

Religious Studies

Advanced GCE

Unit **G581**: 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

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.

NOTE: AO1 level must be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin, with the AO2 level used immediately below.

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.

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.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	<p>AO1</p> <p>Candidates may begin by placing this issue more generally in the religious language debate provided that they do not just write their ‘everything I know about Verification and Falsification’ essay.</p> <p>They may, for example, begin by exploring the issue that just because a statement has meaning does not indicate that the statement refers to something in the real world.</p> <p>Candidates may unpack this by saying that it is important to notice that for Wittgenstein <i>there are only the games</i>. We cannot get ‘outside’ the games to ask the ‘real’ meaning of words. We can only play another game. To ask the real meaning – perhaps the dictionary meaning – of a word is not to step outside the world of games, but rather to play the lexicography game.</p> <p>Some may point out that this has several significant consequences. Most obviously we cannot get outside games – our linguistic life is a matter of our competence in playing different games: I may confidently play a greater or smaller number of games than you; they will almost certainly not be precisely the same sets of games. This means that we cannot say that one game is intrinsically better or truer than another. Its value and meaning are determined by its own rules.</p> <p>They may note that the language games do not <i>reflect</i> reality – they <i>make</i> it. Wittgenstein has moved away from any notion that language involves pictures of reality, or that there is any one master form of language. If this is so, we cannot ask what reality is like – we can merely play another form of language game – the ‘reality’ language game.</p>	35	<p>A general discussion of religious language which does not specifically focus on Wittgenstein should be considered a general topic answer.</p> <p>It is important that candidates understand this point and do not think that there is some sort of ‘real language’ outside particular games.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>AO2 As they explain these views and how Wittgenstein came to them, they are likely to assess whether or not he made it possible to speak through a religious language game in a meaningful way.</p> <p>Some may conclude that he does not take the debate very far as the meaning is solely dependent on those playing the language game while others may explore the extent to which this ability to play the game itself takes the argument forward.</p>		<p>Candidates might consider Geach's argument that the theory of language games is circular as the meaning of the game is dependent on the meaning of the words and vice-versa. They might argue, as Ayer does, that there would be no reason to prefer the language game of physics to that of witches and warlocks, or consider Patrick Sherry's point that it is legitimate to ask 'Why science?' or 'Why religion?'. A few might mention Kai Nielsen's charge of Wittgensteinian Fideism, but there is no requirement to do so.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	<p>AO1</p> <p>Some candidates may start by pointing out that for many a process of conversion, whether from one faith to another, or from no faith at all, or, indeed, someone discovering a vocation to be a priest, is a gradual matter, with perhaps no Damascus moment like St. Paul but more a person finding new ways of seeing the world.</p> <p>Religious experience might be just seeing ordinary people in new ways, meeting a particular person and being drawn by that person's character, or feeling in a personal way the call of the poor of some developing country as a call from God.</p> <p>For many people, religious experience is not a matter of loud noises, voices, high drama, of visions of eternity, but rather of experiencing ordinary things in a particular kind of way – perhaps in prayer, in joint activity with others, in aesthetic experience or just in the particularity and preciousness discerned in another.</p> <p>Mark Wynn has pointed to the ways that particular places or pilgrimage can mediate the presence of God. When we see the world our understanding is coloured by association.</p> <p>Having outlined what might be meant by a conversion experience, candidates may place the idea within the context of religious experiences in general. Candidates may have studied a number of scholars in this area and provided they focus their responses on the question they may use as many or as few of these writings as they wish.</p>	35	<p>A general discussion of religious experience which does not specifically focus on conversion should be considered a general topic answer.</p> <p>Most candidates will mention William James but focus needs to be specific to conversion. James needs to be used relevantly.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>AO2</p> <p>It is important in their evaluation that candidates clearly assess the extent to which conversion experiences can be seen as evidence, strong or otherwise, for the existence of God. Some might be tempted to write all they know about religious experiences which may lead them to a general topic level of response.</p> <p>Whether they see conversion experience as evidence or delusion it is their evaluation of the issue which should be given credit.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
3	<p>AO1</p> <p>Some candidates may begin by explaining the philosophies of Plato, Boethius or Aristotle where God is argued to be outside and separate from both space and time and therefore unaffected by either. This doctrine, also found in St. Thomas Aquinas and earlier in the Fourth Lateran Council, states that God is not composed or divisible by any physical or metaphysical means. The term 'Simplicity of God' simply means that God is not made up of parts.</p> <p>Candidates may distinguish between descriptions of God as eternal and as everlasting.</p> <p>They may point to this teaching being applied to our understanding of God's entire nature. His being, nature, and substance is that of complete simplicity.</p> <p>Some may discuss the view that in its absolute sense, the term 'eternal' is often taken to mean infinite duration, just as omnipresence may be taken to mean infinite presence. It is however more accurate to say that eternal means a duration without limits whether actual or imagined, without succession and without end.</p> <p>Alternatively some candidates may use some of their knowledge of the writings of Boethius or others and discuss the issues surrounding a God who is outside time; particularly the question of his relationship with his creation.</p>	35	<p>Many candidates might make use of Boethius, but there is no requirement to do so to produce a legitimate response. The question does not specify any particular philosophical view.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>AO2 Depending on the issues explored by the candidates there are a number of routes they may take in their evaluation of the statement in the question.</p> <p>Their evaluations should focus on the problems raised by this particular belief and not get tied down into the question of whether or not a God with this attribute exists at all.</p> <p>In their assessment they should evaluate both positions, possibly in the light of other teachings should they want to. Some candidates might make use of Process Theology or Swinburne's claim that God should be seen as everlasting rather than eternal. They might argue that God in the Judaeo-Christian tradition, at least as read in the Bible, is different from the God of Greek Philosophy.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
4	<p>AO1</p> <p>Candidates may begin by explaining that for Aristotle the soul was the animating principle of the body. The difference between a live body and a corpse is the presence of the soul. When the soul dies, so does the body.</p> <p>They may unpack this notion by saying that the soul is, in Aristotle's sense, the 'form' of the body. But it is not eternal, it dies. Aristotle speculated that perhaps the natural soul, in some form, perhaps as reason, might continue eternally, but he had no notion of personal survival.</p> <p>Dawkins, on the other hand, they may explain, distinguishes between two versions of the soul, which he calls Soul One and Soul Two.</p> <p>Some may explain that by Soul One he refers to a particular theory of life. It is claimed by others that there is something non-material about life, some non-physical vital principle - the theory according to which a body has to be animated by some anima, made conscious by some mysterious thing or substance called consciousness. This means that in the sense of Soul One, for Dawkins, science has either killed the soul or is in the process of doing so.</p> <p>They may then point out that, for Dawkins, Soul Two is very different. They may explain that he believes that there is a second sense of soul which takes off from one of the Oxford Dictionary's definitions: "Intellectual or spiritual power; high development of the mental faculties." They might also mention his belief that the only form of survival is genetic or mention his notion of memes.</p>	35	While awareness of other views on body and soul could be present, it is important that these are made relevant to be rewarded.

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>AO2</p> <p>Candidates may or may not express support for either of these positions or even find similarities between the two. It could be argued that Dawkins is not as far from Aristotle (or Aquinas) as he seems to believe. They might argue that notions of the soul rest on linguistic misunderstanding of the term 'soul' or on outdated science.</p> <p>The question requires <i>critical</i> comparison: successful responses will move beyond mechanical accounts of parallels and differences to genuine consideration of the issues.</p> <p>It is important to notice that this is not a 'life after death' question. Although reference may legitimately be made to issues of survival, this needs to be within the terms of the question.</p>		

APPENDIX 1 A2 LEVELS OF RESPONSE – G581–G589

Level	Mark /21	AO1	Mark /14	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>	1–3	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	6–9	A basic attempt to address the question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> knowledge limited and partially accurate limited understanding might address the general topic rather than the question directly selection often inappropriate limited use of technical terms <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L2</i></p>	4–6	a basic attempt to sustain an argument and justify a viewpoint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some analysis, but not successful views asserted but little justification <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L2</i></p>
Communication: some clarity and organisation; easy to follow in parts; spelling, punctuation and grammar may be inadequate				
3	10–13	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>	7–8	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	14–17	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>	9–11	a good attempt at using evidence to sustain an argument holistically <ul style="list-style-type: none"> some successful and clear analysis some effective use of evidence views analysed and developed <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L4</i></p>
Communication: generally clear and organised; can be understood as a whole; spelling, punctuation and grammar good				
5	18–21	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>	12–14	A very good/excellent attempt which uses a range of evidence to sustain an argument holistically <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

