



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2023

**A LEVEL
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - COMPONENT 3
A STUDY OF RELIGION AND ETHICS
A120U30-1**

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2023 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

Marking guidance for examiners, please apply carefully and consistently:

Positive marking

It should be remembered that candidates are writing under examination conditions and credit should be given for what the candidate writes, rather than adopting the approach of penalising him/her for any omissions. It should be possible for a very good response to achieve full marks and a very poor one to achieve zero marks. Marks should not be deducted for a less than perfect answer if it satisfies the criteria of the mark scheme.

Exemplars in the mark scheme are only meant as helpful guides. Therefore, any other acceptable or suitable answers should be credited even though they are not actually stated in the mark scheme.

Two main phrases are deliberately placed throughout each mark scheme to remind examiners of this philosophy. They are:

- “Candidates could include some or all of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.”
- “This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.”

Rules for Marking

1. Differentiation will be achieved on the basis of candidates' response.
2. No mark scheme can ever anticipate or include every possible detail or interpretation; examiners should use their professional judgement to decide whether a candidate's particular response answers the question in relation to the particular assessment objective.
3. Candidates will often express their ideas in language different from that given in any mark scheme or outline. Positive marking therefore, on the part of examiners, will recognise and credit correct statements of ideas, valid points and reasoned arguments irrespective of the language employed.

Banded mark schemes

Banded mark schemes are divided so that each band has a relevant descriptor. The descriptor provides a description of the performance level for that band. Each band contains marks. Examiners should first read and annotate a candidate's answer to pick out the evidence that is being assessed in that question. Once the annotation is complete, the mark scheme can be applied. This is done as a two-stage process.

Banded mark schemes stage 1 – deciding on the band

When deciding on a band, the answer should be viewed holistically. Beginning at the lowest band, examiners should look at the candidate's answer and check whether it matches the descriptor for that band. Examiners should look at the descriptor for that band and see if it matches the qualities shown in the candidate's answer. If the descriptor at the lowest band is satisfied, examiners should move up to the next band and repeat this process for each band until the descriptor matches the answer.

If an answer covers different aspects of different bands within the mark scheme, a 'best fit' approach should be adopted to decide on the band and then the candidate's response should be used to decide on the mark within the band. For instance if a response is mainly in band 2 but with a limited amount of band 3 content, the answer would be placed in band 2, but the mark awarded would be close to the top of band 2 as a result of the band 3 content. Examiners should not seek to mark candidates down as a result of small omissions in minor areas of an answer.

Banded mark schemes stage 2 – deciding on the mark

Once the band has been decided, examiners can then assign a mark. During standardising (at the Examiners' marking conference), detailed advice from the Principal Examiner on the qualities of each mark band will be given. Examiners will then receive examples of answers in each mark band that have been awarded a mark by the Principal Examiner. Examiners should mark the examples and compare their marks with those of the Principal Examiner.

When marking, examiners can use these examples to decide whether a candidate's response is of a superior, inferior or comparable standard to the example. Examiners are reminded of the need to revisit the answer as they apply the mark scheme in order to confirm that the band and the mark allocated is appropriate to the response provided. Indicative content is also provided for banded mark schemes. Indicative content is not exhaustive, and any other valid points must be credited. In order to reach the highest bands of the mark scheme a learner need not cover all of the points mentioned in the indicative content, but must meet the requirements of the highest mark band.

Awarding no marks to a response

Where a response is not creditworthy, that is it contains nothing of any relevance to the question, or where no response has been provided, no marks should be awarded.

Eduqas A Level Generic Band Descriptors

Band	<p style="text-align: center;">Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions 20 marks</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching</i> - <i>influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies</i> - <i>cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice</i> - <i>approaches to the study of religion and belief.</i>
5	<p style="text-align: center;">17-20 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • An extensive and relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates extensive depth and/or breadth. Excellent use of evidence and examples. • Thorough and accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Insightful connections are made between the various approaches studied. • An extensive range of views of scholars/schools of thought used accurately and effectively. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	<p style="text-align: center;">13-16 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A detailed, relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples. • Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Purposeful connections are made between the various approaches studied. • A range of scholarly views/schools of thought used largely accurately and effectively. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	<p style="text-align: center;">9-12 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainly accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A satisfactory response, which generally answers the main demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth in some areas. Satisfactory use of evidence and examples. • Mainly accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Sensible connections made between the various approaches studied. • A basic range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	<p style="text-align: center;">5-8 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Basic level of accuracy and relevance. • A basic response, addressing some of the demands of the question set. • The response demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth, including limited use of evidence and examples. • Some accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Makes some basic connections between the various approaches studied. • A limited range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	<p style="text-align: center;">1-4 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Low level of accuracy and relevance. • A very limited response, with little attempt to address the question. • The response demonstrates very limited depth and/or breadth. Very limited use of evidence and examples. • Little or no reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Little or no use of scholarly views/schools of thought. • Very few or no connections made between the various approaches studied. • Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. <p>N.B. A maximum of 2 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'</p>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant information.

Band	<p align="center">Assessment Objective AO2 - Part (b) questions 30 marks <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i></p>
5	<p align="center">25-30 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue. • A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set. • Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • The views of scholars/schools of thought are used extensively, appropriately and in context. • Confident and perceptive analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	<p align="center">19-24 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue. • The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed. • The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Views of scholars/schools of thought are used appropriately and in context. • Purposeful analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	<p align="center">13-18 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue. • Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed. • Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence. • Views of scholars/schools of thought are generally used appropriately and in context. • Sensible analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	<p align="center">7-12 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue. • A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed. • A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence. • Basic use of the views of scholars / schools of thought appropriately and in context. • Makes some analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Some mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	<p align="center">1-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue. • An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set. • Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence. • Little or no use of the views of scholars/schools of thought. • Limited analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied. • Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant analysis or evaluation.

GCE A LEVEL RELIGIOUS STUDIES – COMPONENT 3

A STUDY OF RELIGION AND ETHICS

SUMMER 2023 MARK SCHEME

To be read in conjunction with the generic level descriptors provided.

Section A

Either,

0	1
---	---

 (a) **Explain John Finnis' development of Natural Law.** [AO1 20]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Candidates may set Finnis' theory in context by briefly outlining Aquinas' Natural Law which states that a good action is one that fulfils the God-given purpose of the agent. Aquinas states that this purpose is to establish a right relationship with God.
- Candidates may point out that Finnis' system has more in common with that of Aristotle in its basis in flourishing or well-being (eudaimonia) and practical reasoning (phronesis) and the role of the phronimos (right minded person).
- Finnis offers a slightly different focus to Aquinas stating that the purpose of a human being is to live a worthwhile life and to flourish, thus appearing closer to Aristotle's original concept of eudaimonia as opposed to Aquinas' Beatific Vision.
- Finnis' decision-making approach is based on a set of seven self-evident basic goods which are based on the natural laws of the universe and establish what humans need in order to flourish. An action is therefore good if it participates in one or more of the basic goods in order to achieve the purpose of the agent.
- Candidates may explain that the self-evident nature of a basic good as the basis of practical reason means that his version of Natural law is not open to the Naturalistic Fallacy.
- The basic goods are life, knowledge, play, aesthetic experience, sociability, practical reason and religion. Candidates may also be aware that Finnis later identified marriage as 'a basic and exigent good' (2008) because it is the unique blend of the basic goods of life (i.e. procreation) and human friendship.
- Finnis then explains what he means by practical reasonableness with nine requirements: a coherent plan of life, no arbitrary preference amongst values, no arbitrary preference amongst persons, detachment, commitment, efficiency within reason, respect for every basic value in every act, the requirements of the common good and to follow one's conscience.
- Candidates may choose to exemplify Finnis' Natural Law with reference to immigration and/or capital punishment.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

- (b) **‘Finnis’ Natural Law is effective in dealing with ethical issues.’**
Evaluate this view. [AO2 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Finnis’ adaptation could be argued to be more effective as Finnis offers a clear link between morality and the legal system which allows us to make laws which serve the basic goods of humanity. This gives us a moral, as well as legal, duty to obey the law and is an effective way to deal with ethical issues.
- Finnis does allow for the possibility that law-makers may not aim to establish basic goods, stating that here the principle of *lex iniusta non lex* (an unjust law is no law at all) would apply, leaving humans with a legal obligation, but not a moral one. However, this is not an effective way of dealing with moral issues as it leaves humans with very difficult decisions to make.
- An alternative point of view is that humans have always had to face this type of dilemma, and just because Finnis’ Natural Law is not always applied to human law-making, this does not make it ineffective when it is applied.
- Finnis’ adaptation could be more effective as, although Finnis himself follows Roman Catholicism, the theory removes the requirement for traditional belief in God. Although one of Finnis’ basic goods is religion, this is in the broadest possible sense of the term. Candidates may well argue that this is a more effective approach in a secular society.
- However, the origins of Finnis’ basic goods and requirements could be questioned. Although there is no requirement for a deity to create the natural order in the universe, there is still a requirement to believe in self-evident natural laws. Some claim these are derived from a Western liberal view which privileges one particular cultural perspective.
- Religious believers may object to Finnis’ adaptation as it may be seen to permit actions which go against biblical laws, whereas Aquinas’ Natural Law is believed to be in agreement with divine law and therefore more effective. The primary precepts are seen as universal and not derived from a particular cultural perspective.
- However, it could be argued that Aquinas’ exposition of his Natural Law is very much rooted in his own cultural perspective, and that this has caused much injustice in the application of Natural Law over time.
- Aquinas’ Natural Law could be seen as easier to apply to ethical issues than Finnis’ version as the precepts are clearer. The basic goods and principles of practical reason are overly complicated and allow for too much human error.
- However, this could be seen as the main strength in Finnis’ theory – it allows for the complicated nature of human decision making and is not a ‘one size fits all’ approach.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

Or,

0 2 (a) **Examine Proportionalism as a development of Natural Law.** [AO1 20]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Aquinas' Natural Law states that a good action is one that fulfils the God-given purpose of the agent to establish a right relationship with God.
- The 5 primary precepts (worship God, live in ordered societies, reproduce, seek knowledge and preserve life) are the basis of morality.
- These precepts are self-evident and applied using the secondary precepts, which are rules rationally derived from the primary precepts to give clear guidance about how to act and achieve the ultimate purpose.
- The difficulty with this theory is that it is deontological in nature and the situation and consequences of actions are seen as irrelevant. It can sometimes appear to go against common understandings of justice.
- Aquinas, aware of this, wrestled with the gravity of sin in relation to evil actions performed in different situations. Aquinas often applied different lines of reasoning depending upon the issue, for example, in considering stealing, war and other moral issues such as capital punishment.
- Aquinas recognised that although good and evil actions are clearly defined, not all bad or evil actions were wholly bad or evil and were influenced by such factors as intention of the action.
- In the most extreme cases, when faced with the impossibility of doing good, Aquinas developed the Principle of Double Effect (PDE) by considering the act of killing in self-defence. It is from the PDE that the notion of 'commensurate' or 'proportionate' reasoning was derived.
- The debate known as Proportionalism began with Peter Knauer's analysis of 'proportionate reason' found in the PDE. Knauer argued that proportionate reasoning should be the fundamental principle for morality.
- Knauer's work provoked debate about Proportionalism that was surveyed by Bernard Hoose in 1985. This debate also included trying to establish the precise nature of proportionate reasoning, but more importantly deciding when it was appropriate to apply proportionate reason, what it was relevant to, and how this was to be done (a methodology).
- Over the years the fourth condition of Aquinas' PDE became the ideal that 'it is never right to go against a principle unless there is a proportionate reason to justify it'. Proportionalism viewed itself as true to the deontological nature of Aquinas' Natural Law but reflecting Aquinas' rational approach to ethics.
- The initial debate concerned extreme cases for which PDE was appropriate and Proportionalism was confined to 'negative morality' such as issues pertaining to unavoidable death. For such Proportionalists, proportionate reason was confined to conflict situations (McCormick).
- However, as Proportionalism has developed, different and more holistic ways of considering moral issues were proposed. Joseph Selling proposed to broaden the context of a moral situation to focus on the ethical act as an 'event' and incorporating various elements involved. Garth Hallett developed Aquinas' principle into a system of philosophical 'Value Maximisation' that is more radical than Natural Law.
- Candidates may explore the minimisation of pre-moral / ontic evil and the distinction between 'good' and 'right' acts in proportionate reasoning.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

- (b) **‘Proportionalism is not effective in dealing with ethical issues.’**
Evaluate this view. [AO2 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Proportionalism could be seen as more effective in dealing with ethical issues as it allows the situation to be considered in extreme circumstances while still following the rules of Natural Law in most situations.
- This means that there are clear-cut guidelines which are easy to follow for the most part, but where following these rigidly would lead to injustice, there is room for a different decision to be seen as ethical. Candidates may well illustrate this point with a range of different examples.
- This version clearly follows the principle of Aquinas’ application of Natural Law as there are many examples in his writing of taking a proportionate approach. Therefore, it is more effective than the strict interpretation of Natural Law that has been used over the years as it is actually closer to the intentions of the originator of the theory – ‘the more you descend into detail, the more it appears how the general rule admits exceptions’ (Aquinas).
- Proportionalism also offers a way to combine the best aspects of Natural Law – a structured moral framework – with the flexibility of Situation Ethics in order to get the best of both worlds. It avoids the outdated biological basis of Natural Law (Curran) but also avoids the main criticisms of Situation Ethics relating to the lack of moral guidance. This makes it more effective in dealing with ethical issues in the modern world.
- However, it could be argued that Proportionalism dilutes the structured moral framework of Natural Law in an unacceptable way. The theory was condemned by Pope John Paul II in *Veritatis Splendor* as it would allow for certain actions which are intrinsically evil.
- It could be seen as too open to interpretation as it is not totally clear what would constitute a ‘proportionate’ reason to break a natural law.
- In predicting the value of an action in order to decide whether the reason to break the rule is proportionate, Hoose has been criticised as coming too close to Utilitarianism or consequentialism.
- However, supporters of Proportionalism may reject this criticism as the deontological rules of Natural Law take precedence in the vast majority of situations. They would argue that, in extreme circumstances, looking at the potential consequences of a situation before making a final decision is the common-sense approach and puts the people involved about a rigid obsession with rules for the sake of rules.
- Proportionalists would argue that their approach is more effective than Natural Law as it comes closer to the agapeistic approach of Jesus seen in the gospels, while still accounting for the human need for structure and authority.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

Section B

Either,

0 3 (a) Explain Bentham's Act Utilitarianism.

[AO1 20]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Act Utilitarianism is a form of moral relativism. It is a consequentialist and teleological theory which builds on the natural human tendency to pursue pleasure and avoid pain.
- Bentham's Act Utilitarianism is based on the principle of utility, or the greatest happiness principle: a good action is one that aims to promote 'the greatest happiness for the greatest number.' In Bentham's terms, this means looking at actions which create the greatest amount of happiness overall for humanity, not just the greatest number of people in a given situation.
- Bentham believed that past experiences did not always guide us to moral choices and that each situation was different. As a result, he focused on the quantity of pleasure produced by each separate act and regarded all forms of pleasure as of equal worth – 'the quantity of pleasure being equal, the game of push-pin is as good as poetry' (Bentham). An act must produce the greatest amount of pleasure with the least amount of pain.
- The hedonic calculus is used as a means to measure pleasure in each unique situation by considering seven factors:
 - Intensity – the stronger the pleasure the more weight it carries
 - Duration – longer lasting pleasures create greater happiness
 - Certainty – a pleasure that is sure to happen carries more weight than a possibility of pleasure.
 - Remoteness – pleasures that are closer in time carry more weight
 - Fecundity – if the pleasure will lead to further pleasures in the future, this gives a greater overall quantity
 - Purity – a pleasure that does not contain any pain is better than one in which pleasure and pain are mixed.
 - Extent – the greater the number of people affected by the pleasure, the better.
- Each factor is equally valid in the decision-making process and the hedonic calculus should be used to weigh up the quantity of pleasure that will result from each possible course of action before deciding on the best overall option.
- Bentham used the criteria 'can they suffer?' to decide whose happiness should be considered when weighing up the overall utility of an action.
- Candidates may choose to illustrate the main features of Act Utilitarianism by drawing on the issues of animal experimentation or nuclear deterrence to exemplify their points or, alternatively, they may choose examples from other areas of ethics to support their explanations.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

- (b) **‘Act Utilitarianism clearly promotes justice.’**
Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- The principle of utility is an indicator of how Act Utilitarianism promotes justice as happiness is sought for as many people as possible. Surely justice comes from serving the interests of the many.
- However, there are many circumstances in which the happiness of the majority could be achieved by the suffering of the few. The example often used by candidates is that of gang rape. This seems to suggest that Act Utilitarianism can be used to promote the very opposite of justice.
- Candidates may, however, discuss whether such examples represent accurate applications of the hedonic calculus which, after all, contains six factors other than extent, and requires the weighing up of both pleasure and pain.
- The fact that this complex ‘pleasure measuring’ process is required may allow for the conclusion that Act Utilitarianism does promote injustice when used in its most basic form, and that, as people have little time in real situations to make lengthy calculations of pleasure over pain, the basic utility principle will be used most often and so the criticism stands.
- Candidates may, however, consider whether a theory can be criticised on the grounds that it is not followed accurately.
- Another line of argument would be to consider the difficulty of predicting the consequences of an action, particularly in their broadest possible sense. Human nature means that people tend to expect the consequences they want rather than making an objective assessment of the relative merits of all possible consequences of an action. Justice may be better served by having clear-cut rules.
- However, if consequences are not used and a more deontological approach is taken, then examples of injustice may be more likely. It is clear that consequences affect people’s lives and, by judging every action on its merits, Act Utilitarianism can be used to promote justice at an individual level.
- Act Utilitarianism can be complex, however, as application of the Hedonic Calculus to every situation is time consuming and not straightforward. Therefore, it could be argued that a form of Rule Utilitarianism would better promote justice as it is easier to follow the general rules, while still maintaining the benefits of the principle of utility.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

Or,

0	4
---	---

 (a) Explain Virtue Theory.

[AO1 20]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Virtue theory offers an alternative approach to ethics which focuses on what makes a good person rather than looking at whether specific actions are good or bad.
- The goal of life is to develop into a virtuous person and to move closer to a state of eudaimonia (the highest good), which is both a goal for individuals and for the whole of humanity.
- Eudaimonia can be translated as happiness, but it is not an emotional state, but rather the application of reason to work out how to live a good life in order to achieve a state of human flourishing.
- Aristotle identifies both moral and intellectual virtues which must both be developed in order to flourish as a human.
- The moral virtues are excellences of character which fall between the two vices of excess and deficiency. A person who possesses the moral virtues has the right kind of character to do good things. In order to practice these effectively, humans should aim for the mean response (the golden mean) in each situation.
- The moral virtues listed by Aristotle are: courage, temperance, liberality, magnificence, magnanimity, proper ambition, patience, truthfulness, wittiness, friendliness, modesty and righteous indignation. (Accept appropriate synonyms for these terms.) Candidates may give examples of the excesses and deficiencies of some of these virtues and explain that these are developed through habit.
- To behave well a person should be aware of the doctrine of the mean and behave with dignity in every situation, using the intellectual virtue of prudence to judge the correct response.
- Candidates may also explain the other intellectual virtues listed by Aristotle and demonstrate understanding that the intellectual and moral virtues often work in conjunction to allow a person to make good moral decisions.
- To be effective, virtue theory cannot be practised in isolation, rather humans must develop as part of communities in which friendship is important.
- Aristotle links virtue to justice, stating that justice is the outcome of virtuous behaviour and is 'virtue entire' rather than a separate virtue in its own right.
- Some commentators have drawn out four key virtues which appear to be particularly important to Aristotle: temperance, justice, courage and wisdom. These are seen as being at the heart of moral character, with wisdom being the finished form of all the virtues and the one quality which will lead to naturally moral and just behaviour.
- Candidates may also discuss Jesus' teachings on the virtues found in the Beatitudes, the use of virtues in Aquinas' Natural Law or the developments of Virtue Theory by MacIntyre or Anscombe.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

- (b) **‘Being a good person is more important than doing good actions.’**
Evaluate this view. [AO2 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- On one hand it is clearly difficult to separate what a person does from the sort of person that they are. It could be argued that good people are more likely to seek to do good actions and therefore moral character is the most important thing to focus on.
- An agent-centred approach also allows people to consider the situation and the context of their actions and to make sensible decisions in a specific situation without requiring a set of rules to manage their decision making.
- However, this approach also gives very little guidance to the moral agent and allows scope for arbitrary and individualistic decision making. There are many points in history in which ‘good’ people have made some very poor moral decisions.
- Being a good person can be seen as more important as there is little value in simply following rules. A person who recognises and understands the reasons for trying to choose good has a stronger character than a person who simply learns a set of external rules and acts in accordance with these.
- Therefore, Virtue Theory is more than a simple focus on action and is a holistic approach that aims to develop human beings into the best characters they can be. This results in independent, strong-minded, responsible and wise individuals who are capable of naturally doing good without the confines of rules, which are sometimes impractical and inflexible.
- However, it could be argued that this idea is naïve and overly trusting. It relies on the potential goodness of others, when even Aristotle admits that many people are too tempted by the vices. Aristotle seemed to believe that a fairly narrow range of people were capable of achieving virtue, so the theory cannot be applied universally.
- A counter argument is that virtue does not need to be achievable by all in order to be valuable. Virtuous people can serve as good role models for others and so guidance can be offered without the need for a set of rules through the example of such people.
- However, if a person never carries out good deeds, it is impossible to judge their virtue, suggesting that actions are important in giving a moral baseline.
- It could be argued that an approach such as Natural Law which expects the development of virtue alongside a clear code for moral action gives the best overall approach.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.

Or,

0 5 (a) **Examine the implications of determinism for moral responsibility.**
[AO1 20]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Hard determinists would argue that it is not possible to hold an individual morally responsible for their actions as moral agents have no control over their moral attitudes.
- Either we are biologically programmed to act in particular ways through our genes and cannot override this (biological determinism).
- Or we are psychologically conditioned to act in particular ways and cannot escape from this (psychological determinism).
- Or the chain of causation is such that we are determined to act in particular ways (philosophical determinism).
- This therefore means that there is no value to human ideas of goodness or right and wrong, and discussions of these in the form of meta-ethics are pointless.
- It also means that it is unfair to punish people for immoral acts.
- Candidates may choose to discuss examples where the actions of an individual have been defended using some form of determinism e.g. the Darrow defence, the case of Stephen 'Tony' Mobley or the Venables and Thompson case.
- Hard determinism makes all normative ethical theories such as Natural Law or Utilitarianism redundant as, if humans have no free will to make moral choices, then it is pointless to give rules or guidelines about how to act morally.
- Soft determinism allows for moral choices to be made at times. Although the decisions made by moral agents are caused by determining factors, these causes are complex, and it makes no sense to say that humans cannot make moral choices at times.
- This therefore means that humans are partly responsible for their moral choices and can be held accountable for their actions.
- In terms of soft determinism, there is some value in normative ethics as humans do need to decide how to act morally.
- It is also legitimate to punish or praise people according to their actions as there was some element of choice involved.
- Some philosophers point out that certain determining factors can be overcome. For example, it has been proved that forms of psychological conditioning can be reversed.
- However, soft determinists accept that it is difficult to draw a line between that which is determined and that which is freely chosen.
- Therefore, for example, soft determinists may argue that determining factors should be taken into account when making judgements about punishment for immoral acts but should not be the sole factor upon which judgements are made.

This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.

- (b) **‘Moral responsibility is nothing more than an illusion.’
Evaluate this view.**

[AO2 30]

Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant responses should be credited.

- Hard determinists would agree with this perspective for various reasons, as they believe that humans have no control over their actions.
- John Locke’s locked room analogy illustrates this idea clearly. Universal causation gives the illusion of free will but in reality, all actions are determined.
- However, this idea cannot be proved and could be criticised as being largely speculation.
- An alternative perspective is given by Sartre, who would call the statement in the question an example of ‘bad faith’, an attempt to avoid the reality of free will and the corresponding burden of moral responsibility.
- Scientific determinists such as Dennett may argue that our feelings of moral responsibility are an illusion as we are determined to act in particular ways by our genes. Candidates may draw on a range of examples from evolutionary biology to illustrate this view.
- However, this perspective is far from universal and there are many alternative perspectives from biology, including the work of Sirigu on the biological location of decision making.
- As scientific evidence is used on both sides of the debate, expect candidates to weigh up the strength of the case and make a reasoned judgement about which side offers the more convincing account.
- Psychological determinists may argue that the statement is true as humans are all conditioned to behave in particular ways. Examples such as the ‘little Albert’ experiment may be used to illustrate this idea.
- However, psychologists have shown that it is possible to overcome conditioning and to make choices about their actions. For example, Rogers’ work on self-actualisation.
- Candidates could evaluate the methodology used by the particular psychologists in order to reach their conclusions here.
- Also, the perspective of soft determinism could be used to argue that moral responsibility is more than an illusion, although some aspects of our decision making are clearly caused by external factors. Again, expect candidates to discuss the merits of this approach in comparison with the other theories they have chosen for discussion.
- The question allows for candidates who choose to back up their arguments with reference to predestination.

Overall, candidates should engage with the debate and come to a substantiated evaluation regarding the issue raised.