



GCE MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2016

RELIGIOUS STUDIES

RS1/2 PHIL

INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

1343/01

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2016 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

AS RELIGIOUS STUDIES

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

ASSESSMENT

1. Each question is to be marked according to the stated level descriptors. In such marking, it is essential that the whole response to a part-question is read and then allocated to the level it best fits. Examiners may wish to underline significant features or make a brief comment to justify the level allocated.
2. Where a band of marks is allocated to a level, discrimination will be made with reference to the development of the response.
3. Quality of written communication is assessed as an integral part of the level descriptors; no additional weighting should be given to this factor when determining the level of response of a candidate's piece of work.
4. The standard of subject content and quality of language to be expected is that of a student midway through an A Level course. In other words, the AS standard is above GCSE but below A Level.
5. All part-answers on the examination paper should be treated equally in terms of demand and attribution of marks.
6. Where a **single** relevant statement has been made in an AO1 response, Level 1 should be awarded. However, a single relevant statement would not justify the top mark of the Level being awarded.
7. Aim to use the full mark range. Do not hesitate to award maximum marks to responses that meet the criteria of the relevant level descriptor. Equally, responses which are completely irrelevant should be awarded no marks.
8. It is a feature of levels of response marking that examiners are prepared to reward fully responses which are valid and of high ability but do not conform exactly to the requirements of a particular level. This should only be necessary **occasionally** and where this occurs examiners must indicate by a brief written explanation why their assessment does not conform to the levels of response descriptors laid down in the mark scheme.
9. Apply the principle of salvage between the two parts of a question so that due credit is given for relevant knowledge, understanding and evaluation, even if the material is misplaced.

METHODS OF MARKING

10. The assessed level of response to each part of each question should be indicated in the left-hand margin (L1, L2 etc), leaving the right-hand margin for the numerical award.
11. No half marks or bonus marks are to be awarded under any circumstances.
12. A ringed total, indicating the total marks gained in responses to both parts of a question, should be shown at the end of each complete answer.
13. Any written comments on scripts should be factual, preferably using the terminology found in the level descriptors. It is important that such terminology is only from the descriptor of the level awarded (e.g. *bare outline* is only applicable to AO1, Level 2). No reference should be made to the possible grade achieved and no derogatory comments should be made.
14. Every page containing a candidate's writing should have an appropriate mark in red to indicate that it has been read and assessed.
15. It is permitted for Welsh candidates to write specialist terms, key concepts and scholarly quotations in English.
16. The key to fair marking is consistency. Do not change your marking pattern once scripts have been despatched to the WJEC.

SAMPLE SCRIPTS

17. Send ten scripts to the Principal Examiner (with **a stamped self-addressed envelope** for their return to you) by first-class letter post within 60 hours of the standardisation meeting of examiners. Please ensure that the correct postage is put on the envelopes.
18. All **three** parts of the Initial Sample record sheet should be sent to the Principal Examiner with the scripts. **Keep a record of your original marks.**
19. Write a large **S** on the front cover of each of the ten scripts you send **and** check the 'S' box on the electronic marking form by the mark awarded to each of these scripts (regardless of whether or not the mark was changed by the Principal Examiner).
20. Do not send any marked scripts to the WJEC until the Principal Examiner contacts you by phone, letter or e-mail.

EXAMINER'S REPORT

21. A written question-by-question report on the performance of candidates, as evidenced in the scripts you have marked, should be sent to the Principal Examiner **within five days** of the stated date for completion of marking. This is **essential**, not optional. Your report is most helpful if it contains comments on frequent misunderstandings, weaknesses, common errors and questions which caused difficulties, as well as positive qualities, good practice and encouraging features. A comment that a particular question is answered well or badly is of no value unless accompanied by some specific explanation.

GENERIC LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level	Units 1 and 2 AS AO1 Descriptor	Marks
7	A thorough answer in the time available; an accurate and relevant treatment of the topic, showing thorough knowledge and understanding. Effective use is made of well-chosen evidence and examples where appropriate. Form and style of writing are highly suitable. Material is organised clearly and coherently. Specialist vocabulary is used accurately. Good legibility and high level of accuracy in spelling, grammar and punctuation.	30-28
6	A fairly full answer in the time available, including key facts and ideas, presented with accuracy and relevance, along with evidence of clear understanding. Apt use is made of evidence and examples where appropriate. Form and style of writing are suitable. Material is organised clearly and coherently. Specialist vocabulary is used accurately. Clear legibility and high level of accuracy in spelling, grammar and punctuation.	27-25
5	Addresses the question; mainly accurate and largely relevant knowledge; demonstrates understanding of main ideas. Some use is made of evidence or examples where appropriate. Form and style of writing are suitable. Most of the material is organised clearly and coherently. Some accurate use is made of specialist vocabulary. Satisfactory legibility and accuracy in spelling, grammar and punctuation.	24-20
4	A partially adequate treatment of the topic; mainly accurate and largely relevant knowledge; basic or patchy understanding; little use made of relevant evidence and examples. Form and style of writing are suitable in some respects. Some of the material is organised clearly and coherently. Some accurate use is made of specialist vocabulary. Satisfactory legibility and accuracy in spelling, grammar and punctuation.	19-15
3	Outline answer. Knowledge limited to basics, or low level of accuracy and or/relevance. Limited understanding. Evidence and examples lacking or barely relevant. May be disorganised. Specialist vocabulary is used sparingly and/or imprecisely. Legibility and accuracy in spelling, grammar and punctuation are adequate.	14-10
2	A bare outline with elements of relevant accurate information showing a glimmer of understanding, or an informed answer missing the point of the question. Specialist vocabulary is used sparingly and/or imprecisely. Legibility and accuracy in spelling, grammar and punctuation are barely adequate.	9-5
1	Isolated elements of approximately accurate information loosely related to the question. Little coherence and little correct use of specialist vocabulary. Legibility and accuracy in spelling, grammar and punctuation are such that meaning is unclear.	4-1
0	No accurate, relevant knowledge or understanding demonstrated.	0

Level	Units 1 and 2 AS AO2 Descriptor	Marks
7	A thorough response to issue(s) raised in the time available. Different views are analysed and evaluated. The argument is strongly supported by reasoning and/or evidence, with an appropriate conclusion being drawn. Form and style of writing are highly suitable. Material is organised clearly and coherently. Specialist vocabulary is used accurately. Good legibility and high level of accuracy in spelling, grammar and punctuation.	15-14
6	A fairly full response to issue(s) raised in the time available. Different views are considered, with some critical analysis or comment. The argument is adequately supported by reasoning and/or evidence. Form and style of writing are suitable. Material is organised clearly and coherently. Specialist vocabulary is used accurately. Clear legibility and high level of accuracy in spelling, grammar and punctuation.	13-12
5	Addresses the main issue(s). More than one view is mentioned (though not necessarily in a balanced way), with limited analysis or comment. The argument is partially supported by reasoning and/or evidence. Form and style of writing are suitable. Some of the material is organised clearly and coherently. A little accurate use is made of specialist vocabulary. Satisfactory legibility and accuracy in spelling, grammar and punctuation.	11-10
4	Some grasp of the main issue(s) is shown; analysis or comment is limited. An attempt is made to construct an argument, partially supported by some reasoning and/or evidence. Little or no recognition of more than one view. Form and style of writing are suitable in some respects. Some of the material is organised clearly and coherently. Some accurate use is made of specialist vocabulary. Satisfactory legibility and accuracy in spelling, grammar and punctuation.	9-7
3	Issue(s) only partly understood and appreciated. Some limited attempt made at analysis or comment. Reasoning is simplistic and basic. Evidence is minimal. May be disorganised. Specialist vocabulary is used sparingly and/or imprecisely. Legibility and accuracy in spelling, grammar and punctuation are adequate.	6-5
2	Some brief attempt made to address the question in a very simple way, with little understanding, analysis or reasoning. Specialist vocabulary is used sparingly and/or imprecisely. Legibility and accuracy in spelling, grammar and punctuation are barely adequate.	4-3
1	Some isolated points relevant to the question. Little coherence and little correct use of specialist vocabulary. Legibility and accuracy in spelling, grammar and punctuation are such that meaning is unclear.	2-1
0	No valid relevant reasoning.	0

GCE RELIGIOUS STUDIES (AS)

SUMMER 2016 MARK SCHEME

RS 1/2 PHIL INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

- Q.1 (a) Explain how the cosmological argument seeks to prove the existence of God. [AO1 30]**

Candidates are likely to include some or all of the following, but other relevant points will be credited:

Answer should be structured to reflect how each of the following may prove the existence of God: Plato – necessity of self-moved mover; Aristotle – First mover; first three of Aquinas' 'Five Ways': 1. Motion/change – unmoved mover, including concept of 'efficient cause' 2. Cause – first/uncaused cause 3. Contingency – uncreated/non-contingent/Necessary being. Reference may also be made to Copleston's development of this argument. Kalam version (First cause, concepts of infinity, personal creator); Leibniz's Principle of Sufficient Reason, etc.

- (b) The cosmological argument is a strong argument for the existence of God.' Assess this view. [AO2 15]**

Candidates are likely to include some or all of the following, but other relevant points will be credited:

Strong argument: A posteriori/premise drawn from empirical world; based on common experience of cause/effect; infinity of matter impossible; offers simple logical explanation (cf Ockham's razor); part of cumulative case, etc.

Not strong argument: possibility of infinite regression; 'Big Bang'; plurality of causes; cause not necessarily the God of Classical Theism; debate about cause/effect, self-change and contingency/non-contingency (e.g. people/animals move themselves – Kenny; how is God uncaused if nothing else is? No experience of how universes begin - Kant); existence without explanation – Russell's 'brute fact', etc.

- Q.2 (a) Explain how the teleological argument seeks to prove the existence of God. [AO1 30]**

Candidates are likely to include some or all of the following, but other relevant points will be credited:

Answer should be structured to reflect how each of the following may prove the existence of God: Plato: demiurge; Aristotle: complexity and beauty in the world result of divine intelligence; Aquinas' Fifth way 'From the governance of the world'; Paley's Watch analogy; Observation of natural phenomena – structure of human eye (Paley), detail of a thumbprint (Newton), etc. Anthropic principle (cosmos developed for intelligent life) and Aesthetic argument (appreciation of beauty not necessary for survival, therefore natural selection not only process governing behaviour/survival), etc.

- Q.2 (b) 'The teleological argument is made ineffective by its counter arguments.' Assess this view. [AO2 15]**

Candidates are likely to include some or all of the following, but other relevant points will be credited:

Ineffective: Design only apparent order and result not evidence of intention; 'God of gaps' rather than empirical evidential claims; arguments against design from science – including reference to Darwin and Dawkins; alternative explanation of evolutionary natural selection; Natural selection explains problem of evil, (i.e. random suffering, animal suffering, etc) therefore more acceptable alternative to divine 'intelligent' design theories, various counter arguments arising from Hume, etc.

Not ineffective: Based on observation of apparent design, order and purpose in the universe (a posteriori – therefore uses a scientific method); Hume's counter arguments not universally accepted; scientific theories are often in need of updating/proved false – therefore scientific evidence against the teleological argument does not make it ineffective, contemporary scientists (e.g. Brown, Polkinghorne, Tennant, P. Davies, et al.) support design concept; etc.

- Q.3 (a) Explain what is meant by the 'problem of evil'. [AO1 30]**

Candidates are likely to include some or all of the following, but other relevant points will be credited:

Reference must be made to what the *problem of evil* is: inconsistency of omnibenevolence, omnipotence and existence of evil and how removing any of these criteria can offer a solution to the problem of evil but in doing so creates further problems, e.g. denies *either* the concept of the God of classical theism *or* the existence of evil – neither of which is a satisfactory explanation. Reference may also be made to the types of evil and their relevance to the debate i.e. *Natural*: Evil which occurs outside of the direct control of humans, e.g. earthquakes, tsunamis, flooding, volcanic eruption, etc. *Moral*: Evil which is a direct result of human action: e.g. murder, theft, rape, child abuse, etc. Also expect some reference to problems of animal suffering – incompatible with majority of theodicies therefore no explanation as to why they suffer – questions God's benevolence. Immensity of suffering questions all of God's characteristics, etc. Innocent suffering – questions idea of divine justice, etc. Expect reference to suitable examples to illustrate both problems.

- (b) **‘Theodicies fail to solve the problem of evil for religious believers.’
Assess this view with reference to the theodicy of either Augustine or
Irenaeus. [AO2 15]**

Candidates are likely to include some or all of the following, but other relevant points will be credited:

Fails:

Augustine: Based on concepts relating to logical, scientific and moral error. Concept of hell as part of universe’s design implies foreseen flaw, therefore not made perfect; if humans were created perfect then evil choice would not have been made; scientific evidence disagrees with ‘fallen’ nature – development of species over time/evolutionary developments, etc.; biological impossibilities of all humans being ‘seminally present’ in Adam; failure to justify ‘innocent’ and animal suffering; evil not merely absence of good but real entity, etc.

Irenaeus: questions omnibenevolence of God when purpose of life is to grow through suffering; incompatible with biblical accounts of Creation, Fall and Atonement; idea of suffering leading to moral/spiritual development not universal experience but often leads to more evil/suffering (soul-breaking rather than soul-making); excessive extent of evil/suffering not accounted for, fails to justify suffering of ‘innocent’; animal suffering unresolved; fails to explain uneven distribution of suffering; if all go to heaven, no incentive to do good rather than evil, etc.

Does not fail:

Augustine: The Augustinian theodicy is consistent with biblical tradition of wholly good creator God; consistent with accounts in bible of Fall and Atonement; consistent with human experience of cause/effect; responsibility for suffering becomes humanity’s rather than God’s, etc.

Irenaeus: provides purpose for suffering; compatible with scientific view of evolution; involves genuine human responsibility respecting human free will; promotes human growth/development in achieving moral virtue; maintains belief in life after death; in accord with Buddhist attitude of acceptance of suffering, etc.

- Q.4 (a) Explain why problems of objectivity and authenticity present a challenge to mysticism. [AO1 30]**

Candidates are likely to include some or all of the following, but other relevant points will be credited:

Nature of subjectivity of religious experiences; challenges of verification and falsification to the use of language to describe a religious experience; Franks Davis three categories of challenges (i.e. description-related; subject-related and object related challenges); Wisdom's parable of the gardener; Freud's view of religious experience (cf Oceanic experience) as expression of desire to retreat from world and return to womb; issues of psychological health; naturalistic explanations; etc.

Max level 5 if only one element (i.e. 'objectivity' or 'authenticity') is addressed.

- (b) 'Mysticism cannot overcome the challenges of the empirical world.' Assess this view. [AO2 15]**

Candidates are likely to include some or all of the following, but other relevant points will be credited:

Cannot overcome the challenges:

Live in a world based on reason/logic/scientific enquiry; mysticism is sometimes seen as 'navel gazing' with no clear end or purpose; mystics tend to live apart from society – therefore of no real value to those within it; lack of empirical evidence; confusion over interpreting mystical experience; possibility of deception from some; alternative explanations from psychology, etc.

Can overcome the challenges:

Many religious traditions are founded on mystical experiences (e.g. angelic visions; prophetic dreams, etc); can help to strengthen religious belief for both individuals and communities; seeking contact with the divine/transcendent is encouraged in several religious traditions; also increases individual and, sometimes, corporate spiritual understanding; reveals truths undiscoverable through other means; challenges superficial material understanding of world; provides comfort to many; deepens faith; inspirational lifestyle; promotes understanding of peace and unity, etc.