of eternal life without this forming the primary motivation for action.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

4. (a) Apply Aquinas' Natural Law to the issue of abortion.

[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Aquinas' Natural Law is a form of moral absolutism and, as such, will give clear guidelines about the issue of abortion.
- The primary precepts of the preservation of life (or defence of innocent life) and of reproduction both indicate that abortion goes against the purpose of human life and is therefore a morally wrong action as it involves the deliberate killing of an innocent human being and prevents reproduction.
- Secondary precepts such as 'do not kill' and 'do not perform abortion' can be derived from the primary precepts and should be followed in order to develop a right relationship with God.
- Abortion may be seen as an apparent good (an action which appears good in the circumstances or relating to the consequences) rather than a real good (an action which works towards the primary precepts and therefore fulfils the purpose of the agent.)
- An agent must consider both interior and exterior acts when contemplating abortion. While the interior act may be good (e.g. to save lives), the exterior act of abortion will always be bad (as it is contrary to the primary precepts), therefore abortion cannot be justified by good intentions.
- Candidates may discuss the principle of double effect in relation to abortion. An action may be performed with a bad effect if and only if this is the unintended side effect of another good action. So, for example, a hysterectomy may be performed to save the life of a pregnant woman with uterine cancer. The surgery itself is a good action as it preserves her life. The intention of the surgeon is to save the life of the mother. The unintended side effect is abortion, but this is not the main purpose of the action. To satisfy the conditions of double effect, there must be no alternative way to achieve the good effect (such as postponing the surgery until after the birth of the baby).
- Candidates may point to the difficulty of applying Natural Law to abortion in cases of rape and incest, for example, and may explain ways in which conflict between the rights of the mother and the child may make application of the precepts less than clear.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

(b) 'Natural Law offers a perfect way to make moral decisions.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Natural Law is seen as perfect by many as it is based on the conviction that God created a purposeful world - a view held by the majority of the world religions – and therefore its principles are universal and valid for all people at all times.
- It is compatible with religious absolute morality - the 'divine' laws found within most major world religions. By fulfilling natural law humans are fulfilling God's will according to many sacred texts, e.g. purpose of sex is procreation as stated in the Bible and Qu'ran.
- It gives due place to God-given conscience and reason in ethical decision making, and gives clear cut rules which makes it ideal for believers to make decisions in areas which are not directly covered by scripture.
- However, some believers do not find it perfect as it conflicts with specific religious moral injunctions e.g. Jesus said in Matthew Chapter 5v39, 'if someone strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him the other also' which contradicts Natural Law's view that humans have the right to defend themselves.
- Many religions or denominations within a religion oppose an absolutist approach to morality, e.g. Buddhism or the Quakers. They would consider the situation the person finds themselves in. In the New Testament, Jesus appears to oppose legalistic (law-based) morality. He appears to have adopted a form of personalism'. He says that people are more important than rules, e.g. the healing on the Sabbath (Matthew Chapter 12v9-13).
- Natural Law may be seen as perfect, but it fails to recognise that the world we live in is far from perfect and sometimes compromises must be made in order to take the most moral action. Consequentialist and relativist approaches may not lead to moral 'perfection' but they are likely to give a more realistic approach in the modern world.
- Also, Aquinas' Natural Law is unlikely to be seen as perfect by atheists who do not regard the world as exhibiting divine order or purpose. Evidence from science may be used to support the claim that the world is inherently disordered, and therefore that Natural Law has no secure basis.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

5. (a) Explain the main features of Act Utilitarianism.

[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Act utilitarianism is a form of moral relativism. It is a consequentialist and teleological theory which builds on the natural human tendency to pursue pleasure and avoid pain.
- Bentham's Act Utilitarianism is based on the principle of utility ('one ought to seek out pleasure and avoid pain'), and the greatest happiness principle ('the greatest happiness for the greatest number'). In Bentham's terms, this means looking at actions which create the greatest amount of happiness overall for humanity, not just the greatest number of people in a given situation.
- Bentham believed that past experiences did not always guide us to moral choices and that each situation was different. As a result, he focused on the quantity of pleasure produced by each separate act and regarded all forms of pleasure as of equal worth (the quantity of pleasure being equal, the game of push-pin is as good as poetry.) An act must produce the greatest amount of pleasure with the least amount of pain.
- The hedonic calculus is used as a means to measure pleasure in each unique situation by considering seven factors:
 - Intensity – the stronger the pleasure the more weight it carries
 - Duration – longer lasting pleasures create greater happiness
 - Certainty – a pleasure that is sure to happen carries more weight than a possibility of pleasure.
 - Remoteness – pleasures that are closer in time carry more weight
 - Fecundity – if the pleasure will lead to further pleasures in the future, this gives a greater overall quantity
 - Purity – a pleasure that does not contain any pain is better than one in which pleasure and pain are mixed.
 - Extent – the greater the number of people affected by the pleasure, the better.
- Each factor is equally valid in the decision-making process and the hedonic calculus should be used to weigh up the quantity of pleasure that will result from each possible course of action before deciding on the best overall option.
- Candidates may choose to illustrate the main features of Act Utilitarianism by drawing on the issues of animal experimentation or nuclear deterrence to exemplify their points or, alternatively, they may choose examples from other areas of ethics to support their explanations.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

(b) 'Act utilitarianism offers an effective way to make moral decisions.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Act utilitarianism is an effective way to make decisions as it is realistic and is a widely accepted and practised basis of morality used in modern democracies and in making decisions about, for example, distribution of NHS finances.
- It is based on achieving happiness for the majority, which is a reasonable goal for morality and will work because it is based on what humans naturally seek to do, therefore fitting in with common-sense decision making.
- However, it is difficult to quantify happiness in a precise way, as Bentham tries to do, and different people will naturally give different weightings to certain aspects of the hedonic calculus, causing disagreement about what is the moral course of action.
- It is also difficult to accurately determine all the potential consequences of an action and so, while Act Utilitarianism may be effective in theory, this is not always the case when put into practice.
- Act utilitarianism could be argued to be effective because it permits a modern, flexible approach to ethical decision-making which considers the situation and the consequences and allows for personal autonomy. It also considers the good of others and not just the individual, making it fair.
- However, some would argue that the selfish pursuit of individual happiness is a problem in society and that the flexibility of Act Utilitarianism is a weakness rather than a strength as it allows for moral norms to be broken on the basis of perceived 'greatest happiness'.
- Candidates could illustrate this point with examples in which pursuit of the greatest happiness for the greatest number results in injustice to minorities or in acts which are regarded by other moral codes as morally reprehensible.
- There is also the problem of intention – ignoring an individual's motive does not seem an effective way to judge what is moral. Candidates may argue that achieving greatest happiness when intending to promote injustice or harm another person cannot be an effective way to make decisions.
- Candidates may choose to argue that other forms of utilitarianism address some of the issues of Act Utilitarianism and are more effective when making moral decisions. However, they may also argue that adaptations of classical Utilitarianism lose the essential spirit of the theory.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised