



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2018

**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 2018 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 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.

GCE RELIGIOUS STUDIES

SUMMER 2018 MARK SCHEME

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) Apply Fletcher's Situation Ethics to ethical issues relating to homosexual relationships. [AO1 30]

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

- Situation Ethics is a relativist theory that will not give a definitive moral guideline about homosexual relationships. Each relationship will be assessed relative to the law of agape. This means that candidates have considerable freedom to interpret how the theory may be applied and may take a range of different approaches to their answer.
- Candidates may apply the four working principles to consider issues relating to homosexual relationships.
- For example, pragmatism – the chosen course of action must work in practice towards the most loving outcome. Candidates may point out that the position taken by some Christians that gay couples may live together but must not have a physical relationship could be regarded as immoral as it is not a pragmatic requirement and is likely to lead to frustration rather than a loving outcome.
- Personalism – candidates may explain that the choices made by different couples about how to live out an ethical relationship must be respected, and that doing the most loving thing for the people in each individual relationship is important.
- Candidates may also apply the six fundamental principles to consider ethical issues relating to homosexual relationships.
- For example, 'the ruling norm of Christian decision making is love,' – candidates may explain that this principle could lead to Christians acting out of agape rather than obedience to a narrow interpretation of certain passages in scripture when it comes to homosexual relationships.
- Candidates may explain alternative interpretations of biblical passages related to homosexuality. For example, the story of Sodom and Gomorrah may be interpreted as condemning all homosexual relationships, or as condemning any non-consensual physical relationship, or as being a condemnation of the lack of hospitality shown to strangers. Candidates may discuss these interpretations in the light of the fundamental principle.
- 'Love wills the neighbour's good, whether we like them or not.' This principle could be linked to Jesus' approach to those considered 'outsiders' in his society and candidates could explain how this approach could influence the views of heterosexual Christians towards gay relationships.

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

- (b) 'Agape (selfless love) should replace all religious rules.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Candidates may use Fletcher's fundamental principle to argue that love should lie at the heart of all Christian moral decision making. They may support this with biblical teaching such as 1 Corinthians 13.
- This line of argument may be supported with examples from the life of Jesus in which he acts out of love rather than rigid adherence to religious law, such as healing on the Sabbath.
- Situation Ethics allows a more flexible response to moral issues which could be seen as more useful than following a rigid set of laws and rules. This point may well be illustrated with examples of contemporary moral issues where particular religious rules may appear to give an unfair or immoral response.
- However, the difficulty of understanding and applying the law of agape to different situations could be considered.
- One line of argument would be that humans are too easily biased and may apply a form of love that is not truly unconditional.
- Candidates could argue that Jesus, as the son of God, was able to apply the law of agape, but that rules and regulations are required for other human beings to act morally.
- Another line of argument is that the law of agape gives too much freedom and responsibility to flawed human beings.
- Candidates may argue that humans require more definite guidance on moral decision making and that religious rules are necessary so that humans do not sin inadvertently when trying to act out of love. They may give specific examples of religious rule which give clear moral guidance, such as 'do not commit adultery.'
- Situation Ethics has been widely condemned by a range of religious leaders for being dangerously individualistic and contrary to a truly Christian approach to ethics. It could be argued that such leaders are best placed to judge which moral rules should be followed.
- To develop this point, candidates could give examples of situations in which an individualist approach may lead to 'immorality' on the basis of other religious rules.
- Alternative religious rules that should always be adhered to may be discussed.

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

2. (a) Apply Bentham's hedonic calculus to the use of nuclear weapons as a deterrent. [AO1 30]

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

- Bentham's utilitarianism is a relativist theory that does not give definitive moral guidelines about the use of nuclear weapons as a deterrent. This means that candidates may apply the criteria of the hedonic calculus in different ways to the issue and give different weightings to the quantity of pleasure and pain that results. All reasonable applications should be credited.
- Bentham's theory of utility is based on the premise that a moral action is one that will maximise pleasure and minimise pain.
- The Hedonic Calculus is a set of criteria designed to measure which course of action will create the 'greatest happiness for the greatest number' in a given moral situation.
- In the case of the use of nuclear weapons as a deterrent, the balance of pleasure and pain should be considered using the seven criteria of the calculus.
- Intensity – the strength of pleasure that comes from avoiding nuclear war and from the sense of security a deterrent gives may be considered.
- Duration – the possession of nuclear weapons as a deterrent is seen to have contributed to the long-term peace and stability of much of the world following World War 2.
- Certainty – some may suggest that we cannot be certain whether peace in the latter half of the 20th Century stems from the possession of nuclear weapons or from other factors. The weapons may fall into the 'wrong' hands and we would not then be certain that they would be used as a deterrent alone.
- Remoteness – candidates may explain that the happiness that comes from a feeling of security is closer than the pain which may come from the eventual use of nuclear weapons.
- Fecundity – the possession of nuclear weapons as a deterrent may lead to further pleasure as countries seek out alternative methods of conflict resolution. Alternatively, the use of nuclear weapons as a deterrent may increase distrust globally and lead to international relations based on threats of violence rather than cooperation, which is unlikely to lead to further pleasure.
- Purity – the possession of nuclear weapons as a deterrent is not a pure pleasure, as the knowledge of the destructive capabilities of such weapons, and the fear of misuse will cause some pain. Also, the cost of maintaining a nuclear deterrent means that some will experience pain through the choices countries make in order to fund such weapons.
- Extent – if the deterrent works, then the pleasure extends, at least, to the populations of the countries which possess nuclear weapons. The extent may be greater if groups of allies are considered.

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

- (b) 'Pleasure is the only true basis for morality.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Utilitarianism is based on maximising pleasure and minimising pain, deriving this from the hedonist approach which values pleasure as the basis for morality.
- One line of argument is that all humans ultimately value pleasure and therefore basing morality on pleasure means that a moral action is one that fulfils human nature.
- However, some may argue that this makes humans little better than swine and that love, reason, or obedience to the will of God may be the true basis for morality as these aspects distinguish humans from animals.
- Candidates may develop this point using Mill's distinction between higher and lower forms of pleasure and argue that higher pleasures are a more appropriate basis for morality.
- Another line of argument is that pleasure is subjective and therefore an inadequate basis for morality. To develop this argument, alternative applications of the criteria of the hedonic calculus to a particular issue could be used.
- Along similar lines, it could be argued that it is impossible to quantify pleasure in any meaningful way, and that the hedonic calculus does not really help to objectively measure pleasure in real life situations.
- Alternatively, it could be claimed that the hedonic calculus does offer a meaningful way of weighing up which actions are moral and that the answers derived from this process fit in with our general moral intuitions, making it a genuine basis for morality.
- However, examples could be given in which the action which produces 'the greatest happiness for the greatest number' could produce injustice or immorality.
- It could be argued that basing morality on pleasure will always lead to a relativist approach to morality, and that actually humans require moral absolutes to form the true basis for morality.
- Candidates may choose to argue that 'pleasure' needs to be defined more clearly or qualified in order to form the basis for morality. They may argue for an alternative form of utilitarianism such as rule utilitarianism or preference utilitarianism in making their case.
- Candidates may also choose to argue in favour of one of the other ethical theories studied: natural law or situation ethics, as forming a better basis for morality.

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



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2018

**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 2018 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 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.

GCE RELIGIOUS STUDIES

SUMMER 2018 MARK SCHEME

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 the different ontological arguments for the existence of God presented by Anselm and Malcolm. [AO1 30]

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

- Anselm's arguments were expressed in a deductive form; they are a priori arguments for God's existence – not dependent on evidence or experience, but on our understanding of what 'God' means. This is also true for Malcolm.
- Anselm refers to Psalm 14 – 'Truly there is a God, although the fool has said in his heart, 'There is no God and demonstrates how the fool must at least have an idea of what God is, if only to dismiss God's existence and with this Anselm provides a definition for God as 'God is that than which nothing greater can be conceived'.
- Using a form of deductive reasoning, Anselm demonstrates that God's existence is, by this definition, obvious. Malcolm makes no reference to biblical sources but uses the definition of God as an unlimited being to base his argument on.
- Anselm states that it is both possible to exist in the mind and to also exist in reality. He then states that existence in the mind and in reality is considered greater than just existence in the mind alone. Therefore, if God is defined as 'that than which nothing greater can be conceived' then he must exist in the mind and reality, as this is greater than just existing in the mind alone. Therefore God exists. Malcolm rejects Proslogion 2, accepting Kant's objection that existence is not a predicate as it adds nothing to the content of the concept.
- Anselm widens his argument in Proslogion 3, to demonstrate, again by deductive reasoning, that not only does God exist but also that God's existence is necessary. Malcolm supports the argument in Proslogion 3 by stating that necessary existence is a predicate.
- Anselm states that it is possible to think of something that has to exist and to think of something that exists but does not have to. It should be considered that that which has to exist is necessarily 'greater' than that which does not have to exist. It necessarily follows that the category of having to exist should be applied to God, as that is greater than the category of not having to exist. Therefore, again by definition, Anselm deductively proves that God not only exists, but exists necessarily.
- Malcolm's argument states that the nature of an unlimited being (his definition for God) is one that of something which is either impossible or necessary. If God is an unlimited being he can neither come into existence or cease to exist because that suggests he is a limited being which, by definition, he is not because that suggests. If the idea of an unlimited being is not self-contradictory then God necessarily exists.

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

- (b) 'Ontological arguments for God's existence are completely ineffective.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- The ontological argument for God's existence has a thousand year history in the annals of religious philosophy and deserves respect. As an a priori argument it is a rational proof whose logic is inescapable when the deductive form of its premises are accepted. For Anselm this argument was entirely effective in confirming his own theistic beliefs – that God's existence was both obvious and necessary. In this sense it proves effective for its original audience.
- It should also be recognised that theistic religions from the Abrahamic tradition, such as Christianity, Judaism and Islam, all accept the definition of God as proposed by Anselm and therefore they would also generally consider this to be an effective form of argument as it confirms the view of their own faith traditions - ie that God is the greatest possible being, 'that than which nothing greater can be thought of.'
- What further demonstrates the effectiveness of the ontological argument is that it fits contemporary forms of philosophy and logic, such as the modal systems adopted by modern day ontological argument philosophers, such as Malcolm and Plantinga. The effectiveness of these modern day versions is due to the fact that these scholars are able to take into account traditional criticisms of the argument and deal with these before proposing the modern formulations of the argument, arguably increasing its effectiveness.
- However, not all philosophers, or religious believers, accept that the ontological argument is an effective proof for God's existence. Indeed, one of its earliest critics was Anselm's contemporary, Gaunilo, who rejected the idea that it was possible to define anything into existence. Indeed, this is often the cornerstone for many philosophers and commentators for rejecting the argument, in that its fundamental premise is flawed and therefore renders the arguments as ineffective.
- Equally, several hundred years later, Immanuel Kant, also rejected the argument, suggesting that Descartes was misusing the word 'exist'. It was not possible, in his view to simply add the word exist to a list of perfections that something did or didn't have – thereby showing the argument to be ineffective.
- Any criticism of deductive, a priori, arguments render the ontological argument as an ineffective argument in terms of proving God's existence.
- In this sense, it would seem that the arguments that are pitted against the ontological argument are sufficiently robust to undermine any reasonable claim that it is an effective argument in proving the existence of God.

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

4. (a) Explain the different teleological arguments for the existence of God presented by Aquinas and Tennant. [AO1 30]

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

Aquinas and Tennant present teleological arguments expressed in an inductive form; they are a posteriori arguments for God's existence – dependent on evidence or experience.

Aquinas had two arguments (NB the two are often conflated as they do work together and this is acceptable):

- Argument from **order and regularity**: the regular movement of 'natural bodies'; everything in the universe follows natural laws, even if they possess no intelligence (i.e. the regular movement of the stars in the sky – which in Aquinas's time people had no rational 'scientific' explanation for).
- Argument from **purpose**: starting point for this argument was observation of existing and observable objects that appeared to be working towards an end or purpose; even objects that lack intelligence still behaved in purposeful ways. From this Aquinas goes on to induct a conclusion that something was guiding them to behave thus; uses the analogy of the archer.

The ideas of order and purpose work together to suggest an intelligent being and the only possible explanation was that this guiding intelligence was God.

Tennant had two arguments:

- The **Anthropic Principle**: by observing the existing universe and inducting a conclusion that the precise nature of this universe, and its various components, were deliberately designed so as to support the development of intelligent life. For Tennant it was the existence of a set of evidences that provided the ideal circumstances for humans to exist. The provision was for the sustenance of life as well as demonstrating that the universe allowed itself to be analysed, something that led to benefit for humankind. The process of evolution that leads to human life is seen as a deliberate natural mechanism, planned by a divine designer, included within the fabric of the universe.
- The **Aesthetic Principle**: Tennant develops his ideas to include the aspect of beauty as a provision from a benevolent designer that allows humankind to 'enjoy' existence. This provision is also considered by Tennant to be a divine revelation – demonstrating both the existence as well as nature of God.

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

- (b) 'Scientific arguments are more persuasive than teleological arguments in explaining the existence of the universe.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Scientific arguments are based on logical and empirical bases. As such, these entirely rational arguments, offer a clear and solid set of proofs that can readily be verified and thus can be taken as strong arguments, persuading via universally acknowledged and accepted criteria. Teleological arguments are not as clearly based on these things and so do not have the ability to be as easily accepted, undermining their persuasiveness.
- In the 21st Century, scientific arguments are often readily accepted as there is often an assumption that scientists are well informed as well as intelligent. Philosophical arguments, such as teleological arguments do not have the same level of acceptance in contemporary society.
- Darwin's theory of evolution is useful in understanding how life on earth developed – it does not provide an answer for why the universe exists or why it exists in the way that it does, therefore this form of scientific argument cannot be considered to be persuasive when considering the existence of the universe whereas teleological arguments are able to provide a response to this question and therefore provide a persuasive argument.
- Teleological arguments usually posit the idea that there is some kind of purpose for the universe's existence, with an underlying intelligence responsible for this purpose, this view supports those who maintain a belief in a divine power. Scientific arguments do not depend on this approach, not least because there is no clear empirical evidence that supports such a view. In this sense, those that require empirical evidence to help persuade within an argument, would be more inclined to accept scientific arguments than philosophical ones.
- Teleological arguments are as much based on faith as they are on reason. For those who accept faith as a valid premise, then this would make the teleological arguments persuasive – but for those who are unwilling to accept this premise then the persuasiveness of the argument is much reduced.
- The longevity of teleological arguments suggest that there is a persuasiveness about them, as they have not been entirely discredited. Scientific arguments are not always accepted by all people and therefore may not always be considered to be universally persuasive.
- Scientific views are often used to complement teleological arguments – making them appear more persuasive. The two sets of arguments are not necessarily mutually exclusive.
- Hume as an empiricist may be used as an example of presenting a variety of scientific challenges.
- Intelligent design including irreducible complexity can show how scientific means can be used to consolidate the idea of God's design.

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