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### Annotations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annotation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🟢</td>
<td>Level 1 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🔴</td>
<td>Level 2 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🟠</td>
<td>Level 3 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🔴</td>
<td>Level 4 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>💀</td>
<td>Level 5 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>📣</td>
<td>Highlighting a section of the response that is irrelevant to the awarding of the mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🚫</td>
<td>Point has been seen and noted eg where part of an answer is at the end of the script</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject Specific Marking Instructions

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

NOTE: AO2 material in AO1 questions must not be cross-credited and vice versa.

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.

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.
Positive awarding: it is a fundamental principle of OCR’s assessment in Religious Studies at Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced GCE that candidates are rewarded for what they ‘know, understand and can do’ and to this end examiners are required to assess every answer by the Levels according to the extent to which it addresses a reasonable interpretation of the question. In the marking scheme each question is provided with a brief outline of the likely content and/or lines of argument of a ‘standard’ answer, but this is by no means prescriptive or exhaustive. Examiners are required to have subject knowledge to a high level and the outlines do not attempt to duplicate this.

Examiners must not attempt to reward answers according to the extent to which they match the structure of the outline, or mention the points it contains. The specification is designed to allow teachers to approach the content of modules in a variety of ways from any of a number of perspectives, and candidates’ answers must be assessed in the light of this flexibility of approach. It is quite possible for an excellent and valid answer to contain knowledge and arguments which do not appear in the outline; each answer must be assessed on its own merits according to the Levels of Response.

Key Skill of Communication: this is assessed at both Advanced Subsidiary and A2 as an integral part of the marking scheme. The principle of positive awarding applies here as well: candidates should be rewarded for good written communication, but marks may not be deducted for inadequate written communication; the quality of communication is integral to the quality of the answer in making its meaning clear. The Key Skill requirements in Communication at Level 3 include the following evidence requirements for documents about complex subjects, which can act as a basis for assessing the Communications skills in an examination answer:

- Select and use a form and style of writing that is appropriate to your purpose and complex subject matter.
- Organise relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.
- Ensure your text is legible and your spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate, so your meaning is clear.

Levels of Response: the descriptions are cumulative, ie a description at one level builds on or improves the descriptions at lower levels. Not all the qualities listed in a level must be demonstrated in an answer for it to fall in that level (some of the qualities are alternatives and therefore mutually exclusive). There is no expectation that an answer will receive marks in the same level for the two AOs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative Content</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (a)</td>
<td>Candidates might explain that although sources for information about the Zealots are limited, there are some commonly held views.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whether or not they were an organised group appears to be unknown and it is debated as to whether they were a short lived group with no clear aim or strategy, or, they evolved from the Sicarii with past connections to a Fourth Philosophy.

The name comes from a ‘zeal’ for God’s Law and they wanted to rid Palestine of foreign rule. They opposed direct rule by the Romans and saw them as usurpers of God’s rule.

Josephus records a poor opinion of the Zealots eg that they were ruthless and committed brutal crimes in the name of their zeal to maintain Jewish Law and customs.

In their zeal for the purity of the Law, it is possible that they committed acts of violence/retribution against the Romans and those Jews whom they thought were corrupting God’s Law. They may have carried out summary executions. They destroyed Herod’s fort in Antonia as it was decorated with idolatrous paintings. During the Jewish War the Zealots took the opportunity to assassinate a number of the aristocracy/Sadducees including Jonathan, the High Priest. They attempted to capture the Temple, which they considered had been corrupted and elect their own High Priest.

Some candidates might draw comparisons between Zealot beliefs and those of the Pharisees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative Content</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (b)      | Candidates might argue that the Zealots were unusual in their active, physical resistance to the Romans and the aristocratic Jews. The Roman presence was predominantly felt around Jerusalem and Caesarea and it was not a very great force. Only Judea was ruled directly by the Romans, so Roman occupation was experienced second hand by other areas ruled by Herod’s sons.  
  
  Daily religious life, observance of the mitzvot, the influence of the Pharisees and their teachings on the observance of the Law might be considered more important than politics. Jews were not conscripted and were allowed to observe the Sabbath and festivals. They continued to pay the Temple tax in shekels and were given the concession that Roman images did not appear in the Temple.  
  
  Other arguments might demonstrate the numbers of ways that Roman rule might impinge on all Jews. The collection of taxes, the existence of garrisons, Roman paganism and the Emperor’s head on all coins as well as Roman summary justice and brutal punishments, were all likely to induce hatred and resistance.  
  
  Some candidates might make reference to the politics in Jewish religious life itself e.g. the rivalry between Pharisees and Sadducees, the division between the wealthy religious rulers and the poor. | 10    |          |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative Content</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (a)</td>
<td>Answers might begin with an explanation of source criticism and its purpose in attempting to solve the problem of when and by whom a gospel was written. It is most likely that answers will concentrate largely on the synoptic problem and the question of priority and the written sources of each gospel. Some candidates might show awareness of the history of the development of source criticism of the gospels and the views which have the most support of scholars. Answers might explain some of the arguments for the various source hypotheses. They might show how a study of the sources contributes to understanding some of the differences and similarities in the gospel accounts. Examples might be given from the text of the gospels or from the different arguments of scholars to illustrate the points made.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Indicative Content</td>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Candidates might consider that studying and analysing the background, purpose, date, intended readership of any gospel writer is essential/complementary to a serious study of the theology of the gospel and further deepens understanding. Some might argue that to consider all these other aspects of a gospel is an attempt to discredit a particular gospel as being the truth about Jesus. Evidence from a gospel might be used to support this. Some might argue that some believers would prefer to read a gospel as a true story, God-given, and not consider the hand of the author at all. Some responses might consider that confusion might arise as to which gospel story is the correct one. However, in the final analysis, it might be judged that source criticism leads to greater accuracy and allows people to make informed judgements on which to base belief/ disbelief. Some candidates might point out, with examples, that some of the findings of source criticism are arrived at and supported by the content of the text.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Indicative Content</td>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (a)</td>
<td>Answers should contain description of the events of the Jewish trial before the Sanhedrin and an explanation of the distinctive features of Mark’s version, which should include the role of the chief priests and High Priest; the evidence of false witnesses. Candidates might explain the build up of tension in Jesus’ refusal to answer the false charges which leads to the direct question, ‘Are you…Son of God?’ and Jesus’ answer, ‘I am’. There might be an explanation of the importance of the High Priest’s question and Jesus' answer followed by the symbolism of the ‘Son of Man’ passage. This might (or might not) be seen as the point where Mark abandons the ‘messianic secret’ and Jesus' true identity is revealed. Also significant are the High Priest’s ‘tearing his clothes’, the implications of the charge of blasphemy and the reasons for the condemnation to death and the physical abuse of Jesus. Some candidates might explain the account of the trial in terms of the apparent emphasis in Mark's gospel on the culpability of the Jews in the death of Jesus.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Indicative Content</td>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Candidates might oppose the statement and evaluate evidence from arguments that Jesus’ death was a political event that served the purposes of the Jews and the Romans.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some candidates might argue that the Jewish plot to arrest Jesus had been instigated because of Jesus’ challenges to the religious leaders and the laws. Events such as the Triumphal Entry and the Cleansing of the Temple were intended as confrontational to the Jewish authorities.

Some candidates might assess whether the Roman authorities had their own reasons to kill Jesus. As a matter of expediency (for both Jews and Romans) the accusation of blasphemy was changed to a political charge of treason for the Roman trial, to ensure the death penalty.

Some might consider that throughout the Passion story, Jesus acted knowingly to bring about the fulfilment of God’s plan of sacrifice and redemption and that the role of others in his betrayal, arrest and death was pre-ordained, as the (unsuspecting) instruments of the divine plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative Content</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4 (a)    | Candidates might explain the manuscript/textual traditions for the long and short ending of Mark and views on whether there is a lost ending of Mark.  
Explanation might include the issue of whether Mark intended to end the gospel at 16:8 or whether it stops abruptly.  
There are various arguments and debates about this which include issues such as the unexpectedness of the ending; the final verse 16:8, which states that the women flee and were too afraid to tell anyone and, the existence in some manuscripts of a ‘shorter ending’ at 16:9 which adds a form of commission of the disciples to the account.  
Discussion of the longer ending might include some explanation about the issues of authorship, style and vocabulary and the question of whether the additional verses were a later attempt to reconcile the ending of Mark with that of Matthew and Luke. The longer ending tells of physical appearances by Jesus and a speech to the disciples before his ascension. | 25    |           |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative Content</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Candidates might offer evidence that, theologically, in the scene with the women at the tomb, Mark's gospel does establish the fact of the risen Christ. eg the angels say, 'He has been raised.' The women are told that he will appear in Galilee. The women's fear is at the awesomeness of the news.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>However, in the first century, the word of women would require verification (as in the other gospels) for their story to be credible. There is also no evidence of the delivery of the message to the disciples.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the longer ending there are physical appearances which link to those which occur in Matthew and Luke and seem to partly resolve the question of what happened next.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>However, Mark’s narrative even with both endings is very short compared with that of Matthew or Luke.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The final assessment might depend on whether the short ending of Mark is seen to be satisfactory on its own and/or whether the longer ending is seen to be contrived and an inferior copy of information in Matthew and Luke’s account.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 1 AS Levels of Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark /25</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>Mark /10</th>
<th>AO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>absent/no relevant material</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>absent/no argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–5</td>
<td>almost completely ignores the question</td>
<td>1–2</td>
<td>very little argument or justification of viewpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- little relevant material</td>
<td></td>
<td>- little or no successful analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- some concepts inaccurate</td>
<td></td>
<td>- views asserted with no justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- shows little knowledge of technical terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication: often unclear or disorganised; can be difficult to understand; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6–10</td>
<td>a basic attempt to address the question</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>a basic attempt to sustain an argument and justify a viewpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- knowledge limited and partially accurate</td>
<td></td>
<td>- some analysis, but not successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- limited understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>- views asserted with little justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- selection often inappropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- might address the general topic rather than the question directly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- limited use of technical terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11–15</td>
<td>satisfactory attempt to address the question</td>
<td>5–6</td>
<td>the argument is sustained and justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- some accurate knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>- some successful analysis which may be implicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- appropriate understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>- views asserted but not fully justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- some successful selection of material</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- some accurate use of technical terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16–20</td>
<td>a good attempt to address the question</td>
<td>7–8</td>
<td>a good attempt to sustain an argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- accurate knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>- some effective use of evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- good understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>- some successful and clear analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- good selection of material</td>
<td></td>
<td>- considers more than one viewpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- technical terms mostly accurate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication: generally clear and organised; can be understood as a whole; spelling, punctuation and grammar good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21–25</td>
<td>a very good/excellent attempt to address the question showing understanding and engagement with the material</td>
<td>9–10</td>
<td>A very good/excellent attempt to sustain an argument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- very high level of ability to select and deploy relevant information</td>
<td></td>
<td>- comprehends the demands of the question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- accurate use of technical terms</td>
<td></td>
<td>- uses a range of evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- shows understanding and critical analysis of different viewpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Communication: answer is well constructed and organised; easily understood; spelling, punctuation and grammar very good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Communication:**
- Level 1: Often unclear or disorganised; can be difficult to understand; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate
- Level 2: Some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate
- Level 3: Generally clear and organised; can be understood as a whole; spelling, punctuation and grammar good
- Level 4: Very clear and well-organised; easily understood; spelling, punctuation and grammar very good