



**ADVANCED**  
**General Certificate of Education**  
**2012**

---

**Religious Studies**  
Assessment Unit A2 6  
*assessing*  
Ethics and Society  
**[AR261]**  
**MONDAY 28 MAY, MORNING**

---

**MARK**  
**SCHEME**

## Levels of Response

The specification requires that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the learning outcomes and skills set out in the specification.

- 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.

In addition, for synoptic assessment, A Level candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the connections between different elements of their course of study.

- Critically evaluate and justify a point of view through the use of evidence and reasoned argument.

In addition, for synoptic assessment, A Level candidates should relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to aspects of human experience.

Each of the two assessment objectives has been categorised into five levels of performance relating to the respective abilities of the candidates. Having identified, for each assessment objective listed opposite, the band in which the candidate has performed, the examiner should then decide on the appropriate mark within the range for the band.

**A2 BANDS****AO1 (30 marks)**

<p><b>Band 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A full and highly informed response to the task.</li> <li>• Demonstrates comprehensive understanding and accurate knowledge.</li> <li>• A very high degree of relevant evidence and examples.</li> <li>• A very sophisticated style of writing set within a clear and coherent structure.</li> <li>• An extensive range of technical language and terminology.</li> <li>• An almost totally faultless use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>	<b>25–30</b>
<p><b>Band 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reasonable and well informed response to the task.</li> <li>• Demonstrates a high degree of understanding and almost totally accurate knowledge.</li> <li>• A very good range of relevant evidence and examples.</li> <li>• A mature style of writing set within a mainly clear and coherent structure.</li> <li>• A wide range of technical language and terminology.</li> <li>• A mainly accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>	<b>19–24</b>
<p><b>Band 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A good response to the task.</li> <li>• Demonstrates a reasonable degree of understanding and mainly accurate knowledge.</li> <li>• A good range of relevant evidence and examples.</li> <li>• A reasonably mature style of writing with some coherent structure evident.</li> <li>• A good range of technical language and terminology.</li> <li>• Reasonably accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>	<b>13–18</b>
<p><b>Band 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited response to the task.</li> <li>• Demonstrates some knowledge and understanding.</li> <li>• A basic range of evidence and/or examples.</li> <li>• Style of writing is just appropriate.</li> <li>• Structure is disorganised in places.</li> <li>• Limited range of technical language and terminology.</li> <li>• Limited command of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>	<b>7–12</b>
<p><b>Band 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A very basic response to the task.</li> <li>• Demonstrates minimal knowledge and understanding.</li> <li>• Little, if any, use of evidence and/or examples.</li> <li>• Inappropriate style of writing within a poor structure.</li> <li>• A very basic range of technical language and terminology.</li> <li>• Very poor use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>	<b>0–6</b>

## AO2 (20 marks)

<p><b>Band 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A comprehensive and coherent response demonstrating an excellent attempt at critical analysis, supported by a high awareness of scholarly views.</li> <li>• Very good personal insight and independent thought expressed through a highly developed argument which is set, where necessary, in the context of wider aspects of human experience.</li> <li>• An extensive range of technical language and terminology.</li> <li>• An almost totally faultless use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>	<b>17–20</b>
<p><b>Band 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A very good response demonstrating a very good attempt at critical analysis, supported by a good awareness of scholarly views.</li> <li>• Good personal insight and independent thought expressed through a developed argument which is set, where necessary, in the context of wider aspects of human experience.</li> <li>• A wide range of technical language and terminology.</li> <li>• A mainly accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>	<b>13–16</b>
<p><b>Band 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reasonable response demonstrating a good attempt at critical analysis, supported by an awareness of the views of some scholars.</li> <li>• Some personal insight and independent thought expressed through reasonable argument which is set, where necessary, in the context of wider aspects of human experience.</li> <li>• A good range of technical language and terminology.</li> <li>• Reasonably accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>	<b>9–12</b>
<p><b>Band 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited response demonstrating a modest attempt at critical analysis, with a limited awareness of scholarly views.</li> <li>• Limited personal insight and independent thought expressed through some argument.</li> <li>• A good range of technical language and terminology.</li> <li>• Reasonably accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>	<b>5–8</b>
<p><b>Band 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A very basic response demonstrating little attempt at critical analysis, with minimal awareness of scholarly views.</li> <li>• Poor personal insight and/or independent thought.</li> <li>• Shallow argument.</li> <li>• Limited range of technical language and terminology.</li> <li>• Limited command of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>	<b>0–4</b>

## Section A

AVAILABLE MARKS

- 1 (a)** A discussion of a relativist approach to ethics could include, e.g.:
- relativism as something that needs to be embraced
  - ethical relativism as a serious moral theory
  - the contextual nature of ethics
  - the fact that moral truths are not fixed forever
  - the subjectivist nature of morality
  - the sovereignty/autonomy of the individual
  - the promotion of tolerance
  - allows for evolutionary change
  - allows for personal freedom and choice
  - relativism as not “always meaning anything goes”
  - lack of clarity in the absolutist/relativist distinction – absolutism having elements of relativism and vice versa
  - the inflexibility of moral absolutism
  - possible reference to Utilitarianism, Situation Ethics, Virtue Ethics, Emotivism
  - possible reference to Individual Relativism, Cultural Relativism
  - possible mention of the origins of Relativism and its roots in Nietzsche and Post Modernism. [30]
- (b)** An assessment of the view could include, e.g.:
- consideration of the age old issue “why be good”
  - the relationship between religion and morality
  - religion as providing the moorings/anchor for which all morality is based
  - divine command theory
  - belief in God as giving ultimate meaning to living a moral life
  - the Euthyphro dilemma
  - the views of Kant
  - dangers for morality when associated with religion (Dawkins)
  - belief in God and Religion as being world evading and hence detracting from a sense of moral responsibility
  - the extent to which it is possible to be moral without being religious
  - secular humanist views, utilitarian views
  - differences/conflicts within religious perspectives
  - the anonymous Christian (Rahner)
  - reference to the teaching of Jesus, the views of Paul. [20]

50

- 2 (a)** An explanation of the nature of Human Rights could include, e.g.:
- the Christian view of the origin of Human Rights in God and creation
  - Human Rights as inherent not acquired
  - natural rights versus positive rights
  - definition of a “Human Right”
  - different types of rights, e.g. political and civil; economic, social and cultural
  - explicit reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights
  - the influence of Natural Law, the contribution of Hobbes, Locke and Thomas Paine
  - the influence of the Decalogue
  - the influence of the Enlightenment
  - Utilitarianism and Human Rights
  - Christian views on issues pertaining to dignity, equality and responsibility
  - relativist views of rights
  - rights and responsibilities. [30]
- (b)** An assessment of the claim could include, e.g.:
- the utilitarian principle of the greatest happiness of the greatest number
  - problems associated with majoritism
  - the utilitarian ethic as possibly infringing minority rights
  - the needs of individuals/groups as being absolutely paramount
  - respect for autonomy
  - issues pertaining to discrimination
  - membership of a group as carrying with it particular penalties and the associated injustice
  - the need to take a principled stand for justice for all
  - the need for absolute standards in morality
  - reference to issues relevant to various minority groups, e.g. travellers, the gay community, asylum seekers
  - rights and responsibilities
  - the need to have agreed moral standards in order for society to function normally
  - the influence of cultural relativism
  - the need to protect individuals in minority cases, e.g. honour killings, FGM, arranged or forced marriage. [20]

50

- 3 (a)** An analysis of the moral issues raised by the ecological crisis could include, e.g.:
- human extravagance and negligence
  - the problem of human greed, of profit before people
  - the nature of the delicate balance within the biosphere
  - the issue of moral responsibility
  - the issue of duties (human centred duties against environmental centred duties)
  - approaches such as the Libertarian Extension, Eco-centrism and Conservation Ethics
  - religious, utilitarian and deontological perspectives
  - the views of writers, e.g. Peter Singer, Aldo Leopold
  - the Biblical concept of stewardship
  - possible reference to general factors, e.g. global warming, resource depletion
  - that ultimately the survival of the environment is about human survival. [30]
- (b)** An evaluation of the view could include, e.g.:
- the rejection of the idolatry of technology, of consumer goods, of human control and corporate power (individualism, materialism and consumerism)
  - individual and collective sins at the heart of the ecological crisis – greed, power and ambition
  - God as the creator and sustainer of the earth, humankind as user fructaries/stewards and hence accountable
  - difficulties presented by the Genesis narratives – of “dominion” and “stewardship”
  - religion as having to bear responsibility for the environmental crisis, spiritual welfare more important than earthy matters
  - how non-religious organisations, e.g. Friends of the Earth have appeared as more proactive and reactionary against environmental destruction
  - the legacy of St. Francis of Assisi – seeing divine beauty in every living thing; the principle of universal benevolence
  - how the Church needs to take responsibility for its inactivity in the past
  - how the Church needs to clarify its position, e.g. stewardship, not dominion
  - the influence of other views, e.g. atheistic, utilitarian
  - possible reference to other religions, e.g. Buddhist. [20]

50

- 4 (a) An analysis and discussion of Just War theory could include, e.g.:
- the origins and historical evolution of the theory up to the present
  - reference to key figures, e.g. Augustine, Aquinas
  - the criteria for Just War, e.g. legitimate authority, just cause, last resort, proportionality
  - the distinction between jus ad bellum and jus in bello
  - Just War theory as rooted in Natural Law
  - pacifist objections
  - the realist view of war
  - problems presented by WMD and MAD
  - recent defenders of the theory, e.g. Paul Ramsey, Oliver O'Donovan
  - Just War theory as providing a rational justification for declaring war and enforcing constraints on what can be done in war of ensuring justice and the protection of non-combatants. [30]
- (b) An assessment of the claim could include, e.g.:
- the difficulty of distinguishing between combatant and non-combatant
  - how everyone is guilty by association, e.g. civilians working in munitions factories, support for the government, how the civil apparatus supports the state, how procreation and parenting can be seen as contributing to the war effort
  - how war is essentially about self preservation and thus normal standards of morality have to be abandoned
  - the universal acceptance of non-combatant immunity
  - the intentional targeting of the innocent as being morally reprehensible
  - the indiscriminate nature of modern weaponry
  - possible reference to the doctrine of Double Effect
  - how the development of modern weaponry could provide greater capacity for target discrimination
  - the principle of the sacredness of human life
  - the recognition in International Humanitarian law of who constitutes a legitimate target
  - those who adhere to a Pacifist position as having the right to be protected. [20]

**Section A**

50

**100**

## **GCE Religious Studies**

### **A2 Mark Scheme (A2 1 – A2 8)**

#### **Synoptic Assessment**

##### **Levels of Response**

The specification requires that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the learning outcomes and skills set out in the specification.

- 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. In addition, for synoptic assessment, A Level candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the connections between different elements of their course of study.
- Critically evaluate and justify a point of view through the use of evidence and reasoned argument. In addition, for synoptic assessment, A Level candidates should relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to aspects of human experience.

Each of the two assessment objectives has been categorised into five levels of performance relating to the respective abilities of the candidates.

Having identified, for each assessment objective listed opposite, the band in which the candidate has performed, the examiner should then decide on the appropriate mark within the range for the band.

It is important that in the marking of the synoptic assessment unit, assistant examiners take account of the candidate's abilities in drawing together strands of knowledge and understanding from at least two different content areas.

Using the chosen theme, candidates will be expected to explore connections between elements of the selected areas of study. They should make appropriate use of the content as set out in the subject content for each module.

The five strands of knowledge and understanding act as a common and unifying structure for the specification. These are:

- the key concepts within the chosen areas of study, (e.g. religious beliefs, teachings, doctrines, principles, ideas and theories) and how these are expressed in texts, writings and/or practices
- the contribution of significant people, tradition or movements to the areas studied
- religious language and terminology
- major issues and questions arising from the chosen areas of study
- the relationship between the chosen areas of study and other specified aspects of human experience.

In particular candidates should demonstrate the ability to relate such connections to other aspects of human experience.

**A2 BANDS****AO1 (30 marks)**

<p><b>Band 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A full and comprehensive understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study in relation to the theme.</li> <li>• Well integrated response.</li> <li>• Clear and critical analysis.</li> <li>• Highly accurate use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>• Sophisticated style of writing. Very well structured and coherent throughout.</li> </ul>	<b>25–30</b>
<p><b>Band 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A high degree of understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study in relation to the theme.</li> <li>• A well integrated response.</li> <li>• Some very good critical analysis.</li> <li>• Mainly accurate use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>• Mature style of writing.</li> <li>• Well structured and coherent throughout.</li> </ul>	<b>19–24</b>
<p><b>Band 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A good understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study in relation to the theme.</li> <li>• For the most part an integrated response.</li> <li>• Reasonable degree of critical analysis.</li> <li>• A good degree of accurate evidence and examples.</li> <li>• Reasonably mature style of writing.</li> <li>• Some evidence of good structure and coherence.</li> </ul>	<b>13–18</b>
<p><b>Band 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study in relation to the theme.</li> <li>• Mere juxtaposition of the two areas of study, perhaps emphasising one content area at the expense of another.</li> <li>• A limited attempt at critical analysis.</li> <li>• Insufficient use of accurate evidence and examples.</li> <li>• Immature style of writing.</li> <li>• Lacking in structure and coherence.</li> </ul>	<b>7–12</b>
<p><b>Band 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A basic understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study in relation to the theme.</li> <li>• Demonstrating only partially accurate knowledge of the different content areas studied.</li> <li>• Little attempt, if any, at critical analysis.</li> <li>• Inappropriate style of writing with a very basic structure.</li> </ul>	<b>0–6</b>

## AO2 (20 marks)

<p><b>Band 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A comprehensive analysis of the statement in relation to connections made between the areas of study and other aspects of human experience.</li> <li>• Very effective comparison and evaluation of scholarly viewpoints.</li> <li>• Mature personal insight and independent thought.</li> <li>• A very well sustained and critical argument, expressed accurately and fluently with considerable sophistication using a wide range of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>17–20</b>
<p><b>Band 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A good analysis of the statement in relation to connections made between the areas of study and other aspects of human experience.</li> <li>• Very good comparison and evaluation of scholarly viewpoints.</li> <li>• Good personal insight and independent thought.</li> <li>• A well sustained and critical argument, expressed accurately, fluently and using a range of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>13–16</b>
<p><b>Band 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A reasonable analysis of the statement in relation to connections made between the areas of study and other aspects of human experience.</li> <li>• Very good comparison and evaluation of scholarly viewpoints.</li> <li>• Some evidence of personal insight and independent thought.</li> <li>• A line of argument, expressed accurately and using some relevant terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>9–12</b>
<p><b>Band 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited analysis of the statement in relation to connections made between the areas of study and other aspects of human experience.</li> <li>• Some comparison and evaluation of scholarly viewpoints.</li> <li>• Limited personal insight and independent thought.</li> <li>• Little evidence of critical argument.</li> <li>• Inaccuracies evident.</li> </ul>	<b>5–8</b>
<p><b>Band 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A basic analysis of the statement in relation to connections made between the areas of study and other aspects of human experience.</li> <li>• Little, if any, comparison and evaluation of scholarly viewpoints.</li> <li>• Minimal personal insight and independent thought.</li> <li>• A basic attempt to follow a line of argument.</li> <li>• Imprecisely expressed.</li> </ul>	<b>0–4</b>

## Section B

- 5 (a)** A consideration of some major questions raised by the relationship between religion and state could include, e.g.:
- issues pertaining to authority
  - should religion and state be united or separate?
  - the impact of the process of secularisation
  - the influence of Utilitarianism
  - the moral characterisation of state law as rooted in religious or secular ethics
  - aspects where religion and state could come into conflict, e.g. war, medical ethics
  - the extent to which religion and state can co-exist harmoniously
  - consideration of where the relationship may compromise the integrity of either
  - reference to at least **two** areas of study. [30]
- (b)** An evaluation of the view in relation to other aspects of human experience could include, e.g.:
- the role of the state to look after its citizens, its role as a moral guardian, the utilitarian ethic
  - the state as democratically elected, divinely ordained
  - the issue of obedience
  - issues pertaining to integrity, equality and justice
  - conscientious objection, principled stands against unjust laws
  - the failure of the state to protect its citizens, e.g. Nazi Germany, Zimbabwe
  - the failure of religion to protect its followers
  - the place of Canon Law (Church Law) within the state or Sharia Law
  - problems found in the fact that religion does not necessarily speak with one voice
  - the prophetic role of religion and also examples of religion as providing the roots of intolerance and sectarianism
  - reference to historical and/or contemporary examples. [20]

**Section B**

**Total**

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

50

**50**

**150**