GCE

Religious Studies

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G571:** Philosophy of Religion

Mark Scheme for January 2012

Annotations

Only use annotations emboldened in the Levels of Response.

As scripts may be returned to centres, you should use the minimum of comments and make sure that these are related to the award of a mark or marks and are matched to statements in the mark scheme.

Do not include general comments on a candidate's work.

Record any annotation in the body of the answer, or in the margin next to the point where the decision is made to award, or not award, the mark.

Recording of marks

- Record numerical marks for responses to part-questions **unringed** in the right-hand margin. Show the total for each question (or, in specific cases, for each page) as a single **ringed** mark in the right-hand margin at the end of each question.
- Transfer ringed totals to the front page of the script, where they should be totalled.
- Show evidence that you have seen the work on every page of a script on which the candidate has made a response.
- Cross through every blank page to show that you have seen it.

Subject-specific Marking Instructions

Handling of unexpected answers

The Standardisation meeting will include discussion of marking issues, including:

- consideration of the mark scheme to reach a decision about the range of acceptable responses and the marks appropriate to them
- comparable marking standards for optional questions
- the handling of unexpected, yet acceptable, answers.

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

The Standardisation meeting will include discussion of marking issues, including:

- consideration of the mark scheme to reach a decision about the range of acceptable responses and the marks appropriate to them
- comparable marking standards for optional questions
- the handling of unexpected, yet acceptable, answers.

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

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.

Question			Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)		Some candidates may be aware that the name of this argument was in fact given by Kant and not Anselm. In order to explain Kant's challenge, candidates are likely to begin by explaining the scope of the Ontological Argument itself. They may then point out that in his *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant develops two criticisms of Descartes – these also have force against St Anselm's version of the argument: he might say suppose Descartes is right and existence is indeed a defining predicate of the concept of God, then there is no contradiction – and hence no impossibility – in rejecting a concept together with all its defining predicates. Kant's second objection is based on the belief that 'existence' is not a predicate at all, and therefore cannot be a defining predicate. Kant illustrates this point with the example of the conceptual difference between a hundred real and a hundred imaginary thalers – a common currency in Middle Europe at the time.	25	
	(b)		Candidates may want to suggest what would count as success for Kant. They may for example want to argue that Kant is able to dismiss the validity of the argument. Some may explore the success or otherwise of Kant's argument that 'existence is not a predicate'. Alternatively they may wish to explore the ways in which Anselm still has a valid argument though still one which most philosophers would dismiss at some level or other.	10	

Question			Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2	(a)		Candidates are likely to address this question through the usual triad of beliefs; namely that God is omnipotent, omniscient and omnibenevolent. They may begin explaining omnipotence by describing the idea that the Jewish writers had that nothing, except the logically impossible, was beyond the power of God. Some may describe the importance of this concept for many other issues in the philosophy of religion, particularly the problems it raises in justifying the existence of the God of classical theism. Candidates may explain that 'omnipresent' is very easy to understand on the surface, simply meaning that God is everywhere and by implication in every moment; however what exactly 'every moment' means can become very difficult to grasp, depending which of the many philosophical positions writers may be expounding. Finally candidates may explain the belief that there is nothing that happens in the universe physically, mentally or spiritually that God does not know. Again they may say that this concept can be a bit of two edged sword when it comes to our understanding of God; from the perspective of a loving God it is arguable that an interest and care for everything in the universe is very important. Some may go on to say that this is not unlike the idea expressed in the Christian gospels which describe God as caring for every sparrow and so much more for humanity.	25	
	(b)		Candidates can clearly take a stance on either side of this issue; some may use examples of inconsistent teaching to evaluate the extent to which the statement may be held to be true.	10	

Question			Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2	(b)		They may for example explore the vengeful God found in the Old Testament with the God of compassion preached by Jesus.		
			Others may explore the extent to which the Bible needs to be understood through interpretations which might say that everything has to be read in the context of the time it was written. They may point to the developing understanding of the people of God throughout history from the Old Testament until today.		
3	(a)		Candidates may begin by describing the central issues of the debate, namely the question of contingency and necessity and what might count as a sufficient reason for anything to exist.	25	
			Some may use the writings of Leibniz as a way of explaining this principle, explaining that he said: '...in virtue of which we hold that no fact could ever be true or existent, nor statement correct, unless there were sufficient reason why it was thus and not otherwise.'		
			They may give examples to explain this saying how anything they chose came into existence and the contingent nature of its existence; for example what might be necessary to bring a Playstation 3 about. They may then extrapolate from this to the sufficient reason as to how and why the universe exists.		
			Others may start with how Copleston uses the Third Way of Thomas Aquinas arguing that the universe can only be sufficiently explained if one refers to God.		
			Either route may lead to an explanation of his belief that God is different from contingent beings as he is believed to be 'His own cause'.		

Question			Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
			They may also explore Copleston's belief that it is important for philosophers to be able to explain the existence of the universe.		
	(b)		Candidates may begin by building on their response to Part a), possibly by pointing to Russell's response that the universe is not explainable in the way that Copleston wants it to be. Some may make use of Russell's argument that just because individual human beings all have mothers does not mean that the human race itself has a mother. Others may assess the extent to which Russell was successful or not in his critique which concludes: 'I should say that the universe is just there and that is all.' There is no right or wrong answer to this question; the important thing for candidates is to justify whichever point of view they wish to support or indeed the view that for a variety of reasons neither argument wins the debate.	10	

Question			Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
4	(a)		Candidates are free to choose from any of the scientific or philosophical theories they have studied. Some may for example describe creationist views on the beginnings of the universe. They would not need to explain the variety of views expressed by different kinds of creationists, but may describe one or two. Others may use their studies of the views of Aristotle or Aquinas, discussing for example the ideas of design or prime mover. The detail of the areas they wish to cover will depend on the range of view they wish to explore. Some may, for example, simply compare some creationist views with the idea of the Big Bang where they may need more detail than those who choose to explore a whole range of philosophical views.	25	
	(b)		Many will recognise this statement as a typical view coming out of the science and religion debate. Some will express a range of difficulties with the concept and the limited dichotomy implicit in the statement. Those who wish to take the view that scientists are the only ones who can explain the universe are likely to support their critique with views such as the empirical nature of science allowing for an easier justification of their opinion, giving examples in support of their arguments. Alternative views may explore the limitations of science which cannot explain all of nature, though they should be careful to avoid the God of the gaps approach.	10	

APPENDIX 1 AS LEVELS OF RESPONSE

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		
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		