



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2024

**A LEVEL
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - UNIT 4
RELIGION AND ETHICS
1120U40-1**

About this marking scheme

The purpose of this marking scheme is to provide teachers, learners, and other interested parties, with an understanding of the assessment criteria used to assess this specific assessment.

This marking scheme reflects the criteria by which this assessment was marked in a live series and was finalised following detailed discussion at an examiners' conference. A team of qualified examiners were trained specifically in the application of this marking scheme. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners. It may not be possible, or appropriate, to capture every variation that a candidate may present in their responses within this marking scheme. However, during the training conference, examiners were guided in using their professional judgement to credit alternative valid responses as instructed by the document, and through reviewing exemplar responses.

Without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers, learners and other users, may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that this marking scheme is used alongside other guidance, such as published exemplar materials or Guidance for Teaching. This marking scheme is final and will not be changed, unless in the event that a clear error is identified, as it reflects the criteria used to assess candidate responses during the live series.

UNIT 4 – Religion and Ethics

Mark 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.

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.

A Level Generic Band Descriptors

Band (marks)	Assessment Objective AO1 – Section A questions 30 marks <i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:</i> <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 (25-30 marks)	<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 shows an excellent standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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 (within and/or across themes where applicable). • 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. • Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4 (19-24 marks)	<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 shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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 (within and/or across themes where applicable). • A range of scholarly views/schools of thought used largely accurately and effectively. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar.
3 (13-18 marks)	<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 shows a satisfactory standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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 (within and/or across themes where applicable). • A basic range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar.
2 (7-12 marks)	<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. • Partially accurate response, with some signs of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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 (within and/or across themes where applicable) • A limited range of scholarly views/schools of thought used. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1 (1-6 marks)	<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. • Very limited accuracy within the response, with little coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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. • Very few or no connections made between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable) • Little or no use of scholarly views/schools of thought. • Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. • Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the meaning and clarity of communication. <p>N.B. A maximum of 3 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	Assessment Objective AO2- Section B questions 30 marks <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i>
5 (25-30 marks)	<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. • The response shows an excellent standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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 (within and/or across themes where applicable). • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4 (19-24 marks)	<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. • The response shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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 (within and/or across themes where applicable). • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar.
3 (13-18 marks)	<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. • The response shows a satisfactory standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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 (within and/or across themes where applicable). • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar.
2 (7-12 marks)	<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. • Partially accurate response, with some signs of coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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 (within and/or across themes where applicable). • Some mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1 (1-6 marks)	<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. • Very limited accuracy within the response, with little coherence, clarity and organisation. • 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 (within and/or across themes where applicable). • Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary. • Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the meaning and clarity of communication.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant analysis or evaluation.

WJEC GCE A LEVEL RELIGIOUS STUDIES

SUMMER 2024 MARK SCHEME

UNIT 4 - RELIGION AND ETHICS

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

Section A

1.	Apply John Finnis' Natural Law to the issue of immigration.
----	---

[AO1 30]

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

- In order to apply the theory to the issue of immigration, candidates may choose to outline the basic principles of Finnis' Natural Law, however the majority of the answer should be devoted to application of the theory.
- Finnis' Natural Law includes a set of seven 'basic goods' for humankind. An action is good if it participates in one or more of the basic goods. There are also nine sub-requirements of practical reason which may be applied to immigration.
- When applied to immigration, there is no single position candidates could choose to take as the theory allows for different, equally moral decisions. Any reasonable application of the basic goods and the requirements of practical reason should be accepted.
- For example, in support of immigration, friendship and sociability should be applied to all equally, not just to people from one's own country.
- Immigration broadens our cultural experience and so contributes towards our aesthetic experience and therefore the common good.
- Immigration opens up different avenues to fulfil our need for religion. It also permits people to express their religion freely, which may not have been the case in the country they are leaving.
- Basic goods should be applied equally to all, so we should not favour people in our own country over the needs of immigrants.
- Supporting those fleeing from war-torn countries or areas of famine and disease seems to fulfil the basic goods and do more good than evil.
- Immigration could be seen to work against the common good of the community as it disrupts established communities and puts undue pressure on local services.
- Finnis' Natural Law may not support immigration based on a points system as this could be seen to go against the requirement to apply the basic goods equally to all. It effectively says that highly skilled workers are worth more than those who are lower skilled, which contradicts Finnis' views that any immigration system must respect the intrinsic dignity of all human beings.
- Candidates may be aware of Finnis' support for controlled immigration and his comments about the problems of uncontrolled immigration.

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

2.	Explain soft determinism.
----	----------------------------------

[AO1 30]

Candidates could include some or all of the following, but other relevant responses will be credited.

- Soft determinism is a term coined by William James to describe claims that all human actions are determined by external factors but that moral choice can still be genuine if humans have not been forced to act in a particular way.
- Humans are free to act in accordance with their nature, even though their nature is determined by other factors.
- This means that ethical discussions are still valuable, and humans can be held responsible for their moral decisions in most circumstances.
- Hobbes makes the distinction between internal causes and external causes, arguing that actions determined solely by internal causes allow for free moral choice.
- Internal causes are individual wishes or desires which cause a person to act in a particular way and which may be determined by causation (or conditioning or heredity in modern presentations of the argument.)
- External causes are factors which may cause a person to act against their own wishes or desires through some form of compulsion.
- This means that humans can be seen as morally responsible when acts are determined solely by internal causes. Here soft determinism differs from hard determinism.
- A. J. Ayer looked at this issue in terms of the meaning of the language used to discuss moral decision making.
- He noted that, when a situation is determined by an internal cause, we would say that the behaviour has been caused. When it is determined by an external cause we use the word forced. He uses the example of a person walking across a room to illustrate the difference.
- This clearly illustrates the linguistic difference between classical soft determinism and hard determinism and indicates that people make this distinction when considering moral responsibility – humans are determined to act in certain ways by their nature but make free choices when they are not prevented from acting in accordance with their nature.
- Soft determinism therefore involves commitment to a particular view of freedom – that humans are free if they are not prevented from acting in the way they are determined to act.
- Modern versions of soft determinism focus on the feeling of freedom of choice and the importance to humans of moral responsibility. For example, Peter Strawson argues that, in practical terms, no matter how much proof we find of determinism, this will not stop humans believing that people are responsible for their moral actions. This makes moral responsibility a real fact of human life which should be taken seriously. If we have been determined, we have been determined to possess the feeling of free choice and moral responsibility.

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

Section B

3.	'Intuitionism is superior to Naturalism as an ethical theory.'
----	---

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

Candidates could include some or all of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.

- Proponents of Intuitionism such as Moore and Prichard would argue that it is a better meta-ethical approach as moral truths can only be known through intuition and not through reason or empirical testing.
- Moore looks to Hume's law (the 'is-ought' problem) stating that, in deriving moral statements from natural ones, Naturalism makes an error in reasoning.
- Prichard would support this, claiming that Naturalism makes no distinction between general reasoning, which can be factual and based on observation and collection of data, and moral reasoning, which can only be based on intuition.
- However, supporters of Naturalism would argue that Hume's law does not really support an attack on naturalism as Hume himself believed that morals were based on our natural sentiments. All this argument establishes is that facts alone do not lead directly to moral truths, but that they must be combined with value judgements that are often hidden assumptions in naturalistic reasoning.
- Moore's naturalistic fallacy – that moral terms such as 'good' cannot be defined in natural terms such as 'pleasure' could also be used to support the view in the question.
- However, this leads to the issue that we then have no real grounds to resolve moral disagreements. Moore and Prichard's responses to this criticism could be evaluated.
- Naturalism could be accused of leaving an 'open question' about what is good. For Moore, this proves that Naturalism is wrong as good cannot be defined in other terms. For supporters of Naturalism, however, the reason that the question appears open is that we don't fully understand the meaning of good. Naturalism allows people to search for a definition of a term which humans find difficult whereas Intuitionism expects people to accept that such terms cannot be defined. Expect candidates to come to a reasoned judgement about which approach is 'better'.
- Another line of argument would be to consider the validity of the intuitionist claims about non-natural moral facts being self-evident. This clearly goes against the Naturalist claim that morality can be explored in an empirical way to reach these objective 'moral truths.' Candidates should draw reasoned conclusions about which approach is more valid.

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

4.	‘Belief in predestination is incompatible with belief in God’s benevolence.’
----	---

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

Candidates could include some or all of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.

- Proponents of predestination such as Augustine and Calvin would totally disagree with this statement. Augustine argued that God is wholly good and cannot be other than this.
- Predestination is an example of God’s benevolence as, following the Fall, it would be just for God to leave all to damnation however Jesus is sent to atone for the sins of the elect showing God’s love.
- However, others would reject this as a demonstration of benevolence as only some humans are saved. Some are destined for hell no matter how they act, and this seems unfair and far from benevolent.
- A response could be that the unfairness only comes from a human perspective related to original sin – from God’s perspective this is benevolent. Only God can know why some are chosen rather than others, otherwise humans would have the same knowledge as God.
- Augustine argued that humans are predestined as a result of concupiscence, which in turn derived from the original sin of Adam and Eve. As God originally created humanity with free will, this demonstrates his benevolence, however concupiscence overrides this free will as a result of human error.
- However, if God is omniscient, it could be argued that he is responsible for the choices made by Adam and Eve and it is not benevolent to allow even some of humanity to suffer eternally as a result.
- Pelagius would agree with the statement in the question as he argued that a benevolent God would not allow humans to inherit original sin and the defect of concupiscence.
- He argued that the free will to humans allows people to take moral responsibility and move closer to God by following the example of Jesus and the 10 Commandments. A benevolent God offers his grace to humans who freely choose to believe in him and atonement is for all, not just the elect.
- Arminius’ views about free will could also be used to support the view in the question.
- However, both Pelagius and Arminius’ views were seen as heretical as they questioned the omnipotence of God. Expect candidates to discuss the significance of this in reaching their judgements.
- Candidates could make reference to the Problem of Evil and the theodicies studied in order to develop their arguments.

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

5.	'Individuals have no free choice about how to act.'
----	--

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

Candidates could include some or all of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.

- Proponents of philosophical determinism would support this view, pointing to the empirical evidence to support universal causation. Locke's locked room analogy could be used to illustrate this point.
- However, it could be argued that Locke's position is based on assumptions about causation which are impossible to prove. Sartre would claim that this is an example of acting in 'bad faith' by attempting to deny that free will exists and would argue that the statement in the question is a form of self-deception to avoid taking the consequences of ultimate moral responsibility which come with free will.
- 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 free will.
- 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.
- Also, the perspective of soft determinism could be used to argue that humans have some free choice about how to act, although some aspects of decision making are clearly caused by external factors.
- Alternatively, candidates may argue from the religious perspective that humans are predestined to be elect or reprobate and have no free choice. They may point to evidence from scripture to support this claim or look to the writings of Augustine and Calvin
- However, there is also scriptural evidence to support the existence of free will and scholarship from Pelagius and Arminius suggesting that individuals do have a choice.

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

6.	'The only strength of Emotivism is that it encourages moral debate.'
----	---

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

Candidates could include some or all of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.

- This statement could be contested as it may be argued that Emotivism has other strengths, for example, it highlights that moral debates are nothing more than expressions of emotion. In fact, rather than encouraging moral debate, the strength of Emotivism is that it shows that moral arguments serve no real purpose and are 'just so much hot air and nothing else.'
- However, it could be argued that Stevenson's version of Emotivism shows that there is a purpose to moral debate, in that it can inform us about a person's core beliefs and worldview and can attempt to persuade others to agree with these in a powerful way, which is clearly a strength in an ethical theory.
- Others, however, have pointed out that there is a clear difference between moral debate, which discusses universal principles and can only be understood by rational beings, and expressions of subjective feelings which can be held by non-rational beings. Proponents of this argument would not agree that encouragement of moral debate is a strength of emotivism as it does not really do this.
- It could also be argued that Emotivism encourages debate about ethical and moral language, rather than moral debate per se. The Emotivists criticise ethical Naturalism and argue that moral statements cannot be statements of fact as they cannot be verified empirically and are not analytic statements true by definition. Candidates could give a range of examples to illustrate this point.
- It may be, therefore, that the real strength of Emotivism is that it causes people to question the supposedly rational basis of many normative ethical theories such as Utilitarianism.
- This view has been criticised by Rachels and McIntyre who both object to the removal of reason from moral judgements, stating that there is a difference between mere dislike and moral disapproval.
- However, Emotivists could argue that the matters of fact relating to issues of morality can be debated, for example, the time at which a foetus can be said to be capable of survival outside the womb. Different scientific understanding can change people's feelings about moral issues, yet the moral statements are still emotional reactions to the facts rather than rational statements.
- In opposition, it could be argued that Emotivism has no real strengths. Universal moral reactions to atrocities such as genocide are more than emotional reactions and Emotivism can only be right if all other objective theories of morality fail.

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