

# **Religious Studies**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G571**: Philosophy of Religion

## **Mark Scheme for June 2013**

---

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.

© OCR 2013

## Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
	Level 1 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin
	Level 2 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin
	Level 3 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin
	Level 4 – to be used at the end of each part of the response in the margin
	Level 5 – 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 eg where part of an answer is at the end of the script

**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	Mark	Guidance
1 (a)	<p>Candidates might begin by explaining that Intelligent Design postulates 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. Insofar 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.</p> <p>There is a group of scientists and philosophers who are looking for evidence of design <i>qua</i> order and <i>qua</i> purpose in the universe that shows the need for a designer. This search for design can be found in a number of scientific fields; in this response candidates will be exploring alleged evidence that certain biological observations suggest an intelligent cause which can be tested or evaluated.</p> <p>Explaining Intelligent Design and the use made of this idea by Michael Behe in his biochemical challenge to evolution, candidates may propose that what he seems to be saying in the end is that, in the same way as the laws of Newtonian mechanics do not work when one is describing the world of quantum particles, so evolutionary theory does not explain the biochemical processes which brought about the origin of life or which lead to processes such as blood clotting. Intelligent Design and the search for irreducible complexity may lead some to a god, or it may lead others to a search for new laws or explanations which are entirely part of the natural universe and need no outside agency.</p>	25	<p><b>Explain what is meant by Intelligent Design.</b> This is a question about the science and religion debate, not a request to explain the Teleological Argument.</p> <p>'Intelligent Design' is a technical term, given on the specification, and this question tests knowledge of that area. It refers to a post Darwinian theory of the late twentieth century. Candidates who confuse the concept of Intelligent Design with the intelligent designer of Paley or Aquinas should receive little credit.</p> <p>Candidates may make use of Darwin's Black Box as an integral part of their explanation.</p>

Question		Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
	(b)	<p>Some candidates may begin by exploring what it might mean to 'make sense' in this context. They may for example explore whether or not those scientists who argue for Intelligent Design are going against the accepted rules of science. They may ask if they are jumping to the conclusion that they want, before we have the knowledge and technology to explain scientifically what they want to believe is evidence for the existence of divine creation.</p> <p>Alternatively, candidates may attack the statement in the question and argue for the coherence of attempts to find God in the irreducibly complex. They may, in doing this, evaluate the success or otherwise of attempts to undermine the arguments of scientists such as Michael Behe. It is important that the larger part of this answer is critical and not just another explanation of the case for or against Intelligent Design.</p>	10	<p><b>'The Intelligent Design argument makes no sense.'</b> <b>Discuss.</b></p> <p>Some credit should be given for any relevant argument even where the focus of the answer is elsewhere (e.g. Paley or Aquinas) rather than on Intelligent Design.</p>
2	(a)	<p>Candidates may begin their responses by explaining that Descartes wanted to prove that the objects of the world are much as we perceive them. He could not do this directly, as he could not, by his own arguments, use the evidence of his senses. So he looked for another route. If he could demonstrate that God existed, then he could argue that God does not play tricks on us, and that therefore the world is pretty much as we think it is. But since he could not rely on sense experience to give evidence of God, he had to find an <i>a priori</i> proof which demonstrates that God has to exist – an Ontological argument.</p>	25	<p><b>Explain Descartes' version of the Ontological argument.</b></p> <p>If a candidate confuses Anselm and Aquinas, it is important for examiners to identify material relevant to the question.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Candidates may then explain that Descartes builds his arguments on two notions: firstly, God is by definition perfect. An imperfect God would not be God. So, if God is perfect, he must contain all perfections, including the perfection of existence. If he did not exist he would not be perfect. So, he must exist. Secondly, existence is a defining predicate of the concept of God in exactly the same way that having three sides and three angles is intrinsic to the concept of a triangle. Without three sides there can be no concept of a triangle. Candidates may make use of Descartes' example of the mountain and the valley.</p> <p>Some may point out that a defining predicate is a description that a concept has to have to be itself. It is essentially tautologous – Kant uses the term 'analytic' for a sentence of this type.</p>		
(b)	<p>Some candidates may make use of their knowledge of Kant's critique in their discussion of this statement. They may for example say 'suppose Descartes is right and existence is indeed a defining predicate of the concept of God. There is no contradiction – and hence no impossibility – in rejecting a concept together with all its defining predicates.' They could say that they accept that if God existed then he would necessarily exist, but that they did not believe in him or his necessary existence. There would be no contradiction here, and hence they could argue that there is no such thing as a perfect God.</p> <p>Kant's second objection is based on the belief that existence is not a predicate at all, and therefore cannot be a defining predicate. If we believe that a predicate adds a description to a concept and that existence as a predicate does not work this way then we can conclude that Descartes cannot justify the existence of a perfect God.</p>	10	<p><b>'Descartes has proved that a perfect God exists.'</b> <b>Discuss.</b></p> <p>AO1 style material on Kant should go beyond assertion into considered argument.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
3 (a)	<p>Candidates may begin by explaining that the phrase <i>creatio ex nihilo</i> points to the belief among many theists that God created the universe 'out of nothing'. This means that before the act of creation there was nothing, no material from which to form a universe. Some may explain that this is not a view found in the book of Genesis, though others may explain that it may be inferred from it.</p> <p>Some may point out that the idea came about as a reaction to a form of Gnosticism which saw all matter and material as evil. There was a great deal of philosophical debate around these ideas during the second and third centuries. A clearer statement was put forward by Augustine of Hippo in the late fourth century, where he argued that since God alone is Being, he was able to will to exist what had not existed formerly.</p> <p>Some would argue that this did not become the formal teaching of the Christian Church until the Fourth of the Lateran Councils. This council stated:</p> <p><i>'We firmly believe and openly confess that there is only one true God, eternal and immense, omnipotent, unchangeable, incomprehensible, and ineffable ... Creator of all things invisible and visible, spiritual and corporeal, who from the beginning of time and by His omnipotent power <b>made from nothing</b> creatures both spiritual and corporeal, angelic, namely, and mundane, and then human, as it were, common, composed of spirit and body.'</i></p>	25	<p><b>Explain what is meant by '<i>creatio ex nihilo</i>'.</b></p> <p>Candidates need to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of Intelligent Design as a technical term as per the specification in order to access the higher levels. If candidates only partially address the question by either confusing or conflating Intelligent Design with the designer from, for example, Aquinas or Paley, they may receive some credit.</p> <p>It is not specifically in Genesis though some might argue that it is implicit, though more formally developed by Augustine, prior to the Fourth Lateran Council.</p>



Question	Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
(b)	<p>There are a number of ways to approach this question though it should be significantly different from responses to 4b as the focus of the question is entirely different. Weaker responses may confuse the two though. Here we should be seeing an evaluation of whether or not it is right for a Divinity to judge a creation he is allegedly responsible for making.</p> <p>Candidates may come down on either side of this debate or neither; credit should be given for their ability to justify their thoughts and beliefs in this area. They may for example argue that since this creative act included free will, a situation is brought about where judgment is a just thing both in terms of reward and in terms of punishment. Others may want to use arguments, such as those of determinism, to say that no blame or praise may be attached to human actions.</p>	10	'God should not judge us as he is responsible for the way we are.' Discuss.
4 (a)	<p>Some candidates may begin with a general explanation of what is meant by theodicy and why different attempts have been made to resolve the problems raised by the existence of evil in our world.</p> <p>Those who begin by explaining the view of Augustine may put his thoughts in the context of his Manichean background; the idea that matter and spirit had different origins, coming from different gods. This meant that the task of the believer was to liberate the good, which was purely spiritual, from the wickedness of matter. It was therefore important for Augustine to say that all of creation was made good, and that evil is the going wrong of something created good. Hence evil is a privation and not a thing in itself. To help people make sense of this, Augustine uses the ideas of the Fall of the Angels and the Fall of Man. Some candidates may also make use of his free will defence.</p>	25	<p><b>Explain the theodicies of <u>both</u> Augustine and Irenaeus.</b></p> <p>Candidates are likely to have studied Irenaeus theodicy through the lens of Hick. Examiners should credit both authentic and more modern interpretations of Irenaeus, depending on how the question has approached.</p>

Question	Indicative Content	Mark	Guidance
	<p>Candidates may then go on to explain the different approach of Irenaeus, who believed that evil served a purpose if we understand this world as a vale of soul-making. He believed that the work of God was ongoing, seeing Christ as working alongside our own efforts. Some may point to Genesis 1:26 as key to understanding the Irenaean view. Here God desires to make man in 'his own image and likeness.' For Irenaeus this means that we are made in the image of God, but that it is only through trials that we can be made into his likeness.</p>		
(b)	<p>This is a standard evaluation of whether or not theodicies work. Some candidates may take the view that since we cannot have God's overview of the relative amount of evil in the world we are not in a position to judge what might be considered to be too much. They may for example go along with Leibniz in arguing that we live in the best of all possible worlds.</p> <p>Others may take the view that certain actions today or in the past support the view that the existence of evil and the existence of a loving God are incompatible. It is important however that candidates do not just list the kinds of evil in the world which might undermine belief in a loving God; they must also assess whether or not such views on evil are successful in proving the God of classical theism does not exist.</p>	10	<p><b>'There is too much evil in the world for there to be a God.' Discuss.</b></p> <p>Candidates may refer to any theodicies – the question is not specific to Augustine and Irenaeus.</p> <p>Candidates could legitimately argue that there could be a God other than the God of classical theism.</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"> <li>little relevant material</li> <li>some concepts inaccurate</li> <li>shows little knowledge of technical terms.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L1</i></p>	1–2	very little argument or justification of viewpoint <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>little or no successful analysis</li> <li>views asserted with no justification.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>knowledge limited and partially accurate</li> <li>limited understanding</li> <li>selection often inappropriate</li> <li>might address the general topic rather than the question directly</li> <li>limited use of technical terms.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>some analysis, but not successful</li> <li>views asserted with little justification.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>some accurate knowledge</li> <li>appropriate understanding</li> <li>some successful selection of material</li> <li>some accurate use of technical terms.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L3</i></p>	5–6	the argument is sustained and justified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some successful analysis which may be implicit</li> <li>views asserted but not fully justified.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>accurate knowledge</li> <li>good understanding</li> <li>good selection of material</li> <li>technical terms mostly accurate</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>L4</i></p>	7–8	a good attempt to sustain an argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>some effective use of evidence</li> <li>some successful and clear analysis</li> <li>considers more than one viewpoint.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>very high level of ability to select and deploy relevant information</li> <li>accurate use of technical terms.</li> </ul> <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"> <li>comprehends the demands of the question</li> <li>uses a range of evidence</li> <li>shows understanding and critical analysis of different viewpoints.</li> </ul> <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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2013

