GCE

Religious Studies

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G571:** Philosophy of Religion

Mark Scheme for January 2013

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Level 1 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin
	Level 2 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin
	Level 3 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin
	Level 4 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin
	Level 5 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin
	Highlighting a section of the response that is irrelevant to the awarding of the mark
	Point has been seen and noted eg where part of an answer is at the end of the script

Subject-specific Marking Instructions

Handling of unexpected answers

If you are not sure how to apply the mark scheme to an answer, you should contact your Team Leader.

NOTE: AO2 material in AO1 answers <u>must</u> <u>not</u> be cross-credited and vice-versa

AS Preamble and Instructions to Examiners

The purpose of a marking scheme is to '… enable examiners to mark in a standardised manner' [CoP 1999 25.xiv]. It must 'allow credit to be allocated for what candidates know, understand and can do' [xv] and be 'clear and designed to be easily and consistently applied' [x].

The **Religious Studies Subject Criteria** [1999] define 'what candidates know, understand and can do' in terms of two Assessment Objectives, weighted for the OCR Religious Studies specification as indicated:

All candidates must be required to meet the following assessment objectives.
Knowledge, understanding and skills are closely linked. Specifications should require that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the content and skills prescribed.

AO1: Select and demonstrate clearly relevant knowledge and understanding through the use of evidence, examples and correct language and terminology appropriate to the course of study.
AO2: Sustain a critical line of argument and justify a point of view.

The requirement to assess candidates' quality of written communication will be met through both assessment objectives.

In order to ensure the marking scheme can be 'easily and consistently applied', and to 'enable examiners to mark in a standardised manner', it defines Levels of Response by which candidates' answers are assessed. This ensures that comparable standards are applied across the various units as well as within the team of examiners marking a particular unit. Levels of Response are defined according to the two Assessment Objectives; in Advanced Subsidiary, the questions are in two parts, each addressing a single topic and targeted explicitly at one of the Objectives.

Positive awarding: it is a fundamental principle of OCR's assessment in Religious Studies at Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced GCE that candidates are rewarded for what they 'know, understand and can do' and to this end examiners are required to assess every answer by the Levels according to the extent to which it addresses a reasonable interpretation of the question. In the marking scheme each question is provided with a brief outline of the likely content and/or lines of argument of a 'standard' answer, but this is by no means prescriptive or exhaustive. Examiners are required to have subject knowledge to a high level and the outlines do not attempt to duplicate this.

Examiners must **not** attempt to reward answers according to the extent to which they match the structure of the outline, or mention the points it contains. The specification is designed to allow teachers to approach the content of modules in a variety of ways from any of a number of perspectives, and candidates' answers must be assessed in the light of this flexibility of approach. It is quite possible for an excellent and valid answer to contain knowledge and arguments which do not appear in the outline; each answer must be assessed on its own merits according to the Levels of Response.

Key Skill of Communication: this is assessed at both Advanced Subsidiary and A2 as an integral part of the marking scheme. The principle of positive awarding applies here as well: candidates should be rewarded for good written communication, but marks may not be deducted for inadequate written communication; the quality of communication is integral to the quality of the answer in making its meaning clear. The Key Skill requirements in Communication at Level 3 include the following evidence requirements for documents about complex subjects, which can act as a basis for assessing the Communications skills in an examination answer:

- Select and use a form and style of writing that is appropriate to your purpose and complex subject matter.
- Organise relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.
- Ensure your text is legible and your spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate, so your meaning is clear.

Levels of Response: the descriptions are cumulative, ie a description at one level builds on or improves the descriptions at lower levels.
Not all the qualities listed in a level must be demonstrated in an answer for it to fall in that level (some of the qualities are alternatives and therefore mutually exclusive). There is no expectation that an answer will receive marks in the same level for the two AOs.

Question			Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
1	**(a)**		It is important that in their answers to this question candidates explain the analogy and not just paraphrase Plato. They may, for example, explain the position the prisoners are in and why they believe the shadows they see to be reality. Some candidates may as part of their explanation talk about Plato's views being formed by the way his teacher (Socrates) was treated by the Athenians who did not, as Plato understood, see reality for what it was. Credit may be given to those who recognise that this fact is reflected in the way he said the prisoners would treat one of their own if he had left and then returned to the cave with a message of the true nature of reality. Others may begin by discussing how Plato's theory of Forms is built on the beliefs expressed through the analogy and that it is the form of the Good that enlightens all other forms.	25	
	(b)		Candidates are clearly free to argue for or against the statement in the question. They may for example disagree and argue that most people still live in a shadow world and that human beings cannot have a clear notion of what reality is. Others may suggest that empirical evidence gained through our senses is all that there is, and that there is in fact no reality beyond our daily experience. Credit may also be given to those who argue that whatever reality is, it is more complex than simple experience or some future dimension where we may exist as perfect 'forms' of humanity. Some candidates may make use of the views of other philosophers they have read, or even scientists such as Dawkins, to build an argument.	10	

Question			Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
2	**(a)**		Candidates are likely to begin their responses by explaining what the teleological argument says, through the writings of either Aquinas or Paley. A number may describe the view that in some circles this remains a popular argument – for many, the most successful for the existence of God. Others may hold the view that, on the other hand, it is strongly disliked by a number of religious philosophers.	25	It is sufficient for this question simply to explain Mill. Candidates may detail the teleological argument but there is no requirement to do so.
			Others may go straight into a description of the views held by John Stuart Mill, who pointed to the amount of evil in the world as a fundamental objection to design. He argued: 'Not even on the most distorted and contracted theory of good which was ever framed by religious or philosophical fanaticism, can the government of nature be made to resemble the work of a being at once good and omnipotent.'		Candidates who simply outline the design argument or who are unaware of Mill's arguments about natural evil are unlikely to move beyond Level 2.
			They may show that his criticism, while tied to the problem of evil, is directed to the idea that, from a flawed universe, the most we can infer is a flawed creator. There is real evil, not merely the result of people's free choices, but also, and more significantly, *natural* evil; that is, deaths from illness, plague, volcanoes, earthquakes, fog at sea, and so on, which seem part of the structure of the world. If these were designed, it seems a very faulty sort of design, and by a designer whose motives we may doubt.		Some may legitimately use examples from others – such as Dawkins' digger wasp – to illustrate their answer.
			Some may use Anthony Kenny's development of this thought where he says that this type of argument 'leads to a God which is no more the source of good than the source of evil. The God to which this argument of rational theology leads is not supreme goodness: it is a being which is beyond good and evil.'		
	(b)		Some may begin by turning this question on its head and pointing out that it is ludicrous to suggest that this argument has resisted all criticisms. This would allow them to go on to explore the various criticisms which have successfully undermined the force of the design arguments.	10	This question is open to discussion of different forms of the teleological argument and a wide range of criticisms.
			They may then assess the extent to which the arguments described in part (a) can be held to be successful critiques of the view that there is evidence of design or purpose in the universe. If candidates give a 'problem of evil' response this is acceptable but they must bring their arguments back to design to be given credit in the higher bands.		
			Those who may wish to agree with the sentiment in the question should use considered teleological arguments and not just assert religious positions and beliefs.		

Question	Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
3 **(a)**	Some candidates may begin by describing the way Sigmund Freud provides an alternative, naturalistic, account of how moral responsibility and guilt feelings could occur. They may point to his view that conscience was essentially the internalising of parental prohibitions and demands, so they seem to come from within ourselves. This creates an aspect of our minds now known as the superego. They will probably describe the Freudian view that there are three parts of what he calls the psychic apparatus – the *id*, which is our instincts, unorganised and a bit chaotic, the *ego*, which is the organised and more realistic part of the mind, and the *super-ego*, which criticises the rest and is the moralising function. For Freud, the new-born child is all *id*, with basic drives such as those for food, aggression and sex. This part of the mind is amoral, egocentric, pleasure-seeking. On the other hand, the *ego* is rational, capable of controlling the *id*. Freud gives the analogy of a horse and rider. The rider (*ego*) controls the way the horse *(id)* goes. Sometimes, control fails and the horse goes the way it wishes to go, over rocky terrain. But the *ego* has to battle with the external world and the *super-ego* as well as with the *id*. When this happens, the *ego* tends to be more loyal to the *id*, avoiding conflict, excusing problems. The *super-ego*, however watches the *ego's* actions like a hawk, punishing it with feelings of inferiority, anxiety and general guilt. The *ego* does have defence mechanisms, such as fantasy, rationalisation, repression and others. For Freud, the *super-ego* symbolically internalises the sense of a father figure and the regulations found in society. It tends to oppose the *id*, giving us a sense of the moral and, setting up taboos against certain types of feelings and actions. If the Oedipus complex (which inclines men to sleep with their mothers and kill their fathers) is particularly repressed, through parents, schooling and authority figures in general, the stricter will be the rule of the *super-ego* over the *ego*, and the stronger the sense of the moral and of conscience castigating our urges. Thus candidates may describe the way this leads to a conclusion where there is no need for religion or a God to explain moral awareness.	25	Some candidates may make relevant reference to the Primal Horde or other aspects of *Totem and Taboo*. To access the higher levels, candidates should focus on moral awareness, not religion in general.

Question			Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
	(b)		Depending on how candidates have responded to the first part of this question, they may begin by disagreeing with the statement or, using their knowledge of other philosophers, argue against the views of Freud. They are likely to consider the extent to which human beings can be moral without any reference to a higher being or divine direction. There are a number of philosophers they can reflect on from a whole range of perspectives, provided they do not just describe their views. If they are agreeing with the sentiment in the question candidates should be careful to evaluate the philosophy and not just state religious views which they hold. Religious views are valid if they make it clear why they think the beliefs are justifiable.	10	

Question			Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
4	**(a)**		Some candidates may begin with pre-Darwinian views on evolution; though others may begin with Darwin's five-year journey on the *Beagle* which he took through a very wide range of the earth's environments. This may help them explain that during the voyage Darwin made meticulous notes on his observations, which led him to the conclusion that a gradual transformation of species had taken place, which in turn had brought about the spectacular variety of life that now exists on our planet. He wanted to develop a theory which explained the causal features which had brought this about. He was also keen that the explanations were empirically verifiable. Candidates may say that Darwin believed that the processes also weed out changes or mutations which do not strengthen life. This theory not only explains the variety of species but predicts continued changes both positive and negative among species. Some candidates may place the debate within the context of an argument against a God; challenging such historic attempts as the argument from design. They would only need to do this in an explanatory way and do not need to evaluate the respective views at this point.	25	The question is about evolution in general and is not specific to Darwin. Nevertheless, it would be difficult to produce a satisfactory answer without knowledge of Darwin.
	(b)		Candidates may agree or disagree with this statement, though they should be careful not to do this by assertion. Some, agreeing with the sentiment, may explore the views of any of the philosophers who may be held to be religious; for example, some may use their knowledge of some of Aquinas' arguments, such as the need for a Prime Mover, to counter the views of atheist writers such as Richard Dawkins. Others may point out that accepting the theory of evolution does not necessarily lead to a rejection of God's involvement with the process.	10	

APPENDIX 1 AS LEVELS OF RESPONSE

Level	Mark /25	AO1	Mark /10	AO2
0	0	absent/no relevant material	0	absent/no argument
1	1–5	almost completely ignores the question • little relevant material • some concepts inaccurate • shows little knowledge of technical terms *L1*	1–2	very little argument or justification of viewpoint • little or no successful analysis • views asserted with no justification *L1*
		Communication: often unclear or disorganised; can be difficult to understand; Spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate		
2	6–10	a basic attempt to address the question • knowledge limited and partially accurate • limited understanding • selection often inappropriate • might address the general topic rather than the question directly • limited use of technical terms *L2*	3–4	a basic attempt to sustain an argument and justify a viewpoint • some analysis, but not successful • views asserted with little justification *L2*
		Communication: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate		
3	11–15	satisfactory attempt to address the question • some accurate knowledge • appropriate understanding • some successful selection of material • some accurate use of technical terms *L3*	5–6	the argument is sustained and justified • some successful analysis which may be implicit • views asserted but not fully justified *L3*
		Communication: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate		
4	16–20	a good attempt to address the question • accurate knowledge • good understanding • good selection of material • technical terms mostly accurate *L4*	7–8	a good attempt to sustain an argument • some effective use of evidence • some successful and clear analysis • considers more than one view point *L4*
		Communication: generally clear and organised; can be understood as a whole; spelling, punctuation and grammar good		
5	21–25	a very good/excellent attempt to address the question showing understanding and engagement with the material • very high level of ability to select and deploy relevant information • accurate use of technical terms *L5*	9–10	A very good/excellent attempt to sustain an argument • comprehends the demands of the question • uses a range of evidence • shows understanding and critical analysis of different viewpoints *L5*
		Communication: answer is well constructed and organised; easily understood; spelling, punctuation and grammar very good		

PART OF THE
CAMBRIDGE ASSESSMENT
GROUP

UKAS
MANAGEMENT
SYSTEMS
001