



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2018

**AS
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - COMPONENT 2
AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF
RELIGION
B120U20-1**

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2018 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 of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.”
- “This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.”

Rules for Marking

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

Banded mark schemes

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

Banded mark schemes stage 1 – deciding on the band

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

If an answer covers different aspects of different bands within the mark scheme, a 'best fit' approach should be adopted to decide on the band and then the candidate's response should be used to decide on the mark within the band. For instance if a response is mainly in band 2 but with a limited amount of band 3 content, the answer would be placed in band 2, but the mark awarded would be close to the top of band 2 as a result of the band 3 content.

Examiners should not seek to mark candidates down as a result of small omissions in minor areas of an answer.

Banded mark schemes stage 2 – deciding on the mark

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

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

Awarding no marks to a response

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

AS Generic Band Descriptors

Band	Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions 25 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	21-25 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 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. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	16-20 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 demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples. • Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	11-15 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 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. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	6-10 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. • 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. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	1-5 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. • 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. • Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. <p>N.B. A maximum of 2 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'</p>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant information.

Band	Assessment Objective AO2- Part (b) questions 25 marks <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i>
5	<p style="text-align: center;">21-25 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue. • A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set. • Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
4	<p style="text-align: center;">16-20 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue. • The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed. • The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
3	<p style="text-align: center;">11-15 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue. • Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed. • Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
2	<p style="text-align: center;">6-10 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue. • A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed. • A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.
1	<p style="text-align: center;">1-5 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue. • An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set. • Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence. • Some use of basic specialist language and vocabulary.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant analysis or evaluation.

GCE AS RELIGIOUS STUDIES

SUMMER 2018 MARK SCHEME

Component 2: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion

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

Section A

1. (a) Explain the different cosmological arguments for the existence of God presented by Aquinas and Craig. [AO1 25]

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

- Aquinas offers an 'a posteriori' argument based on the empirical evidence.
- Argument from change or movement. Everything has potential to move but needs to be acted upon by something in a state of actuality.
- Aquinas states that something cannot be both actual and potential at the same time. Infinite regress is impossible. There must be an unmoved mover – God.
- Aquinas' argument from cause – nothing can be the cause of itself. In the universe we see a series of causes and effects. The universe must have a cause which is external to itself, an uncaused cause – God.
- Examples such as fire and wood are appropriate, relating to this to God and the universe.
- From contingency and necessity. All things including the universe are contingent. This would mean that at some point, nothing existed. Things do exist, so there must be a necessary being who brought all contingent beings into existence – God.
- Craig's form, the Kalam argument, is a modern up-date on the classical Islamic argument of Al Ghazali
- Some candidates may discuss the idea of actual and potential infinities e.g. the library.
- It is an 'a posteriori' argument, based upon the view that everything that begins to exist is caused by something else within time and space.
- 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.
- God exists within time and space.

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

(b) 'The Kalam cosmological argument is convincing.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

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

- The Kalam argument is convincing because the universe clearly exists.
- The argument has the support of centuries of scholarship and is based on empirical evidence.
- The reasoning behind the argument uses scientific principles of cause and effect.
- The Kalam argument is not convincing because God is not the only possible explanation for the universe (Hume).
- If everything has a cause, then God must have a cause.
- We cannot explain the creation of the universe.
- The cosmological argument is based on unverifiable assumptions about God – that he is the first cause and he exists within our notion of time and space.
- The universe may be 'just there' (Russell).
- The 'Big Bang' theory does not require God.
- We cannot know for certain that there is no infinite regress.

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

2. (a) Outline the different teleological arguments for the existence of God presented by Aquinas, Paley and Tennant. [AO1 25]

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

Aquinas and Tennant present teleological arguments expressed in an inductive form; they are a posteriori arguments for God's existence – dependent on evidence or experience.

Aquinas had two arguments (NB the two are often conflated as they do work together and this is acceptable):

- Argument from **order and regularity**: the regular movement of 'natural bodies'; everything in the universe follows natural laws, even if they possess no intelligence (i.e. the regular movement of the stars in the sky – which in Aquinas's time people had no rational 'scientific' explanation for).
- Argument from **purpose**: starting point for this argument was observation of existing and observable objects that appeared to be working towards an end or purpose; even objects that lack intelligence still behaved in purposeful ways. From this Aquinas goes on to induct a conclusion that something was guiding them to behave thus; uses the analogy of the archer.

The ideas of order and purpose work together to suggest an intelligent being and the only possible explanation was that this guiding intelligence was God.

Tennant had two arguments:

- The **Anthropic Principle**: by observing the existing universe and inducting a conclusion that the precise nature of this universe, and its various components, were deliberately designed so as to support the development of intelligent life. For Tennant it was the existence of a set of evidences that provided the ideal circumstances for humans to exist. The provision was for the sustenance of life as well as demonstrating that the universe allowed itself to be analysed, something that led to benefit for humankind. The process of evolution that leads to human life is seen as a deliberate natural mechanism, planned by a divine designer, included within the fabric of the universe.
- The **Aesthetic Principle**: Tennant develops his ideas to include the aspect of beauty as a provision from a benevolent designer that allows humankind to 'enjoy' existence. This provision is also considered by Tennant to be a divine revelation – demonstrating both the existence as well as nature of God.

Paley

- Paley agrees that God is the best explanation of beneficial order.
- He also agrees that beneficial order cannot happen by chance.
- Paley's view differs in that he sees the universe like a complex machine made by an intelligent designer and uses the analogy of the watchmaker.
- Paley's watch analogy highlights the notion of movement between complex parts which work together in order to achieve a purpose and the workings of the universe are analogous to this.
- Using examples such as the workings of the eye or a bird's wing are additional proof that the universe is intelligently designed.

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

(b) 'Paley's view of the teleological argument is convincing.'

[AO2 25]

Evaluate this view.

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

- The most convincing support for Paley's view is that the universe exists and shows regularity of action.
- It is 'a posteriori' and based on solid empirical evidence.
- Science changes and develops and, therefore, scientific evidence is not necessarily a definitive challenge.
- The argument is supported by modern scholarly developments e.g. Tennant. The universe perfectly fits for the development of life and the growth of human knowledge, also intelligent design.
- Teleological argument based on empirical observation of apparent design, order and purpose – this is a scientific method.
- Therefore, the argument rests on the same assumptions as scientific theories.
- Those against Paley's view claim that the teleological argument assumes that God exists.
- The 'God of gaps' argument is unnecessary in the scientific age.
- Darwin and evolution provide a stronger explanation than the watchmaker.
- The universe is mechanistic, driven by biological impulses (Dawkins).
- Hume argued that we simply do not have the knowledge to know if the universe was designed or not and that the designer need not be God.
- Hume challenged the watch analogy – the universe was more like an organic vegetable because the natural world has inner regulation and growth.
- For Hume, the universe does not bear sufficient resemblance to a watch.
- Intelligence must be caused – hence a regression of causes.

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

Section B

3. (a) Explain the ontological argument with reference to Descartes and Malcolm.

[AO1 25]

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

Descartes

- Descartes saw the ontological argument as deductive and 'a priori', based on theoretical deduction rather than observation or experience.
- He saw existence as a quality that belonged to God in the same way that three angles make a triangle.
- For God, existence is a predicate – God's defining predicate.
- Descartes argued that, as he could conceive of his own existence, he could also conceive of the existence of the perfect being.
- Descartes offered his own form of the argument; God, a supremely perfect being, has all perfections.
- Existence is a perfection.
- Therefore God, a supremely being, exists.
- In 'Meditation 5', Descartes argued that there were some qualities that an object necessarily has or else it would not be that object.
- Therefore existence cannot be separated from the concept of God.

Malcolm

- Malcolm centres his argument on necessary existence. He saw Proslogion 2 as unsound.
- He focussed on God as an absolutely unlimited being and saw his arguments as a development of those found in Proslogion 3.
- God's existence cannot be brought about nor threatened by anything.
- God's existence is either impossible or necessary.
- It cannot be impossible since the concept is not self-contradictory.
- Therefore God necessarily exists.

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

(b) 'Kant's challenge to the ontological argument is not effective.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

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

- Kant's challenge centres on the belief that the view of God as a necessary predicate only uses concepts and not realities.
- He says that one cannot define something, albeit island or perfect being, into existence.
- Kant denies existence as a real predicate—a concept is not made greater of more perfect by claiming that it 'is'.
- 'Exists' is just a word that states that a concept has a reality. It does not add anything to the concept.
- The real contains no more than the merely possible, so a concept is not made greater by adding reality.
- It is not fully effective because we do not really know what the word 'God' means.
- Can we really conceive of the idea of 'the greatest or most perfect being'?
- The premises of the ontological argument may not be true as they stem from medieval times and do not take account of modern science.
- As a deductive argument, the ontological argument is rational and persuasive. If premises are accepted the conclusion can be also.
- Most would accept Anselm's definition of God as "a being than which nothing greater can be conceived."
- Challenges such as those of Gaunilo have missed the point. Perfect islands can always have things added to them, but arguments concerning God's characteristics are of a different nature.

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

4. (a) Examine the problem of evil with reference to Mackie and Rowe. [AO1 25]

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

Mackie

- The 'Inconsistent Triad' suggests evil should not exist if God is all-loving and omnipotent.
- If God is all loving (omnibenevolent) then evil and suffering would not exist in the world, because God would not desire it.
- If God is all powerful (omnipotent) then evil and suffering would not exist in the world because God would be able to prevent it.
- Evil and suffering exist therefore either God is not omnibenevolent or is not omnipotent, or God does not exist at all.
- Mackie therefore rejected the traditional/classic concept of God and pointed out that all theodicies fail because all they can do to defend God is to redefine God i.e. not omnipotent.
- Some candidates may refer to the Paradox of Omnipotence in their response.

Rowe

- Rowe in his work: argued that, whilst it seemed reasonable for God to allow some limited suffering to enable humans to grow and develop, he could not accept God allowing what he called 'intense' suffering' Rowe focuses on the evidential problem of evil.
- Animal suffering also seemed pointless. Rowe used the example of a fawn caught in a forest fire as an example of pointless animal suffering.
- Rowe argued that an omnipotent and omniscient being (God) would know when intense suffering was about to take place. Such a being could prevent the suffering from happening.
- An all-loving being would probably prevent all evil and suffering that had no purpose and was pointless and avoidable, such evil and suffering does happen. Therefore, probably God does not exist.
- Theodicies would make sense if evil and suffering were limited in intensity and had some benefit. However, limitless suffering is inexplicable.

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

- (b) "Modern problem of evil arguments prove that God does not exist".

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

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

- Mackie's argument clearly shows that the logical inconsistency of claiming that evil exists alongside an omnibenevolent and omnipotent God.
- However, some would claim that it is acceptable to still accept evil and retain God's characteristics, as for example, God is still omnipotent if he decides to not to exercise his omnipotence.
- The evidential problem of evil as stated by Rowe and Paul proves God does not exist as we can clearly see the evidence of intense suffering around us.
- Candidates could present the evidence and examples used by Rowe (intense human and animal suffering) and Paul (statistical evidence particularly with reference to premature deaths).
- However, some may point out that suffering is necessary for 'the greater good' or to allow us to learn from suffering.
- Candidates may refer to theodicies, is used as a rebuttal of the problem of evil arguments. For example, as the 'Inconsistent Triad' is an old argument then Irenaean and Augustinian type-theodicies, etc. may be used, ideally with reference to the arguments of Mackie and Rowe.
- Examples of evil suffering today may be used, ideally with reference to the arguments of Mackie and Rowe.
- For example, candidates could present an argument in support of Mackie with reference to his Paradox of Omnipotence.

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

5. (a) Examine the nature of mysticism, with reference to transcendent, ecstatic and unitive experiences. [AO1 25]

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

- In mystical experiences, God is encountered beyond ordinary empirical evidence. This is usually individual and subjective, though may be corporate. Mystical experiences can be the experience of having apprehended an ultimate reality.
- Looks at people who claim to have had direct and intimate experiences of God.
- Such experiences draw upon common range of emotions, including happiness, fear and wonder.
- All are directed at the divine and give the experient an overwhelming feeling of desire to belong to God.
- A transcendent experience is one which is 'other-worldly'. This experience goes beyond the normal range of physical human experience.
- An ecstatic experience is one which involves a feeling of overwhelming happiness or joyful excitement. It can be accompanied by a sudden and intense over-powering emotion, almost a 'frenzy'.
- Unitive experiences lead to a feeling of being at one with the divine or a higher reality.
- The aspects of the nature of a mystical experience may be exemplified with reference to specific mystics, e.g. Teresa of Avila. or particular cases of claimed mystical experiences.
- It could be that these three aspects may not be dealt with separately as a mystical experience may compromise a number of these aspects.

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

- (b) 'Mystical experiences are the most valid type of religious experience in communicating religious teachings and beliefs'.

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 25]

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

- Mystical experiences may not be considered as valid as they can be subjective. It may be pointed out that the ecstatic nature of such experiences is similar to the effects of drugs or alcohol.
- However, the same can be said for other types of religious experience such as visions.
- Many types of religious experiences are deemed not to be open to verification. Reference may be made to the challenges presented by Franks-Davis (description-related; subject-related and object-related challenges).
- However, there are criticisms that could be levelled towards Franks-Davis' challenges, which would lead to religious experiences being considered as valid e.g. Swinburne's Principle of Testimony or Principle of Credulity.
- Candidates may argue that conversion is a more valid type of religious experience because the 'fruits' of the conversion are empirically verifiable e.g. a change in a person's actions.
- Public visions can also be empirically verified thus making them a more valid type of religious experience.
- However, private visions in the form of dreams for example, are by their very nature not open to public verification, thus suggesting that they are not the most valid type of religious experience.
- Prayer is often of an individual nature, and as such involve communication with the divine or ultimate reality, but the response to prayer may be considered to be subjective.
- However, it could be said that the effects of prayer are widely observable. For example, prayer as form of religious experience may lead to the renewal of faith or may provide added courage to the person when faced with opposition or persecution, so it may be the most valid type of religious experience in communicating religious teachings and beliefs.

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