GCE

Religious Studies

Advanced GCE **G571**

Philosophy of Religion

Mark Scheme for June 2010

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.

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 not write detailed comments on scripts; 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.

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.

AS LEVELS OF RESPONSE – G571–G579

Band	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 *a.c.i.q*	1–2	very little argument or justification of viewpoint • little or no successful analysis • views asserted with no justification *v lit arg*
		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 *b att*	3–4	a basic attempt to sustain an argument and justify a viewpoint • some analysis, but not successful • views asserted with little justification *b att*
		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 *sat att*	5–6	the argument is sustained and justified • some successful analysis which may be implicit • views asserted but not fully justified *sust/just*
		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 *g att*	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 *g att*
		Communication: generally clear and organised; can be understood as a whole; spelling, punctuation and grammar good		
Band	Mark /25	AO1	Mark /10	AO2
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 *vg/e att*	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 *vg/e att*
		Communication: answer is well constructed and organised; easily understood; spelling, punctuation and grammar very good		

1 **(a)** **Compare the concept of a Prime Mover with the idea of God as craftsman.** **[25]**

Candidates may associate the concept of Prime Mover in this question with the writings of Aristotle and begin by explaining what he meant by this concept. They may also introduce the idea of infinite regress at this point as a support for the belief in a Prime Mover.

They may then go on to explain the significantly different view that God in fact has crafted the entire universe, making Him involved in creation at an intimate level in a way that a Prime Mover, with no other involvement, could never be. Some may raise the issue of the craftsman also being a sustainer though they would need to make the connection to the question explicit.

Candidates may then compare the motivation of these two philosophies, explaining that for many Greeks creation was something to explain through philosophy but for the Jews creation itself was taken for granted and they were much more interested in exploring a philosophy, in the sense of way of life, which was about developing a relationship with their God.

(b) **'Only philosophers can explain creation.' Discuss.** **[10]**

Candidates may build on the work they have done in part (a) possibly raising the question as to whether or not creation is a philosophical or theological issue. Those who argue that the question is basically a theological one will disagree with the statement above but should make an attempt to support their view with argument and not just assert it as a proclamation of faith.

Others may start from a position of philosophy being the only way to raise questions of our existence and understanding of the universe, and then assess the extent to which philosophers have been successful in explaining the nature of creation. Alternatively candidates may argue that it is scientists through theories such as the Big Bang that are best placed to explain creation.

Some may alternatively assess the extent to which a deist approach has been more successful that a theist or atheist approach to this question.

2 **(a)** **Explain Anselm's Ontological argument.** **[25]**

Candidates may begin by explaining that this argument considers an à priori proof for the existence of God, discussing the extent to which merely by understanding the words 'God exists' properly one must accept the truth of the statement.

Some candidates may outline one version of the argument moving from the idea of a being greater than which nothing can be conceived through the reductio ad absurdum to the conclusion that God must exist in reality as well as the mind.

Others may explain the use here of logically necessary existential propositions and their relationship to factually necessary existential propositions exploring why Anselm sought to find a proof for God's existence which was prior to and not dependent upon experience. Candidates may also explore Anselm's second version of the argument which focuses on the idea of necessary existence.

Some candidates, in their explanations, may discuss the motivation of Anselm in terms of faith in search of understanding, as distinct to proving to himself that God existed. In a sense he was asking himself if his faith was rational.

(b) **'It is pointless to deny the logical necessity of the existence of God.' Discuss.** **[10]**

This question is basically asking the candidates to assess the extent to which Anselm was successful in his assertion that belief in God was a logical necessity.

Some candidates may evaluate the extent to which the reductio ad absurdum is a valid move in this syllogism, assessing whether it is no more than some kind of philosophical slight of hand.

Others may explore the extent to which the argument seems to be valid, although in logical terms, it cannot be said to be true as one or other of its premises is false.

3 **(a)** **Explain the concept of Irreducible Complexity.** **[25]**

Candidates are likely to recognise this concept as coming from the discussion about Intelligent Design which seeks to postulate the view that certain features of the universe and of living things are best explained by an intelligent cause rather than a random process such as natural selection. They may explain that so far as one can say that Darwinism is an established and generally accepted view of the development of the universe, Intelligent Design can be said to be a direct challenge to the establishment.

They may then explain the search for biochemical machines within cells which have arguably not evolved. The key here is to explain that some scientists argue that there would seem to be no evidence for the step by step process of evolution, instead Michael Behe and others are arguing that the data of biochemistry within a cell leads to a belief in molecular machinery which is irreducibly complex.

Some candidates may use the example of the mousetrap which Behe himself uses, though any explanation should also raise questions about the validity of using non-organic example to explain biochemical processes.

(b) **'There is no evidence of Intelligent Design in the universe'. Discuss.** **[10]**

In this evaluation candidates will be able to use evidence to support their evaluation from a variety of issues in their AS studies. They may for example assess the kinds of evidence that Hume or Dawkins, for example, would use to judge the concept of design in this argument.

Alternatively they may use the work of writers such as Paul Davies and his Goldilocks Enigma. They may argue, for example, that the universe is not short of evidence to support Intelligent Design, what is lacking are minds open enough to recognise the evidence.

4   **(a)**   **Explain Freud's view that moral awareness comes from sources other than God.**   **[25]**

Candidates may begin their explanations by discussing the moral arguments that Freud is often seen as arguing against. The view he is reacting against is that moral awareness must come from God and is arguably a proof for the existence of God. However it is important that they do not get tied up explaining the validity or otherwise of the arguments and that they stick to views about the routes of moral awareness.

They may explain that Freud, approaching these questions from the point of view of a psychologist, would argue that humanity's moral values are in no way to be seen as objective. Some candidates may link these beliefs to the Freudian concept of the Oedipus complex. Many will describe the story Freud based this idea on and some may also explain that it remains controversial and is often rejected by modern psychotherapists.

Others may, alternatively, use the model of mind described by Freud and discuss the place in our morality of the id, the superego and the ego. These can be tied in with early childhood experiences and traumas to argue that morality is brought about by subconscious activity in the mind interacting with these experiences. This they may explain led Freud to describe Religion as an obsessional neurosis.

(b)   **'God is the only explanation of moral awareness.' Discuss.**   **[10]**

Candidates are free here to assess the question of the roots of moral awareness from any aspect of this issue they have studied.

They may for example assess the evidence Freud used to come to his conclusions and decide for themselves whether or not he succeeds in fully explaining the nature of human moral awareness from the results of early traumatic experiences.

Alternatively they may focus more on evidence which points to moral awareness being a factor of the action of some kind of divine interaction with the world and assess the strengths and weaknesses of this evidence against that of more atheistic approaches.