

# **Religious Studies**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G571**: Philosophy of Religion

## **Mark Scheme for January 2011**

---

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils 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 2011

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](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

**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.

### Practical application of the Marking Scheme

General administrative information and instructions are issued separately by OCR.

Apart from preliminary marking for standardisation purposes, which must be carried out in pencil, the first marking of a script should be in red ink. There should be a clear indication on every page that it has been read by the examiner, and the total mark for the question must be ringed and written in the margin at the end of the script; at A2 the two sub-marks for the AOs must be written here as well. Half-marks may not be used.

To avoid giving the impression of point-marking, ticks should not be used within an answer. Examiners should not write detailed comments on scripts; the marks awarded make the assigned Levels of Response completely explicit.

**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.

**AS LEVELS OF RESPONSE – G571-G579**

Band	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> <b>a.c.i.q</b>	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> <b>v lit arg</b>
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> <b>b att</b>	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> <b>b att</b>
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> <b>sat att</b>	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> <b>sust / just</b>
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> <b>g att</b>	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 view point.</li> </ul> <b>g att</b>
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> <b>vg/e att</b>	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> <b>vg/e att</b>
Communication: answer is well constructed and organised; easily understood; spelling, punctuation and grammar very good				

- 1 (a) **Explain what it means to say that 'God is good'.** [25]  
A01

Candidates may begin by describing the Judeo-Christian beliefs about the goodness of God as found in the Hebrew Bible, particularly the description of creation: '...and God saw that it was good.'

Those who have studied beyond the first chapters of the Bible may make use of the teachings found in the Book of Job, the Song of Songs or several of the psalms.

Candidates will be aware that Jewish writers did not question the goodness of God in their minds. Some may express the idea that they saw all of their own goodness and ethical behaviour flowing from God.

Others may make use of their knowledge of what philosophers such as St. Thomas Aquinas would have said about the word 'good' when it is applied to God; namely that God cannot be 'good' in the sense that human beings can be as he is without limit.

One example of this may be that while humanity may be considered good for resisting evil, the same could not be said of a Divinity who is beyond temptation.

- (b) **To what extent are things only good because God commands them?** [10]  
A02

Candidates are likely to recognise the Euthyphro Dilemma in this question centred on the question of where the goodness of God's commands is located.

This may lead candidates to discuss the issues surrounding the Divine Command Theory; asking if it is possible for God to command things which men could describe as unjust or even evil. Was it right, for example, to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah? Surely not everyone in the cities was a sinner?

However if anyone were to suggest that an action of God was wrong then (s)he would have to address the question of where this awareness of right and wrong had come from.

Arising from this would be questions about the possible limitation on the power of God.

- 2 (a) **Explain why some creationists do not believe in the Big Bang theory.** [25]  
A01

Candidates should be aware that there is no one group of people who may be described as creationists, that they come with a variety of beliefs; from the literalists who are often called 'flat earthers' to the 'young earth' creationists who hold that the age of the earth is between 6000 and 10000 years.

Some may discuss the curious attempts of Bishop Ussher and Lightfoot to tie down a particular date; namely nightfall preceding Sunday October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 4004 BC. Others may explore the Omphalos argument, associated with Philip Gosse. He postulated that the appearance of age was put into the world by God despite the earth actually being young.

Finally, some may explain the most commonly accepted theory, among creationists, that of Progressive Creationism, a form of *Old Earth* creationism. If candidates are taking this approach to the question they may point out that a great deal of modern science can be incorporated into this position, where the Big Bang may be seen as a manifestation of the power of God. They may note that supporters of this view do not hold with progressive evolution; instead they argue that God created 'kinds' of organisms in the order seen in the fossil record and that newer 'kinds' were specially created, not mutated from earlier forms.

Candidates may explain the Big Bang by exploring the idea that before this event there was nothing, no time and no space. The theory holds that the universe sprang into existence from a singularity somewhere between 12 and 15 billion years ago.

- (b) **'Scientists are the only ones who can explain why the universe is here.'** [10]  
**Discuss.**  
A02

Candidates' responses to this question will depend a great deal on how they have answered part (a). If they have chosen to take a creationist stance to the questions they may challenge the basis for this statement and critique the very idea that a scientific explanation of the universe is sufficient.

Others may take the view held by Professor Peter Atkins and others that finding God in the Big Bang is the last refuge of the desperate; in which case they may put forward arguments in support of the statement.

Some may suggest that given the limitations of human knowledge, both scientific and religious, that neither position can be held to have sovereignty over the other.

**3 (a) Explain the nature of the problem of evil. [25]**

A01

Candidates are likely to begin their responses with some form of the inconsistent triad as expressed in philosophers such as Epicurus or David Hume. They may focus on God not being all-loving, not being all-powerful or both in their explanations of the triad. It should be clear from their answers that this issue is only a problem for certain descriptions of God. Aristotle's God, for example, would be quite indifferent to human suffering.

Some candidates may split the nature of this problem into two different approaches. Firstly, moral evil, evil which flows from human choices which raises the question as to why God permits human beings to behave as they do; and secondly, natural evil, which is evil which comes from sources other than humanity such as viruses, earthquakes or the not so friendly bacteria.

While some may attempt to address the nature of this problem through the theodicies, it is important that they explore the issue of the nature of the problem and not just write all they know about Augustine's or Irenaeus' attempts to justify its existence.

**(b) 'Moral evil may be the fault of humanity but natural evil is God's fault.' Discuss. [10]**

A02

Some candidates may make an issue of the distinction in the statement that responsibility for the existence of moral evil is at best ambiguous but the evil in the natural world must be the responsibility of God. Many however are likely to focus simply on the question as to whether or not it is right to look for someone or some divinity to blame for any of the many sufferings which are brought about by either nature or man's inhumanity to man.

Some candidates may address the issue of the extent to which, on some interpretations of the Fall, natural evil is something for which human beings generically bear responsibility.

Some candidates may apply their knowledge of the theodicies to explore different ways of responding to this statement. It is important, however, that they apply their knowledge and not just use this as an opportunity to produce an AO1 response to the discussion.

No one particular conclusion is expected from candidates, rather they should be demonstrating an ability to apply knowledge in a critical, evaluative manner to the specific statement.

- 4 (a) **Explain what Kant means by 'Summum Bonum'.** [25]  
A01

Candidates may use Kant's discussion of Hypothetical and Categorical Imperatives as a way into a response to this question. It is important however that they do not just write all they know about the Imperatives.

Others may, recognising the importance of reason to Kant, begin by pointing to his belief that rationally, perfect virtue ought to be rewarded by perfect happiness. It is therefore the combination of perfect happiness and perfect goodness which brings about the Summum Bonum.

Credit may also be given to candidates who choose to discuss the issue of whether or not Kant is right to say that the Summum Bonum should be achievable as 'ought' implies 'can'.

Others may discuss the question of whether the existence of the idea of a Summum Bonum leads naturally to the conclusion that there should be a God to make sure it happens.

- (b) **'The existence of morality is not evidence for the existence of God.' Discuss.** [10]  
A02

Candidates could take a number of routes to responding to this question. They could for example attack the statement and say that there is no real evidence of morality as such; merely social conventions for getting along with each other and therefore one cannot postulate the existence of a God this way.

Some may say that while morality does exist and is part of human nature there is indeed no reason for suggesting there is therefore a God, merely an evolutionary response to protect the species, for example.

Others may argue that morality does indeed come from an innate sense of duty and that the only way human beings could have that sense is if some higher power placed it there at their creation.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

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 2011