

Religious Studies

Advanced GCE **2771**

Philosophy of Religion 2

Mark Scheme for June 2010

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2010

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Levels of Response descriptors for A2 Units 2771 – 2780

The abbreviations marked in blue below may be used instead of writing out the full trigger line. Examiners may however choose to write out the full trigger line if they choose. Examiners should choose the comment that most reflects the reason for the awarding of the mark. This will usually be the trigger line, in some cases it may be another line from the levels of response. In these cases examiners should choose the appropriate comment and write it beside the final mark awarded.

Band	Mark / 29	AO1	Mark / 16	AO2
0	0	absent / no relevant material	0	absent / no argument
1	1-6	has a little knowledge of the topic (lk) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a little relevant material some accuracy Communication: often unclear or disorganised	1-3	states a point of view (pov) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> shows minimal or no analysis/justification Communication: often unclear or disorganised
2	7-11	has some knowledge of the topic and a little understanding of the question (sk/litu) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some relevant material some concepts accurate shows a little knowledge of technical terms Communication: often unclear or disorganised	4-6	a little argument or justification of viewpoint (lit arg) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some analysis, but not always successful Communication: often unclear or disorganised
3	12-15	focuses on the general topic rather than directly on the question (gen top) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> knowledge limited and partially accurate limited understanding selection of material sometimes inappropriate limited use of technical terms Communication: some clarity and organisation	7-8	an attempt to sustain an argument or justify a viewpoint (att sust/just) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some analysis, but not always successful views asserted but not successfully justified Communication: some clarity and organisation
4	16-19	a satisfactory attempt to address the question itself (sat att) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some accurate knowledge appropriate understanding some successful selection of relevant material some accurate use of technical terms Communication: some clarity and organisation	9-10	an argument is sustained and justified (sust/just) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some successful analysis which may be implicit Communication: some clarity and organisation
5	20-23	a good attempt to address the question (g att) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> mostly accurate knowledge good understanding good selection of relevant material mostly accurate use of technical terms Communication: generally clear and organised	11-12	a good attempt at using evidence to sustain an argument (g att) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some successful and clear analysis might put more than one point of view Communication: generally clear and organised
6	24-26	a very good attempt to address the question (vg att) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> accurate knowledge very good understanding substantial selection of relevant material accurate use of technical terms Communication: answer is well constructed and organised	13-14	a very good attempt at using different evidence to sustain an argument (vg att) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> successful and clear analysis considers more than one point of view Communication: answer is well constructed and organised
7	27-29	an excellent response to the question showing understanding and engagement with the material (exc rep) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> very high level of ability to select and deploy relevant information accurate use of technical terms Communication: answer is well constructed and organised	15-16	an excellent response which uses a range of evidence to sustain an argument (exc rep) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> comprehends the demands of the question shows understanding and critical analysis of different viewpoints Communication: answer is well constructed and organised

1 Critically assess the view that all forms of religious language are meaningless. [45]**AO1**

Some candidates may focus on the trigger word 'meaningless' and begin by assessing the verification principle and the work of the Vienna Circle. This group of scientifically trained philosophers and philosophically interested scientists met under the nominal leadership of Moritz Schlick for discussions of problems in the philosophy of science during academic terms in the years from 1924 to 1936.

Other candidates may focus more on the writings of AJ Ayer and give an account of strong and weak verification. For Ayer strong verification required that the truth of a proposition is conclusively ascertainable; weak verification required only that an observation statement is deducible from the proposition together with other, auxiliary, propositions, provided that the observation statement was not deducible from these auxiliaries alone, for example historical events and certain kinds of scientific facts.

Others may explore some of the different types of religious language and the extent to which language such as symbols and signs, for example, might go beyond an ordinary understanding of meaning. Some candidates may take another route and discuss the way Aquinas uses analogy as a route to finding a meaningful way of talking about God.

Alternatively candidates who have studied Wittgenstein may make use of the Tractatus or Philosophical Investigations. This would give them the opportunity to explain his move from a picture theory of language to the 'language games' he is famous for describing.

As long as candidates focus their answers towards the question any reasonable route may be credited.

AO2

Whichever route candidates choose they should use their evaluation to assess the meaningfulness or otherwise of the form or forms of religious language they are assessing.

Some may for example point to the limitations of the Verification principle, whereas others may see empiricism as a route to making all religious beliefs meaningless.

Candidates may alternatively explore the issues raised by analogy and assess the extent to which philosophers such as Thomas Aquinas were successful in finding a language where religious issues might be discussed meaningfully.

Others may point to the way that Wittgenstein made it possible to take the view that, within a given language game, language has meaning even though it may not point to any referent outside the game.

2 Assess the view that belief in life after death is merely wish fulfilment. [45]**AO1**

Candidates are free to begin by explaining what they understand philosophers to believe about life after death or to explain what is meant by wish fulfilment.

Some may begin with a strongly atheist view and argue that there is no philosophical justification for believing in life after death, using the views of scholars such as Richard Dawkins or Freud; this would lead to an explanation along the lines that the view is indeed 'wish fulfilment'. Credit may also be given to those who use the writing of scholars such as Nietzsche, Frege or Marx all of whom have at some point discussed 'wish fulfilment'.

Others may take a religious view and discuss the resurrection of Jesus and explore the evidence for this in the New Testament and beyond. Some may, alternatively, look at Buddhism exploring the ideas of living many lives. It is important if they choose this route that they focus on the philosophical implications of these belief systems.

Some candidates may explain Hick's thought experiment which is the basis for his Replica Theory, an attempt to justify some form of resurrected self. This may lead to an exploration of monist views on life after death and a comparison with dualism. It is important though that they address the issue of wish fulfilment and not just describe Hick's theory.

AO2

The variety of routes possible in this question allows for a good number of different assessments. Candidates may, for example, explore a belief in the lack of philosophical or empirical justifications for a belief in life after death and assess the extent to which this belief is justified by some philosophers.

Alternatively candidates may argue that there is a great deal of evidence supporting a belief in life after death and that to suggest that it is merely 'wish fulfilment' is taking too narrow a view of this evidence.

important, however, that candidates do assess whichever views they are exploring and that they do not just assert their personal views.

3 'Religious experience proves the existence of God.' Discuss. [45]**AO1**

This question allows candidates to approach a response from a number of different kinds of religious experience and they are free to choose from experiences such as the Toronto Blessing, miracles, other public events such as Lourdes or personal experiences.

Some may begin their answers by exploring the views of William James and explaining the meaning of Ineffable, Noetic, Transient and Passive aspects of religious experience – in particular his teaching on the mystical. They should avoid just explaining these terms while making no effort to address the actual question.

Other candidates may explain the meaning of indirect religious experiences which can be prompted by events in individual lives such as the birth of a child.

Others may focus their responses more towards challenges to the view expressed in the statement. They may for example explore psychological or sociological views expressed by scholars such as Freud and Marx.

Some candidates may use their knowledge of the writings of David Hume to explain how the statement in the question could be challenged. Some may be tempted to describe his teachings on miracles which are relevant provided they do not try and turn the question into one specifically on miracles.

AO2

In their evaluation candidates are free to agree or disagree with the statement or indeed argue that there is not enough concrete evidence on either side for there to be a certain conclusion. Candidates may wish to consider what is meant by proof.

The key is for the candidates to support their evaluations with reasoned argument and demonstrable understanding of the issues. Candidates who argue by assertion are not likely to achieve a mark in a high level band, for which clear analysis is required.

They may for example agree with David Hume's assessment of religious experience and disagree with the statement in the question or they could point to the significant changes brought about in some lives by religious experiences.

4 'Holy Scripture is the most reliable kind of revelation.' Discuss. [45]**AO1**

This question is taken from the part of the specification which asks candidates to understand the concept of revelation through Holy Scripture: the view that scripture is divinely inspired; different approaches to an understanding of the nature of sacred writing.

While most candidates are likely to refer mainly to the Bible, full credit will be given to appropriate reference to Scripture from any religious tradition.

Candidates are free to approach their responses from any philosophical perspective they choose. They may for example place Holy Scripture as revelation into a context of a variety of kinds of revelation, such as verbal inspiration, divine inspiration or visions.

Others may begin by explaining the difference between propositional and non-propositional revelation. Religious believers can be found who hold both these positions. It is commonly held that for Christians the Bible is propositional revelation and that other religious experiences are non-propositional. Appropriate credit will be given for more sophisticated understandings of propositional and non-propositional revelation.

To fully answer the question some comparison with at least one other kind of revelation will be needed.

AO2

In their evaluation some candidates may assess what is meant by 'reliable' in this context; e.g. 'most likely to be true' or 'the most effective way of God communicating with his people'.

Some candidates may take the view that Holy Scripture cannot be seen as a single unit and the value it has in terms of revelation may vary in different parts, dependent on whether it is, for example, myth, poetry, legend or history.

It is important that candidates do not just assert their views through repetition of Biblical stories but that they argue for their evaluation in a coherent manner.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity



OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553