# GCE MARKING SCHEME

**SUMMER 2023**

**AS (NEW)
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - UNIT 2
SECTION B - AN INTRODUCTION TO THE
PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION**

**2120U20-1**

**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 INSTRUCTIONS

## 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 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.

# AS Generic Band Descriptors

| Band | Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions   30 marks |
|------|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| | *Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:*<br>- *religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching*<br>- *influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies*<br>- *cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice*<br>- *approaches to the study of religion and belief.* |
| **5** | **25-30 marks**<br>• Thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief.<br>• An extensive and relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set.<br>• The response shows an excellent standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.<br>• The response demonstrates extensive depth and/or breadth. Excellent use of evidence and examples.<br>• Thorough and accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.<br>• Thorough and accurate use of specialist language /vocabulary in context.<br>• Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| **4** | **19-24 marks**<br>• Accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief.<br>• A detailed, relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set.<br>• The response shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.<br>• The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples.<br>• Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.<br>• Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.<br>• Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| **3** | **13-18 marks**<br>• Mainly accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief.<br>• A satisfactory response, which generally answers the main demands of the question set.<br>• The response shows a satisfactory standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.<br>• The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth in some areas. Satisfactory use of evidence and examples.<br>• Mainly accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.<br>• Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.<br>• Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| **2** | **7-12 marks**<br>• Limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Basic level of accuracy and relevance.<br>• A basic response, addressing some of the demands of the question set.<br>• Partially accurate response, with some signs of coherence, clarity and organisation.<br>• The response demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth, including limited use of evidence and examples.<br>• Some accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.<br>• Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.<br>• Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| **1** | **1-6 marks**<br>• Very limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Low level of accuracy and relevance.<br>• A very limited response, with little attempt to address the question.<br>• Very limited accuracy within the response with little coherence, clarity and organisation.<br>• The response demonstrates very limited depth and/or breadth. Very limited use of evidence and examples.<br>• Little or no reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate.<br>• Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary<br>• Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the meaning and clarity of communication.<br><br>**N.B.    A maximum of 2 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'** |
| **0** | • No relevant information. |

| Band | Assessment Objective AO2- Part (b) questions  30 marks<br>*Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief,<br>including their significance, influence and study.* |
|---|---|
| **5** | **25-30 marks**<br>• Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue.<br>• A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set.<br>• The response shows an excellent standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.<br>• Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence.<br>• Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.<br>• Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| **4** | **19-24 marks**<br>• Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue.<br>• The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed.<br>• The response shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.<br>• The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence.<br>• Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.<br>• Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| **3** | **13-18 marks**<br>• Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue.<br>• Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed.<br>• The response shows a satisfactory standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.<br>• Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence.<br>• Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.<br>• Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| **2** | **7-12 marks**<br>• Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue.<br>• A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed.<br>• Partially accurate response, with some signs of coherence, clarity and organisation.<br>• A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence.<br>• Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.<br>• Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar. |
| **1** | **1-6 marks**<br>• A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue.<br>• Very limited accuracy within the response, with little coherence, clarity and organisation.<br>• An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set.<br>• Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence.<br>• Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary.<br>• Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the meaning and clarity of communication. |
| **0** | • No relevant analysis or evaluation. |

4

# GCE AS RELIGIOUS STUDIES – UNIT 2

## SECTION B: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

## SUMMER 2023 MARK SCHEME

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

**Either,**

**0 3** **(a)** **Outline different challenges to the objectivity and authenticity of religious experience.** **[30]**

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

- Due to the nature of certain types of religious experience, it may be said that the criteria for truth is almost impossible to establish. This is because some experiences are deemed to be subjective and therefore not without dispute with regard to their credibility.

- The work of the Vienna Circle and Logical Positivism said that for a statement to be meaningful (capable of passing on information) it must either be analytic or synthetic. Many religious experiences are claimed in language that falls into neither of these categories, so they are meaningless. Ayer said that at best they would be 'emotive utterances.'

- On the falsification side, Popper and Flew said that the only meaningful statements are those that are capable of being falsified. Flew said that religious believers refuse to have their statements falsified (in this case, claims of religious experience) making such language meaningless, subjective, lacking in authenticity.

- Caroline Franks-Davis identified three challenges to the objectivity and authenticity of religious experience. Description-related. There is no proof that the claim that 'God' or 'the Divine' has been experienced. The description is therefore to be refuted. Authenticity and objectivity should be granted to that which conforms to everyday experience. Religious experiences do not conform to everyday experiences. Subject-related. The subject is the person who receives the claimed experience. S/he is considered unreliable. They may suffer from episodes of hallucinations or from mental illness (described further under 'naturalistic explanations.') As they in a fragile mental state, they have been mistaken and misguided. Object-related. This relates to the object that the person claims to have experienced. The likelihood that the object described has indeed been experienced, is as unlikely as the most unlikely object we can imagine has been experienced. If someone claimed to have experienced something preposterous, we would be unlikely to believe her or him. This should also be the case with a religious experience.

- There are other challenges to religious experience that come from the study of nature and human life. Religious experiences are not open to rational enquiry. This is something that has always been called upon in order for an experience to be considered objective, with the ability for it to be deemed as authentic. There are other explanations as to what is being experienced.

- Freud said that mystical experiences are the manifestations of the repression of sexual urges. The desire for a mystical experience is simply the desire of humans to return to the safety of the womb, a regression, which clearly is not the manifestation of a religious experience.

- Others say that the characteristics of a religious experience can be seen replicated in people who take drugs or use alcohol. Such experiences are simply hallucinations rather than an objective experience.

5

**(b)** **'Challenges to religious experience are not valid.'**
**Evaluate this view.** **[30]**

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

- Candidates should consider whether the challenges to religious experience (including those noted in part a) of the question) are so overwhelming that they render any claims to their occurrence as being invalid.
- The focus clearly needs to be on the *evaluation* of the strength of the challenges rather than a reiteration of what the challenges are.
- Challenges to religious experience may include reference to the lack of authenticity and the subjectivity of religious experience. Due to the nature of certain types of religious experience, it may be said that the criteria for truth is almost impossible to establish. This is because some experiences are deemed to be subjective and therefore not without dispute with regard to their credibility. This may show that such experiences therefore have no basis in reality.
- The work of the Vienna Circle and Logical Positivism said that for a statement to be meaningful (capable of passing on information) it must either be analytic or synthetic. Many religious experiences are claimed in language that falls into neither of these categories, so they are meaningless. Ayer said that at best they would be 'emotive utterances.' Therefore Logical Positivism shows that religious experiences cannot be verified and has no proof of actually occurring.
- However, rejection of the truth of an individual's religious experience just because it cannot be verified or falsified is potentially offensive, as it assumes that the individual's testimony cannot be trusted. Swinburne's Principles of Testimony and/or credulity could be employed here. Indeed, the notion of some religious experiences contains the concept of them being one-off experiences. Hence although they cannot be repeated the truth of the experience cannot be denied.
- Some may claim that what one may believe to be a religious experience is merely the result of a misunderstanding of an experience. Indeed claimed religious experiences have so many parallels with delusional experiences that it is impossible to distinguish between the two.
- Caroline Franks-Davis identified three challenges to the objectivity and authenticity of religious experience. Candidates may give a brief explanation but credit should be given for an *evaluation* of the challenges rather than what the challenges are. Candidates may focus some of their answer on refuting the claims identified by Franks-Davis. They can also give reasons why some of these challenges are valid.
- However, religious experiences provide comfort and support to individuals and groups. Challenges to these experiences do not always take account of the positive psychological effects that recipients claim. As James would say, this shows that the experience has produced 'fruits' thus suggesting that the experience did happen and because of this has resulted in a change in a person's behaviour.
- Many of the challenges only take into account an empirical and rational view of the universe and therefore may be too reductionist to account for an experience which may come from beyond these spheres of experience.
- Religious experiences can increase individual and, sometimes, corporate spiritual understanding and should therefore not be dismissed out of hand because of the challenges to them. Alternatively, candidates may consider that the weight of empirical evidence against religious experiences is so overwhelming that it ensures that challenges to the truth of religious experience.

6

**Or,**

| 0 | 4 |  (a)     **Outline the different cosmological arguments presented by:**

        **(i)      Aquinas' Three Ways <u>and</u>**
        **(ii)    The Kalam Argument, with reference to William Lane Craig.    [30]**

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

- Aquinas' three ways can be found in Summa Theologica. He uses inductive reasoning to point towards the existence of God who is responsible for the creation of the universe.
- His First Way is based on the concepts of motion or change. All things which are moved must be moved by something else, the 'efficient cause'. This efficient cause moves things from a state of potentiality into a state of actuality. Aquinas used the example of wood and fire to illustrate his point. It is important that candidates relate this to God and the universe, showing that God is in a state of actuality and is able to move the universe into a state of actuality. This is because there is no infinite regress. The universe must have a starting point. This starting point is the Prime Mover, God.
- His Second Way refers to the concepts of cause and effect. Cause and effect are universally observable within the universe. This also must be the case for the universe itself. Again, infinite regress is rejected because with no starting point there is no beginning. Clearly this is contrary to experience. So, the universe exists (is an effect) so it must have a cause, the Uncaused Causer, God. Dominoes are often used to illustrate this.
- The Third Way is based upon the concepts of contingency and necessity. In nature there are things which are possible to be and not to be. If this was the case for everything then there would be nothing today. As there is something then this needs an explanation. There must be something which is not contingent. This necessary being relies on nothing for existence. This necessary being which caused all contingency to be, is God.
- The Kalam argument is a modern up-date cosmological argument based on the classical Islamic argument. It is an 'a posteriori', inductive argument, based upon the view that everything that begins to exist is caused by something else within time and space. This makes it 'cosmological.'
- The Kalam (in particular Craig's) argument works as follows. Everything that has a beginning has a cause. The universe had a beginning. The universe began to exist therefore it must have a beginning and a cause - the uncaused causer. This is God. God is a self-causing and necessary being who is not timeless and exists within the universe. He exists within time and space. The universe was caused at a point in time. That cause was God, therefore God exists in time – there is no infinite regress.
- The conclusion in terms of suggesting that the universe came into being as a result of a deliberate choice by a personal creator is an important part of William Lane Craig's argument. As the laws of science did not exist before the universe did then they cannot be responsible for the creation of the universe. Hence the alternative conclusion is given that God is responsible for the existence of the universe.

**(b)** **'Cosmological arguments are effective in proving God's existence.'**
**Evaluate this view.** **[30]**

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

- Candidates should debate whether various cosmological arguments can actually lead to proof of the existence of the God of Classical Theism.
- Cosmological arguments suffer various objections. One is that cause and effect may not be linked. This makes an inductive jump which is not warranted. There is an effect (universe) but we cannot say definitively what the cause is, even whether there is a cause at all. Also, the cosmological argument is inductive and so the conclusion may be possible, even probable but it is not definitive proof.
- There may indeed be a plurality of causes thus the cosmological argument does not prove the God of classical theism. In this sense any conclusion based upon a cosmological argument would be ineffective as it may only prove a beginning to the universe as opposed to the God of Classical Theism as being the cause.
- Logically the argument makes no sense. If everything needs a cause, then what is the cause of God? Aquinas would argue that God is a 'special case' and the argument regarding causes does not apply to God. The cosmological argument only applies to contingent things within the universe.
- The universe could just be a brute fact, something that exists without the need of an explanation. Cosmological arguments rely on the asking of the question 'why?' there is a universe and 'how?' did it come about. If there is no question to ask then the cosmological arguments are not needed as an answer. Though it could be argued that simply avoiding the question is not a sound form of argument.
- Some, including those using the laws of science would argue that there is no need for a first mover as things are capable of moving themselves. Indeed, we of our own volition can choose to move ourselves. However, it could still be argued that initial movement would not have started without a Prime Mover.
- The Big Bang can account for the existence of the universe without the need for reference to God as the first cause. However, many would suggest that there must be a reason why the Big Bang occurred suggesting there is still a role for God.
- The concept of infinity is indeed illogical as we cannot add to infinity. The present moment would not have arrived if infinity were true. There must therefore have been a starting point.
- Things can only achieve a different state via the intervention of a third party, the efficient cause. Only that which is in a state of actuality can effect a change from potentiality to actuality. For example, a person can only teach Spanish to someone else if that first person can in fact speak Spanish themselves. Without the intervention of God then the universe would never have come into being.