



GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2022

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

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2022 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.

UNIT 4 – RELIGION AND ETHICS

SUMMER 2022 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)	<p style="text-align: center;">Assessment Objective AO1 – Section A questions 30 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 (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

UNIT 4 - RELIGION AND ETHICS

SUMMER 2022 MARK SCHEME

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

Section A

1. **Examine the implications of predestination for God's omnipotence and omnibenevolence.**

[AO1 30]

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

- Omnipotence (God being all powerful) is a quality ascribed by believers to God and belief in predestination supports the belief that God is omnipotent, as it means that only God has power over the ultimate fate of humanity.
- This is contrasted with free will which is seen by some as incompatible with human dependence on God and therefore God's omnipotence. This was particularly the case with Augustine, who rejected Pelagius' free will theology as a direct challenge to God's sovereignty.
- Edwards, and later Calvin stated that belief in predestination was essential to maintain the sovereignty of God – if humans could choose their response to God or gain grace through good actions then His omnipotence would be undermined.
- This has further implications as it meant that atonement was limited, as Christ only died to save the Elect. Those who were chosen for salvation would be unable to resist God's grace, again because humans could not have control over their destiny at the same time as maintaining God's omnipotence.
- Omnibenevolence (all-loving or all-good) is another attribute of the God of Classical Theism and belief in predestination also has implications here.
- Augustine would see predestination as an example of omnibenevolence as following the Fall, it would be just to leave all of humanity in a state of damnation, but God's omnibenevolence is shown in the salvation granted to the elect through Jesus' death and resurrection.
- Some would state that predestination is not compatible with omnibenevolence as God only chooses some to be saved. In the case of double predestination, God actively chooses to send the Reprobates to hell, which does not appear benevolent.
- The lack of free choice and autonomy entailed by belief in predestination is also used by some to question God's omnibenevolence, as it does not appear loving to create beings who are little more than pre-programmed robots.
- Augustine would state that God can only be omnibenevolent, as his nature is wholly good, therefore any failure to understand how predestination is a reflection of omnibenevolence is down to human lack of knowledge.

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

2. Explain the implications of libertarianism for moral responsibility.

[AO1 30]

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

- There are many examples and various views from scholars that could be used to answer this question.
- Libertarians would argue that human life is free from deterministic factors and therefore humans should be held totally responsible for their own moral choices. This means that human ideas about right and wrong are incredibly important and should form the focus of study, as humans can rightfully be blamed for making poor moral choices.
- It also means that normative ethical theories are vital in giving guidelines about how best to utilise free will. If a moral agent does not consider how to act, then they may become amoral and can fairly be punished for their actions. Candidates may refer to libertarian thinkers such as Kant and Descartes.
- Professor Robert Kane begins with his definition of free will as something that is 'not beyond our control' and compares it to Aristotle's notion of our behaviour being 'up to us'. It is this idea, the notion that we have ultimate responsibility or 'up to usness' that drives Kane's view that we are morally responsible beings.
- However, humans are also free to choose absolutist moral approaches such as Natural Law which give clear guidelines about good and bad actions. The implications of libertarianism are that we are responsible for choosing the best guide to moral behaviour.
- Sartre viewed freedom as a 'curse' on humanity. Many humans do not wish to shoulder this responsibility and so act in 'bad faith', attempting to deny the extent of their freedom. For Sartre, moral responsibility was inherent to the human disposition.
- Accepting libertarian views means that moral agents cannot use the excuse of genetic predisposition or psychological conditioning to avoid taking moral responsibility, as has been attempted in some court cases.
- However, candidates may refer to a range of scholars who see moral responsibility and free will as practical realities, but simultaneously an illusion e.g. Galen Strawson and Daniel Dennett.
- Some may explore the work of psychologists such as Carl Rogers who attempted to explain free will and moral responsibility through the process of self-actualisation and the Fully Functioning Person and reconcile this with a scientific deterministic worldview.
- Candidates may refer to the work of scientists such as Angela Sirigu, which is inconclusive about free will; however some may refer to new ideas about 'freedom' in relation to a more complete model of what a human being is, for example, Nancey Murphy who maintains that we are 'free' even if there is a purely mechanistic explanation for a human being.

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

Section B

3. 'Using Finnis' Natural Law is a very effective way to make moral decisions.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Finnis' Natural Law could be seen as very effective as it can be applied in different ways by different people while still focusing on the same set of self-evident basic goods. It is permissible to prioritise different basic goods as long as no basic good is directly harmed.
- This gives Finnis' theory a flexibility that is lacking in other versions of Natural Law.
- However, it could be argued that the basic goods, which Finnis claims are self-evident, are in fact incomplete and, as White suggests, only self-evident to Finnis himself. For example, his view that heterosexual marriage is the self-evident fulfilment of the good of friendship and sociability is not seen as self-evident to different people who have different experiences.
- Finnis' basic good of life does not allow consideration of difficult cases of euthanasia or assisted suicide which are the subject of modern debate and this could make it less effective. On the other hand, the clear answer could be seen as effective as it gives a definite guideline and avoids emotive considerations.
- Another reason why Finnis' Natural Law may be seen as effective is because it does not require belief in a particular religion – the basic good of 'religion' is broader than Roman Catholicism or Christianity and so it can be used by a far wider range of people.
- However, it could be argued that Finnis theory is not effective as, although belief in God is not explicitly required, it does require assent to the concept of a common purpose for humanity and has been advocated as a Roman Catholic approach to morality, which shares most of the values of Aquinas' Natural Law.
- Finnis' theory can be seen as effective as it is grounded in reason and is straightforward to follow. In most cases, one should follow the law of the country, as long as these laws respect the basic goods, and this makes a coherent system for morality. A theory in which it is easy to work out what to do is an effective theory.
- However, this could be challenged as not all countries have laws which are considered 'moral' and, while Finnis considers the principle of *lex iniusta non est lex* (unjust law is not law), he also suggests that there is a balance to be made between the social value of obedience to the law and the moral value of disobeying in such circumstances. This introduces some uncertainty into what appears to be a clear-cut theory.

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

4. 'Proportionalism promotes immorality.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Proportionalism could be seen to promote immoral behaviour as it 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 contradicts Romans 3:8 in which Paul condemns and rejects the notion of 'Let us do evil so that good may come'.
- Also, it could be seen to promote immoral behaviour as it is too open to misunderstanding: it is not totally clear what would constitute a 'proportionate' reason to break a natural law and this could lead to immorality if the rules are broken unnecessarily.
- However, supporters of Proportionalism may reject this criticism as the deontological rules of Natural Law take precedence in the vast majority of situations. Accordingly, 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 before a rigid obsession with rules for the sake of rules.
- Proportionalism could be seen as promoting a more moral approach as it allows the situation to be taken into account 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.
- It could be argued that Proportionalism 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 likely to lead to a genuinely moral decision 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) which could be seen to lead to unfair and discriminatory decision making, but also avoids the main criticisms of Situation Ethics relating to the lack of moral guidance. This makes it unlikely to promote immoral behaviour, but instead take a more pragmatic approach about what is moral in a complex and imperfect world.
- Proportionalists would argue that their approach is more moral in some ways 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.

5. 'The concept of hard determinism clearly illustrates that humanity has no free will.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Hard determinists would argue that the concept of completely free moral choice is incoherent, in that humans do not have a 'free will' which allows them to make choices independent of other determining factors.
- However, most proponents of determinism would accept that humans can still make moral choices to some degree, even if the concept of a 'free will' is illusory.
- It could be argued that this makes the determinist position illogical – how can it be accepted that human actions are determined by prior causes, genetic factors or psychological conditioning while at the same time arguing that humans have free choice and are therefore subject to blame or praise for their actions.
- Candidates may draw out the distinction here between 'free will' and 'free moral choice' and may draw on the work of Locke to support the claim that 'free will' is in itself an illusion or the work of Galen Strawson who differentiates between a practical 'free will' that is an illusion and the *a priori* fact that it is impossible.
- The views of Robert Kane and 'self-forming actions' may be used to counter Strawson's claims and point out that free will can work within a largely causal mechanism.
- Candidates may discuss whether the hard determinist attempt to demonstrate that there is no 'free will', and yet still assert that humans can be held morally accountable should be dismissed as incoherent or simply viewed as a pragmatic necessity.
- Alternatively, it could be argued that humans clearly do have free will, and therefore are entirely free to make moral choices.
- Following Sartre's line of reasoning, the fact that the hard determinists reject the idea of free will is actually proof that it exists (the concept of bad faith). Humans work hard to avoid the consequences of total freedom as they do not wish to take on the level of moral responsibility this requires.
- Candidates may explore the various debates within science that strive to explain how we make choices, but also explain how this may give the impression of 'free will'. The arguments of compatibilists such as Daniel Dennett and new libertarian thinkers such as Murphy and Messer may be used as examples. It could be argued that new advances in scientific understanding give additional weight to the position of the philosophical determinist position.
- Alternatively, work in psychology could be presented to support the suggestion that conditioning is not permanent and can be overcome, leaving humans capable of exercising free will, or at least of making choices which demonstrate moral freedom. Rogers' attempt to reconcile the scientific determinist world view with his notion of moral freedom could be used to illustrate this point.
- Religious believers may argue that free will is granted by God and therefore the attempts of the hard determinists to illustrate its non-existence ultimately fail.

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

6. 'Religious beliefs about free will are convincing.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- It could be argued that beliefs about free will are convincing as there is scriptural evidence to support the concept, for example Joshua 24.15.
- However, there is also scriptural evidence to support predestination such as Romans 8:29-30. Candidates may engage with the issue of how far such evidence can be convincing for either side of the issue when taken out of context.
- Another line of argument would be to consider the wider support religious beliefs about free will have gained. For example, Pelagius' views on free will were seen as heretical. Also, the Synod of Dort clearly endorsed Calvin's doctrine of predestination and rejected Arminius' views on free will as unacceptable.
- However, candidates could consider Karl Barth's view that Christianity in the UK is 'incurably Pelagian', and could look at the influence of Arminian beliefs about free will on denominations such as Methodism when deciding how convincing such beliefs are.
- Belief in free will could be seen as convincing as it makes prayer more relevant than belief in predestination. Beings with free will can both seek guidance from God through prayer and ask for forgiveness for sinful acts. As Pelagius points out, 'free will is in all good works always assisted by divine aid.'
- Support for this point could also be taken from Arminius who saw prayer as a means to enhance the work of the Holy Spirit in a believer's life, which again shows that belief in free will fits with the way many believers understand prayer.
- However, this could be seen as questioning the sovereignty of God by suggesting that human requests and actions could influence their own salvation. This was a key reason why Augustine and Calvin argued for predestination.
- Free will also means that humans are free to reject salvation as well as to accept it. For some believers, this is more convincing than the belief in unconditional election held by supporters of predestination.
- Beliefs about free will appear more compatible with God's benevolence than beliefs about predestination, as God is not seen as 'the author of all sin' and does not predestine anyone to eternity in hell, which makes free will convincing for many believers.
- However, candidates could draw on Augustine's ideas about the origins of evil in original sin and the benevolence of God in saving the elect to counter this point.
- Candidates may choose to link religious beliefs about free will to the modern debate surrounding libertarianism and argue that scientific, psychological or philosophical approaches offer support to the concept of free will. Alternatively they may argue that the evidence points more clearly towards determinism.

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