GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2017

AS (NEW)
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - COMPONENT 2
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION
B120U20-1

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2017 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.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Marking guidance for examiners, please apply carefully and consistently:

Positive marking

It should be remembered that candidates are writing under examination conditions and credit should be given for what the candidate writes, rather than adopting the approach of penalising him/her for any omissions. It should be possible for a very good response to achieve full marks and a very poor one to achieve zero marks. Marks should not be deducted for a less than perfect answer if it satisfies the criteria of the mark scheme.

Exemplars in the mark scheme are only meant as helpful guides. Therefore, any other acceptable or suitable answers should be credited even though they are not actually stated in the mark scheme.

Two main phrases are deliberately placed throughout each mark scheme to remind examiners of this philosophy. They are:

- "Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant points should be credited."
- "This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives."

Rules for Marking

1. Differentiation will be achieved on the basis of candidates' response.

2. No mark scheme can ever anticipate or include every possible detail or interpretation; examiners should use their professional judgement to decide whether a candidate's particular response answers the question in relation to the particular assessment objective.

3. Candidates will often express their ideas in language different from that given in any mark scheme or outline. Positive marking therefore, on the part of examiners, will recognise and credit correct statements of ideas, valid points and reasoned arguments irrespective of the language employed.

Banded mark schemes

Banded mark schemes are divided so that each band has a relevant descriptor. The descriptor provides a description of the performance level for that band. Each band contains marks. Examiners should first read and annotate a candidate's answer to pick out the evidence that is being assessed in that question. Once the annotation is complete, the mark scheme can be applied. This is done as a two stage process.

Banded mark schemes stage 1 – deciding on the band

When deciding on a band, the answer should be viewed holistically. Beginning at the lowest band, examiners should look at the candidate's answer and check whether it matches the descriptor for that band. Examiners should look at the descriptor for that band and see if it matches the qualities shown in the candidate's answer. If the descriptor at the lowest band is satisfied, examiners should move up to the next band and repeat this process for each band until the descriptor matches the answer.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

If an answer covers different aspects of different bands within the mark scheme, a ‘best fit’ approach should be adopted to decide on the band and then the candidate's response should be used to decide on the mark within the band. For instance if a response is mainly in band 2 but with a limited amount of band 3 content, the answer would be placed in band 2, but the mark awarded would be close to the top of band 2 as a result of the band 3 content.

Examiners should not seek to mark candidates down as a result of small omissions in minor areas of an answer.

Banded mark schemes stage 2 – deciding on the mark

Once the band has been decided, examiners can then assign a mark. During standardising (at the Examiners’ marking conference), detailed advice from the Principal Examiner on the qualities of each mark band will be given. Examiners will then receive examples of answers in each mark band that have been awarded a mark by the Principal Examiner. Examiners should mark the examples and compare their marks with those of the Principal Examiner.

When marking, examiners can use these examples to decide whether a candidate's response is of a superior, inferior or comparable standard to the example. Examiners are reminded of the need to revisit the answer as they apply the mark scheme in order to confirm that the band and the mark allocated is appropriate to the response provided. Indicative content is also provided for banded mark schemes. Indicative content is not exhaustive, and any other valid points must be credited. In order to reach the highest bands of the mark scheme a learner need not cover all of the points mentioned in the indicative content, but must meet the requirements of the highest mark band.

Awarding no marks to a response

Where a response is not creditworthy, that is it contains nothing of any relevance to the question, or where no response has been provided, no marks should be awarded.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

AS Generic Band Descriptors

Band	**Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions** 25 marks *Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:* - *religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching* - *influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies* - *cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice* - *approaches to the study of religion and belief.*
5	**21-25 marks** • Thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • An extensive and relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates extensive depth and/or breadth. Excellent use of evidence and examples. • Thorough and accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	**16-20 marks** • Accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A detailed, relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples. • Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	**11-15 marks** • Mainly accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A satisfactory response, which generally answers the main demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth in some areas. Satisfactory use of evidence and examples. • Mainly accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	**6-10 marks** • Limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Basic level of accuracy and relevance. • A basic response, addressing some of the demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth, including limited use of evidence and examples. • Some accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	**1-5 marks** • Very limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Low level of accuracy and relevance. • A very limited response, with little attempt to address the question. • The response demonstrates very limited depth and/or breadth. Very limited use of evidence and examples. • Little or no reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. **N.B. A maximum of 2 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'**
0	• No relevant information.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Band	**Assessment Objective AO2- Part (b) questions** *25 marks* *Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.*
5	**21-25 marks** • Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue. • A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set. • Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	**16-20 marks** • Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue. • The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed. • The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	**11-15 marks** • Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue. • Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed. • Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	**6-10 marks** • Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue. • A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed. • A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	**1-5 marks** • A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue. • An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set. • Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence. • Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary.
0	• No relevant analysis or evaluation.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Component 2: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion

MARK SCHEME

To be read in conjunction with the generic level descriptors provided.

Section A

1. (a) Outline Aquinas' cosmological arguments for the existence of God.

[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Aquinas offers an 'a posteriori' argument, based on empirical evidence of the world around us. He claims that everything that exists was caused by something else. However, God is a self-causing and necessary being, but this is based on probability rather than proof. Something must have started this off without being created themselves.
- Aquinas offers his first three ways for proving the existence of God– the First Way is that God is the initiator of change and motion in all things. Aquinas was most interested in changes of state – moving from potentiality to actuality. Whatever is moved must be moved by another. there must be a first mover, moved by no other.
- The Second Way is that God is the first cause, from which all subsequent causes depend. It follows that every effect has a cause, infinite regress is impossible and therefore there must be a first cause. The first cause sees God as a factual necessity because God acts on things. However, in the second, the attention is on things as agents, doing the acting upon.
- The Third Way is necessity to contingency. The world consists of contingent items, that is, beings that are generated and perish. Everything depends on factors beyond themselves and God exists necessarily not contingently, because if all beings ceased to exist there would be nothing now. There must be a being that is necessary rather than contingent. God is distinct and separate from the universe and God is necessary being. The universe is contingent upon God. Expressed formally it is; some contingent beings exist. if contingent beings exist, then a necessary being must exist.
- Aquinas' view is based upon the unverified premise that (i) the universe was created (ii) that the creator was God (iii) God does not need a cause and (iv) the universe is contingent and depends on God.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

1. **(b)** 'Aquinas' cosmological arguments are not convincing.'

Evaluate this view. **[AO2 25]**

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Arguments against Aquinas tend to centre on the view that his assumptions are no longer widely held. He also doubts infinite regress and prefers a hierarchy of causes.
- He also saw God not just as another being like everything else in the universe, but bigger. God is of a totally different order.
- God does not appear to have a cause and that it does not follow that God must be the 'first cause'. Moreover, the concept of a necessary being is not meaningful and the argument is based on unverifiable assumptions about God being creator and first cause. The 'Big Bang' theory of the origin of the universe does not require God.
- Why can't the different forms of the three ways lead to a different God for each? Why should it point to the Christian god? Indeed, the originator God may no longer exist.
- Arguments which support Aquinas include the reasoning leading to the existence of God uses scientific principles of cause and effect.
- Further, it is a very old argument that is 'a posteriori' and based on empirical evidence and can support the scientific notion of the 'Big Bang'.
- For instance, if everything in the universe is contingent, then everything could cease to exist simultaneously and the universe itself would cease.
- Useful scholars may include Hume's opposition to the concept of a necessary being. Russell's view that the universe is simply 'brute fact' and Hawking's view that the 'Big Bang' was spontaneous and does not require God.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

2. **(a)** Outline the teleological arguments of Aquinas and Tennant for the existence of God.

[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- This is an 'a posteriori' argument which is inductive and based on empirical experience. It relies on the notion that certain aspects of the universe display evidence of being deliberately designed. It is Aquinas' Fifth Way, offering the view that non-intelligent matter which achieves a purpose/ end, implies an intelligent designer.
- It infers the existence of God from the existence of the universe, in a similar way, the argument infers the existence of God from a particular aspect or character of the world, namely the presence of order, regularity and purpose.
- Order, regularity and purpose are seen as marks of design.
- Beneficial order could not have happened by chance. Therefore, we must be directed to something that has intelligence, which we call God.
- Non-intelligent material things produce beneficial order. The beneficial order of the universe could not have just happened to occur. God exists as the explanation of beneficial order.
- Tennant uses the aesthetic argument that the beauty of the world, art, music, literature, suggests intelligent designer who wants creation to be enjoyed. The 'Anthropic Principle' highlights intelligent design because of the universe's suitability for human life.
- Nature seems to plan in advance for the needs of animals and humans. this cannot be accounted for by physical laws alone.
- Intricate relationships found in science relating to the development of living organisms show that things cannot have just happened – it looks like the presence of overall direction, working together for our benefit, just as if the universe knows that we are coming.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

2. **(b)** 'Scientific explanations for order in the universe are more persuasive than teleological arguments.'

Evaluate this view. **[AO2 25]**

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- In support of scientific explanations it could be claimed that design is only apparent, with no proof of intention or a designer God.
- The so-called 'God of gaps' argument is unnecessary in scientific age.
- Moreover, Darwin and evolution provide better explanation than the 'Genesis' account of creation. In particular, natural selection explains problem of evil better than intelligent designer theories.
- The teleological argument claims to be based on empirical observation of apparent design, order and purpose – this is a scientific method. Therefore, the argument rests on the same assumptions as scientific theories.
- Behe goes on to argue that the universe is mechanistic, driven by biological impulses.
- Against these claims, opponents argue that science changes and develops and, therefore, scientific evidence is not necessarily a definitive challenge.
- It is also ''a posteriori' and therefore based on empirical evidence.
- Scientific findings have drawn attention to the complexities of nature, leading some to conclude the most 'reasonable' explanation is God.
- Others, such as Dawkins and Atkins argue that random changes can lead to order and complex systems can be self-arranging.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

Section B

3. (a) Outline the challenges to the ontological argument with reference to Gaunilo and Kant.

[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- The Ontological Argument is 'a priori' and attempts to prove God's existence by using the meaning of the word 'God'.
- It is deductive (conclusion follows from the premises) and analytic because the truth or falsity of the argument is determined by the meaning of the words used.
- Critics argue that there is no clear agreement on what the word 'God' means or the definition could simply be wrong.
- However, whatever one believes, it still covers the notion that nothing can be thought to be greater than God.
- A further criticism is the idea of the 'greatest or more perfect being.' is this meaningful and does 'most loving' have a maximum?
- Gaunilo's challenges centres on the view that replacing the word 'God' with 'greatest island' produces true premises, but a false conclusion. The greatest island must possess all perfections, including existence.
- Therefore such an island must exist but in reality it does not. We can always think of a bigger or better island, but such an island cannot have an 'intrinsic maximum.'
- Kant argues that existence is not a real predicate because it does not tell us what an object is like.
- Moreover, the words 'exist' merely states that a concept has an actuality. It does not actually add anything to the concept. The real contains no more than the merely possible.
- He challenges the view that God is a necessary or 'first order' predicate as it only uses concepts and not realities. He claimed that God cannot be argued into existence and, therefore, existence cannot be a predicate. Thus, if you have a triangle, then you must have three angles, but if you do not have a triangle, then you do not have three angles.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

3. **(b)** 'The challenges to the ontological argument are ineffective.'

Evaluate this view. **[AO2 25]**

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- The ontological argument is regarded as effective because it is an 'a priori' argument and a deductive proof with logically inescapable conclusion. This is attractive to believers of theistic religions, because, for them, the existence of God is self-evident.
- Modern versions of the argument still arise, showing the reasonableness of the ontological argument and worth pursuing, principally because, they claim, it has a logically inescapable conclusion.
- Those who disregard it cite the effectiveness of counter-claims e.g. Gaunilo's 'greatest island.' Moreover, there is a powerful and obvious conclusion that you cannot define something into existence.
- Critics also argue that the argument defines God into existence.
- The argument goes on to suggest that we cannot explain the concept of God properly without coming to the conclusion that he exists.
- Anselm's response was that God is unique and has necessary existence.
- Kant disagreed, saying that no contradiction arises if both subject and predicate are rejected. Kant denies existence as a real predicate-a concept is not made greater or more perfect by claiming that it is.
- In addition, the premises of the ontological argument may not be true as they stem from medieval times and do not take account of modern science.
- Alternatively, we simply say that the existence of God is a 'special case'.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

4. **(a)** Explain how Irenaean type theodicies offer a solution to the problem of evil.

[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Irenaean type theodices offer a solution to the problem of evil by claiming that God is not responsible for the creation of evil and that spiritual development comes through suffering.
- It is a soul making theodicy, Humans are not created perfect, but are developing towards perfection. Humanity is formed in the image of God, but not in his likeness. Humanity does not have this yet because the content of God must be developed.
- Ultimately, humanity will develop and mature, through soul-making. This is achieved by developing, through suffering, a conscious fellowship with God.
- God creates humans imperfectly in order that they can develop over time and gives free will and the choice to follow good or evil. If there was no evil, then there could be no choice.
- Moreover, God creates at an 'epistemic distance' and goodness and perfection are found through willing co-operation with God.
- The world is a place of 'soul-making' and eventually, evil will be overcome and humanity will develop into God's perfect likeness. Without suffering, humans could not develop positive qualities such as love, faith and compassion.
- Evil and suffering are worthwhile because of the eventual outcome. Human goodness will come from making free and responsible choices, in situations of difficulty and temptation.
- This is better than being born into goodness with no chance to grow or develop.
- This situation also leads to the development of 'greater goods' (Hick) e.g. moral responses to evil and growth of courage, compassion and forgiveness.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

4. **(b)** 'Irenaean type theodicies are not compatible with a 21st Century world view.'

Evaluate this view. **[AO2 25]**

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- In support of this view is the reliance on the existence of God. If God does not exist, the theodicy fails. Further, is the end-result either guaranteed or achievable? If the end-result is not realised, then how can the evil and suffering experienced be justified?
- Moreover, claims about humans being encouraged by suffering into greater spiritual growth and development would be unverifiable. The challenges of the world do not always result in genuine human development and often seem to produce nothing but greater suffering and misery.
- Further, does the end justify the means? Why is there such huge suffering e.g. the Holocaust? How does the experience of Auschwitz fit into God's plan for human progress?
- Could the same progress be achieved with less suffering?
- What is the point of atonement and Christ's death on the Cross?
- Couldn't God have done this all more quickly and with less suffering? Could he not have given us several lifetimes to achieve the same end?
- Against this view is the notion that if there is an all-powerful and all-loving God, he would have created such a world – one that would encourage human growth and development.
- The world is not perfect and testimony suggests that many people have developed spiritually as a result of suffering.
- Also, the existence of good and evil gives humans the right to choice and freewill – which could well be the intention of a loving God. Not forgetting, science has not disproved the existence of God.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

5. (a) Examine the nature of religious experience with reference to visions **and** mysticism.

[AO1 25]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- It can be claimed that God is experienced beyond ordinary empirical evidence, through what may be known as a religious experience. It is usually individual and subjective, though may be corporate.
- Visions may be sensory, involving external objects, sounds or figures, often containing a message or warning.
- They can be dream or intellectually-based, for instance as inspiration, insight or instruction. Occasionally, they can come as a revelation of inner truth.
- A vision is a message from God and supported by Biblical reference (e.g. Moses in Exodus 3). This possibility is supported by wide personal testimony - Lourdes, Fatima, Walsingham and by Tillich's feeling of 'ultimate concern'.
- Visions often require prayer, interpretation and response from the experient – for example, a change of life-style. Noted mystics and visionaries include St Teresa and Julian of Norwich.
- Visions may be sensory if they are encountered by a group, for example the Angel of Mons or Lourdes.
- Most occur when the experient is conscious and able to differentiate between the experience and a dream. Experients testify to feelings of great joy, exultation and intellectual illumination which is impossible to describe, sense of reality and truth – the 'otherness' of God. Alternatively, they may be ineffable and beyond human expression.
- Mysticism is an experience of having apprehended an ultimate reality - an awareness of the presence of God and the unity of all things in one substance and one life. It may be a sense of union with God, a sense of dependence, separateness or a sense of great joy and well-being. It can be classified as either extrovertive (outward-looking) or introvertive (inward-looking).
- Sometimes, the experience may be ecstatic - a filling of the soul with bliss and peace, as, for example, experienced by Teresa of Avila.
- Unitive experiences suggest a uniting of the soul with reality, sometimes involving a feeling of separation from God or a sense of loss.
- Other possibilities include feelings of transcendence – that is, not localisable in space and time.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.

5. (b) 'Visions and mysticism are valid means of communicating religious teaching and belief.'

Evaluate this view. **[AO2 25]**

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Those in favour would cite the sheer weight of testimony in support of visions and mysticism as a means of communicating religious teaching and belief. There is the encouragement of the sheer weight of testimony in support and the claims of supporters to have heard and/ or experienced God and had changed lives.
- Moreover, if God exists, this would surely be the way God might choose to communicate. There are also testimonies to answered prayer and miracles. Some claim that, where visions and mysticism are concerned, God is the simplest explanation.
- Religious experience may also be akin to sense experience – we experience people so we should be able to experience God. A religious experience should make a notable difference to the religious life of a person and lead them to a new life marked by wisdom, humility and goodness.
- Those against claim that visions and mysticism may be the result of delusions, hallucinations or may be drug-induced. Moreover, they are contrary to everyday experience and could simply be misunderstandings.
- Others may argue that we cannot experience God as we experience people since we cannot experience the non-corporeal. It would also be difficult to differentiate between recognizing God and other possible objects of experience. For instance, God is said to be the creator, but how could this attribute be recognised?
- If God does not exist, how can he be experienced? Why doesn't everyone experience God? Critics argue that such experiences could be wishful thinking/ or stemming from mental/ psychological needs.
- Visions and mysticism are phenomena which just cannot be verified.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.