



---

# **GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME**

---

**SUMMER 2023**

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

## **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.

## **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

<b>Assessment Objective AO1 – Section A questions [30 marks]</b>	
<b>Band (marks)</b>	<p><i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching</i></li> <li>- <i>influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies</i></li> <li>- <i>cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice</i></li> <li>- <i>approaches to the study of religion and belief.</i></li> </ul>
<b>5 (25-30 marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief.</li> <li>• An extensive and relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set.</li> <li>• The response shows an excellent standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• The response demonstrates extensive depth and/or breadth. Excellent use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>• Thorough and accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.</li> <li>• Insightful connections are made between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable).</li> <li>• An extensive range of views of scholars/schools of thought used accurately and effectively.</li> <li>• Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<b>4 (19-24 marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief.</li> <li>• A detailed, relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set.</li> <li>• The response shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>• Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.</li> <li>• Purposeful connections are made between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable).</li> <li>• A range of scholarly views/schools of thought used largely accurately and effectively.</li> <li>• Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<b>3 (13-18 marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mainly accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief.</li> <li>• A satisfactory response, which generally answers the main demands of the question set.</li> <li>• The response shows a satisfactory standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth in some areas. Satisfactory use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>• Mainly accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.</li> <li>• Sensible connections made between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable).</li> <li>• A basic range of scholarly views/schools of thought used.</li> <li>• Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<b>2 (7-12 marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Basic level of accuracy and relevance.</li> <li>• A basic response, addressing some of the demands of the question set.</li> <li>• Partially accurate response, with some signs of coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• The response demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth, including limited use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>• Some accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.</li> <li>• Makes some basic connections between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable)</li> <li>• A limited range of scholarly views/schools of thought used.</li> <li>• Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<b>1 (1-6 marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Low level of accuracy and relevance.</li> <li>• A very limited response, with little attempt to address the question.</li> <li>• Very limited accuracy within the response, with little coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• The response demonstrates very limited depth and/or breadth. Very limited use of evidence and examples.</li> <li>• Little or no reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.</li> <li>• Very few or no connections made between the various approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable)</li> <li>• Little or no use of scholarly views/schools of thought.</li> <li>• Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary.</li> <li>• Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the meaning and clarity of communication.</li> </ul> <p><b>N.B. A maximum of 3 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'.</b></p>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant information.</li> </ul>

<b>Band</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO2 - Section B questions [30 marks]</b> <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i>
<b>5</b> <b>(25-30 marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set.</li> <li>• The response shows an excellent standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence.</li> <li>• The views of scholars/schools of thought are used extensively, appropriately and in context.</li> <li>• Confident and perceptive analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable).</li> <li>• Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b> <b>(19-24 marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed.</li> <li>• The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence.</li> <li>• The response shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• Views of scholars/schools of thought are used appropriately and in context.</li> <li>• Purposeful analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable).</li> <li>• Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b> <b>(13-18 marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed.</li> <li>• The response shows a satisfactory standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence.</li> <li>• Views of scholars/schools of thought are generally used appropriately and in context.</li> <li>• Sensible analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable).</li> <li>• Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b> <b>(7-12 marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed.</li> <li>• Partially accurate response, with some signs of coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence.</li> <li>• Basic use of the views of scholars/schools of thought, appropriately and in context.</li> <li>• Makes some analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable).</li> <li>• Some mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b> <b>(1-6 marks)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set.</li> <li>• Very limited accuracy within the response, with little coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence.</li> <li>• Little or no use of the views of scholars/schools of thought.</li> <li>• Limited analysis of the nature of connections between the various elements of the approaches studied (within and/or across themes where applicable).</li> <li>• Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary.</li> <li>• Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the meaning and clarity of communication.</li> </ul>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant analysis or evaluation.</li> </ul>

# WJEC GCE A LEVEL RELIGIOUS STUDIES

## UNIT 4 - RELIGION AND ETHICS

### SUMMER 2023 MARK SCHEME

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

#### Section A

0	1
---	---

**Explain different religious concepts of predestination with reference to St Augustine and John Calvin.**

[AO1 30]

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

- Augustine believed that Adam and Eve had an original righteousness and were able to avoid sin; they were mortal by natural constitution, but they were immortal by a divine gift.
- Augustine's Doctrine of Original Sin is based on the ancestral sin (The Fall) of Adam and Eve which becomes a defect inherited by all humans known as concupiscence. Concupiscence is an orientation away from God and towards lesser goods and it refers to the inherited inclination from Adam in human beings to commit sins.
- Humans inherit this because all are descended from Adam and Eve and because humans are born as a result of sexual intercourse, which itself is a result of concupiscence. All humanity is *massa peccati* - a 'condemned lump' predisposed to sin.
- The essential human nature is to be free; *liberium arbitrium*, but the secondary fault of concupiscence overrides this.
- Humans should therefore suffer the consequences of their sinful actions in the afterlife, however through God's grace some will receive salvation. Those who will be saved, 'the elect' will be unable to resist God's grace and therefore will make morally good choices so that they can be granted eternal life in heaven.
- There is debate as to whether Augustine advocated single or double predestination based upon the notion that to elect also incorporates the notion of rejection.
- John Calvin's 'Doctrine of Election' is based on belief in the total sovereignty of God. Nothing happens by chance.
- He agrees that the Fall caused humanity to be completely depraved and therefore unable to respond freely to the possibility of salvation through Jesus.
- Calvin states that some humans will receive salvation from God, but that God alone will determine this as, if humans could influence who is saved, this would challenge God's power and sovereignty. This theory is *sola scriptura* i.e. based entirely on scripture. God decreed this even before birth, clearly demonstrating that this had nothing to do with meritorious works.
- Calvin argues for something which became known as double predestination – God actively chooses who will be saved (the elect) and who will be damned (the reprobates). The elect have done nothing to deserve their status, but may know that they are called by God and are likely to seek forgiveness for their sins. The reprobates are more likely to show traits leading to punishment in hell as they fall prey to sin.

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

0	2
---	---

**Explain different religious concepts of free will with reference to Pelagius and Arminius.**

[AO1 30]

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

- Pelagius argued that a loving God would not punish all of humanity for the Fall; he rejected the notion of original sin. He proposed that it is participation in the fallen world that leads to sin, influenced by long-term habits of sinful action due to the corruption and ignorance of righteousness.
- Pelagius considered humans to be free to choose between good and evil without hindrance from an inherited tendency to sin and freedom that is not solely dependent upon the grace of God. Natural goodness in human beings is therefore voluntary goodness.
- God's grace supports humans through moral laws such as the 10 Commandments and through the example of Jesus. God would not create commandments that were impossible to follow. This allows humans to take responsibility for moral choices and are capable of living holy and sinless lives.
- Pelagius accepts that God's grace is necessary to support humans using their free will correctly in choosing to do 'good works'. God's grace is therefore the agent of empowerment that opens up the potential and opportunity to do good works in the first place. However, this grace is not irresistible.
- He also believes that forgiveness is open to all through God's grace and Christ's atonement, and will be granted to those who repent.
- This view was seen as heresy by the Church Council of Carthage (418 CE) by promoting the view that human actions govern and control salvation. Augustine saw this unfettered free will as a challenge to God's sovereignty and as advocating the perfectionism of Origen.
- In contrast, Arminius accepted that original sin and the resulting limitations in human ability to make correct decisions using free will; humans were deprived of 'original righteousness' through the Fall.
- However, he argued that God's grace preceded each human moral decision and permits all moral agents to do good works as long as they freely choose to accept it. Arminius rejected Calvin's concept of unconditional election and argued that election is conditional on faith. This meant that some humans could reject the offer of salvation of their own free will.
- The notions of Providence, Concurrence and Middle Knowledge may be used by candidates to discuss how Arminius reconciled free will with God's sovereignty.
- Arminius' arguments are summed up in the Five Articles of Remonstrance offered in protest against Calvin's doctrine of predestination. These are conditional election, unlimited atonement, total depravity, resistible grace and the idea that evil can be resisted. These show that humans are able to make free moral choices about whether to do good or not through God's prevenient grace.
- Arminius' ideas were rejected as heresy by the Synod of Dort, but remained popular in certain branches of the church e.g. The Methodist Church in England, founded by the Wesley brothers.

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

## Section B

**0 3** 'There is no difference between ethical and non-ethical statements.'

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 30]**

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

- Emotivists would argue that there is a clear difference between ethical and non-ethical statements as ethical statements are simply expressions of emotion. For example, saying that abortion is wrong is not a statement of fact but is the equivalent of saying 'Boo! To abortion.'
- For an Emotivist, a moral statement is subjective and expresses something about the individual who uses the word, rather than being an objective fact about the world.
- However, there are difficulties with this theory in that it leaves moral disagreements as nothing more than shouting matches and doesn't allow condemnation of moral atrocities on rational grounds.
- A Naturalist would agree with this view and argue that ethical statements can be seen as objective facts about the world which can be analysed in the same way as other objective truths.
- There may be debate over which natural aspects of the world morality should be based on, but it cannot be disputed that ethical statements are objective facts in the same way as other statements about the world.
- 'Hume's Law' could be proposed as a counter argument here, expressing the logical fallacy in deriving an 'ought', a statement of ethics, from an 'is', a statement of fact. This clearly shows that the two types of statement are not the same.
- However, while Hume has been used in support of the Emotivist position, it is not clear that this is the only conclusion to be drawn from his criticism. It could be argued that he is pointing out the missing assumptions which should be stated more clearly in the Naturalist position rather than challenging Naturalism in its entirety.
- Alternatively, it could be argued that ethical statements are objective truths based on our moral intuition and therefore can be seen as statements of a specific type of truth which can be known without recourse to rational argument. Ethical statements express our universal moral intuitions, which are objective truths in that they are shared by all moral agents.
- This makes ethical statements different from other statements as the terms used cannot be defined and can only be known through intuition.
- However, the Intuitionist view of ethical statements could be questioned as it is unclear where our moral intuitions come from or whether they are, in fact, objective and universal as Moore claims.

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

**'Moral terms can only be known through intuition.'**

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 30]**

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

- Intuitionism would agree with the statement as the theory claims that moral laws exist independently of human beings and can be known through intuition.
- Moral terms such as 'good' are known intuitively and moral judgements are about how to bring about the good.
- Moore argues that it would be a mistake to claim that moral terms can be known in any way other than through intuition. He calls the idea that moral terms can be defined through non-moral concepts as the 'naturalistic fallacy.'
- Moral terms such as 'good' are simple concepts which cannot be broken down into constituent parts, not can they be observed through the senses. The only means to understand moral terms is through intuition.
- However, one issue with this view is that it leaves no real grounds to resolve moral disagreements. What happens if people's moral intuitions do not agree?
- Prichard would argue that different intuitions are a result of some people having more developed moral thinking than others, but this does not really help to resolve moral disagreements.
- Some may argue that Prichard's role of, and distinction between, moral and general reasoning supports the notion of intuitive ethical thinking processes.
- Moore would also argue that moral terms must be known through intuition as, when we try to define morality in natural terms, we are left with 'open questions.' For example, it is possible to conclude that a particular action creates the greatest happiness for the greatest number, but still to ask whether the action is good. For Moore, this proves that goodness cannot be defined as pleasure.
- However, Naturalists would argue that, just because we have not agreed yet upon which definition of good is the correct one, this does not mean that moral terms cannot be defined in natural terms. The job of ethics is to identify which theory best defines morality.
- Many philosophers are critical of the concept of non-natural moral facts which can be known through intuition and argue that these simply don't exist (e.g. Mackie's argument from queerness). They are a way to avoid justifying moral judgements and Intuitionism is nothing more than an admission of failure to agree upon a rational basis for morality.

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

0	5
---	---

**‘Proportionalism has more weaknesses than strengths.’**

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 30]**

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

- Proportionalism can be seen to have many of the strengths of Natural Law, in that it allows an element of flexibility which prevents some of the injustices caused by absolute rules.
- It could be seen to offer the best of both a generally absolutist approach to ethics and yet a common sense approach to applying absolutist rules sensitively for ethical decision making in a morally ambiguous world.
- However, some would claim that the flexibility to adapt absolutist rules is the main weakness of Proportionalism because it loses the benefits of having clear-cut, objective and unambiguous rules, and complicates decision-making unnecessarily.
- For this reason Proportionalism has been condemned by the Roman Catholic church. For example, in his encyclical ‘Veritatis Splendour’, Pope John Paul II stated that Proportionalism was not an acceptable approach as it did not condemn any actions as intrinsically evil.
- Another strength of Proportionalism is that it is actually more typical of the way in which Natural Law has been applied throughout history through a long tradition within Roman Catholic moral thinking dating back to the work of Aquinas.
- Bernard Hoose’s overview highlights the way in which Natural Law has actually been applied both deontologically and teleologically. As Aquinas stated, ‘the more you descend into detail, the more it appears how the general rule admits exceptions...’
- On the other hand, it could be claimed that Proportionalism is weak because it elevates short-term goals over the long-term development of real human goods. For example, lying to somebody to avoid hurting their feelings may appear to be the right thing to do, but it does not contribute to the real good of creating a strong society based on truth and honesty.
- However, this exposes another weakness with Proportionalism, namely that of deciding which situations are sufficient to justify a proportionate response. The degree of human judgement involved can be seen as a distinct weakness.
- Despite this, a major strength of Proportionalism could be its more compassionate approach to the deontology found within Natural Law as it allows for the inclusion of agape in decision making and will sometimes allow circumstances to be taken into account. This overcomes some of the issues with a rigid application of Natural Law and also avoids the problems of the outdated biological basis of Natural Law
- However, Proportionalism could be too open to interpretation and too reliant on prediction of consequences in order to decide whether there is a proportionate reason to break a rule.

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

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 30]**

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

- One major strength of soft determinism may be that it solves the issue of human moral responsibility without denying that all actions have immediate and essentially determining causes.
- This hybrid of the ideas that there are determining factors that influence our decisions and yet that we still can make free choices that are not always ‘forced’ seems more compatible with how humans understand the world. It allows us to separate internal and external causes in a logical way (Hobbes) and fits in with the way in which humans genuinely feel (P. F. Strawson) and so further strengthens the case for soft determinism.
- In addition to this, whilst the concept of a metaphysical free will has increasingly little support in modern scientific and philosophical understandings, the feeling of freedom common to most humans is undeniable. This is recognised even by those who argue for hard determinism.
- However, many hard determinists, for example, Galen Strawson would that free will is a feeling that is an ‘illusion’. They would argue that soft determinism simply perpetuates the illusion of free will when it should be discarded, and determinism fully accepted. However, this ‘illusion’ still needs explanation for some.
- Ayer’s observation that, even if we were to accept that we are not entirely free agents ‘it would not follow that the idea of freedom would go by the board.’ Instead, he argues, we need to view our unforced choices as free in some way so that conventional legal and moral frameworks continue to make sense. This is a key strength for soft determinism as it gives meaning to our understanding of morality.
- Candidates may, however, argue that the tenets of soft determinism constitute an unacceptable compromise of the ‘facts’ of hard determinism and, as such, are a specific weakness to the theory. For example, the soft-determinist insistence on moral responsibility is false as humans cannot be responsible for actions over which they have no control. The implications of this for human society may be discussed.
- One other weakness of soft determinism is that it insists on a particular view of freedom which is at odds with the common understanding of free will. Most people see free will as the ability to choose what they want without being influenced by other factors. Only then would humans be morally responsible for their actions.
- The view of free moral choice being confined to freedom to act in a determined way without being prevented from doing so is a strange notion of freedom and is seen as being at odds with moral responsibility.

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