# OCR
## Oxford Cambridge and RSA

# GCE

# Religious Studies

Unit **G571**: Philosophy of Religion

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

# Mark Scheme for June 2016

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.

**Annotations**

| Annotation | Meaning |
|---|---|
| L1 | Level one – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin. |
| L2 | Level two – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin. |
| L3 | Level three – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin. |
| L4 | Level four – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin. |
| L5 | 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. |
| SEEN | Point has been seen and noted, e.g. where part of an answer is at the end of the script. |

**Subject-specific Marking Instructions**

**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.

**MARK SCHEME:**

| Question | | | Indicative Content | Mark | Guidance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | a | **Explain Anselm's attempt to prove that God exists.**<br><br>Candidates may begin by writing that Anselm's Ontological Argument may be found in his very brief work, Proslogion. They may explain that Anselm believed that true understanding was a consequence of faith – his personal motto was *Credo ut intelligam* (I believe that I may understand). This entire book is cast as a prayer. Anselm's intention is twofold: to demonstrate that God exists, the subject of Chapter Two, and then, in subsequent chapters, to demonstrate that God is indeed the type of God in whom Christians believe.<br>Candidates are likely then to make use of one of the translations or summaries of the argument in the Proslogion for example: 'That he cannot be thought not to be' – see guidance<br><br><br>The extent to which candidates can demonstrate an understanding of this complex argument will indicate the appropriate level of response. | 25 | Which indeed is so true that it is *not possible* for it to be thought *not to be*.<br><br>Because something is possible to be thought to be which is not possible to be thought not to be, and the latter is greater than that which is possible to be thought not to be.<br><br>Wherefore, if that than which a greater cannot be thought is possible to be thought not to be, then the very thing than which a greater cannot be thought is not that than which a greater cannot be thought; but this cannot be consistent.<br><br>So real therefore is the thing than which nothing greater can be thought that it is not even able to be thought not to be. And this is what you are, O Lord our God.<br><br>Therefore, so truly do you exist, O Lord my God, that you are not even able to be thought not to be. |
| | 1 | b | **'God's existence is logically necessary." Discuss.**<br><br>Candidates are likely to recognise this as an important assumption / postulate of Anselm's argument. They may assess whether or not anything can be logically necessary and perhaps use mathematics to demonstrate its truth. Others may use their knowledge of Kant's view on existence not being a predicate like others to attack the | 10 | Other versions of the Ontological Argument or criticisms thereof might validly be used to explain the process of Anselm's argument, but the main focus of the question should be Anselm. |

| Question | | | Indicative Content | Mark | Guidance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | statement in the question. The focus should ultimately be on evaluating the statement especially where new information is presented as part of the argument.<br><br>Some candidates may compare the idea of factually necessary propositions as opposed to the logically necessary proposition put forward by Anselm. Examiners should be careful not to look for a specific response based on Anselm but credit any reasonable evaluation of the statement. | | Candidates may make use of their knowledge of Descartes or more modern versions of the Ontological argument. |
| | 2 | a | **Explain how Kant used the existence of morality to postulate the existence of God.**<br><br>Candidates may begin by explaining the background to the views postulated by Kant. They may, for example, explain the importance of duty to Kant and his view that all morality is rational leading to the belief that an irrational maxim would also be immoral. This may also include an exploration of his views on the Good Will.<br>Kant's argument may then be summarised by some candidates in some form or other, possibly as in guidance.<br><br>Some candidates may develop the idea that ought implies can, explaining that Kant's notion seems to be that if it makes no sense to tell someone that he/she ought to do something if it is impossible to do so, then whenever we say 'ought', 'can' necessarily follows. This may help with the candidates' evaluation of Kant in part 'b'.<br><br>Candidates may define 'postulate' and explain that for Kant morality / reason / duty only makes sense if one assumes the three postulates – freedom, immortality and God. | 25 | Rationally, perfect virtue ought to be followed by perfect happiness; The combination of perfect happiness and perfect goodness is the *summum bonum* ('highest good');<br><br>Clearly this is not achieved in this life. Good things happen to bad people and catastrophes to the virtuous;<br><br>Therefore, because the *summum bonum* ought to be achieved, it can be achieved; If it is not achievable in this life, it must be achievable in the next;<br><br>If the s*ummum bonum* exists in the next life, there must be someone to provide it;<br><br>This someone is obviously God. |

| Question | | | Indicative Content | Mark | Guidance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | b | | **"Morality is a psychological need, not a proof of God's existence." Discuss.** | 10 | |
| | | | Candidates are likely to see this as a typical challenge, especially in terms of modern sociology and psychology, to Kant's view on why we are moral. Many will have studied Freud in the context of the source of moral awareness and may therefore use his beliefs as a support to their analysis. They could, for example, assess the idea that it is our families and peers who affect our morality and it has nothing to do with any divine being. | | |
| | | | Others may take a more analytical approach and discuss the inherent problems in a view which requires the assumption that 'ought implies can'. Kant's notion seems to be that if it makes no sense to tell someone that he ought to do something if it is impossible to do so, then whenever we say *ought*, *can* necessarily follows. If they choose this route they will need to assess the extent to which this belief is a genuine challenge to the idea that morality is a social need. | | |
| 3 | a | | **Explain how Irenaeus justified the existence of natural and moral evil.** | 25 | |
| | | | Candidates may begin by explaining that unlike many other philosophers Irenaeus postulates that evil exists for a purpose. In contrast to Augustine, candidates may explain Irenaeus' theodicy as soul-making rather than soul | | |

| Question | | | Indicative Content | Mark | Guidance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | deciding (despite this being modern terminology).<br><br>While this can be a useful introduction, candidates should avoid spending too much time on Augustine. Candidates might develop their explanations through the Irenaean belief that God created human beings in his image but we were intended to work our way towards his likeness.<br><br>They might explain that Irenaeus believed that the work of God was on-going and that without perceived evils such as death and other pains humanity would not learn the need for goodness and repentance. This might be illustrated, for example, with Irenaeus's comparison with the baby who needs to move from their mother's milk towards solids.<br><br>Some might explore the idea that Irenaeus is trying to balance his belief in the free choice of humanity with the work of God being essential to our salvation. Candidates should, in their responses, explore explanations of both natural and moral evil.<br><br>Other candidates may be aware that Irenaeus was challenging Gnosticism, seeking to demonstrate that it is the free choices of humanity working with the actions of God which brings about salvation. | | Conflations with Hick's theodicy should be noted and this material may be used validly to explain Irenaeus' approach. For example, Irenaeus did not believe in universal salvation; indeed, we are to make ourselves moist like clay for the potter's work and if we do not then we may go hell. |
| 3 | b | | **"A good God would not allow any evil to exist in the world." Discuss.**<br><br>Candidates may take a number of approaches to this evaluation. They could for example agree with the statement and focus their analysis on the question of whether or not God actually exists and if he does can he | 10 | |

| Question | | | Indicative Content | Mark | Guidance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | be considered good in any relevant way. Some may approach these ideas through the questions raised by the Euthyphro Dilemma.<br><br>Alternatively they may take a more straightforward approach and evaluate the various attempts to justify the existence of evil and the belief in a good God. This time they could legitimately focus on Augustine if they so choose. Even if they agree with the statement they should make some attempt to engage with the alternative views. | | This approach would allow them to draw on a wide range of the material they have studied and examiners should be careful to expect a full range of responses to this question. Candidates might for example explore issues raised by protest theodicy or process theodicy; or thinkers such as Dawkins, Phillips, Dostoyevsky or Mill. |
| | 4 | a | **Explain why some scholars believe that the existence of Irreducible Complexity in some molecules implies an intelligent designer.**<br><br>Candidates may place their explanations within the context of a scientific response to Darwin's challenge known as 'Darwin's black box'. They might explain that some postulate the view that certain features of the universe and of living things are best explained by an intelligent cause rather than a random process such as natural selection. They may further explain that so far as one can say that Darwinism is an established and generally accepted view of the development of the universe, Intelligent Design can be said to be a direct challenge to the establishment.<br><br>They may then explain the search for biochemical machines which have arguably not evolved within cells. The key here is to explain that some scientists argue that there would seem to be no evidence for the step by step process of evolution. Instead Michael Behe and others are arguing that the data of biochemistry within a cell leads to a belief in molecular machinery which is irreducibly complex, such as blood clotting or biological machines. | 25 | Answers which exclusively focus on classical design arguments (e.g. Aquinas and Paley) have not answered the question and will not gain credit. |

| Question | | | Indicative Content | Mark | Guidance |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Some candidates may use the example of the mousetrap which Behe himself uses, though any explanation should also include an indication that some scientists question the validity of using a non-organic example to explain biochemical processes. | | |
| | 4 | b | **To what extent is Irreducible Complexity a Creationist delusion?** | 10 | |
| | | | Candidates may assess this issue from a scientific or philosophical position. Some may, for example, say that since there is no hard empirical evidence for irreducible complexity then it is both a scientific and creationist illusion. If they take this approach they should demonstrate an awareness of the work of Behe and others and explain why, in their assessment, they fail to make a case for intelligent design in this way. If this is the case they may well conclude that intelligent design is not a valid route for those looking for evidence of God in his creation. Others may challenge the statement and use some of the claims from Behe's book, Darwin's Black Box, or of/from other scholars to make an argument for intelligent design and its conclusions. It is important that candidates demonstrate understanding of the philosophical implications of these beliefs and not just give an AO1 account of the details of irreducible complexity. A balanced assessment may legitimately lead to a conclusion that more evidence is needed before anyone can reasonably say whether or not irreducible complexity exists. | | 'Delusion' is not being used in any technical capacity in this question; any conventional understanding of the word is creditable. |

**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 <br> • little relevant material <br> • some concepts inaccurate <br> • shows little knowledge of technical terms <br><div align="right">*L1*</div> | 1–2 | very little argument or justification of viewpoint <br> • little or no successful analysis <br> • views asserted with no justification <br><div align="right">*L1*</div> |
| | | 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 <br> • knowledge limited and partially accurate <br> • limited understanding <br> • might address the general topic rather than the question directly <br> • selection often inappropriate <br> • limited use of technical terms <br><div align="right">*L2*</div> | 3–4 | a basic attempt to sustain an argument and justify a viewpoint <br> • some analysis, but not successful <br> • views asserted but little justification <br><div align="right">*L2*</div> |
| | | 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 <br> • some accurate knowledge <br> • appropriate understanding <br> • some successful selection of material <br> • some accurate use of technical terms <br><div align="right">*L3*</div> | 5–6 | the argument is sustained and justified <br> • some successful analysis which may be implicit <br> • views asserted but not fully justified <br><div align="right">*L3*</div> |
| | | 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 <br> • accurate knowledge <br> • good understanding <br> • good selection of material <br> • technical terms mostly accurate <br><div align="right">*L4*</div> | 7–8 | a good attempt at using evidence to sustain an argument <br> • some successful and clear analysis <br> • some effective use of evidence <br> • views analysed and developed <br><div align="right">*L4*</div> |
| | | 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 <br> • very high level of ability to select and deploy relevant information <br> • accurate use of technical terms <br><div align="right">*L5*</div> | 9–10 | A very good/excellent attempt to sustain an argument <br> • comprehends the demands of the question <br> • uses a range of evidence <br> • shows understanding and critical analysis of different viewpoints <br><div align="right">*L5*</div> |
| | | Communication: answer is well constructed and organised - easily understood; spelling, punctuation and grammar very good | | |

PART OF THE
CAMBRIDGE ASSESSMENT
GROUP

UKAS
MANAGEMENT
SYSTEMS
001