



AS LEVEL

Philosophy

PHLS1 / Epistemology and Philosophy of Religion

Mark scheme

2175

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME v0.2

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2015 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, schools/colleges registered with AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by AQA Education.

AQA Education (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334).
Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester, M15 6EX.

Section A – Epistemology

1 What is empiricism?

[2 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
2 AO1	2	A clear and correct answer, with no significant redundancy.
	1	A partial answer, possibly in the form of fragmented points. Imprecise and/or significant redundancy.
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative Content

- The view that (a) all of our concepts are ultimately derived from sense experience and (b) all of synthetic knowledge is ultimately derived from sense experience (ie it is a posteriori).
- There is also an extreme form of empiricism that states that all of our knowledge (including, for example, mathematical knowledge) is ultimately derived from sense experience.

2 Explain why, for Locke, extension is a primary quality.

[5 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
5 AO1	5	A full, clear and precise explanation. The student makes logical links between precisely identified points, with no redundancy.
	4	A clear explanation, with logical links, but some imprecision/redundancy.
	3	The substantive content of the explanation is present and there is an attempt at logical linking, but the explanation is not full and/or precise.
	2	One or two relevant points made, but not precisely. The logic is unclear.
	1	Fragmented points, with no logical structure.
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- Primary qualities are those that are intrinsic to the object exist independently of how we perceive them.
- They include solidity, extension, motion, number and figure.
- Locke gives several examples to support the distinction – for example, the argument based on divisibility: if a grain of wheat is divided repeatedly into two parts we would continue to perceive it to have some qualities and not others. Those that we perceive the divided grain to continue to have (despite however many divisions) are primary qualities. Given that extension works in this way (we cannot imagine the two new pieces of grain not being extended), it follows that extension is a primary quality.

Notes:

- Credit any correct example.
- There is no requirement for students to critique Locke's example here.

Students might draw a contrast with secondary qualities, which are those that (only) exist in the object as 'powers' to produce particular experiences in us and include colour, taste, smell and sound.

- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

3 Outline and explain the key differences between idealism and indirect realism.

[9 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
9 AO1	7-9	<p>The answer is set out in a clear, integrated and logical form. The content of the answer is correct. The material is clearly relevant and points are made clearly and precisely.</p> <p>There may be some redundancy or lack of clarity in particular points, but not sufficient to detract from the answer.</p> <p>Technical philosophical language is used appropriately and consistently.</p>
	4-6	<p>The answer is clear and set out in a coherent form, with logical/causal links identified.</p> <p>The content of the answer is largely correct, though not necessarily well integrated. Some points are made clearly, but relevance is not always sustained.</p> <p>Technical philosophical language is used, though not always consistently or appropriately.</p>
	1-3	<p>Some relevant points are made, but no integration.</p> <p>There is a lack of precision – with possibly insufficient material that is relevant or too much that is irrelevant.</p> <p>There may be some attempt at using technical philosophical language.</p>
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- Idealism is an anti-realist theory of perception which means it denies the existence of an external world, whereas indirect realism is a realist theory as it maintains the existence of an external world that causes our perceptions (or sense-data) of it.
- Idealism is a ‘direct’ theory of perception because it argues that we directly perceive ordinary objects, such as trees – although it thinks these are composed of sense data. Indirect realism, however, argues that we do not directly perceive ordinary objects, but are aware of them indirectly, through a direct ‘representation’ of them.

Note This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

4 Outline and explain the tripartite view of knowledge ('Justified True Belief').

[9 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
9 AO1	7-9	<p>The answer is set out in a clear, integrated and logical form. The content of the answer is correct. The material is clearly relevant and points are made clearly and precisely.</p> <p>There may be some redundancy or lack of clarity in particular points, but not sufficient to detract from the answer.</p> <p>Technical philosophical language is used appropriately and consistently.</p>
	4-6	<p>The answer is clear and set out in a coherent form, with logical/causal links identified.</p> <p>The content of the answer is largely correct, though not necessarily well integrated. Some points are made clearly, but relevance is not always sustained.</p> <p>Technical philosophical language is used, though not always consistently or appropriately.</p>
	1-3	<p>Some relevant points are made, but no integration.</p> <p>There is a lack of precision – with possibly insufficient material that is relevant or too much that is irrelevant.</p> <p>There may be some attempt at using technical philosophical language.</p>
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- Only about propositional knowledge – 's knows that p'.
- Gives three conditions that are each necessary and taken together sufficient for s to know p.
- Condition 1 – s knows that p only if s believes that p.
 - It is impossible for a person to know a proposition without believing that proposition. This is sometimes called the 'psychological' or 'internal' criterion.
- Condition 2 – s knows that p only if p is true.
 - It is impossible for a person to know a proposition that is false. When a false belief is held, it is merely a belief. Beliefs can be true or false. Knowledge can only be true (distinction between 'knowledge' and 'knowledge-claims'). This is sometimes called the 'external' criterion.
- Condition 3 – s knows that p only if s is justified in believing p.

This condition is required because it is possible to have a true belief that would not, at least intuitively, count as knowledge, eg lucky guesses. For a person to know a proposition, they must have a reason/grounds for holding that belief. There are various theories of justification.

Note

- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

5 Are there innate ideas?

[15 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
15 7 AO1 8 AO2	13-15	<p>The student argues with clear and sustained intent.</p> <p>A complete and coherent argument leads to a clear conclusion. The content is detailed and correct, and sufficient material is selected and deployed to answer the question fully.</p> <p>The conclusion is arrived at through a balancing of arguments, with appropriate weight given to each argument and to the argument overall. Where there are crucial arguments, these are distinguished from less crucial ones.</p> <p>There may be trivial mistakes – both relating to the content and to the logic – but they do not detract from the argument.</p>
	10-12	<p>The student argues with intent, though this is not necessarily sustained.</p> <p>A complete and coherent argument leads to a conclusion. The content is detailed and correct and most of it is integrated.</p> <p>There is a recognition of arguments and counter-arguments, but balance is not always present and the weight to be given to each argument is not always fully clear.</p>
	7-9	<p>There is some evidence that the student is trying to answer the question.</p> <p>An argument to a conclusion is set out, but not fully coherently. The content is largely correct, though there may be some gaps and lack of detail.</p> <p>Relevant points are recognised/identified and mentioned, but not integrated in a coherent way. Alternative positions may be identified and juxtaposed, but not necessarily precisely and their relative weightings may not be clear.</p>
	4-6	<p>There is limited evidence that the student is trying to answer the question.</p> <p>There may be a conclusion and several reasonable points may be made, but there is no clear relationship between the points and the conclusion. There may be much that is missing, or the essay may be one-sided.</p> <p>There might be substantial gaps in the content, or evidence of serious misunderstandings.</p> <p>Several reasonable points are made and there are some attempts to make inferences.</p>
	1-3	Simple mention of points, no clear argument.
0	Nothing written worthy of credit.	

Note on QWC

The level descriptors focus on the philosophical skills which students are required to demonstrate, through the medium of written communication. The Quality of Written Communication (QWC) requirements (which are assessed in the 15-mark questions) are essential to philosophical argument, so are subsumed within the level descriptions.

The QWC requirement for the clear and coherent organisation of material, in an appropriate style or styles, is addressed by the requirements for the selection and deployment of material in the form of argument.

The QWC requirements for the use of appropriate vocabulary and for accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar are addressed through the philosophical requirement for clarity.

Indicative content

Arguments for the claim are likely to include:

- Descartes' Trademark argument.
- Plato's arguments about recollection – teaching the slave boy.
- Leibniz' view that innate ideas exist but are revealed through experience.
- Discussion of various examples that do not immediately appear to be easily accounted for by experience, eg universals, substance, causation, infinity, numbers, pronouns/connectives such as 'all'.
- Hume's 'missing shade of blue' counter-example and the weakness of his response to it.

Arguments against the claim are likely to include:

- Locke's arguments about the tabula rasa, his 'two fountains' of sensation and reflection, his theory of abstraction and various examples discussed including 'infinity'
- Hume's distinction between impressions and ideas and various examples/arguments including 'gold mountain', the idea 'God' and the blind-man argument.

Criticisms of arguments for the claim are likely to include:

- Does Descartes successfully counter empiricist explanations of the origin of the idea 'God'?
- Locke's two arguments re 'infinity' – that it is derived from experience and that it is not a 'positive' idea.
- Plato's metaphysical assumptions and specific problems with the slave-boy example, eg that Socrates implicitly teaches the boy.
- Even if there are some ideas that are not derived from experience, this does not mean they are innate, eg they might be derived from other sources such as intuition or revelation.

Criticisms of arguments against the claim are likely to include:

- Universal claims (eg the internal angles of a triangle add up to 180 degrees) are difficult to justify (and not based on experience).

Locke's theory of abstraction is circular.

Note

- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

Section B – Philosophy of Religion

6 In his ontological argument, how does Anselm define God?

[2 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
2 AO1	2	A clear and correct answer, with no significant redundancy.
	1	A partial answer, possibly in the form of fragmented points. Imprecise and/or significant redundancy.
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

A being greater than which cannot be conceived.

7 Outline the problem of evil.

[5 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
5 AO1	5	A full, clear and precise explanation. The student makes logical links between precisely identified points, with no redundancy.
	4	A clear explanation, with logical links, but some imprecision/redundancy.
	3	The substantive content of the explanation is present and there is an attempt at logical linking, but the explanation is not full and/or precise.
	2	One or two relevant points made, but not precisely. The logic is unclear.
	1	Fragmented points, with no logical structure.
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- If God exists, then God is omnipotent, omniscient and morally perfect.
- If God is omnipotent, then God has the power to eliminate evil.
- If God is omniscient, then God knows when evil exists.
- If God is morally perfect, then God has the desire to eliminate all evil.
- Evil exists.
- So either God does not have the power to eliminate all evil (so is not omnipotent)
- or God does not know when evil exists (so is not omniscient)
- or God does not have the desire to eliminate all evil (so is not morally perfect)
- or God does not exist.

Note

- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

8 Outline the Euthyphro dilemma.

[9 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
9 AO1	7-9	<p>The answer is set out in a clear, integrated and logical form. The content of the answer is correct. The material is clearly relevant and points are made clearly and precisely.</p> <p>There may be some redundancy or lack of clarity in particular points, but not sufficient to detract from the answer.</p> <p>Technical philosophical language is used appropriately and consistently.</p>
	4-6	<p>The answer is clear and set out in a coherent form, with logical/causal links identified.</p> <p>The content of the answer is largely correct, though not necessarily well integrated. Some points are made clearly, but relevance is not always sustained.</p> <p>Technical philosophical language is used, though not always consistently or appropriately.</p>
	1-3	<p>Some relevant points are made, but no integration.</p> <p>There is a lack of precision – with possibly insufficient material that is relevant or too much that is irrelevant.</p> <p>There may be some attempt at using technical philosophical language.</p>
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- Either (1) morally good acts are willed by God because they are morally good or (2) morally good acts are good because they are willed by God.
- If (1), then morally good acts are good independent of God's will. This means there is a moral standard independent of God. This might limit his omnipotence.
- If (2), then it is inappropriate to praise/worship God for being good. If (a) God sets the standard of goodness, then it seems inappropriate to praise him for meeting it; if (b) there is nothing prior to God's willing that is good, then nothing can guide his willing, so it is arbitrary.
- So either God is not omnipotent or he is not worthy of worship

Note

- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

9 Outline Aquinas' First Way (the argument from motion).

[9 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
9 AO1	7-9	<p>The answer is set out in a clear, integrated and logical form. The content of the answer is correct. The material is clearly relevant and points are made clearly and precisely.</p> <p>There may be some redundancy or lack of clarity in particular points, but not sufficient to detract from the answer.</p> <p>Technical philosophical language is used appropriately and consistently.</p>
	4-6	<p>The answer is clear and set out in a coherent form, with logical/causal links identified.</p> <p>The content of the answer is largely correct, though not necessarily well integrated. Some points are made clearly, but relevance is not always sustained.</p> <p>Technical philosophical language is used, though not always consistently or appropriately.</p>
	1-3	<p>Some relevant points are made, but no integration.</p> <p>There is a lack of precision – with possibly insufficient material that is relevant or too much that is irrelevant.</p> <p>There may be some attempt at using technical philosophical language.</p>
	0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- Things in the world are in motion
- Whatever is moved is moved by another thing
- Movement is a reduction from potentiality to actuality
- Nothing can be reduced from potentiality to actuality except by something already in actuality
- The same thing cannot be both potentially and actually something
- Therefore a thing cannot move itself
- Therefore what is moved must be moved by another
- There cannot be an infinite regress
- Therefore there must be an unmoved mover, which is God.

Note

- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

10 Is religious language meaningless?

[15 marks]

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme	
15 7 AO1 8 AO2	13-15	<p>The student argues with clear and sustained intent.</p> <p>A complete and coherent argument leads to a clear conclusion. The content is detailed and correct and sufficient material is selected and deployed to answer the question fully.</p> <p>The conclusion is arrived at through a balancing of arguments, with appropriate weight given to each argument and to the argument overall. Where there are crucial arguments, these are distinguished from less crucial ones.</p> <p>There may be trivial mistakes – both relating to the content and to the logic – but they do not detract from the argument.</p>
	10-12	<p>The student argues with intent, though this is not necessarily sustained.</p> <p>A complete and coherent argument leads to a conclusion. The content is detailed and correct and most of it is integrated.</p> <p>There is a recognition of arguments and counter-arguments, but balance is not always present and the weight to be given to each argument is not always fully clear.</p>
	7-9	<p>There is some evidence that the student is trying to answer the question.</p> <p>An argument to a conclusion is set out, but not fully coherently. The content is largely correct, though there may be some gaps and lack of detail.</p> <p>Relevant points are recognised/identified and mentioned, but not integrated in a coherent way. Alternative positions may be identified and juxtaposed, but not necessarily precisely and their relative weightings may not be clear.</p>
	4-6	<p>There is limited evidence that the student is trying to answer the question.</p> <p>There may be a conclusion and several reasonable points may be made, but there is no clear relationship between the points and the conclusion. There may be much that is missing, or the essay may be one-sided.</p> <p>There might be substantial gaps in the content, or evidence of serious misunderstandings.</p> <p>Several reasonable points are made and there are some attempts to make inferences.</p>
	1-3	Simple mention of points, no clear argument.
0	Nothing written worthy of credit.	

Note on QWC

The level descriptors focus on the philosophical skills which students are required to demonstrate, through the medium of written communication. The Quality of Written Communication (QWC) requirements (which are assessed in the 15-mark questions) are essential to philosophical argument, so are subsumed within the level descriptions.

The QWC requirement for the clear and coherent organisation of material, in an appropriate style or styles, is addressed by the requirements for the selection and deployment of material in the form of argument.

The QWC requirements for the use of appropriate vocabulary and for accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar are addressed through the philosophical requirement for clarity.

Indicative content

- Religious assertions look like propositions – claims about states of affairs/empirical matters of fact.
 - According to the verification principle – to be meaningful, assertions (claims about matters of fact) must be verifiable.
 - By verifiable, we mean either they can be verified in practice, or you can state the conditions under which you would say they were true or false. Verification/falsification – two sides of the same logical coin.
 - Problem – religious statements cannot be empirically verified. For the logical positivist, that makes them meaningless as assertions.
- Hick – they are verifiable – but only eschatologically. But how convincing is this? What if the post-mortem experience is ambiguous? Is Hick's argument for continued post-mortem survival plausible?
- Flew – Wisdom's parable of the gardener shows that the religious believer will not accept anything as **falsifying** their utterance. Rather than accept that they are false, the believer simply qualifies their claim – until the claim becomes empty of content, so meaningless. 'Death by a thousand qualifications.'
- Hare – Bliks – religious utterances do not assert propositions, but particular world-views/ways of seeing the world. As such, they are not the kinds of things which can be verified/falsified, because they determine what will (and will not) count as evidence.
- Mitchell – the Partisan – religious believers will allow falsification. They do accept that there is evidence which counts against their claim, but not decisively/conclusively

Note

- This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

AS LEVEL PHILOSOPHY (PHLS1)**ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES GRID**

Question	AO1	AO2
1	2	
2	5	
3	9	
4	9	
5	7	8
6	2	
7	5	
8	9	
9	9	
10	7	8