



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2018

**A LEVEL (NEW)
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - UNIT 5
PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION
1120U50-1**

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 5 – Philosophy of Religion : 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. |

Unit 5 – Philosophy of Religion

MARK SCHEME

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

Section A

1. Examine the criticisms of verification and falsification in relation to religious language. [AO1 30]

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

- The key criticism of the verification principle is that it cannot itself be verified by the criterion established for meaning. For this reason, using it as the standard for the meaning of anything else would seem, at best hypocritical and at worst meaningless.
- Other criticisms of the verification principle is that it does not count statements about historical events or universal scientific statements – both of which are widely regarded as meaningful, not least because they provide a backdrop to how most human life is experienced.
- Another criticism is that the logical positivists analysis of meaning appears to be arbitrary – in that there is no clearly defined reason as to why this should be the method by which meaning is established.
- Furthermore, the concept of eschatological verification (i.e. that there could be some sense experience that would be available to us after death which may verify the existence of God, etc.) also undermines the validity of the verification principle.
- Criticisms of falsification are often explained through various metaphors, analogies or parables. One such is that of philosopher Richard Hare who coined the term 'blik' to refer to a way of looking at the world that provides meaning for them, even if others do not share their view. This objects to the criteria of falsification that claims statements about the world can only be meaningful if something can be held to count against them - otherwise they are rendered meaningless. For the person experiencing the 'blik', meaning is still derived even if evidence is offered that counters the 'blik'.
- Basil Mitchell's parable of the partisan and the stranger shows that some things can still held to be meaningful, even when there is evidence accepted that appears to contradict the held belief as there is a commitment that entails the view that 'things will work out in the end'.
- Richard Swinburne's parable of the toys in the cupboard highlights the fact that (through his idea that we can understand what it means for toys in the cupboard to 'come to life' and move around when we don't observe them) a concept may be meaningful even though falsifying the statement is not possible).

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

2. Explain Freud's view of religious belief.

[AO1 30]

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

- Freud recognised the significance of religion within the sphere of human activity and spent much of his life and work reflecting on the relationship between religious belief and human behaviour. His work largely suggests that religion is unhelpful in allowing humans to develop a healthy psychological maturity, considering it to be an 'infantile' pursuit that prevented human beings from fulfilling their potential. Freud considered religion as an illusion and/or a neurosis. He believed that it was a 'universal obsessional ritual' that had the function of allowing its followers to avoid imaginary misfortunes (Hell, damnation, etc.) and to indulge in practices that promoted both aggressive and egoistic desires.
- Freud used the Oedipus myth to reflect on the complex relationships between parents and children and how this caused the child's psyche to both react and develop. Issues around love, hate, jealousy, rivalry and dependence were recognised as having their root in these relationships and could result in intense emotional turmoil within the individual. A key function of religion, from Freud's perspective, was to give these relationships a narrative that allowed the experience to become a social rather than individualised one. Hence the promotion of father figures as 'omnipotent' in the God figure and the idea of mothers as 'virginal' – both ideas firmly established within the Christian narrative. This gave a social acceptability to such considerations that would be considered inappropriate if promoted by the individual without such a context.
- Freud promoted the idea of a collective human 'memory' in his primal horde theory. This idea (which he based around the work of Darwin) suggested that human ancestors, killed an alpha-male within the horde, out of jealousy for this male who had had exclusive sexual access to the females of the horde due to their superior strength and intellect. This caused a severe reaction in guilt as this alpha-male had also been highly respected and feared amongst the horde. The guilt then becomes focussed on a totem that in turn becomes the object of devotion and worship and the murdered alpha-male takes on the mantle of a god. This also explained Freud's theory that religion was a way of repressing traumas.
- Religion was also seen by Freud to provide wish-fulfilment and was a reaction against helplessness; religion provided a framework by which those who felt disenfranchised by their experiences in life could make sense of the world through their religious belief and feel empowered by adhering to its rituals and mythologies.

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

Section B

3. 'Religious experiences have little influence on religious beliefs and practices.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Definitions of religious experiences may state that these are remarkable or significantly unusual events, such as visions, conversions or miracles. In such cases these are experiences outside of the 'norm'. Equally, the definition may incorporate those experiences which are recognizably religious and therefore can be considered as religious experiences – such as prayer, ritual action, religious assembly, reading of sacred writings, etc. In this definition it is difficult to separate any religious belief or practice from religious experience as by definition, that is what they are.
- Religious experiences may not have a direct influence on beliefs and practices that have value for religious communities and individuals for a variety of reasons. For instance, they are a way to affirm a faith system. This affirmation can still be valid even if a religious experience does not occur. Although it should be recognized that for many religious believers these same beliefs and practices can be deepened by an associative religious experience and thus their value is, arguably, enhanced.
- A religious experience may serve as a means of adding value to this as it may be an integral part of the practice – for instance public prayers or affirmations of faith are often regarded as shared religious experiences. Again, for others, beliefs and practices are a way to promote faith value system. Repetitive actions, restated beliefs (verbalised daily or even more frequently) allow both individuals and communities to demonstrate what is important to them and may even serve as a means by which others outside of the religious community might come to appreciate the value of what is believed/practiced.
- Religious experiences may be held as extremely valuable to both religious individuals and religious communities as they may strengthen faith in the face of opposition from those not part of the religion, however, this strengthening of faith can still happen through a personal, or communal, commitment to faith through repeated practices or beliefs that may not be considered to necessarily be a religious experience.
- Religious experiences can inform many of the established customs, rituals, beliefs and practices that exist within religious communities. However, some communal religious practices, such as assembling at a place of worship, undertaking a particular ritual action or observing certain practices at a religious festival may all occur without necessarily be considered to be religious experiences and yet have the considered value of strengthening cohesion within the religious community. This is important as a means of preserving identity and reinforcing common bonds between those who belong to the religion.

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

4. Religious responses to New Atheism have been unsuccessful.’

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- New atheism, as a movement, has been exceptionally and very publically critical of all forms of religious belief and in this has openly challenged and attempted to undermine religious influence in the twenty-first century in both public and private arenas. This demonstrates that the religious establishment has been largely unsuccessful in preventing the rise, spread and influence of this movement.
- Key debates over the relationship between religion and science, which were often the platforms of the early proponents of New Atheism are largely rejected by religious observers as being overly simplistic. A number of high profile religious believers hold respected positions within the scientific community and are able to demonstrate the compatibility of their faith with the principles of science. Where these approaches hold to be true, religious responses to New Atheism have been successful. Where religious believers still hold a polemical view of the roles of science and religion, the responses of religion to new atheism have not demonstrated the same success.
- Religious responses to the movement have often been well-informed and subtle, using the public arena to debate with the new atheists the beneficial effects of religion. This has led some observers to point to key figures within the New Atheist movement and suggest that their effectiveness as serious challengers to the validity of religious belief has been largely reduced due to becoming caricatures of themselves in the way that the media has depicted them and their responses to these public debates with religious figures. Some of the types of behaviours (promoted as negative) cited of religious believers by these key figures– i.e. aggressive militarism, exclusivist approaches and reductionist claims, have all been the hallmarks of these proponents of New Atheism and, as such, have become self-defeating.
- Traditional attacks on religious belief and practice has frequently seen a response by a rise in fundamentalism – this has held true, in some respects, with the attacks from New Atheism. Where this has found expression in aggressive responses, New Atheism has often found itself to be publicly exonerated – however, where this has found expression in a reaffirmation of beliefs, a promotion in positive morality and a demonstration in positive community relations between the sacred and secular spheres, then the claims of New Atheism have been successfully met by the responses of religion.

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

5. 'The definition of miracle, as written by Hume, is the least problematic of all definitions of miracle.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- An exploration of why Hume's definition may be considered to be effective. (i.e. reference to deity or invisible agent; recognition that a miracle is an 'interposition' and a 'transgression' of a law of nature. Following this, understanding that this definition may allow for miracles to be contested as being irrational but also, in a broader sense, allows for the possibility that it is rational to accept that miracles may, indeed, sometimes occur. Recognition that defining a miracle often centres on what the purpose of a miracle is purported to be. As definitions often incorporate the idea of an interruption of a law of nature, then 'laws of nature' also needs clarification when considering whether the definition of miracle is adequate. Coupled with this is under what conditions will a definition of miracle be accepted as adequate – candidates should debate this key issue. If there is an acceptance of a God being responsible for intervening with the laws of nature then further questions are raised about whether such a being is responsible for establishing the laws of nature and, if this is the case, why would they then go against the laws they had established? Does this suggest logical or moral inconsistency? Equally, if such a God were omniscient then they would have foreseen the consequences of the laws of nature and possibly extended them to allow for 'miraculous' events to happen with a greater moral consistency.
- However, alternative definitions may be considered as being less problematic. If the definition requires reference to a supernatural figure or divine influence, then it is likely that such a definition would be both acceptable and adequate for a religious believer. Such a definition might strengthen the religious claims of the believer or contextualise the significance of the event. Both the definitions of Aquinas and Swinburne would support such an idea. However, such a definition is not without its issues. Were such an occurrence by an interventionist God possible then it raises questions about the morality of a God who would choose to intervene in some events but not others. This raises further questions about the characteristics associated with the God of classical theism, specifically omnibenevolence (why cure one person from a terminal disease but allow the genocide of millions of people?).
- There is also the possibility that what is witnessed actually exists outside of the sphere of religion. It could be considered to be nothing more than a coincidence – such as the definition proposed by Holland, meaning that this becomes the least problematic definition as it allows for the absence of a supernatural agent, and still permits the existence of natural laws, as the event is nothing more than unusual coincidences – interpreted as having significance by those witnessing the event. Although the lack of a religious dimension to these events may mean that others find this definition inadequate.

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

6. 'Symbolic religious language is only meaningful for religious believers.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Consideration of the purpose of symbol and how it is expressed through language. A commonly referred to definition is that a symbol is something which 'points to a metaphysical reality and participates in it' (Schubert).
- In context, symbols have a deep significance for those that interact with them. One such example may be the Christian Cross. On one level this is two bisecting lines, the vertical one usually being a third longer than the horizontal. For a non-religious believer it may have a superficial meaning as indicative of the religion of Christianity or it may point to the instrument of execution commonly practiced by the Roman Empire. However, for the religious believer it may also evoke sacrifice, love, salvation, selflessness, hope, redemption, absolution, community, identity and triumph. In this sense, there is clearly more meaning behind the symbol for the religious believer. However, it could be argued that the non-religious believer can understand the meaning of this symbol for the religious believer, on intellectual grounds. For the religious believer there is also an emotional engagement with the symbol.
- Tillich suggests that symbols participate in the object that they refer to (e.g. the national flag – a symbol of the country also represents patriotism/national pride). It would seem that the participatory aspect of symbolic language would not be meaningful for those who do not engage with the symbol in this way. Religious language, according to Tillich, does not refer to an objective reality.
- Randall suggested that symbols only work because they have the ability to motivate those who interact with them. As such they have the ability to inspire people to action and to heightened states of emotion. This also has a binding effect when the symbol is accessed by groups of people who hold a common interpretation of the symbol. Again, whilst accessible on an intellectual level this social cohesion and emotion fuelling aspect of the symbol and associated symbolic language would not necessarily be meaningful to the non-believer.
- Symbolic religious language depends on context. That context may change and this may change the meaning of the symbolic language. Such an example would be the swastika - a symbol universally held, in the context of Eastern religious and cultural thought, as one of peace, unity and harmony. The change of context in the corruption of the symbol by the Nazi party in the 1930s and 1940s meant that the meaning of the symbolic religious language wound this symbol has been markedly changed. The symbolic language still has meaning but this is radically altered according to the context it is understood in.
- How do we know whether a symbol is adequate? Can symbols successfully represent that which is beyond our experience? Can it give the wrong insights as there is no way to determine it?

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