



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2019

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

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 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.

WJEC GCE A LEVEL RELIGIOUS STUDIES

SUMMER 2019 MARK SCHEME

UNIT 5 – PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

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

Section A

1. Examine the understanding of religious language as mythical. [AO1 30]

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

- Candidates may explain that religious language as non-cognitive means that it should not be interpreted in a literal sense. A mythical interpretation gives insight into the purpose of existence and aids humans in the need to confront life's fears. It is used widely in religion to impart values of a religious, ethical and social nature.
- There is considerable overlap between myth, symbol, metaphor, allegory and analogy, all of which are found within religion. As Tillich said 'the language of faith is the language of symbols.'
- Myths are products of the society in which they were created. They have to be understood as such in order to give them their true value. As all human cultures have myths, their function is universal. They can be interpreted differently by different people and that is part of the beauty of myths. Their functions lend themselves perfectly to their use within religion.
- Some cultures have myths which are found only in that culture. However, there are innumerable common themes, which relate to religious issues, which permeate most cultures. Some of these include creation myths, myths about good vs. evil and heroic myths. Examples of these are found widely in religious contexts. In addition to this, many myths display a similar structure, being products of a literary genre.
- Myths try to respond to ultimate questions such as 'why am I here?' or 'how did the universe come into being?' and these abound within religious texts.
- Creation myths may be used as a case study in order to show the non-cognitive use of language in religions. For example, candidates may refer to the deeply mythical language used in Genesis 1 such as the earth being a 'formless void' with primordial waters. A comparison may be drawn between this and other myths that start in the waters. Explanations may refer to the God of the myths, one who has power over chaos.
- A common theme of all creation myths is the answer that it gives to the question of 'what is the purpose of humans?' Human superiority is the answer, with humans being stewards of the earth.
- Another key theme may be heroic myths which may also incorporate the theme of good vs. evil. There are hundreds that candidates could draw upon in order to show the use of mythical language. They may use stories that have their bases in historical events but may contain mythical and symbolic elements. For example, the story of Rama and Sita where Rama is not only the hero but the story also shows the theme of good triumphing over evil.

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

2. Examine reasons New Atheists give for rejecting religion.

[AO1 30]

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

- The problem of evil, both moral and natural has always been a problem that non-religious people have used as evidence against God's existence. This is still the case and continues to find its adherents amongst New Atheists today.
- A rejection of belief in gods and/or deities means that religious belief has diminished credibility. A belief in such things could be said to derive from a bygone era which is more aligned to fairytale and myth.
- New Atheism may suggest that religion contradicts and/or impedes scientific progress. As more and more advances are made in science then religion may suffer more and more as a result. Things can be explained without reference to religion and indeed, many New Atheists will say that religion should not figure in the scientific age.
- Related to this, New Atheism may say that its views are thinking and intellectual which are appropriate to today's world. Contrary to this religion is non-thinking and non-intellectual which makes the ground fertile for the rise of New Atheism.
- The soil of a secular society is fertile for the rise of New Atheism. A decline in traditional religious family values leads many to rebel against such things and claim that a religious lifestyle is not relevant today.
- There has been a decline in traditional values associated with religion as well as a decline in belief in deities, myths and all matters supernatural. This gives further credibility to anti-religious propaganda, branding religion as a product of a bygone age as opposed to lending itself to the scientific era.
- Terrorist activity which has been linked to a religious group may lead to responses in the form of New Atheism. This may be perpetuated by sensationalised media coverage of terrorist attacks and of fundamentalist groups.
- New Atheism may promulgate the view of religion as infantile, which was suited to a previous age but not any longer. This may include a rebuttal of much material from sacred writings as well as an attack on the classical arguments for God's existence.
- There may be pertinent case studies, which refer to the specific work of New Atheist apologists such as Harris, Dennett, Dawkins, and Hitchens.
- Candidates may legitimately refer to psychology and other areas of study that suggest religion is a 'harmful neurosis', a product of the mind. Referencing, for example Freud, is understandable, even though he is not a New Atheist, his views are still referred to by New Atheists.

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

Section B

3. **'Empirical approaches prove that Jung's views on religion are wrong.'**
Evaluate this view. [AO2 30]

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

- Jung claimed to be an empiricist, adhering to the phenomenological standpoint. His empirical claim is because he drew on direct observation or experiences that can be analysed, such as visions or dreams. Whilst this method is subjective, he stated that it had complete validity as an empirical method as visions and dreams give an understanding of one's psyche.
- However, others would challenge this as a purely subjective and non-empirical approach. This is because they may claim that visions and dreams are personal and so cannot be valid empirical evidence. Jung also explained his views by using terms that were non-empirical in that they could not be 'tested', such as archetypes.
- This leads to his views being labelled as 'unscientific' and in general, 'unscientific' is not given credibility in academic circles. 'Scientific' is normally attached to that which can be seen and acted upon but this does not apply to Jung's work.
- In contrast to this though it could be argued that even that which is labelled as 'scientific' itself is subject to the accusation of being selective and therefore not a true representation of reality. The scientific method involves hypothesis, testing, observation and an interpretation of the results. Jung would claim that his methodology uses some of those approaches.
- But a major difference between Jung's methodology and an empirical one is that science would be worried about the degree of subjectivity involved in Jung's experimental work. This, however, does not concern Jung. He wanted to understand a person's mind and he was not concerned with whether this related to anything objective. If the methodology is wrong then so would his conclusion be. But, that is the same for all approaches.
- In Jung's defence the interpretation used in his work is no different from interpretation that is involved in so much of human activity. We read a book and we interpret it. He looks at the reality of the experience for the subject. Its truth and validity is determined by whether that experience is a genuine one for the subject. His views on religion cannot be verified or falsified but this may not be a problem with his methodology. Rather, it concerns the very particular nature of the subject matter of religion.

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

4. 'It is impossible for miracles to happen.'
Evaluate this view

[AO2 30]

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

- The laws of nature cannot break. They are generalisations based on past experience that only applies up until the present moment. So, a definition of miracle that involves a break in a law of nature means that they cannot happen. This would be the definition of 'miracle' accepted by many, religious or not.
- Hume says that it is improbable that miracles happen. There is far more evidence for the laws of nature holding than for the occurrence of miracles. The testimony is poor and relates to an unscientific age, which was intrigued by wonder. Miracles can promote a religion so religions will naturally claim a miracle has occurred for its own gain.
- But, Hume's criticisms can be seen to be elitist and incorrectly suggest that all who claim a miracle are uneducated and only claim miracles in order to gain something.
- Swinburne defends the possibility of miracles occurring. He says that miracles need to involve both a particular timescale and also need to have a religious significance. He proceeds to provide a rebuttal of Hume's criticism of miracles.
- He says that laws of nature can be suspended infrequently when God needs to interact with people. God's omnipotence allows for the possibility of miracles as God can break the laws of nature. The fact this happens only occasionally is due to the desire to retain human free-will and also due to the fact that God does not always want to interfere with the laws of nature.
- However, a God who performs miracles can be rejected on moral grounds. This is because if God can act and does not act then this God is not worthy of worship. This God may appear to choose arbitrarily, performing seemingly insignificant miracles whilst not performing others that would perhaps be more worthy.
- But contrary to this point, miracles are one-off events, so it is only to be expected that there will not be a vast amount of empirical evidence or further occurrences. In addition, many miracles may happen to individuals, so their very nature is such that they cannot be claimed to be verified objectively by others.
- Accounts of miracles, especially in holy books are divinely authenticated truths and so the burden of proof is already there with no need for further verification.
- Miracles have been claimed in the past and in the present in many different societies and cultures, many of which would be deemed to be scientific and educated. This is a rebuttal of one of Hume's criticisms and this also affirms faith traditions, often giving credibility to either a faith or a religious leader.
- Indeed, it could be argued that depending on a person's definition of miracle, a miracle can happen and does happen, if an event occurs which concurs with their definition. An example of this could be when a miracle is defined as 'a change for the better'.

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

5. **'The views of Logical Positivism are convincing.'**
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 the views of Logical Positivism do not convince as it is easy to see the flaws in its Verification Principle. That is, the Verification Principle is neither analytic nor synthetic and so is meaningless. This is a point which is plain for all to see hence Logical Positivism is unconvincing as it actually fails its own test.
- Logical Positivism would also deem all historical and scientific statements as meaningless. This is because these types of statements cannot be universally verified in practice although we would certainly accept them as being meaningful today. Hence Logical Positivism could be deemed to be unconvincing as the criteria used are not valid ones.
- However, a contrary point to consider is that Logical Positivism can be synonymous with empirical and scientific. Today the need for statements to be verified is of paramount concern. It is easy to see how people would subscribe to the views of Logical Positivism.
- Running parallel to this point could be the notion that religious belief is infantile and unscientific. Any movement which results in questioning religious statements may therefore be accepted as being convincing in today's empirical world.
- It could be argued that Flew's falsification Principle is convincing as religious believers do not allow anything to count against their beliefs, hence making their statements meaningless.
- People could also point to the meaning attached to ethical statements which are non-cognitive which Logical Positivism deems to be meaningless utterances. Credibility could likewise be given to religious language according to this view. To limit meaning to a single strand is too reductionist.
- However, people could refer to the array of philosophers who would support the conclusions of Logical Positivism, such as Russell, Ayer and Hume. This may add credibility to Logical Positivism in the eyes of non-religious people.
- But, critics of Logical Positivism can be cited in more than equal numbers, such as Hick (against the Verification Principle) Hare, Mitchell and Swinburne (against the Falsification Principle). Candidates may justifiably refer to the arguments of these scholars when suggesting that Logical Positivism is suitably challenged, making it unconvincing.
- It is also perfectly valid to use non-cognitive concepts such as analogy in order to show that the views of Logical Positivism are unconvincing as one can understand religious language by means of non-cognitive concepts.

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

6. 'Language games fail to resolve the problem of understanding religious language.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- A weakness of the language game theory is that it is not valid to make comparisons between religion and a game. If this analogy is denied then the whole theory cannot work. However, others would argue that the comparison is a valid one. This is because religion does display similar features and characteristics to those of a game. Games and religions do have sets of rules which apply to that one context. It accepts that there may be overlap between games and religions, such as a ball is used in many games, just as prayer is a concept within religions. Thus language games may resolve the problem of understanding religious language.
- The fact that Wittgenstein moved away from Logical Positivism, declaring those views to be wrong could be seen as a strength for language games. It was after deliberation and contemplation that he came to the views of his later works thus suggesting that these were his stronger theories after he had realised flaws with his picture theory of language.
- A key point of resolution is that meaning is now attached to the use of language and this is something that we accept in everyday life. Emotional statements are viewed in the context of their use and have profound meaning in the context in which they are used. Language games allow religious statements to be meaningful within a particular believing community. Vitally, language games also show the error and danger of criticising one form of life from the outside.
- However, contrary to that, many would argue that this is exactly the weakness of language games, showing that it resolves nothing. In life we do establish criteria of meaning. We do expect to verify language from an empirical standpoint. Otherwise it leads to an 'anything goes' mentality. A commonly accepted set of criteria is a strength, which language games denies.
- Moreover, a further weakness of language games is that it is isolationist and suggests that language cannot be learned. However, it is evident that people can learn the religious language game from the outside. Indeed, it may also be claimed that the strength of that is that the view from the outside is more objective. For example, myth and symbol are concepts which can be understood both from a religious and non-religious perspective.
- In support of language games as a method of resolving the problem of understanding religious language, it may be true to say that those within a game are the ones who can 'play' it best, are more acquainted with the rules of the game. Hence the view of language games which suggests that the best way to understand religion is to be in the religious language game, to 'look and see'.

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