



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2017

**AS (NEW)
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - UNIT 2
SECTION A: AN INTRODUCTION TO RELIGION
AND ETHICS**

2120U20-1

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2017 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.

AS RELIGIOUS STUDIES

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

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.

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 | Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions 30 marks |
|------|---|
| | <p><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;">25-30 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 shows an excellent standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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 /vocabulary in context. • Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 4 | <p style="text-align: center;">19-24 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 shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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. • Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 3 | <p style="text-align: center;">13-18 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 shows a satisfactory standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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. • Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 2 | <p style="text-align: center;">7-12 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. • Partially accurate response, with some signs of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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. • Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 1 | <p style="text-align: center;">1-6 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. • Very limited accuracy within the response with little coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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 • Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the meaning and clarity of communication. <p style="text-align: center;">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 | <p align="center">Assessment Objective AO2- Part (b) questions 30 marks <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i></p> |
|-------------|---|
| 5 | <p align="center">25-30 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. • The response shows an excellent standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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. • Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 4 | <p align="center">19-24 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 response shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 3 | <p align="center">13-18 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. • The response shows a satisfactory standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 2 | <p align="center">7-12 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. • Partially accurate response, with some signs of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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. • Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 1 | <p align="center">1-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue. • Very limited accuracy within the response, with little coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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 grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. • Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the meaning and clarity of communication. |
| 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant analysis or evaluation. |

Unit 2 Section A: An Introduction to Religion and Ethics

MARK SCHEME

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

1. (a) Compare how Bentham and Mill attempted to achieve the 'greatest happiness for the greatest number.' [AO1 30]

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

- A moral action is defined in Utilitarianism as one which fulfils the principle of utility – to create the 'greatest happiness for the greatest number.' This is based on the aim of pursuing pleasure and avoiding pain.
- Bentham's Act Utilitarianism focuses on the quantity of happiness in each individual action. Acts are not good or bad in themselves, but are judged by how well their consequences fulfil the principle of utility. As such, Act Utilitarianism is a relativistic and consequentialist theory.
- The Hedonic Calculus is used to measure the quantity of pleasure by considering seven factors: intensity, duration, certainty, remoteness, fecundity, purity and extent. These factors must be applied to all who are affected by the action in order to make a moral decision.
- Mill's development of Utilitarianism focuses on the quality of pleasure rather than the quantity. Higher pleasures associated with the intellect are worth more than lower pleasures associated with the body. Therefore the principle of utility should be fulfilled through a greater balance of higher pleasures looking in the broadest sense at the 'interests of man as a progressive being.'
- Mill's 'harm principle' works towards securing the principle of utility in its broadest sense as it prevents people from seeking pleasure through the pain of others.
- The principle of utility can be fulfilled through creating 'rules' based on past experience rather than judging each action individually. For example, the rule 'do not murder' would create the greatest overall happiness in society, even if it may not create happiness in an individual case.
- Mill is seen by many scholars as a 'weak' Rule Utilitarian, in that the rules offer good general guidelines but may be broken in extreme circumstances to better serve utility.

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

1. (b) 'Mill's version of Utilitarianism gives clearer guidance than Bentham's when making moral decisions.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- One line of argument may be that the difficulties of quantifying happiness make the correct course of action unclear in many situations when following Bentham's version. The hedonic calculus does not offer a purely objective analysis of a situation.
- Supporting this line of argument, it could be claimed that individuals will judge the quantity of happiness according to their own preferences rather than taking into account the interests of all involved. It is unclear how to avoid this in Act Utilitarianism; even when applying the hedonic calculus there will inevitably be differences in interpretation.
- Another line of argument is that the application of the hedonic calculus to all aspects of a situation is unrealistic and time-consuming therefore it cannot give practical guidance in real-life situations.
- Candidates may point out that Bentham's Act Utilitarianism could allow injustice to a minority in order to create the greatest happiness for the greatest number. This may go against our moral intuition and therefore offer unclear guidance.
- However, Bentham's Act Utilitarianism allows moral decisions to be made according to the specific situation, which often gives clearer guidance than trying to follow a more general moral rule.
- On the other hand, Mill's version of Utilitarianism allows for clear rules to be created based on the principle of utility which make it less time-consuming and therefore easier to apply to moral decision-making.
- In spite of this, it may be argued that Mill's version of the theory makes the principle of utility even more difficult to apply as it is not always easy to distinguish higher and lower pleasures. Some would go as far as to claim that Mill has lost the genuine flexibility of the theory in his effort to simplify its application.
- Neither version can give clear guidance as both are based in some sense on predicting consequences, which is unreliable.

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

2. (a) Compare how the Divine Command Theory and Ethical Egoism define what makes an action moral. [AO1 30]

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

- Both theories are meta-ethical theories focusing on the whole concept of morality and on what makes a moral action.
- Divine Command Theory sees God as the origin and regulator of morality – what is good is what God says is good.
- A moral action is therefore one which God commands.
- Right and wrong are seen as objective truths based on God's will as the divine lawgiver. These truths should form the foundation of any human system of morality.
- Adams offers a modified version of Divine Command Theory and states that an action is moral if it obeys the commands of a loving God, thus avoiding some of the more obvious criticisms of the theory.
- Ethical Egoism 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 well-being.
- This is usually based on psychological egoism which claims that human nature is such that all our actions are motivated by self-interest.
- 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.
- Stirner rejects the concept of egoism based purely on material gain (as defined by capitalism), as greed is only one part of the ego. He looks more broadly at the interests of individuals and at other aspects of the ego such as empathy and critical thought. 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.
- 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.

2. (b) 'Morality is whatever God commands.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- This statement certainly fits in with the claims of Divine Command Theory. The question remains whether this is the best definition of a moral action.
- A line of argument in favour of the statement is that morality can only be based on God's commands as God is the creator of the universe and morality is built into the universe as part of God's plan.
- In addition, God is the only objective source of morality – to define moral actions in human terms is to invite subjective and biased decision-making.
- However, this line of argument leads to the Euthyphro dilemma – is an action good because it is loved by God or does God only love good actions?
- To develop this idea, God could command actions which we would regard as wrong, but these would have to be seen as moral according to this view. This makes morality completely arbitrary.
- Alternatively there could be a moral standard higher than God, questioning God's omnipotence.
- It could be argued that Adam's modified Divine Command Theory allows a solution to the Euthyphro dilemma as God's loving nature means that he will not command actions that we might see as immoral.
- On the other hand, different religions claim that different things are commanded by God. There is no way to judge which things are genuinely commanded by God.
- An alternative line of argument would be to consider the idea that morality must be based on something other than commands, as just because it is commanded, does not make it morally right (Ayer).
- Alternative theories about what defines morality including Virtue Theory and Ethical Egoism may be discussed, as it may be claimed that the definition of morality should be focused more on human qualities or needs than on the will of God.

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



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2017

**AS (NEW)
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - UNIT 2
SECTION B - AN INTRODUCTION TO THE
PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION**

2120U20-1

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2017 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.

AS RELIGIOUS STUDIES

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

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.

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 | Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions 30 marks |
|------|---|
| | <p><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;">25-30 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 shows an excellent standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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 /vocabulary in context. • Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 4 | <p style="text-align: center;">19-24 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 shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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. • Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 3 | <p style="text-align: center;">13-18 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 shows a satisfactory standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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. • Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 2 | <p style="text-align: center;">7-12 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. • Partially accurate response, with some signs of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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. • Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 1 | <p style="text-align: center;">1-6 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. • Very limited accuracy within the response with little coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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 • Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the meaning and clarity of communication. <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 | <p style="text-align: center;">Assessment Objective AO2- Part (b) questions 30 marks <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i></p> |
|-------------|--|
| 5 | <p style="text-align: center;">25-30 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. • The response shows an excellent standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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. • Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 4 | <p style="text-align: center;">19-24 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 response shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 3 | <p style="text-align: center;">13-18 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. • The response shows a satisfactory standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 2 | <p style="text-align: center;">7-12 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. • Partially accurate response, with some signs of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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. • Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| 1 | <p style="text-align: center;">1-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue. • Very limited accuracy within the response, with little coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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 grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. • Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the meaning and clarity of communication. |
| 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant analysis or evaluation. |

Unit 2 Section B: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion

MARK SCHEME

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

3. (a) **Explain Aquinas' cosmological arguments for the existence of God.** [AO1 30]

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

- The inclusion of three of five Ways postulated by Aquinas in his Summa Theologica that, by use of inductive reasoning, point towards the existence of God.
- First Way – concepts of motion/change – reference to Aquinas explanation of how all things are moving or movers and how this process occurs via the 'efficient cause' (linked to this they may also include reference to Aristotle's explanation of all things moving from their potential to actual via the efficient cause – including the example of the block of marble/statue/sculptor to explain this).
- Aquinas: For motion is nothing else than the reduction of something from potentiality to actuality. But nothing can be reduced from potentiality to actuality, except by something in a state of actuality.
- Reference to Aquinas's own example of wood/fire to explain sequence of movement and Aquinas's explanation of God as the Unmoved Mover being the source of all movement in the universe.
- Explanation of Second Way – sequences of cause and effect as an irrefutable law of the universe; impossibility of infinite regress (i.e. without a starting point nothing can begin to happen – consequently if there is no starting point then there is no beginning which is contradictory to experience) – appropriate example to illustrate this (e.g. dominoes falling)
- Aquinas: In the world of sense we find there is an order of efficient causes. There is no case known (neither is it, indeed, possible) in which a thing is found to be the efficient cause of itself; for so it would be prior to itself, which is impossible.
- Explanation of Third Way – concepts of contingency and necessity – God as necessary being. Expect suitable example to illustrate this (e.g. parent/child)
- Aquinas: The third way is taken from possibility and necessity, and runs thus. We find in nature things that are possible to be and not to be, since they are found to be generated, and to corrupt, and consequently, they are possible to be and not to be. But it is impossible for these always to exist, for that which is possible not to be at some time is not. Therefore, if everything is possible not to be, then at one time there could have been nothing in existence.... it would have been impossible for anything to have begun to exist; and thus even now nothing would be in existence -which is absurd.

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

3. (b) **‘Cosmological arguments for God’s existence are not persuasive.’**
[AO2 30]

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

- Candidates may refer to the fact that cosmological arguments do not point to a clear and incontestable answer and therefore fail to establish, beyond any reasonable doubt, any definitive conclusion. They could therefore be considered to be entirely unpersuasive as a means for establishing the existence of God.
- Evidence can be used in the argument and be accepted as valid yet the conclusion drawn can still be denied, without contradiction, thereby undermining the persuasiveness of the argument. (e.g. just because we can prove the universe has a beginning by reference to evidence/experience we can still deny the conclusion that God began it without contradiction because there may be other conclusions that could be drawn regarding its beginning).
- It could be argued that, logically, deductive arguments, such as the ontological argument, are far more persuasive as the force of argument presented through the stated premises, once accepted, are undeniable in the conclusion that they point towards – and whilst this does not necessarily mean that cosmological arguments are therefore ineffective, it could be suggested that, as they lack this ability to point towards undeniable conclusions, they are relatively unpersuasive as arguments for God’s existence.
- However it is important to recognise that cosmological arguments, supported by well known philosophers and scholars throughout the ages establish probability – gathering evidence and suggesting the most likely conclusion based on evidence and because of this can be persuasive.
- Arguments based on evidence are often more persuasive than arguments that are not because it is possible to relate to evidence, having a physical (or at least agreed upon) objectivity, and thereby providing a solid foundation upon which to construct an effective argument.
- Cosmological arguments are *a posteriori* and synthetic - they depend on evidence or experience which enhances both their reliability and credibility as arguments, making them more persuasive.
- The evidence or experiences that cosmological arguments are based on makes them subject to being able to be tested by anyone – making them more accessible and understandable – and therefore more likely to be considered persuasive.
- Many of the aforementioned points demonstrate that a cosmological argument for God’s existence has the potential to be considerably persuasive.

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

4. (a) Explain what is meant by the problem of evil.

[AO1 30]

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

- Candidates may refer to Epicurus ('Either God wants to abolish evil, and cannot; or he can, but does not want to. If he wants to, but cannot, he is impotent. If he can, but does not want to, he is wicked. If God can abolish evil, and God really wants to do it, why is there evil in the world?') and/or Mackie's (God is Omnipotent, God is Omnibenevolent, Evil exists) problem of evil statements.
- Candidates are expected to explain the problem of evil is, i.e. the logical inconsistency of omnibenevolence, omnipotence and existence of evil.
- How removing any of these criteria can offer a solution to the problem of evil but in doing so creates further problems, e.g. denies either the concept of the God of classical theism or the existence of evil – neither of which is a satisfactory explanation.
- Candidates may include reference to specific problems of evil as raised by Rowe (intense human and animal suffering – the acceptance that limited suffering may prove ultimately beneficial to animals/humans but the intensity of suffering that was the reality for both species was entirely incompatible with an all-loving and all-powerful God) or Paul (premature deaths – the mathematical estimate that the sheer scale of premature deaths of innocent children is abhorrent, as – being so young - they lack the ability to make free will decisions about God and their suffering and deaths can in no way be something that an omnipotent and omnibenevolent deity should permit).
- Reference may also be made to the types of evil and their relevance to the debate i.e. natural: evil which occurs outside of the direct control of humans, e.g. earthquakes, tsunami, flooding, volcanic eruption, etc.
- Moral: Evil that is a direct result of human action: e.g. murder, theft, rape, child abuse, etc. (Expect reference to suitable examples to illustrate the problems).

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

4. (b) **‘Augustinian type theodicies solve the problem of evil.’**

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Some observers consider that the Augustinian theodicy is consistent with the biblical tradition of wholly good creator God and is consistent with accounts in the Christian Bible of The Fall and Atonement through Christ.
- It is consistent with the human experience of cause/effect in the sense that all moral actions have consequences and that humans can observe through experience, as well as through scriptural guidance, that actions that are inherently good and in agreement with God’s purpose for humanity – bring consequences that benefit humanity but those that don’t result in suffering and evil for others.
- The responsibility for suffering becomes humanity’s (due to the sin of Adam which all humans as ‘seminally present’ inherit) rather than God’s and therefore removes the ‘problem’ as it was human freewill – deliberately turning away from the perfect goodness of God and his creation – that caused evil to exist in both moral and natural terms.
- The theodicy is in accordance with the Jewish and Islamic attitudes of suffering as punishment for sin against God.
- However candidates may refer to criticisms of Augustinian theodicy based on concepts relating to logical, scientific and moral error.
- The concept of hell as part of universe’s design implies a foreseen flaw, therefore the universe was not made perfect, undermining Augustine’s premises.
- If humans were created perfect then evil choice would not have been made as perfect humans would not be able to perform any action that was less than perfect.
- Scientific evidence disagrees with ‘fallen’ nature – science is based on evidence that there has been a development of species over time/evolutionary developments, etc. Also biological impossibilities of all humans being ‘seminally present’ in Adam, undermines the ‘historical’ likelihood of Adam’s existence as the progenitor of all human beings.
- Failure to justify ‘innocent’ and animal suffering – as raised by Rowe and Paul in their challenges to the existence of an omnipotent and omnibenevolent God.
- Evil is not merely absence of good but a real entity – the concept of ‘privation’ belittles the reality of evil for many sufferers – particularly when the suffering is immense or intense.

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