



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2019

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

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2019 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.

A Level Generic Band Descriptors

Band	Assessment Objective AO1 – Section A questions 30 marks <i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:</i>
(marks)	<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 (25-30 marks)	<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. • Insightful connections are made between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • An extensive range of views of scholars/schools of thought used accurately and effectively. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4 (19-24 marks)	<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. • Purposeful connections are made between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • A range of scholarly views/schools of thought used largely accurately and effectively. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar.
3 (13-18 marks)	<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. • Sensible connections made between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • A basic range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar.
2 (7-12 marks)	<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. • Makes some basic connections between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable) • A limited range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1 (1-6 marks)	<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. • Very few or no connections made between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable) • Little or no use of scholarly views/schools of thought. • 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 3 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	Assessment Objective AO2- Section B questions 30 marks <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i>
5 (25-30 marks)	<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. • The views of scholars/schools of thought are used extensively, appropriately and in context. • Confident and perceptive analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4 (19-24 marks)	<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 views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • The response shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • Views of scholars/schools of thought are used appropriately and in context. • Purposeful analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar.
3 (13-18 marks)	<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. • Views of scholars/schools of thought are generally used appropriately and in context. • Sensible analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar.
2 (7-12 marks)	<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. • Basic use of the views of scholars/schools of thought, appropriately and in context. • Makes some analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • Some mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1 (1-6 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue. • An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set. • Very limited accuracy within the response, with little coherence, clarity and organisation. • Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence. • Little or no use of the views of scholars/schools of thought. • Limited analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable). • Some use 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.

WJEC GCE A LEVEL RELIGIOUS STUDIES

SUMMER 2019 MARK SCHEME

UNIT 4 - RELIGION AND ETHICS

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

Section A

1. **Explain the arguments of the philosopher John Locke and the psychologist Ivan Pavlov in support of hard determinism.** [AO1 30]

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

- Hard determinism is the view that human actions are determined by factors other than free will.

John Locke:

- Locke developed a philosophical determinism theory based on universal causation. Therefore, Locke believed that all events are determined by an unbreakable chain of past causes.
- Locke therefore believed that the future must logically be as fixed and unchangeable as the past.
- Because of this Locke believed that free will was an illusion. He believed people who believe they have free will are deluding themselves.
- People think they have free will because they believe they can pause to reflect before making a choice. However, all such thoughts are just the result of ignorance of past causes.
- Locke created an analogy of a man locked in a bedroom to illustrate the above theory.

Ivan Pavlov:

- Psychological determinism claims that human behaviour can be predicted as a result of certain determining factors.
- Behaviourists claim that all human behaviours develop as a result of our interaction with our environment which conditions our responses. This can be studied in a systematic way to predict human behaviour.
- Pavlov discovered the theory of classical conditioning, which entailed linking two stimuli together to produce a learned response in an animal, when studying digestion in dogs. His famous example related to conditioning a dog to salivate when it heard a bell.
- Pavlov believed that many human behaviours had been conditioned in the same way through their environment and were therefore not the result of free will but did not prove this through experimentation.
- Watson then showed that classical conditioning could be applied to humans with the 'Little Albert' experiment.
- Both believed that accidental classical conditioning through interactions with the environment determined human behaviour.

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

2. **Explain the arguments of the philosopher John Paul Sartre and the psychologist Carl Rogers in support of libertarianism.** [AO1 30]

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

- Libertarianism is the theory that people are completely free to act i.e. moral agents have complete morally responsibility for their own actions.

John Paul Sartre

- Sartre believed there was no God i.e. there is no supreme/higher power controlling humanity.
- Sartre also argued that people can understand they have free will because humanity is 'pour-soi' ('being for itself'), unlike animals who are just en-soi ('being in itself') i.e. humans have a self-consciousness.
- Therefore, there is a distance between a person's self-consciousness and the physical world. Sartre calls this 'the gap' and it is this gap that allows people to have free will.
- Humankind's freedom is obvious because of the way people try to deny their own freedom. Freedom can bring pain; therefore, people will try to avoid the reality of their own freedom - a self-deception, Sartre called 'bad faith'.
- Sartre illustrated the 'bad faith' with the example of a cafe waiter.
- Sartre believes freedom is both 'a gift and a curse' for humanity. A gift because people have the freedom of making something out of their lives. A curse because freedom brings the responsibility that a person must develop their own lives.

Carl Rogers

- Rogers belongs to the psychological school of thought called 'Humanism'.
- Rogers believed that people were born as experiencing beings, who live in the present and have the potential to respond freely to their current situations. However, Rogers concedes that a person's life can become determined by external conditioning
- Rogers, however, rejected that such deterministic factors were permanent. This is because he believed that people can still achieve free will through the process of 'self-actualisation'.
- Self-actualisation involves an individual achieving their own, freely decided goals, wishes and desires in life and reaching their full potential.
- Rogers believed that if a person can act on their own free will feelings, they can break the 'chains' of determinism and express their own free will i.e. they can self-actualise.
- To do this requires an environment of unconditional positive regard so that people feel free to make their own mistakes without approval being withdrawn.
- Rogers believes that full self-actualisation occurs when a person's 'ideal self' (i.e. who they would freely like to be) is the congruent with their own 'self-image'.

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

Section B

3. 'Moral terms are nothing more than expressions of human emotions.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Ayer claims that moral statements are neither analytic nor synthetic and therefore not verifiable using sense experience. Therefore, Ayer found himself in a strange position with ethical terms in that, although obviously not meaningless, they could not be verified.
- Whilst religious language for Ayer was clearly meaningless, ethical language did indeed serve some purpose and so appeared unique.
- Ayer never proposed that ethical propositions were of no value or worth or that ethical debate was not worthy of pursuit, as he states clearly in later writings, but simply that they are not factual or that it is not possible to verify them.
- However, Ayer did recognise that they do serve to express human emotions regarding particular moral issues in the same way that grunts or cheers can express approval or disapproval.
- This claim could be seen as accurate as it offers a more scientific analysis of the meaning of ethical language.
- Moral disputes are rarely resolved to the satisfaction of both parties, and emotivism gives a reason to explain this. Disputes will occur, as emotional responses to moral actions are not universal or innate, however these disputes are rarely resolved because Ayer would say that there is no factual content to the differences and so there is nothing to rationally debate.
- This would leave ethical debate as a pointless activity, however many conflicts have been averted and human rights improved because of moral debate and many would argue that there is a rational basis for these discussions.
- Emotivism could be seen to support the important human value of egalitarianism i.e. it allows everyone's moral position to be equally valid, making the statement agreeable, however this is only if people accept that their moral statements are not factually true and can only ever be expressions of their emotion. This would cause problems for many religious believers who would claim that their moral statements are truths revealed by God.
- This position may also be seen as a degeneration of human culture as all opinions, however, 'morally unacceptable' on other terms, must be seen as equally valid expressions of emotion.
- Candidates may go on to argue that other ethical theories offer a better analysis of moral terms, showing that they are more than expressions of human emotions. For example, naturalism claims that there can be moral facts.
- A further line of argument may be to assess the moral implications of agreeing with the Emotivist analysis. As there are no moral absolutes, it makes it difficult to condemn acts such as murder and rape. Again, candidates may look to other meta-ethical theories to offer a better solution.
- Candidates may also question the idea of moral terms being 'nothing more' than expressions of emotion. They may use the views of Stevenson to argue that ethical statements may well be expressions of emotion, but they also contain a persuasive element which attempts to influence the actions of others.

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

4. 'Finnis' Natural Law is a practical ethical approach for contemporary society.'
Evaluate this view. [AO2 30]

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

- It could be argued that, as we live in a secular society, John Finnis' Natural Law has the potential to work because although it is essentially a 'religious' ethic for Finnis, it also has the capacity to be adopted by anyone, so long as they have an explanation for questions of an ultimate nature. This was unlike Aquinas' version of Natural Law.
- The above is further supported because Finnis argues that the aim of Natural Law is to ensure a person is able to live a worthwhile life and to 'flourish' i.e. to establish what is really 'good' for humankind. Therefore, Finnis is trying to develop an ethic that enables humans to flourish in the present and is not based on rewards in a post-mortem existence (unlike Aquinas' Natural Law).
- However, it could be argued that Finnis' Natural Law is elitist: it favours the educated and mature above others i.e. Finnis recognises that the seven basic goods may not be appreciated by everyone. This makes it impractical as it cannot be used universally.
- It is also complicated and difficult to follow. Surely a practical ethical approach is one which is easily understood.
- Another point in favour is that there is scope for discretion in Finnis' version of Natural Law. This is because the seven basic goods do not exist in a hierarchy. Therefore, although some acts are definitely wrong (because they do not participate in a basic good), there is no single correct act and agents are able to make different but equally moral decisions.
- This could appeal to the post-modernist perspective which does not accept traditional fixed values like the deontological commandments/rules of the Bible or Aquinas' Natural Law. The flexibility of Finnis' version would therefore appeal.
- However, the basis for Finnis' basic goods could be questioned – it is unclear whether his seven basic goods really are definitive for the whole of humanity. If the derivation of the basic goods is questioned, then the theory itself cannot be practical in contemporary society.
- Also, Finnis rejects pleasure as a motivation for action, however in contemporary society many would argue that pleasure is perhaps the best basis for morality. Therefore, a different ethical theory such as Utilitarianism may be more suitable.

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

5. 'The strengths of Proportionalism, as an ethical theory, clearly outweigh its weaknesses.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Proportionalism has many strengths, including the maxim of the theory that the precepts of Natural Law should not be broken unless there is a proportionate reason to do so. This approach combines the clear-cut approach of Natural Law with an element of flexibility which prevents some of the injustices of absolutist rules. Therefore, it would appear to offer the best of both worlds and seems a common-sensical approach.
- However, although there are different understandings of what proportionalism is, all forms would agree that 'proportionate reason' is NOT simply a matter of common-sense but a very serious course of reasoning often restricted to crisis and conflict situations and not everyday morality.
- Proportionalism has been condemned by the Catholic Church. For example, Pope John Paul II in his encyclical 'Veritatis Splendor' stated Proportionalism is wrong on the grounds that it is a form of consequentialism.
- Another strength of Proportionalism is that it has its roots in Thomas Aquinas' Summa Theologica and originates with the Principle of Double Effect.
- An alternative line of argument is that it is a well-known part of 'Just War' theory, which was originally proposed by Augustine and developed by Aquinas.
- Some may argue that a Proportionalist approach is clearly visible in the writings of Aquinas on other moral issues as well. For example, Aquinas considered the question of whether it would be moral for a starving man to break the secondary precept of stealing in order to save his life. He concluded it was permissible. However, theologians would clarify that this decision was based not on proportionate reason, but rather that Aquinas argued that this was 'not stealing proper'.
- There is also an argument that Proportionalism proposes apparent goods rather than real goods. For example, lying to avoid hurting somebody's feelings may be the 'right' thing to do in a particular situation, but it does not contribute to the real good of creating an ordered society based on truth.
- Proportionalism could be seen as a more compassionate approach to ethics than say Natural Law, because it considers the whole moral event, rather than just acting upon specific deontological principles in just considering the act itself.
- However, it could be argued that this makes Proportionalism more open to abuse which is exactly what some may argue in relation to those proportionalists that have taken Peter Knauer's view that proportionate reasoning is the basis of all morality.
- It also means that Proportionalism loses the universal application of moral principles found in Natural Law, which makes it a poor basis for morality as it does not promote equality.

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

6. 'Religious believers should accept the theory of predestination.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- One reason why religious believers should accept the theory of predestination is because holy texts suggest they should. For example, Romans 8:29-30: "For those God foreknew he also predestined ... And those he predestined, he also called; those he called" or in the Qur'an, in 76:30, it states: "And you do not will except that Allah wills...."
- However, holy texts could also be cited to suggest humanity has free will. For example, Joshua 24:15 states: "But if serving the LORD seems undesirable to you, then choose for yourselves this day whom you will serve..." or in the New Testament: John 8:36 Jesus stated: "So if the Son sets you free, you will be free indeed" or in the Qur'an: 54:49 it states: "Verily, all things have We created in proportion and measure." (or 'proportion and measure' can be translated as predestination).
- Candidates are likely to discuss the implications of these (or other relevant) apparently contradictory passages and a range of conclusions should be credited if they are supported with reasoning.
- Another reason why religious believers should accept the theory of predestination is because it has theological support from Augustine's 'Doctrine of Original Sin'. Without such a belief in predestination, God's omnipotence could be questioned as human choice and action could determine who would be saved.
- However, not all religious believers accept Augustine's concept of original sin which could be seen to question God's benevolence as God only saves some moral agents and not all: 'a God that punishes or rewards on the basis of God's own eternal decisions is unfair and immoral' (Russell). Pelagius' view of original sin as the means by which humans gained free will may be more acceptable to some believers.
- Religious believers may also accept the theory of predestination because it has theological support from Calvin's 'Doctrine of Election' which was affirmed by the Synod of Dort in 1619. This historical acceptance of the doctrine gives it credibility.
- Again, however, this theory is not accepted by all religious believers. Many Christians, particularly those in the Methodist tradition, would be more convinced by the theological concept of free will put forward by Arminius. The view that God's prevenient grace allows humans to exercise free will is an important one when considering individual responsibility for their own actions.
- Expect candidates to weigh up the merits of the different theological perspectives and reach a reasoned judgement about which carries the greatest weight.
- Candidates may also choose to evaluate the implications of accepting predestination in terms of the value of prayer, the existence of miracles and the problem of evil. Each of these is a valid line of enquiry.

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