

Religious Studies

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G571**: Philosophy of Religion

Mark Scheme for June 2012

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, OCR Nationals, 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 2012

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

1. 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.

2. 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 begin by pointing out that in his struggles with the problem of evil, Augustine argues first that the fact that there are things of varying goodness makes for a greater goodness of things as a whole than if there weren't such variety.</p> <p>He then argues that evil is not something fully real (absence of good – <i>privatio boni</i>) but only something dependent on that which is more real, such as disease (which is an evil) can exist only in a body (which is a good).</p> <p>Candidates may then explain that if this position can be maintained, then it will be possible to extend the free-will defence to cover not only those evils usually categorised as moral evils, but also those usually categorised as natural.</p> <p>Others may explain Augustinian beliefs about the fall and its influence on the existence of evil in the world.</p>	25	Answers must focus on natural evil. Moral evil may be relevantly mentioned but should be used in relation to natural evil.
1 (b)	<p>Candidates may agree with this statement and argue that there is no such being as the Christian God, making use of any areas of philosophy they have studied in order to evaluate the statement and come to some sort of conclusion.</p> <p>Some may use the writings of scientists such as Richard Dawkins to support their view that there can be no God. It is important that they evaluate these views and not just write out what Dawkins, Atkins and others say. Others may challenge the idea that 'natural evil' exists at all and use the philosophical writers who hold this position to argue for their view. It is important that they do not just state their views; they must attempt some philosophical justification for them.</p> <p>Others may evaluate the theodicies themselves building on their responses to Part (a).</p>	10	Responses might make use of the inconsistent triad, which is legitimate.

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
2 (a)	<p>For Kant, there are three postulates of practical reason: that we are immortal, that God exists, and that we are free beings. For Kant a key value is <i>autonomy</i>, that is, the notion we are wholly free beings in fair universe. We are capable of choice and, above all, are rational beings.</p> <p>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>The argument Kant gives can be summarised into the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationally, perfect virtue ought to coincide with (be rewarded by) perfect happiness; • The combination of perfect happiness and perfect goodness is the <i>summum bonum</i> ('highest good'); • Clearly this is not achieved in this life. Good things happen to bad people and catastrophes to the virtuous; • Therefore, because the <i>summum bonum</i> <u>ought</u> to be achieved, it <u>can</u> be achieved; • Therefore, God must exist to provide the <i>summum bonum</i> in the afterlife. 	25	<p>Although candidates may very properly refer to or explain the Categorical Imperative, this is not by itself sufficient to answer the question fully. There must be direct reference to God and the afterlife.</p> <p>Some candidates may erroneously assume that Kant believes that we have an innate knowledge of right and wrong. This point should be ignored when marking 2a: what matters is the argument about the <i>summum bonum</i>.</p> <p>Kant himself did not see this argument as a <i>proof</i> of God. Its significance is evidential.</p>
(b)	<p>Candidates may take a number of routes in response. Many, however, are likely to make use of their studies of Freud to develop their arguments.</p> <p>Freud provides a naturalistic account of how moral responsibility and guilt feelings could occur. For Freud, conscience was the internalising of parental prohibitions and demands, so they seem to come from within. This creates the <i>superego</i>.</p> <p>Some may argue that for Freud, the <i>superego</i> symbolically internalises the sense of a father figure and the regulations found in society. They may note that it tends to oppose the <i>id</i>, giving us a sense of the moral and setting up taboos against certain types of feelings and actions.</p> <p>Responses might include the Oedipus complex in which boys go through a phase where they wish to sleep with their mothers and kill their fathers. If it is particularly repressed, through parents, schooling and authority figures in general, the rule of the <i>superego</i> over the <i>ego</i> will be stricter, and the sense of the moral and of conscience castigating our urges will be stronger.</p>	10	<p>The notion of innate morality, as argued by Newman, H.P.Owen, Aquinas or others, may be relevantly used in 2b.</p> <p>The question is not specific to Kant's version of the moral argument.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>Candidates will be aware that Aristotle's most distinctive contribution to the theories for the existence of God is his notion of God as Prime Mover. Some may point out that St Thomas Aquinas would use this notion as the first of his Five Ways – it is an important element in his Cosmological Argument.</p> <p>Some may explain that by motion Aristotle meant more than simply the movement of an object from here to there, as when a football is kicked, or a stone thrown through a greenhouse window.</p> <p>For Aristotle, motion also means change, as for example, when a piece of coal becomes hot – it moves from potential (it is capable of being hot) to actuality (it has become the hot thing it was capable of becoming). The cause of change must be external to the thing itself – something outside heats the coal.</p> <p>They may use his argument that something capable of being heated, such as coal, or moved, such as a football, has to be heated or moved by something itself actually hot (like fire) or moving (like a footballer's boot). Therefore, argues Aristotle, the beginning of the chain which leads to the change must itself be unchanging – it must be actual and not potential. In short, there must be an unmoved mover, the Prime Mover, itself unmoved by something else but attracting all matter by way of charge to actualise its potential.</p>	25	<p>Aquinas' Five Ways, especially the First, may be relevantly used, but a response which dealt only with Aquinas would be unsatisfactory. Knowledge of Aristotle must be explicit.</p> <p>The Prime Mover is not an efficient cause, so responses should emphasise the relationship to <i>telos</i> (purpose and final cause) to demonstrate full understanding.</p>
(b)	<p>In responding to this question, candidates will be able to draw on a number of areas of their studies. They could, for example, respond to Aristotle's argument for a Prime Mover to say either that an accident makes no sense or that there is no evidence of a Prime Mover.</p> <p>Alternatively they could use what they know about the design argument and approach the debate from that point of view; again, arguing for or against an accidental universe.</p> <p>They could even use their knowledge of the science and religion debate. The important issue for their level of response is that they justify whichever views they are putting forward and that they do not just argue by assertion.</p>	10	<p>Some candidates may be aware of Stephen Hawking's recent arguments that the universe is indeed accidental.</p> <p>The problem of evil could be relevantly used as evidence of accident.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Marks	Guidance
4 (a)	<p>Candidates are likely to begin by explaining exactly what is meant by the Forms, pointing to Plato's belief that there exist two kinds of beings, spiritual essences (such as souls), and material beings (such bodies and so on). Each has its proper realm – the realm of reality and the realm of appearances.</p> <p>If we look at this material realm, where we live, everything changes and dies, but souls, being simple, are eternal and unchanging. So, for Plato, parallel with this world, there exists an unchanging and permanent realm which is the realm of souls. Because this does not decay, that is true reality.</p> <p>They may say that Plato saw that in this world all life depends on warmth and light from the sun. We would not be able to see the objects of this world without light from the sun. In the same way, our mental powers need something in the spiritual realm to enable us to understand the truth in the Forms. So, just as we have the sun supreme over appearances, there must be a supreme Form, the Form of the Good, which gives life to the other Forms and understanding to the mind to enable us to have any knowledge of them.</p> <p>This may lead candidates to explain that for Plato the highest knowledge is knowledge of the Form of the Good. No knowledge can be certain but that; and that he further thought that the only people who look beyond beautiful – and imperfect – things in this world and ask 'What is good in itself?' are philosophers.</p>	25	<p>Candidates are expected to notice that they need to go beyond a description of the Forms: they need for higher levels to be explicit about the relationship between the Form of the Good and other Forms. Simply saying what the Form of the Good is would show some understanding, but better responses would be able to state how it affects both the Realm of the Forms and understanding of it.</p>
(b)	<p>Candidates are likely to be aware and begin by explaining Plato's own pupil Aristotle did not believe in this theory and thereby evaluate the extent to which the Forms can teach us anything about the real world.</p> <p>They may, for example, begin by using Aristotle's argument that 'good' comes in so many varieties that there cannot be a single Form of it. The goodness of a person is very different from being a good shovel, a good meal, a good painting, a good horse, or whatever example they may wish to use. Someone who is a good person may be a very bad shovel, and a good rider may be a bad person.</p> <p>This may lead to a critique of the usefulness or not of Plato's methods and conclusions.</p>	10	<p>Most responses will refer to Aristotle, but there is no requirement in the wording of the question to do so. Other arguments may be just as valid, and should be appropriately rewarded.</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 selection often inappropriate might address the general topic rather than the question directly 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 with 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 to sustain an argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some effective use of evidence some successful and clear analysis considers more than one view point <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				
5	21–25	a very good/excellent attempt to address the question showing understanding and engagement with the material <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;"><i>L5</i></p>	9–10	A very good/excellent attempt to sustain an argument <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;"><i>L5</i></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 2012

