

GCE

Religious Studies

Unit **G571**: Philosophy of Religion

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Mark Scheme for June 2015

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, 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 2015

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Level one – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level two – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level three – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level four – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Level five – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin.
	Highlighting a section of the response that is irrelevant to the awarding of the mark.
	Point has been seen and noted, e.g. where part of an answer is at the end of the script.

Subject-specific Marking Instructions

Handling of unexpected answers

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

NOTE: AO2 material in AO1 answers must not be cross-credited and vice-versa.

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.

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)	<p>Candidates may use a number of Old and/or New Testament passages to describe beliefs that God can be seen as both a Lawgiver and a Judge. For example some may begin by explaining the importance of the Ten Commandments in the Judaeo-Christian tradition while others may explain that the Torah gives 613 laws by which a Jew should live his or her life whereas the teaching in the Sermon on the Mount could be argued to have reduced these 'to love your neighbour as yourself.'</p> <p>Some candidates may compare the often devastating judgements made by the God of the Old Testament with the more compassionate Father/God presented in the New Testament; the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, as opposed to the teaching in the story of the woman caught in adultery.</p>	25	<p>Explain the belief that God is both lawgiver and judge.</p> <p>The question does not specifically require a Biblical approach.</p>
1	(b)	<p>Some candidates may begin by exploring what might be meant by 'good' in terms of any understanding of God. Some will be aware that Aquinas is clear that 'good' as human term cannot be applied to God and they may therefore attack the question itself.</p> <p>Others may evaluate the extent to which a God who, for example, destroys the first born males of an entire nation, allows the holocaust or creates a digger wasp may be considered to be 'good' in any sense.</p>	10	<p>'God is not good.' Discuss.</p> <p>Some may explore the theodicies or the Euthyphro Dilemma, but it is important that any new information presented in part b is considered as part of an argument, rather than as the presentation of new information.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>Some candidates may begin by explaining Aquinas' fifth way which is taken from the governance of the world, explaining his view that we see that things which lack knowledge, such as natural objects, act for a purpose, and this is evident from their acting always - or nearly always - in the same way, to obtain the best result. It is plain that they achieve their end by design and not by chance.</p> <p>It is obvious that something without intelligence could not move towards an end so unerringly unless it were directed by a being with knowledge and intelligence, just as an [inanimate] arrow is directed by an archer. Therefore, some intelligent being exists which directs all natural things to their end. This being, Aquinas says, we call God.</p> <p>Others may alternatively focus on Paley and the regularity and purpose which can be found in a watch and in any other examples he used and then explain how we can draw inferences by analogy.</p> <p>Hume, for example, argued that what we choose to say about the world is like shapes the outcome of the argument. A watch is a machine, and machines have machine-makers. But, consider a cabbage. If we examine its leaves, they are wonderfully fitted together and they serve a purpose as a very healthful form of food. But, if we found a cabbage, we could not go from that to draw the inference that there exists a cabbage-maker. Cabbages we know as natural things, like dandelions or nettles.</p> <p>Is the world any more like a watch than it is like a cabbage or a giant slug or a dandelion? By choosing a machine as an analogy, some philosophers have already determined the outcome they want.</p>	25	<p>Explain the teleological argument and Hume's criticisms of it.</p> <p>Candidates do not need to cover any particular version of the Teleological Argument to gain credit.</p> <p>There are a range of criticisms that Hume offers specifically to the Teleological Argument and different selections of these will be seen in different scripts.</p>

Question		Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2	(b)	<p>Candidates may analyse Hume's view that we cannot go from an effect to a cause greater than that needed to produce the cause, they may refer to Hume's example of a set of scales. Suppose we can see only one pan, which, let us say, has a known weight in it. The pan is in the air, so we know that what is in the other pan is heavier. We have no idea whether it is heavier by an ounce or by a ton, and we have no idea whether it is a ton of feathers or an elephant holding it down with his big toe.</p> <p>Equally, the most we could infer from the existence of a watch is that there <i>was</i> a watchmaker. We do not and cannot know whether he is still active or even still alive. We cannot say whether he made the watch alone or had some little helpers.</p> <p>In the same way, we cannot go from the facts of this world, with all its limitations, to the infinite, all-loving, all-powerful, all-knowing God in whom most believers wish to place their faith. Hume suggests that perhaps this world is the discarded effort of an infant deity or the work of a committee of gods – we simply cannot know.</p> <p>It is important that candidates do not just explain Hume's argument but that they assess the extent to which he is successful in demonstrating that there is no evidence for the existence of God.</p>	10	<p>'Hume successfully demonstrates that there is no evidence for the existence of God.'</p> <p>Note that this question widens the possible range of responses to include areas discussed by Hume beyond the Teleological Argument, but it is equally valid to concentrate on the Teleological Argument points alone.</p>

Question		Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
3	(a)	<p>Candidates may begin by explaining the view that for Kant, a key value is autonomy, that is, the notion we are wholly free beings. We are capable of choice and, above all, are rational beings. This freedom of choice entails the ability to determine what is right and wrong, which he does through the notion of the Categorical Imperative, which works out the implications of the rational awareness that we should always do our duty without regard for the consequences. We ought, rationally, to do our duty for its own sake.</p> <p>They may further explain that Kant believed we do our duty because it is rational to do so, and not because God has commanded it. If we did what was right because God commanded it, or had ethical rules laid down by God, or our reason had been determined by God, we would not be autonomous creatures, but heteronymous, that is directed by another.</p>	25	<p>Explain what Kant believed about the innate moral awareness in human beings.</p> <p>Candidates may approach this question using other aspects of Kantian thinking, e.g. the postulates and credit should be awarded, as usual, according to the levels of response.</p> <p>Responses that only use non-Kantian forms of the moral argument are unlikely to achieve beyond Level 2.</p>

Question		Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
3	(b)	<p>Candidates may focus their responses to this question on the work of Sigmund Freud who provided an alternative, naturalistic, account of how moral responsibility and guilt feelings could occur. For Freud, conscience was essentially the internalising of parental prohibitions and demands, so they seem to come from within ourselves. This creates an aspect of our minds he called the super-ego.</p> <p>For Freud, the superego internalises the sense of a father figure and the regulations found in society. It tends to oppose the id, giving us a sense of the moral and, setting up taboos against certain types of feelings and actions. If the Oedipus Complex (which inclines men to sleep with their mothers and kill their fathers) is particularly repressed through parents, schooling and authority figures in general, the rule of the superego over the ego will be stricter, and the stronger the sense of the moral and of conscience castigating our urges.</p> <p>Some may also assess how various religious teachings have added to the idea of moral control through guilt. Others, while analysing this body of work, may critique it in such a way that they argue for Kant and the idea that moral awareness has nothing to do with guilt.</p>	10	<p>'Moral awareness is more about guilt than God.' Discuss.</p> <p>Although Freud is mentioned in the specification, there is no specific requirement from the question to use his ideas.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)	<p>Candidates should see this as a question on Aristotle who identified four types of cause that make something what it is. This may lead them to explain these as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Material Cause. This is what something is made from – the material cause of a chair may be the plastic and wood and metal from which it is made. Without them, a particular chair would not exist. 2. Formal Cause. A chair is what it is because it is in the form of a chair – that is the shape which the wood, metal etc. have. If it were not that shape, it would not be a chair. Some may explain that for Aristotle, the form is in the chair and each chair has its own form. The transcendence of Plato’s single Form is therefore made immanent. 3. Efficient Cause. This is what brings a chair about, in this case, a chair maker. Had there not been an efficient cause, the chair would not exist – something causes it to be, just as certain biological events bring about, for example, a butterfly. 4. Final Cause. This is the purpose for which a thing exists, that is, what it is for. A chair exists for the purpose of providing somewhere to sit, a house to provide shelter, and so on. Some may explain that Aristotle believed that all nature has a purpose. 	25	<p>Explain what Aristotle meant by material, efficient, formal and final causes.</p> <p>In the examples they use, candidates should not be restricted simply to physical objects.</p> <p>When discussing the Final Cause, it is not necessary to use material on either actuality/potentiality or the Prime Mover to achieve higher levels, however it is possible to use this material to enhance explanation.</p>

Question		Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
4	(b)	<p>Candidates may begin by assessing the way in which Aristotle believed in a God, but one very unlike the Christian, Jewish or Islamic belief. Some may explore the idea that for Aristotle, God is perfect and everlasting. Being perfect he is interested only in perfect things. And the only thing worthy of his contemplation is perfect being – himself. He spends eternity simply contemplating his own wonderful being, uninterested in anything else. Some candidates may assess the extent to which Aristotle was successful in justifying this belief.</p> <p>Others may begin by assessing the views held by Aristotle that the world is eternal like God – it has always existed. The question of how it was caused does not seem to arise for Aristotle. God’s relationship to the earth is as Final Cause – not cause in any modern scientific sense of the term, but as purpose or goal. The best part of the person is the most God-like part of us, the intellect, and the best human activity is the same as that of God – pure contemplation.</p> <p>Some may argue that the Four Causes and Aristotle’s empiricism have been influential and underpin modern scientific method. Examples of modern inventions can be described using the Four Causes. In discussing Aristotle’s reliance on empiricism some may contrast this with Plato’s rationalism and ideas that the senses cannot be trusted but true knowledge is found only in the realm of Forms.</p>	10	<p>To what extent was Aristotle successful in explaining the world?</p> <p>It is possible to approach this question in the limited time available in a number of ways. It is possible, for example, to explore the issue simply from engaging with Aristotle’s understanding of purpose and Final Cause.</p>

APPENDIX 1 AS LEVELS OF RESPONSE

Level	Mark /25	AO1	Mark /10	AO2
0	0	absent/no relevant material	0	absent/no argument
1	1–5	almost completely ignores the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> little relevant material some concepts inaccurate shows little knowledge of technical terms <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L1</i></p>	1–2	very little argument or justification of viewpoint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> little or no successful analysis views asserted with no justification <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L1</i></p>
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> knowledge limited and partially accurate limited understanding might address the general topic rather than the question directly selection often inappropriate limited use of technical terms <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L2</i></p>	3–4	a basic attempt to sustain an argument and justify a viewpoint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some analysis, but not successful views asserted but little justification <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L2</i></p>
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some accurate knowledge appropriate understanding some successful selection of material some accurate use of technical terms <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L3</i></p>	5–6	the argument is sustained and justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some successful analysis which may be implicit views asserted but not fully justified <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L3</i></p>
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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> accurate knowledge good understanding good selection of material technical terms mostly accurate <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L4</i></p>	7–8	a good attempt at using evidence to sustain an argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some successful and clear analysis some effective use of evidence views analysed and developed <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L4</i></p>
Communication: generally clear and organised; can be understood as a whole - spelling, punctuation and grammar good				

Level	Mark /25	AO1	Mark /10	AO2
5	21–25	<p>A very good/excellent attempt to address the question showing understanding and engagement with the material</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • very high level of ability to select and deploy relevant information • accurate use of technical terms <p style="text-align: right;">L5</p>	9–10	<p>A very good/excellent attempt to sustain an argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comprehends the demands of the question • uses a range of evidence • shows understanding and critical analysis of different viewpoints <p style="text-align: right;">L5</p>
Communication: answer is well constructed and organised - easily understood; spelling, punctuation and grammar very good				

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

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

© OCR 2015

