

# **Religious Studies**

Advanced GCE **2779**

Philosophy of Religion 1

## **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](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## A2 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.

At A level, candidates are required to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding, and their ability to sustain a critical line of argument in greater depth and over a wider range of content than at AS level.

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. *Weighting: 65% [A2]*

**AO2:** Sustain a critical line of argument and justify a point of view. *Weighting: 35% [A2]*

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 A2, candidates answer a single question but are reminded by a rubric of the need to address both Objectives in their answers. Progression from Advanced Subsidiary to A2 is provided, in part, by assessing their ability to construct a coherent essay, and this is an important part of the Key Skill of Communication which ‘must contribute to the assessment of Religious Studies at AS and A level’.

**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.

## Practical application of the Marking Scheme

General administrative information and instructions are issued separately by OCR.

Apart from preliminary marking for standardisation purposes, which must be carried out in pencil, the first marking of a script should be in red ink. There should be a clear indication on every page that it has been read by the examiner, and the total mark for the question must be ringed

and written in the margin at the end of the script; at A2 the two sub-marks for the AOs must be written here as well. Half-marks may not be used.

To avoid giving the impression of point-marking, ticks should not be used within an answer.

Examiners should follow the separate instructions about annotation of scripts; remember that the marks awarded make the assigned Levels of Response completely explicit.

**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.

\*

Synoptic skills and the ability to make connections: these are not explicitly required in units 2781-2790, as their assessment is focused in the Connections units 2791-2795, but any evidence should be taken into account when matching the work to a level.

**Levels of Response:** the descriptions are cumulative, i.e. 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.

## 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"> <li>a little relevant material</li> <li>some accuracy</li> </ul> Communication: often unclear or disorganised	1-3	states a point of view (pov) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows minimal or no analysis/justification</li> </ul> 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"> <li>some relevant material</li> <li>some concepts accurate</li> <li>shows a little knowledge of technical terms</li> </ul> Communication: often unclear or disorganised	4-6	a little argument or justification of viewpoint (lit arg) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some analysis, but not always successful</li> </ul> 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"> <li>knowledge limited and partially accurate</li> <li>limited understanding</li> <li>selection of material sometimes inappropriate</li> <li>limited use of technical terms</li> </ul> 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"> <li>some analysis, but not always successful</li> <li>views asserted but not successfully justified</li> </ul> Communication: some clarity and organisation
4	16-19	a satisfactory attempt to address the question itself (sat att) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some accurate knowledge</li> <li>appropriate understanding</li> <li>some successful selection of relevant material</li> <li>some accurate use of technical terms</li> </ul> Communication: some clarity and organisation	9-10	an argument is sustained and justified (sust/just) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some successful analysis which may be implicit</li> </ul> Communication: some clarity and organisation
5	20-23	a good attempt to address the question (g att) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>mostly accurate knowledge</li> <li>good understanding</li> <li>good selection of relevant material</li> <li>mostly accurate use of technical terms</li> </ul> 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"> <li>some successful and clear analysis</li> <li>might put more than one point of view</li> </ul> Communication: generally clear and organised
6	24-26	a very good attempt to address the question (vg att) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>accurate knowledge</li> <li>very good understanding</li> <li>substantial selection of relevant material</li> <li>accurate use of technical terms</li> </ul> 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"> <li>successful and clear analysis</li> <li>considers more than one point of view</li> </ul> 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"> <li>very high level of ability to select and deploy relevant information</li> <li>accurate use of technical terms</li> </ul> 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"> <li>comprehends the demands of the question</li> <li>shows understanding and critical analysis of different viewpoints</li> </ul> Communication: answer is well constructed and organised

**1 To what extent are all versions of the Ontological Argument flawed? [45]****AO1**

Candidates might explain the ontological arguments for the existence of God as put forward by Anselm in both proslogion 2 and 3 and by Descartes in Meditation 5.

Candidates might explain that for Anselm, the argument is put forward from an established position of faith seeking understanding. For Descartes, the argument is a deductive proof that follows from a consideration of the properties of the concept of God.

Candidates might also focus on explaining the criticisms of these arguments by thinkers such as Gaunilo and Kant. Some candidates may also consider modern versions of the argument as put forward by Norman Malcolm in his development of Anselm's second argument or Alvin Plantinga's use of possible worlds.

**AO2**

Candidates may argue that all ontological arguments are indeed flawed as existence cannot be regarded as a predicate (Kant). They may also focus on the difficulty of moving from thought to reality and consider whether this affects the validity or soundness of the argument.

Other candidates may disagree and argue that the concept of God is vastly different from all other concepts and that God is the only being whose essence entails existence (Descartes). Candidates may pick up on the word 'all' and consider whether the problems raised necessarily commit all versions of the argument to failure.

**2 Assess the view that teleological arguments cannot withstand the challenges of Hume. [45]****AO1**

Candidates might outline versions of the teleological argument such as that of William Paley or Thomas Aquinas. They should outline some of Hume's criticisms of teleological arguments. These include Hume's use of strict concept empiricism in arguing that human beings cannot have sufficient knowledge to assume the existence of a designer.

Hume rejects analogies that compare the universe to a machine; an organic substance such as a vegetable may be an equally appropriate analogy. Hume also argues that if there were a designer, the proper conclusions might be that the universe is the work of a limited designer or designers.

**AO2**

Candidates may argue that in the light of the theory of evolution, Hume's challenge is strengthened. They might also refer, as Hume does, to the problem of evil as counting against an all powerful, all good God.

Other candidates may challenge Hume's empiricist approach and argue that the information gained by our senses can be interpreted in a number of different ways. Some candidates may counter Hume's arguments with reference to modern teleological arguments such as the Anthropic principle.

**3 Evaluate the religious experience argument as put forward by William James. [45]****AO1**

Candidates might outline the work of William James and explain how his conclusions may enable one to argue for the existence of God. Some candidates may be aware that James did not really set out to provide a proof of God's existence.

James takes a psychological approach to religion and argues that although experiences are psychological phenomena, they are not necessarily reducible to that. The common aspects of these experiences and their positive effects lead to the probability of God. Candidates may also demonstrate understanding of some of the criticisms of religious experience such as the ideas of Freud.

**AO2**

Candidates may support James' conclusions by referring to the positive effects of religious experience. They may use examples of the widespread nature of experiences such as the research carried out by the Religious Experience Research Unit.

Candidates may raise a number of points in criticism of James: the argument is not a proof, the experiences are highly subjective and they raise the issue of conflicting truth claims. Other candidates may be aware that these would not be regarded as insurmountable problems by James himself.

**4 'Freud's challenges to religious belief are unconvincing.' Discuss. [45]****AO1**

Candidates may outline Freud's work on religion. Freud's theories were derived from observing the obsessional behaviour of mentally ill patients. Freud describes religion as a 'universal obsessional neurosis.' Candidates are likely to refer to the Oedipus Complex and the theory of the Primal Horde.

Other candidates may focus on wish fulfilment as outlined by Freud in 'The Future of an Illusion.' This may lead to a consideration of the merits of religious experience. Some candidates may contrast Freud's views with those of Jung.

**AO2**

Candidates may accept this statement on several grounds. Some of Freud's work was based on a limited number of case studies and because of its use of the subconscious as an explanation, it is ultimately unfalsifiable.

Candidates may argue that the psychological basis of religious belief need not rule out a supernatural origin. Other candidates may reject the statement as, unlike religion, there is some empirical evidence to support Freud's theories.

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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**