

**A LEVEL**

**Examiners' report**

# **RELIGIOUS STUDIES**

---

**H573**

For first teaching in 2016

**H573/01 Summer 2022 series**

# Contents

Introduction .....	3
Paper 1 series overview .....	4
Question 1* .....	5
Question 2* .....	6
Question 3* .....	7
Question 4* .....	9

## Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. A selection of candidate answers is also provided. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

A full copy of the question paper and the mark scheme can be downloaded from OCR.

### Advance Information for Summer 2022 assessments

To support student revision, advance information was published about the focus of exams for Summer 2022 assessments. Advance information was available for most GCSE, AS and A Level subjects, Core Maths, FSMQ, and Cambridge Nationals Information Technologies. You can find more information on our [website](#).

#### Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this PDF as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Export to** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for PDF to Word converter).

## Paper 1 series overview

The Philosophy of Religion paper assesses AO1 knowledge and understanding (40% of the marks available) and AO2 analysis and evaluation (60% of marks).

Candidates who did well on this paper generally did the following:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally did the following:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• embedded the evaluation throughout the essay, using the material as a vehicle for discussion</li> <li>• focused directly on the question rather than more general issues raised by the topic</li> <li>• often outlined what was going to be argued at the beginning of the essay with a hypothesis and reasons, developed this through the essay</li> <li>• carefully selected relevant material rather than all material around the topic.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• wrote everything they knew from a section of the specification without tailoring it to the question being asked</li> <li>• presented a confusion of philosophical ideas</li> <li>• evaluated by juxtaposition of different views, rather than develop reasons why one was stronger or weaker</li> <li>• used what seemed like pre-prepared responses, often ignoring the question set.</li> </ul>

This paper proved accessible to the cohort of candidates. It presented candidates with appropriate challenges and it differentiated effectively. Most candidates were able to write three full-length essays without much difficulty. Sometimes timing or knowledge issues were evident as a few candidates only answered one or two questions instead of three. An absence of planning at the start of essays was noticeable, some responses would have benefitted from this before writing.

Candidates performed well on Question 1 as they were able to apply a breadth and/or depth approach to Augustine's theodicy. There were some excellent responses to Questions 2, 3 and 4. In general, successful responses were able to focus on the question set throughout the essay rather than shifting the attention towards the general topic during explanation or analysis.

Where candidates were less successful in Questions 2, 3 and 4 it was due to a lack of developed explanations of the ideas being presented, sometimes including misconceptions of the subject matter. On occasions, there was a tendency towards underdeveloped explanations leading to analysis that could have benefitted from a firmer grasp of the details being assessed.

### Question 1\*

1\* 'Augustine's theodicy justifies evils in the world.' Discuss.

[40]

This was the most consistently well-answered question on the paper as most candidates were able to explain some parts of Augustine's theodicy and give some reasons why it might not succeed. Candidates could identify how Augustine used the story of the Fall and the impact this had on his view of how evil entered the world. More successful responses moved the content beyond explanation and into critical analysis. What marked out the very best was the appreciation of the subtlety of Augustine's argument, including the principle(s) of plenitude, harmony or the aesthetic principle and the reasons why God might give less grace to some of the angels, although this was not required for the top marks.

Some responses chose to compare Augustine's theodicy with that of Hick in his development of Irenaeus' thinking; sometimes this was successful as an approach, where detailed comparison with Augustine was made, but sometimes candidates moved away from Augustine and wrote explanations of an Irenaean theodicy instead of giving much detail about Augustine, only returning to Augustine in the conclusion.

Less effective responses provided either a cursory overview of Augustinian thought or only considered certain elements. This led to a less comprehensive response. It also often meant that key concepts were missing which meant that the analysis provided was either less coherent due to factual error or omission of ideas that could have strengthened it further. Some responses appeared pre-prepared, writing something on Augustine, Irenaeus and Hick, ignoring the question at times.

A good range of criticisms were used. It was good to see Schleiermacher's arguments used well by candidates. Many simply stated the inconsistent triad without using it as a direct challenge to Augustine. Those that did, generally argued very well. Candidates made good use of the Darwinian/Dawkins line to refute the argument of seminal presence, but less successful responses did not engage fully in this. D.Z. Phillips' critique of Swinburne's didactic evil, suggesting that evil can never be an expression of a loving God, was not relevant to Augustine but was asserted in a number of responses.

### Exemplar 1

		Adam and Eve came to earth as perfectly moral beings, but were tempted by a fallen angel to eat the forbidden fruit. This means, Adam and Eve misused their free will, which corrupted our souls as humans, this explains why moral and natural exists. Augustine describes evil as privation, a lack of good.
--	--	--

Exemplar 1 illustrates some accurate knowledge but would have benefitted from a more thorough development of the ideas presented by Augustine. The language and expression was simplistic at times (not a bad thing in itself), which led to a lack of depth or breadth of understanding of Augustine's theodicy. The response is hinting at Original Sin but does not go further than this. The analysis present was generally successful when compared to the levels of response. Unlike Exemplar 1, this response went on to Hick without any specific reference to Augustine and why this would be seen as a useful critique of whether Augustine's theodicy justifies evils in the world.

## Question 2\*

2\* Critically assess Aquinas' Fifth Way.

[40]

Question 2 produced a variety of responses. The knowledge of Aquinas' argument was good at times but often underdeveloped. Several responses spent insufficient time explicating Aquinas' Fifth Way, instead choosing to press on to an explanation of Paley's teleological argument, which was not always made relevant. Many candidates correctly identified Aquinas' arrow and archer analogy, but it was an even split between those who explained it correctly and those who did not explain it or explained it incorrectly, preferring to attribute this to design qua purpose. More successful responses were able to identify how Aquinas' argument linked to design rather than chance. A significant number ended up using the analogy to explain that there was a first mover or something that actualised the arrow rather than linking it to telos/non-intelligent objects. Good use was made of examples such as rivers flowing to the sea, perennial flowering, or pollination by bees to show understanding of order by regularity.

Some candidates wrote a little about the Fifth Way but ended up writing about the Second Way. A small number of responses included a hybrid of the teleological and cosmological arguments found in the Five Ways. A very small number simply wrote about the first three Ways.

The evaluation of Question 2 was approached in several different ways and many of these were very good. Evolution, Hume & Russell were often used well, and Hume was used to good effect in critical analysis of Aquinas. Many candidates evaluated Paley's argument and so the argument was not as succinct and linked back to the question as it should have been. Some candidates directed their arguments to the first of Aquinas' three Ways but this was not successful. Some language was simplistic, and the use of rhetorical questions did not add to the evaluation. The attempt to analyse and evaluate was generally successful, although more concerted work to counter the criticism of the Fifth Way would have been more fruitful. Analysis often took the form of general discussion of design at times, not a specific focus on Aquinas. Some responses were successfully engaged in debates about evolution, Ockham's Razor, and other challenges to *a posteriori* arguments, but this often did not engage in the critical reasoning beyond stating that Aquinas makes too many inductive leaps - a phrase that was rarely justified.

There was some useful expression of Hume's teleological criticisms. More limited responses would use evolution and/or evil in the world but there was little development or link to Aquinas directly. Some used Paley and the anthropic principle to support, but many asserted Paley's arguments either as Aquinas, or simply a continuation of Aquinas, rather engaging in evaluation. Candidates were confused by some of Hume's criticisms and elected to use critiques more fitting for cosmological arguments.

### Misconception



Aquinas' Fifth Way is **design qua regularity**, focusing on order present in natural bodies (that lack intelligence for themselves) being directed by some intelligence. These natural bodies act in a consistent (regular) way to achieve the best result.

## Question 3\*

3\* 'Anselm's four-dimensionalist approach successfully explains God's action in time.' Discuss. [40]

Although least attempted, Question 3 provided some of the richest philosophical discussion during this year's paper. A significant number of responses were successful in identifying this debate and the quality of responses varied based on level of understanding and argumentation – this allowed the question to differentiate well using the levels of response.

Better responses were able to identify that Anselm understands that God IS eternity (rather than BEING eternal), which allows God to be 'everywhere' and 'everywhen' (the essence of the four dimensionalist approach). Some were able to point out, given God's nature as that than which nothing greater can be conceived, God cannot be found in parts but should be understood as wholly simple – making it clear 'wherever' God is, is 'whenever' God is (as God is not divisible). The best responses showed all times and spaces are understood as within God due to God and eternity being one and the same. Other more limited responses were not able to identify that for Anselm eternity is not a property of God, it is God's nature – subsequently Anselm believes a timeless God can act in time. Others made it clear Anselm believes in a God who creates *ex nihilo*, who can be petitioned in prayer and can perform the essential miracles of the Christian faith (and more), such as the incarnation and resurrection. Some were able to argue either these ideas suggest it is not necessarily a logical contradiction of Anselm's theology for God to act in time or that God's immutable nature led to God's impassibility – making the role of Jesus difficult to explain as part of salvation history. Most candidates successfully focused on the resolution Anselm (Boethius) provides to the issue of human freewill and just rewards and punishment by a timeless God, as another perfectly valid view. The strongest responses were able to identify that since all time and space were in God then God can act.

Some candidates made the case God cannot act in time due to Anselm's 'God's immutable and timeless nature', making it impossible for God to 'act' as this would involve change. Less successful responses were unable to move past the similarities with Boethius' concept of a timeless God, outside of the spacio-temporal realm, unaffected but viewing time in one 'simultaneous present'. Successful lines of argument often rejected the transcendent model of God in favour of a God that is in time and able to react in a loving way (overcoming issues with impassibility) with God's creation, responding to prayers and performing miracles. Swinburne and others were used to argue a timeless God cannot act in time due to logical contractions. Some successful counter-arguments suggested that all discussion surrounding God for Anselm should be understood through the lens of analogy as the language to assist in the principle of accommodation when it comes to the finite mind understanding the infinite.

### Assessment for learning



Anselm's view of God's relationship with time can be found in Proslogion Chapters 18-22, widely available online in PDF. This builds on Anselm's ontological argument.

## Misconception



Anselm understands that God IS eternity rather than being eternal – God does not possess attributes for Anselm. God is wholly simple, due to God's perfect nature, so cannot be found in parts as God is indivisible. It is best to understand that all time and space are within God.

## Exemplar 2

actions. This problem meant God could not be loving or just so had to be solved. Boethius' original proposal was a 'presentist' one, whereby humans live in the present moment and God lives in a state of existence 'as if it were' the present. For Boethius, God lived outside of time while humans lived inside it, observing <sup>as if</sup> from a lofty peak above. ~~As a result~~ God's eternal nature meant he saw present, past and future all in simultaneity, while therefore preserving his people's free will but still retaining his all-knowing identity. And while Anselm liked his theory, he also exposed the flaws of it: if God lived in a timeless existence 'as if it were' the present, that means humans had knowledge of <sup>the</sup> five present 'now' and the concept of 'future' while God did not, resulting in Boethius' solution <sup>making</sup> humans <sup>to be</sup> more 'knowing' than God. Anselm correctly and successfully solves this issue: he claimed Boethius was wrong to give the present moment 'ontological privilege' and that the present moment was actually no more real than any other point in time. God still exists in atemporality seeing everything at once, but for Anselm, this was because God existed in all time zones in simultaneity, as not one was more 'real' than the other two.

Exemplar 2 shows an exceptional understanding of the debate regarding God's relationship with time and the development of Boethius present in Anselm's work. The quality of writing here shows how to push forward argumentation with the knowledge and understanding being a vehicle for the debate. Rather than AO1 and AO2 being seen as separate they are skilfully blended together in this response.



## Question 4\*

4\* Critically evaluate Aristotle's views on the Prime Mover.

[40]

This question posed problems for some candidates as they struggled focusing on Aristotle's Prime Mover. Stronger responses showed a detailed understanding of key aspects of Aristotle's understanding of change or 'motus' in the world. They were able to place this in a helpful context of broader Aristotelian thought without becoming unhelpfully drawn away from the prime focus of the question. Many were able to explain the concept of the Prime Mover drawing objects towards their telos. Hughes' example of the saucer of milk and the cat was often well-deployed. The better responses were able to identify that Aristotle did not seek to explain where the universe came from as he believed in pre-existing, chaotic, everlasting matter in a constant state of flux through circular motion. In more successful analyses, contrasts were drawn to the Platonic concept of the Form of the Good, this was done to shed further light on different aspects or critical issues within Aristotle's thinking, rather than as an end in itself. Some candidates challenged Aristotle's view of whether telos was evident in the world, either through referencing existentialist views such as those of Sartre, or with examples of objects having different purposes depending on context. Candidates had learnt that the lack of direct observation of the Prime Mover was a criticism of Aristotle, given his empiricism, and that he could be accused of straying into rationalism.

Less effective responses only gave partial, incomplete explanations of Aristotle's thinking, for example omitting concepts such as progression from potentiality to actuality or aspects of how the Prime Mover interacts with the world as pure actuality. Answers sometimes became weighed down in overly long expositions regarding Plato's cave as a means of trying to explain the idea of the Form of the Good. Some candidates chose to compare the Prime Mover to the God of classical Abrahamic theism. However, some candidates simply noted that they were different, and hence religious believers would not accept the Prime Mover, or that the Prime Mover was 'better' without ever truly engaging in an analysis of Aristotle's reasoning behind his belief in the Prime Mover. There was some use of the concept of gravity and more contemporary cosmology being a better explanation for perpetual motion seen in the world than the Prime Mover.

A number of candidates conflated the Prime Mover with Aquinas' Prime Mover and incorrectly focused on the need for a first cause to a chain of efficient causes and denial of infinite regression. There were aspects of this that were creditable, but it hampered the overall understanding of Aristotle's Prime Mover.

### Assessment for learning



Aristotle's Metaphysics Book XII provides some useful discussion on the Prime Mover, in particular part 7, it is freely available online.

### Misconception



Aristotle's Prime Mover is not to be confused with Aquinas' Prime Mover. The same term is used but they mean different things. Aristotle's Prime Mover is not a creator, since Aristotle believes matter was pre-existing in a state of everlasting circular motion, so the Prime Mover is not the first or efficient cause of the universe.

## Exemplar 3

Aristotle's views on the Prime Mover are similar (but not the same) as Aquinas' views on God. Both believed in a perfect supreme being that other things are made in its image. Aristotle believed that the telos of everything was to become fulfilled by the Prime Mover. The Prime Mover actualises something's potential and achieves its telos. I think that this is comparable to the idea that ~~humanity's~~ <sup>humanity's</sup> telos ~~in life~~ is to become closer to God.

Although comparable, it is important to note that Aristotle's views of the Prime Mover did not depict it as a God. The Prime Mover is only able to recognise perfection, so it can therefore only be aware of its own existence. Aristotle viewed the Prime Mover's ability to actualise the potential of things as just part of its

Exemplar 3 deploys precise knowledge of the Prime Mover throughout, and shows excellent breadth, confidence and engagement with the question. The candidate was able to achieve Level 6 for both its AO1 and AO2. They were able to deploy relevant scholarly thought which demonstrates a nuanced critical engagement with the material used. Again, this is a good example of a script that focuses on driving the essay forward through argumentation rather than separate paragraphs on AO1 and AO2.

---

# Supporting you

---

## Post-results services

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our post-results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#).

## Keep up-to-date

We send a weekly roundup to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates. If you haven't already, [sign up here](#).

## OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. Most of our courses are delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses on the relevant subject page on our [website](#) or visit [OCR professional development](#).

## Signed up for ExamBuilder?

**ExamBuilder** is the question builder platform for a range of our GCSE, A Level, Cambridge Nationals and Cambridge Technicals qualifications. [Find out more](#).

ExamBuilder is **free for all OCR centres** with an Interchange account and gives you unlimited users per centre. We need an [Interchange](#) username to validate the identity of your centre's first user account for ExamBuilder.

If you do not have an Interchange account please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username, or nominate an existing Interchange user in your department.

## Active Results

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. It is available for all GCSEs, AS and A Levels and Cambridge Nationals.

It allows you to:

- review and run analysis reports on exam performance
- analyse results at question and/or topic level
- compare your centre with OCR national averages
- identify trends across the centre
- facilitate effective planning and delivery of courses
- identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle
- help pinpoint strengths and weaknesses of students and teaching departments.

[Find out more](#).

## Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on  
**01223 553998**

Alternatively, you can email us on  
**support@ocr.org.uk**

For more information visit

 **ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder**

 **ocr.org.uk**

 **/ocrexams**

 **/ocrexams**

 **/company/ocr**

 **/ocrexams**

## We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.



**I like this**



**I dislike this**

Please note – web links are correct at date of publication but other websites may change over time. If you have any problems with a link you may want to navigate to that organisation's website for a direct search.



OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2022 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up to date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

You can copy and distribute this resource freely if you keep the OCR logo and this small print intact and you acknowledge OCR as the originator of the resource.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: N/A

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.