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Annotations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annotation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 –</td>
<td>to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 –</td>
<td>to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 –</td>
<td>to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4 –</td>
<td>to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5 –</td>
<td>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 contact your Team Leader.
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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1        | **AO1**  
Candidates might begin by providing an outline summary of the events of the Holocaust. They might discuss the impact that it has had on Jewish theology in the problem of reconciling the existence of suffering with belief in an omnipotent and good G-d.  
Candidates are likely to consider the contributions of post-Holocaust theologians and the conclusions they reach, eg: ‘the G-d of Israel remained hidden in order to allow human free will’ (Berkovitz); ‘traditional explanations of evil and suffering do not apply to the Holocaust, it is too enormous a tragedy’ (Fackenheim); ‘it was because the Jews of Eastern Europe [the main victims] had refused to modernise – their orthodoxy and piety were medieval’ (Maybaum); ‘G-d died in Auschwitz, the thread uniting G-d and humanity, Heaven and Earth, has been broken’ (Rubenstein).  
Berkovitz, Fackenheim, Maybaum and Rubenstein are the figures of post-Holocaust theology cited in the specification, although candidates are free to select the views of other scholars.  
**AO2**  
In their analysis, candidates might discuss whether any of the contributions are convincing – whether they have anything to offer the modern mind seeking a theology which is both intellectually coherent and which corresponds with the facts.  
They might discuss whether the views expressed are the same responses as those to be found in earlier, traditional Jewish (or other faith) sources.  
They might discuss whether the scholar in question is calling for a radically new understanding of the word ‘G-d’.
<p>| 35      |                                                            |       |          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2        | **AO1**  
Candidates are likely to begin by outlining their understanding of the meaning of the phrase Orthodox Judaism. They might explain that Orthodoxy is but one of several divisions within Judaism today, albeit the largest. They might explain that the term was first used by Reform Jews to designate their traditionalist opponents.  

They might explain that Orthodox Judaism is an umbrella term for all forms of traditional Judaism which are Talmudic in belief and practice i.e those groups who believe that the Written Torah and Oral Torah are divine and relate with binding authority to every area of a Jew’s life.  

Candidates might explain that within contemporary Orthodoxy there is a variety of trends, and they might be able to give examples such as Hasidic Jews who often cut themselves off from the outside world, and Neo-Orthodox Jews who attempt to live a ritually and religiously full life while being totally integrated into modern society.  

They might explain that within contemporary Orthodoxy there are varying attitudes to the present day State of Israel, and they might be able to give examples of the differences.  

**AO2**  
In their analysis, candidates might discuss whether there is some sort of test to determine whether people are, in fact, true Jews.  

Some might argue that the traditional beliefs of Judaism do not constitute a creed which the Jew must accept in order to remain within the fold; that Judaism emphasises conduct rather than profession of faith, and that it offers considerable latitude in the matter of belief. They might argue that according to traditional Judaism, all those born of a Jewish mother, or converted by a recognised Orthodox rabbi, qualify as bona fide Jews. They might argue that all Jews were present at Sinai.  

Others might make use of the Agudath HaRabonim declaration (1997) that non-Orthodox movements are outside Judaism, that the true Jew is the one who accepts the binding nature of Torah (the revealed Law of G-d) in his/her life. | 35    |          |
AO1
Candidates are likely to offer a definition of the two groups in relation to their general origins: Ashkenazi (Hebrew Ashkenaz, ‘Germany’) are Jews of North European descent; Sephardi (Hebrew Sepharad, ‘Spain’) are Jews of South European, North African and Middle Eastern descent. They might explain that the terms arose in the Middle Ages when Europe and Western Asia were divided between countries under Christian and Islamic rule. They might give an outline history of the two communities. They might discuss the importance of the distinct geographic regions in the development of Ashkenazi/Sephardi traditions, music, dress and language. They might discuss the consequences of the largely modern phenomenon of racial anti-Semitism for Ashkenazi and Sephardi Jewry today.

Candidates might discuss the religious practice of Ashkenazim and Sephardim: whether they affirm the same principles of Judaism, follow the same Jewish laws, use the same liturgical rites, and share the same religious customs. They might discuss whether either community has been more receptive to the challenges of modernity. They might discuss the attitude of the two groups to Zionism and the establishment of the State of Israel. They might discuss social friction between the groups eg in the State of Israel, and whether such disputes are religious or cultural. They might discuss whether the differences between Ashkenazim and Sephardim are still a factor in Jewish religious life today.

Some candidates might agree with the statement in the question, perhaps arguing that both groups share the same tenets of Judaism; that both are steeped in the culture of Rabbinic Judaism and follow the halakhic decisions of the Shulchan Aruch (with the notes of Rabbi Moses Isserles redressing the Sephardi bias).

AO2
They might argue that differences between Ashkenazim and Sephardim only arise in customs and in liturgy, and they might give examples such as the pronunciation of Hebrew, differences in prayers in the liturgies etc.

Others might disagree, perhaps arguing that the differentiation between Sephardim and Ashkenazim in religious matters has become much more marked in the modern world.

They might argue that modern religious movements in Judaism developed in Ashkenazi countries. They might argue that Sephardi Judaism does not include movements such as Reform or Conservative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4        | **AO1**  
Candidates are likely to explain the Torah’s teaching that all land is G-d’s land; that humans have a responsibility to care for it, and are given the power to oversee it on G-d’s behalf. They might explain that the Jews have a particular relationship with the Land of Israel and that the Torah contains instructions for right use of this land, including eg the Sabbatical rest every seven years (shemittah) and the jubilee legislation. They might explain that the Land in the Jewish scriptures has political, economic, environmental and social ramifications, and they might discuss whether the same applies today. They might discuss other concepts related to the Land such as the establishment of kibbutzim and Jewish responses to current environmental concerns.

Candidates might discuss the historical and political factors surrounding the establishment of the present day State of Israel. They might explain the differences between the concept of the Land of Israel and the modern day State, and whether or not the mitzvot unique to the Land apply in it. They might discuss the difficulties involved in applying religious teachings in a modern, secular society.

**AO2**  
In their analysis, candidates might consider the difficulties faced by the Israeli government in fulfilling the biblically-mandated requirement for the Land to ‘rest’ without destroying the State’s fragile agricultural economy.

They might argue the consequences for Jewish communal life if the traditional teachings on stewardship of the Land are applied in the present day (secular) State.

Others might argue that the traditional teachings on stewardship of the Land are being observed by religious Jews today. They might argue that rabbinic legislation exists to avoid the hardships of Land-rest laws (eg the heter mechira dispensation whereby farmland is temporarily sold to a non-Jew).

They might argue that Jewish survival in the Land is conditional upon it being maintained as the Holy Land, ie the fulfilment of its mitzvot. | 35    |          |
## APPENDIX 1 – A2 LEVELS OF RESPONSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark /21</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>Mark /14</th>
<th>AO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1     | 1–5      | almost completely ignores the question  
• little relevant material  
• some concepts inaccurate  
• shows little knowledge of technical terms. | 1–3 | very little argument or justification of viewpoint  
• little or no successful analysis  
• views asserted with no justification. |
| 2     | 6–9      | A basic attempt to address the question  
• knowledge limited and partially accurate  
• limited understanding  
• might address the general topic rather than the question directly  
• selection often inappropriate  
• limited use of technical terms. | 4–6 | a basic attempt to sustain an argument and justify a viewpoint  
• some analysis, but not successful  
• views asserted but little justification. |
| 3     | 10–13    | satisfactory attempt to address the question  
• some accurate knowledge  
• appropriate understanding  
• some successful selection of material  
• some accurate use of technical terms. | 7–8 | the argument is sustained and justified  
• some successful analysis which may be implicit  
• views asserted but not fully justified. |
| 4     | 14–17    | a good attempt to address the question  
• accurate knowledge  
• good understanding  
• good selection of material  
• technical terms mostly accurate. | 9–11 | a good attempt at using evidence to sustain an argument holistically  
• some successful and clear analysis  
• some effective use of evidence  
• views analysed and developed. |
| 5     | 18–21    | A very good/excellent attempt to address the question  
showing understanding and engagement with the material  
• very high level of ability to select and deploy relevant information  
• accurate use of technical terms. | 12–14 | A very good/excellent attempt which uses a range of evidence to sustain an argument holistically  
• comprehends the demands of the question  
• uses a range of evidence  
• shows understanding and critical analysis of different viewpoints. |

**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: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts – spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate
- Level 4: generally clear and organised; can be understood as a whole – spelling, punctuation and grammar good
- Level 5: answer is well constructed and organised – easily understood; spelling, punctuation and grammar very good