



---

# **GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME**

---

**SUMMER 2018**

**A LEVEL (NEW)  
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - UNIT 4  
RELIGION AND ETHICS  
1120U40-1**

## **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.

## **UNIT 4 – Religion and Ethics: Mark Scheme**

### **Marking guidance for examiners, please apply carefully and consistently:**

#### **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 or all 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.



<b>Band</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment Objective AO2- Section B questions 30 marks</b>  <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i></p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>5</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(25-30 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set.</li> <li>• The response shows an excellent standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence.</li> <li>• The views of scholars/schools of thought are used extensively, appropriately and in context.</li> <li>• Confident and perceptive analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable).</li> <li>• Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(19-24 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed.</li> <li>• The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence.</li> <li>• The response shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• Views of scholars/schools of thought are used appropriately and in context.</li> <li>• Purposeful analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable).</li> <li>• Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(13-18 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed.</li> <li>• The response shows a satisfactory standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence.</li> <li>• Views of scholars/schools of thought are generally used appropriately and in context.</li> <li>• Sensible analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable).</li> <li>• Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(7-12 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed.</li> <li>• Partially accurate response, with some signs of coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence.</li> <li>• Basic use of the views of scholars/schools of thought, appropriately and in context.</li> <li>• Makes some analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable).</li> <li>• Some mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>(1-6 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set.</li> <li>• Very limited accuracy within the response, with little coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence.</li> <li>• Little or no use of the views of scholars/schools of thought.</li> <li>• Limited analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable).</li> <li>• Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary.</li> <li>• Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the meaning and clarity of communication.</li> </ul>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>0</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant analysis or evaluation.</li> </ul>

**GCE A LEVEL (NEW)  
RELIGIOUS STUDIES**

**SUMMER 2018 MARK SCHEME**

**Unit 4 –Religion and Ethics**

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

**Section A**

1. Compare the meta-ethical approaches of Intuitionism and Emotivism. **[AO1 30]**

**Candidates could include some or of the following, but other relevant responses will be credited.**

- Intuitionism and emotivism both look for a way to understand moral statements without requiring analysis of the natural world, therefore both reject naturalism as a meta-ethical approach.
- Intuitionism accepts that there are objective moral laws which exist independently of human beings, whereas emotivism argues that moral laws do not exist.
- In intuitionism, objective moral laws are established through intuition, rather than through observing the natural world, therefore there can be no definition of what we 'ought to do' and any rational attempt to provide this rests on a mistake (Pritchard). However, all moral agents share intuitive ability therefore moral truths independent of humans, such as 'murder is wrong' do exist.
- In emotivism, ethical statements are seen as the expression of personal approval or disapproval (boo-hurrah theory) and are therefore not independent of the moral agent. Different humans will have different emotive reactions to particular situations and this explains why people disagree about morality.
- H.A. Pritchard is a realist who claims that, because we have a sense of moral obligation established through intuition, that moral obligation must exist. To believe otherwise is to open ourselves to infinite sceptical regress.
- He argues that there are two kinds of thinking involved in morality; general thinking involves the use of reason to establish the facts about a situation, moral thinking entails intuition which perceives the right thing to do and comes prior to philosophical reasoning. If we try to seek reasons for acting against our own interests but in accordance with our moral intuitions, we are 'doomed to failure'.
- Ayer, on the other hand, sees moral statements as neither analytic nor verifiable using sense-experience, and therefore as meaningless in the sense of offering moral truths.
- For example, the moral statement 'murder is wrong' is the same as saying 'down with murder' or 'boo to murder'. The ethical element of a statement such as 'you should not have murdered that man' only serves to express an individual's moral disapproval, it does not add any additional moral 'fact' to the fact that 'you have murdered that man.'
- Moral statements may well be designed to influence the behaviour of others (Stevenson), but are not truth claims.
- As a result, emotivism cannot be reduced to subjectivism, as our moral statements indicate a persuasive element which can allow for genuine disagreement.

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

2. Explain Bernard Hoose's Proportionalism.

[AO1 30]

**Candidates could include some or all of the following, but other relevant responses will be credited.**

- Proportionalism is a hybrid deontological/teleological ethic which combines Natural Law with some aspects of Situation Ethics.
- Hoose did not invent Proportionalism, but attempted to explain how the idea was rooted in the work of European and American Catholic moral theologians looking as far back as Aquinas' principles of just war.
- The theory is based on Natural Law and is a development of Aquinas' principle of double effect – i.e. that it is morally acceptable to perform a bad action if and only if it is the unintended (but foreseeable) side effect of another morally good action. This fits in with Aquinas' requirement that interior and exterior acts should both comply with Natural Law.
- Proportionalism develops this idea and states that the moral rules derived from the precepts of Natural Law are not absolute, but rather form strong moral guidelines which should be followed unless there is a proportionate reason not to.
- Hoose put forward the maxim 'it is never right to go against a principle unless there is a proportionate reason which would justify it.' Candidates may develop this maxim with examples taken from either immigration, capital punishment or another area of applied ethics. For example, it is wrong to kill (as this goes against the primary precept to defend innocent life), but in a war it may be acceptable to kill in order to defend innocent people. The defence of the innocent victims of war may be seen as a proportionate reason to break the moral law which prohibits killing.
- Hoose makes the distinction between ontic/premoral goods and evils (those which relieve or cause pain and suffering) and moral and immoral acts (those which comply with or contravene natural moral law). He argues that a 'good' act is one which follows the moral rules given by natural law and a 'right' act is one that may not follow the moral rule, but creates the lesser of two evils. Again, candidates may choose to exemplify this distinction with the use of examples taken from the two named areas of applied ethics or from any other area.
- Application of agape, or the law of love allows the agent to decide in which circumstances it is proportionate to perform a 'good' act rather than a 'right' act.

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



## Section B

3. 'The strengths of Finnis' adaptation of Aquinas' Natural Law theory outweigh its weaknesses.'

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 30]**

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

- Finnis' seven basic goods may be seen as more appropriate for the modern world than Aquinas' five primary precepts as they seem more in step with a modern understanding of the human condition.
- While Finnis does require religion as one of the basic goods, this is defined very broadly and therefore could be seen as a real strength in our modern, pluralist world.
- Finnis' theory moves away from pleasure or selfish motivations for action and places reason at the heart of morality. However, this is practical reason, based on how to act.
- It could be argued that Finnis' theory is strong because it allows flexibility to respond to moral issues. The nine requirements of practical reason give a detailed explanation of how to apply Finnis' natural law, without taking away from an individual's ability to make free moral choices about which correct action to take.
- Finnis' theory may be seen as compatible with modern scientific thinking as one of the common goods is 'sociability' and this fits in with evolutionary thinking about human development.
- A key part of Finnis' theory involves respect for the rule of law in order to coordinate society and work towards the common good. This respect can also be seen as a cornerstone of modern functioning democracy and therefore candidates may argue that this is a key strength of the theory.
- Finnis does not, however, seem to consider the role of pleasure in his basic goods. Some would argue that pleasure is the sole intrinsic good.
- More fundamentally, Finnis does not offer any rational foundation for his 'basic goods' beyond that they appear good to most people. He assumes their existence, and bases his theory on this assumption, but he may be wrong.
- Buckle argues that, while the basic goods are plausible, Finnis' requirement to 'never harm a basic good' amounts to support for absolutist Roman Catholic principles such as the rejection of abortion and contraception in the same way as these are rejected by Aquinas' Natural Law. This may be argued to be a strength or a weakness.
- Although Finnis supports the rule of law, he does not believe that we are fully obliged to follow human laws which contradict natural law, therefore this position does not fully support the rule of law required by democracy.
- Candidates should weigh up the relative merits of the strengths and weaknesses and come to a judgement.

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

4. 'The whole of a person's life is predestined by God.'

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 30]**

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

- Candidates may choose to argue in support of the statement using Calvin's teachings about unconditional election. They may link this to God's omnipotence and omniscience.
- This position is supported by biblical teachings such as Romans 8: 28-30, however, it could be argued that this text, and others used to support predestination, have different, more valid interpretations.
- While the implications of his view appear unjust, Calvin argued that, as the roots of this doctrine are biblical, it should be taught so that humans can understand the need for humility. Again, it could be argued that the interpretation of scripture can be contested and therefore Calvin's defence of predestination is not strong.
- Some, such as Russell, would argue that God appears tyrannical according to Calvin's conception and would reject his claims that God's justice is simply unknown to us and we should not question this.
- Alternatively, candidates may follow Augustine's line of argument, that essential human nature is free, but that the doctrine of original sin means that we are born predestined to be a sinner as this overrides our liberium arbitrium. Therefore, the use of the word 'whole' in the question could be questioned.
- It could be claimed that, if the whole of life is predestined, then many Christian concepts such as sin would need to be re-evaluated. This point could be developed with reference to moral attitudes and the criminal justice system.
- Another line of argument would be to consider a Buddhist perspective, arguing that our current existence is predestined not by God, but by karma from a previous existence. This would allow an evaluation of the extent to which an individual can influence their karma through, for example, adherence to the Noble Eightfold Path.
- The views of Pelagius and Arminius could be used to argue against the view in the question, making the case for free will rather than predestination, and possibly linking this to moral responsibility.
- This point could be developed through considering the extent to which belief in free will and predestination can be reconciled.
- Alternatively, Muslim perspectives may be explored. Belief in Qadr (divine destiny) entails belief in predestination, yet humans are held accountable for their actions on the day of judgement. Again, candidates may explore the debate surrounding God's justice and may evaluate responses that attempt to reconcile belief in Qadr and free will.

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

5. 'Hard determinism is far more convincing than soft determinism.'

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 30]**

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

- Hard determinism may be seen as convincing as it is supported by scientific theory. Evidence to support physical or biological determinism could be evaluated with reference to scholars such as Newton and Laplace, or evidence such as the Human Genome project.
- However, challenges to scientific determinism such as chaos theory or the Gaia hypothesis may be raised and evaluated in opposition to this view.
- Alternatively, hard determinism could be considered from the perspective of theological determinism, with consideration of the implications for this view in terms of the nature of God as omnipotent and omniscient.
- Again, this view could be challenged with issues relating to human moral responsibility and the nature of sin.
- Psychological evidence could also be used to support hard determinism. Behaviourist theories could suggest we are determined and this line of argument could be developed with consideration of classical or operant conditioning. The degree to which hard determinism could be seen as a combination of psychological and biological factors (the nature/nurture debate) could be considered.
- Philosophical arguments such as Locke's claim that free will is an illusion could be used to support hard determinism, with reference to his 'man in a locked room' analogy. However, as with theological determinism, this has implications for human moral responsibility and leads to unpalatable conclusions such as the view that Hitler was not morally culpable for his actions.
- Soft determinism may be seen as more convincing as it solves the issue of human moral responsibility without denying that all actions have causes.
- The idea that there are determining factors that influence our decisions, but ultimately we have still made free choices unless we have been forced to act in a certain way, seems more compatible with how humans understand the world. It allows us to separate internal and external causes in a logical way (Hobbes).
- This argument could be developed using Ayer's observation that, even if we were to accept that we are not entirely free agents, through whichever version of determinism can be best proven, 'it would not follow that the idea of freedom would go by the board.' Instead, he argues, we need to view our unforced choices as free in some way so that conventional legal and moral frameworks continue to make sense.
- Candidates may, however, argue that the tenets of soft determinism constitute an unacceptable compromise of the 'facts' of hard determinism and, as such, are not more convincing.

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

6. 'Free will means that God is not responsible for evil.'

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 30]**

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

- If humans have free will, it could be argued that humans are fully responsible for evil as they choose whether to do good or to sin.
- This line of reasoning could be developed with reference to Pelagius' denial of the doctrine of original sin and his emphasis on free will as the basis for morality.
- This idea could be developed through consideration of Irenaean-type theodicies and the idea that humanity is made in God's image with the responsibility to grow into God's likeness through the appropriate exercise of free will.
- However, it could be argued that humans were created with free will by God and therefore, as God is omniscient, he must be at least partially responsible for evil as he could foresee our imperfect choices.
- Alternatively it could be argued that God is responsible for creating a world which contains natural evil, and this is not the result of human free will, therefore God is at least responsible for some of the evil in the world.
- However, it could be argued, following Augustinian-type theodicies, that natural evil only entered the world as a result of the Fall and through original sin, therefore human free will caused this original state in which evil could flourish and God is not responsible.
- Again, reasons for the rejection of the doctrine of original sin, such as God's justice and fairness, could be considered.
- Following a libertarian line of reasoning, human actions are free and therefore humans can be held morally responsible for their choices. Moral evil, is therefore the result of free human choice and we have not been disposed or predestined to act in a particular way by God.
- To develop this point, Sartre would argue that there is no God, and therefore God cannot be responsible for evil, but that much pain can be caused by human actions, particularly when we attempt to deny our own freedom in order to avoid moral responsibility.
- Buddhists would also agree with the concept that God is not responsible for evil, but may question whether the blame lies entirely with human free will. The extent to which we are determined by our karma and the extent to which we are free to choose moral actions could be evaluated.
- Candidates have considerable freedom to draw on a wide range of material and scholarship to evaluate this view and may make use of any legitimate practical examples to illustrate their points.

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