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Annotations used in the detailed Mark Scheme (to include abbreviations and subject-specific conventions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annotation</th>
<th>Meaning of annotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>Blank Page – this annotation must be used on all blank pages within an answer booklet (structured or unstructured) and on each page of an additional object where there is no candidate response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

**Handling of unexpected answers**

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

**A2 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.

At A level, candidates are required to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding, and their ability to sustain a critical line of argument in greater depth and over a wider range of content than at AS level.

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 A2, candidates answer a single question but are reminded by a rubric of the need to address both Objectives in their answers. Progression from Advanced Subsidiary to A2 is provided, in part, by assessing their ability to construct a coherent essay, and this is an important part of the Key Skill of Communication which ‘must contribute to the assessment of Religious Studies at AS and A level’.

**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.

* Synoptic skills and the ability to make connections: these are now assessed at A2 as specification, due to the removal of the Connections papers.

**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.
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, i.e. 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.
Candidates must answer only one question from Part 1 and one question from Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative Content</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>AO1</strong> Candidates may begin with Barth’s debate with Brunner over natural theology and revelation. Brunner argued that although nature and human conscience provide a point of contact with God, it is not sufficient for salvation (the Fall has distorted the <em>imago Dei</em>). However, conscience still functions enough to condemn humans and make them open to God’s law. To all of this Barth famously replied ‘no’. The material image of God is too corrupt to enable any aspect of conscience to be open to God. There is no general point of contact (even if the creation reflects the divine order, it is not the basis for salvation or reasoned response to God). Candidates may then go on to discuss Barth’s theology of revelation focussing on the Word, the Trinity and his teaching on religion. Barth argued that all religions are ‘untruth’ (<em>Aufhebung</em>) in so far as they are human responses to the divine. He also described religion as ‘faithlessness’ (<em>Unglaube</em>); religions are not the source of faith as only God’s grace provides this.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>To what extent does Karl Barth’s rejection of natural theology mean that he must be a religious exclusivist?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>AO2</strong> Many candidates might argue that Barth’s theology is exclusivist. His rejection of natural theology, coupled with his rejection of religion (untruth is often translated as ‘abolition’) and the uniqueness of the Word as revealed in Jesus Christ all support this interpretation. However, others will question whether this is really so. Barth’s critique of religion also applied equally to Christianity as a human institution. His chapter on the ‘abolition of religion’ was also a call for tolerance e.g. ‘religion and religions must be treated with a tolerance which is informed by the forbearance of Christ, which derives therefore from the knowledge that by grace God has reconciled to Himself godless man and his religion’ (<em>Church Dogmatics</em>). Some might look further at apparently exclusivist doctrines such as election and the Trinity and argue that Barth’s aim was to express the majesty of God’s grace over all creation and all religions. They might, argue, therefore that as God can reveal Himself in anything, then his revelation can extend to any religion (even if it is more perfectly revealed in Christianity).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicative Content</th>
<th>Marks</th>
<th>Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AO1 There are two parts to this essay which candidates may wish to tackle separately. First is the claim that there is no adequate definition of religion. Some may point out that there is a certain degree of circularity when it comes to trying to define it. They might refer to Feuerbach’s analysis where he argues that religion in essence is human experience of nature (‘self-feeling feeling’). For Feuerbach there is no revelation, only human existential response to deeper experiences which are then frequently falsely objectified. Some might refer to Ninian Smart’s phenomenological approach. Having observed those phenomena which are considered to be religious, he then proposes six dimensions of all religions of which the ‘experiential’ is the most basic one (the ‘focus’). The second part of the essay question concerns truth and falsehood. Religions might be true or false according to Feuerbach only in so far as they are genuine existential expressions. In Smart’s analysis a religion is ‘true’ if it has some sense of the mystical and the numinous. AO2 Candidates might argue as Smart does, that the question of defining religion is far too complex then to move into the abstract realm of truth: ‘There will be no single definition of religion in terms of content, and the search for such a definition will be a snare, leading one on to lack of discrimination’ (Smart). Furthermore as Smart rejects all theological approaches to religion, then there is no independent set of doctrinal truth claims to make judgements of truth/falsehood. On the other hand some might argue that Feuerbach’s analysis of religion is adequate. In which case all religions which claim objective/metaphysical truth are false and any religion which is humanistic is true.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>‘As there is no adequate definition of religion no one can claim that any one religion is true or false.’ Discuss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Indicative Content</td>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some might argue that even Smart distinguishes between religions which give a better account of the Other than those which are merely mystical or magical. So, in that sense a religion could be true or false.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>AO1</strong> Candidates may wish to set out the secular liberal feminist agenda first. Feminism of this type begins with the simple observation that as women are as equally rational as men, then politically, educationally and economically there should no discrimination. Men and women have equal rights; reform of society also means the tackling of patriarchal taboos. Liberal feminist theologians have responded by re-evaluating Christianity and its tradition. Most candidates will probably explain how liberal analysis of the Bible begins by placing it in its historical context and evaluating how it challenged the moral and spiritual values of its day. For example some argue that there is a ‘golden thread’ beginning with Genesis 1 (men and women both made equally in the image of God), through Jeremiah to Galatians 3:28 (in Christ... neither male nor female) where women are regarded as absolute equals with men. Some might look at Jesus’ challenge to taboos (the woman with internal bleeding) and acceptance of women as disciples (Mary and Martha, women at the well). They might point out how the very early Church seemed to practise radical equality but second generation leaders departed from this and became more conservative and traditional. <strong>AO2</strong> Many candidates might look at the work of Elizabeth Cady Stanton in her <em>Women’s Bible</em>. On the one hand she appeared to accommodate Christianity through historical analysis of the Bible by rejecting passages which were clearly patriarchal and sexist. However, her method was only to rescue enough to persuade Christian women to support feminism. Actually what she revealed was the inadequacies of biblical Christianity and the superiority of secular feminism.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>To what extent have feminist theologians successfully responded to the challenges of secular liberal feminism? Any feminist theological response (eg. reconstructionist, radical, named feminist theologian) to secular liberal feminism is acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Indicative Content</td>
<td>Marks</td>
<td>Guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others might discuss Hampson’s conclusion that there is no ‘golden thread’ and such a ‘thread’ must be counter-balanced by the greater number of passages where women are abused, exploited and marginalised by patriarchal societies. On the other hand others might argue that liberal feminist theologians have responded well to their secular counterparts. The Bible reflects life in all its complexities. Some stories (such as the ‘texts or terror’) continue to puzzle, challenge and make us reflect. Furthermore, by rejecting the spiritual dimension secularists have only offered partial equality. Feminist theologians, it might be argued, have pointed to the radical nature of the Kingdom of God which has yet to be fully implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>AO1</strong> This essay invites a wide range of responses. Many candidates will begin by offering a definition of androgyny. It has a variety of meanings from a being who is male and female to a being who is neither female or male (but just gendered) to a being who is male/female. Androgyny in theology may refer to God or to human beings or even Christ. From a Christian conservative point of view human gender distinctions are part of the natural order. In Genesis 1:27 God creates male and female to have distinct characteristics which after the Fall are reinforced in the particular roles which each has to perform. The traditional distinctions are reinforced by a philosophical view which is that the complementary relationship is to be seen the in the public/private, the active/passive, provider/child-bearer distinctions (eg. Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, <em>Mulieris Dignitatem</em>). God is also gendered because as Father He is creator. Others might look at alternative Christian views. In the Gnostic tradition God is androgynous being the ‘Whole’ or ‘Fullness’. Christ and Mary Magdalene represent the male/female principle sufficient for complete salvation. Some may discuss Julian of Norwich’s language of Christ as ‘our mother’ and the male/female language of God in the Old Testament wisdom tradition.</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Androgyny is theologically unacceptable.’ Discuss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Indicative Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2</td>
<td>Some might argue that one of the important insights of feminist theology is a rediscovery of the range of gendered language which has been used to describe God, especially the Trinity. The problem has been that exclusive male language has diminished experience of God and Christ; Christian history indicates that this is a comparatively recent development (Ruether for example points to the Shaker androgynous view of God). On the other hand radicals such as Mary Daly have no time for the kind of androgyyny in which ‘John Travolta and Farrah Fawcett-Majors scotch taped together’ (<em>Beyond God the Father</em>). Daly cites Galatians 3:28 as all that is wrong with Christianity. It attempts equality by adding women to men ('in Christ there is neither...') thereby defining gender almost exclusively in male (or phallic) terms. Some might conclude androgyyny is entirely appropriate if it means understanding God incorporates both genders. Others might feel that androgyyny undermines human identity (as expressed in traditional theological terms).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 1 A2 Levels of Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark /21</th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>Mark /14</th>
<th>AO2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>absent/no relevant material</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>absent/no argument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1     | 1–5      | almost completely ignores the question  
  • little relevant material  
  • some concepts inaccurate  
  • shows little knowledge of technical terms. | 1–3 | very little argument or justification of viewpoint  
  • little or no successful analysis  
  • views asserted with no justification. |
|       |          | Communication: often unclear or disorganised; can be difficult to understand; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate |
| 2     | 6–9      | A basic attempt to address the question  
  • 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. | 4–6 | a basic attempt to sustain an argument and justify a viewpoint  
  • some analysis, but not successful  
  • views asserted but little justification. |
|       |          | Communication: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate |
| 3     | 10–13    | satisfactory attempt to address the question  
  • some accurate knowledge  
  • appropriate understanding  
  • some successful selection of material  
  • some accurate use of technical terms. | 7–8 | the argument is sustained and justified  
  • some successful analysis which may be implicit  
  • views asserted but not fully justified. |
|       |          | Communication: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate |
| 4     | 14–17    | a good attempt to address the question  
  • accurate knowledge  
  • good understanding  
  • good selection of material  
  • technical terms mostly accurate. | 9–11 | a good attempt at using evidence to sustain an argument holistically  
  • some successful and clear analysis  
  • some effective use of evidence  
  • views analysed and developed. |
|       |          | Communication: generally clear and organised; can be understood as a whole; spelling, punctuation and grammar good |
| 5     | 18–21    | 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. | 12–14 | A very good/excellent attempt which uses a range of evidence to sustain an argument holistically  
  • comprehends the demands of the question  
  • uses a range of evidence  
  • shows understanding and critical analysis of different viewpoints. |
|       |          | Communication: answer is well constructed and organised; easily understood; spelling, punctuation and grammar very good |