

Religious Studies

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **G571**: Philosophy of Religion

Mark Scheme for June 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

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"> little relevant material some concepts inaccurate shows little knowledge of technical terms. a.c.i.q	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. v lit arg
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. b att	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. b att
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. sat att	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. sust / just
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. g att	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. g att
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. vg/e att	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 vg/e att
Communication: answer is well constructed and organised; easily understood; spelling, punctuation and grammar very good				

- 1 (a) **Explain the Irenaean theodicy.** [25]
A01

Candidates may begin by expressing the idea that, for Irenaeus, evil is meant to serve a purpose. It is key to understanding Irenaeus that his theodicy can be described as 'soul-making' rather than the 'soul-deciding' theodicy of Augustine.

Some may point to Irenaeus' use of Genesis 1:26 where God is described as wanting to make man in his own 'image and likeness'. This means that we may be born in the image of God but we must grow, throughout history, into his likeness. Irenaeus would argue that God intended man to mature over a lengthy time, sending His own Son as a part of this learning process.

Evil is therefore sent as part of this maturing of humanity; without evils such as death and other pains we would not learn the need for goodness and repentance.

For Irenaeus humanity needs to be patient much like the clay in the hand of a potter, one of his favourite images. However the clay that is humanity needs to work with the potter and not harden to the work and be discarded. The idea that everyone will eventually be saved seems to be a later interpretation which is not found in Irenaeus' own writings; indeed Irenaeus suggests that those who harden themselves will go to hell.

Candidates are likely to use the interpretations of these writings used by Hick. They may say that for Hick something's goodness may depend very much on its purpose. He argues that a world without pain or the possibility of pain might be a very good world in itself, but it would not be a good world for the purpose of soul-making. If God made this to be a world in which we could develop, then this creation, Hick argues, suits that purpose well.

- (b) **To what extent can evil be said to be simply a test?** [10]
A02

Candidates may begin by exploring the issue that, while some may believe that this life is simply a test to achieve eternal life, this is not what the theodicies are actually saying.

Some may address the issue as to whether or not there is any justification for suffering such as the death of a child which would help a parent to 'mature'. This may lead to the often expressed view that there is simply too much evil present in the world, both moral and natural, for any argument to justify its existence.

Others may make use of stories such as the man described in the Christian gospels as being born blind so the power of God may be shown through Christ's cure of him.

- 2 (a) **Explain Hume's criticisms of the Cosmological Argument.** [25]
A01

Candidates may begin by exploring the fact that Hume had problems with the very notion of causation. He pointed out that while we are very comfortable using the language of causation, scientifically it is much more problematic. Some may discuss the idea of a cue ball being responsible for a red ball moving on a snooker table.

However Hume argued that we should consider the moment when the cause is succeeded by the effect. Immediately before the moment, the cause is not yet the effect. Immediately after, the effect is no longer the cause. He asks what happens at the precise moment when the cause is not yet the effect and the effect is no longer the cause?

Some may point out that Hume goes on to argue that what we term cause and effect may be no more than a statistical correlation; though others may say that common sense may itself undermine his argument.

In order to make sense of these beliefs in terms of the question, candidates will also have to explain what the Cosmological argument is and why it is believed by some that Hume may have undermined the success of the proof, such as it was.

- (b) **To what extent was Hume successful in his critique of the cosmological argument?** [10]
A02

Candidates may begin by taking the question apart and evaluating what might count as success in this context. Did anyone who previously believed in this as a way to understanding God have their beliefs destroyed?

Alternatively they may criticise what Aquinas or others were trying to do when they used this argument as a proof for the existence of God and assess whether or not Hume has succeeded in his attempts. Will an analysis of how we understand cause and effect really stop religious people or philosophers from trying to argue from the way the world works back to a creator who actually put the world in motion?

Candidates' conclusions are less important than the extent to which they have considered more than one point of view and not just repeated the views of others with no demonstrable understanding.

3 (a) Explain Aristotle's understanding of the four causes. [25]

A01

Candidates may be aware that Aristotle developed his notions of the concept of cause and effect in the *Metaphysics*. They may also be aware that the idea became central to all of his work.

Some may outline, with some explanation, the four types of cause he describes in his work; material, formal, efficient and final. This may lead to an exploration of how one leads on from the other.

Without a material cause nothing would exist and hence it is the first cause; however 'wood' without a formal cause could never be a desk. Candidates may note that the form of a desk is, in this case, immanent and not related to Plato's Forms.

Some may then argue that it becomes clear that for a piece of wood to take the form of something like a desk there has to be a desk maker, and hence an efficient cause. This may lead some onto a discussion of the importance of the way Aristotle understands 'final cause' or for him the purpose of any thing. His belief that all nature has a purpose is going to become very important for much of the rest of his metaphysics.

(b) Aristotle's four causes fail as a description of the real world. Discuss. [10]

A02

Some candidates may begin by exploring what might be meant by the real world in this or any other context. They may compare Aristotle's attempts to understand the nature of the world with that of his teacher Plato, assessing whether or not his description was any more successful.

Others may assess the extent to which Aristotle's views are an accurate description as they stand of the world; might it not be said, for example, that the extinction of many species would argue that not everything has a purpose?

4 (a) Explain Paley's argument for the existence of God. [25]

A01

While many candidates may focus on Paley's watch analogy, some may be aware that in his *Natural Theology* he has developed many different approaches to the teleological argument, drawing on the science of his day.

He describes the human eye as an organ of extraordinary flexibility and ability. He also noted the way the wing of a bird and the fin of a fish seem to be engineered to allow flight or movement through water. Added to this was the way the planets rotate and the seasons change all with regularity and purpose.

Those who focus on a description of the watch analogy may add these comments which Paley made:

Our inference would not be weaker even if we had never seen a watch before; the watch is so obviously different from the rock that it must have a different source. Even if the watch did not work perfectly, there is enough design to enable us to deduce the watchmaker. In the same way, our inference would still hold even if there were parts of the machine whose function we could not work out.

Some candidates may explain Paley's distinction between order *qua* regularity and order *qua* purpose.

(b) 'The universe has no purpose.' Discuss. [10]

A02

Some candidates may begin by attacking the statement and assessing some of the views of philosophers who argue for purpose in the universe. They may for example assess the extent to which Paley, even if he was right about design, was right to suggest that this design had a purpose.

Others, using the views of Darwin, may critically examine the idea that evolution is progressive, which might be used as an argument for purpose.

Others may attack this idea suggesting that entropy, the second law of thermodynamics, may mean that ultimately everything in the universe will fall apart and that therefore there can be no purpose.

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

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

