



---

# **GCE MARKING SCHEME**

---

**SUMMER 2022**

**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 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.

## **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	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions    30 marks</b></p> <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</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>25-30 marks</b></p> <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>• Thorough and accurate use of specialist language /vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>19-24 marks</b></p> <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>• Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>13-18 marks</b></p> <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>• Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>7-12 marks</b></p> <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>• 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</b>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1-6 marks</b></p> <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>• 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 2 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- Part (b) questions</b> 30 marks <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i>
<b>5</b>	<p><b>25-30 marks</b></p> <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>• Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>19-24 marks</b></p> <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 response shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence.</li> <li>• Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<p><b>13-18 marks</b></p> <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>• Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context.</li> <li>• Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<p><b>7-12 marks</b></p> <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>• 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</b>	<p><b>1-6 marks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue.</li> <li>• Very limited accuracy within the response, with little coherence, clarity and organisation.</li> <li>• An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set.</li> <li>• Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence.</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>
<b>0</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No relevant analysis or evaluation.</li> </ul>

## GCE AS RELIGIOUS STUDIES – UNIT 2

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

#### SUMMER 2022 MARK SCHEME

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

3. (a) **Examine the nature of the following types of religious experience:**

- (i) **visions**
- (ii) **conversion.**

[AO1 30]

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

- It can be claimed that God is experienced beyond ordinary empirical evidence, through what may be known as a religious experience. It can be individual or corporate. They are believed to transmit some information either about the nature of the divine or about the nature of reality.
- **Visions** can be categorised in many ways, but the usual categories are sensory, intellectual and dreams. A vision is a message from God and can be supported by scriptural reference (e.g. Moses in Exodus 3). This possibility is supported by wide personal testimony - Lourdes, Fatima and by Tillich's feeling of 'ultimate concern'.
- However, the categorisation of visions is not clear-cut. It is better to think of it as a prism or the colours of a rainbow. One vision can be comprised of a number of aspects which candidates could exemplify.
- In terms of a sensory vision, an external figure may reveal previously unknown information to the recipient. This may involve an intellectual vision. These generally occur when the recipient is in a conscious state. However, visions involving dreams will occur when the person is in an unconscious state. This too will transmit information to the recipient. Common to most are feelings of great joy, exultation and intellectual illumination which is impossible to describe, a sense of reality and truth, what Otto would call the 'otherness' of God. Alternatively, they may be ineffable and beyond human expression.
- Visions often require prayer, interpretation and response from the experiencer – for example, a change of lifestyle. Noted mystics and visionaries include St Teresa and Julian of Norwich.
- Sensory visions can be group visions or individual visions. Some of these visions are corporeal in nature (physical nature) and others are non-corporeal. At times corporeal figures can only be seen by certain people.
- **Conversion means** the adoption of new **religious** beliefs that differ from the **convert's** previous beliefs and lead to a change in direction of a life. Conversion can be individual, for example St. Paul or communal, for example at Pentecost, the conversion of the disciples in the Book of Acts. It can involve a change in direction from theism to atheism, atheism to theism (St. Augustine) or a conversion from one religious tradition to another.
- There are a variety of component parts to the description of conversion that candidates could refer to as well as individual and communal. Conversion can be sudden, an unexpected event that happens 'out of the blue'. However, conversion can also be gradual, where a person undergoes almost a 'drip-feed' set of experiences that culminates in conversion.
- The conversion generally brings about a feeling of renewal where the person may describe a feeling of being 'born again' or of becoming a new person. This conversion may be as a result of their own choice to freely surrender themselves to the experience. Others describe being 'taken' by the experience where they are completely passive, with the experience happening to them.

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

- (b) **‘Visions are the most effective way of communicating religious teaching and beliefs.’**

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 30]**

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

- Candidates may evaluate the validity of visions and conversion as ways of communicating religious teaching and belief by comparing validity with other types of religious experience such as prayer and mysticism.
- They may suggest that all experiences are a valid means of communicating teaching and practice or may select one or more than one type of religious experience as having more validity in this respect. For example, they may say that visions are the most valid way of communicating teaching and belief as visions are indeed the foundations of many religious beliefs and teachings. A pertinent example may be St. Peter’s vision of a blanket containing all sorts of creatures descending. This communicated the belief and teaching of Jews being able to eat with Gentiles.
- However, others may suggest that the results of claimed visions are so diverse and contradictory that they would deem those visions to be less than valid ways of communicating anything clear.
- Some may argue that visions are delusional and have been driven by some psychological need. In this sense they can neither communicate religious teaching nor belief as they do not stem from any objective reality.
- However, those in favour would cite the sheer weight of testimony in support of visions as a means of communicating religious teaching and belief. There is the encouragement of the sheer weight of testimony in support and the claims of supporters to have heard and/ or experienced God and had changed lives.
- Moreover, if God exists, these would surely be the ways in which God might choose to communicate religious teachings and belief.
- However, a problem arises due to the nature of some types of religious experience. That is that they are ineffable. If a person, who claims to have experienced a vision for example, cannot describe anything about that experience, then how can they communicate anything regarding belief and/or teaching?
- On the other hand, there are examples of those that perhaps could not initially vocalise the experience, but later on could. That experience was then found to be completely packed with key religious teachings and belief or a way forward for particular individuals. St. Paul was initially struck dumb, but then vocalised key teachings.

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



4. (a) Examine the following challenges to ontological arguments presented by:
- (i) Gaunilo
  - (ii) Kant.

[AO1 30]

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

- Ontological arguments are *a priori* arguments and attempts to prove God's existence by using the meaning of the word 'God'. They are deductive (the conclusion necessarily follows from the premises) and analytic because the truth or falsity of the argument is determined by the meaning of the words used.
- Therefore, the success of ontological arguments depends upon the acceptance of the definition of the word 'God'.
- This aspect of the ontological argument has been severely challenged by numerous scholars.
- In a work titled 'On behalf of the fool', Gaunilo replied to Anselm's proof by using an argument structure known as *reductio ad absurdum*. He makes a claim that in the same way that Anselm argues it is possible to argue the existence of God through the definition of God is that than which nothing greater can be conceived, then it must therefore be possible to have the idea of a perfect island and, because of this idea, then this island must exist. However, as Gaunilo pointed out this certainly does not mean that such an island exists in reality. We can always think of a bigger or better island, but such an island cannot have an 'intrinsic maximum'.
- In other words, Gaunilo is stating that the idea of a something that can be thought of as existing separately outside of our minds, just because it is the greatest thing we can think of, is a logical nonsense. Just because you can define a greatest possible being does not automatically lead to the fact that one actually exists – and it here that he makes use of his island analogy to underline the absurdity of Anselm's argument.
- Kant argues that existence is not a real predicate because it does not tell us what an object is like. The rejection of 'existence' as a predicate is a very popular challenge to the ontological argument.
- Moreover, the word 'exist' merely states that a concept has an actuality. It does not actually add anything to the concept. The real contains no more than the merely possible. Kant used the example of 100 really thalers/100 real thalers existing. They contain no more thalers than the merely possible.
- He challenges the view that God is a necessary or 'first order' predicate as it only uses concepts and not realities. He claimed that God cannot be argued into existence and therefore, existence cannot be a predicate. Thus, if you have a triangle, then you must have three angles, but if you do not have a triangle, then you do not have three angles. One can reject the triangle along with its properties. So too one can reject God along with God's properties.

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

**(b) 'A priori arguments for God's existence are very persuasive.'**

**Evaluate this view.**

**[AO2 30]**

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

- The ontological argument as an *a priori* argument appears to be persuasive. This is because the argument is presented in a logical, sequenced fashion with premises that lead us to an inescapable conclusion. Many would accept premises such as the definition of God given by Anselm. If the premises are correct then it is possible that the conclusion is also correct.
- However, *a priori* arguments do rely on the premises being correct in order that a correct conclusion may follow. Also, even if the premises of an argument are correct then the conclusion may still be incorrect thus making *a priori* arguments unpersuasive in proving God's existence.
- It could be argued though that *a priori* arguments are 'pure' arguments in the sense that they do not rely on (subjective) evidence unlike *a posteriori* arguments. Supposed evidence can be wrong due to misinterpretation. The persuasiveness of an *a priori* argument rests on the notion that they can be deemed to be universally valid. Once a definition is established in an *a priori* fashion then it cannot be rejected. For example, a bachelor is always an unmarried man.
- Contrary to this though, it could be argued that *a priori* arguments are not persuasive due to the very fact that they are not based on evidence and experience. This would lead us to contend that *a posteriori* arguments are far more persuasive. Today's world asks for empirical proof before accepting something as valid. *A priori* arguments cannot give us this 'scientific' proof and they are therefore unreliable.
- Classical arguments for God's existence such as the cosmological and teleological arguments are both examples of *a posteriori* arguments. They provide us with far more reliable grounds for proving God's existence than *a priori* proofs do. They have stood the test of time and their inductive nature is persuasive.
- Some indeed say that *a priori* proofs are nothing more than circular arguments which really present us with no new information and do not actually 'prove' anything.
- *A priori* arguments rely on the understanding of the use of language such as definitions of words. This can be viewed in two ways. First, they can be deemed to be unpersuasive as they are merely a play on words, pure semantics. However, on the other hand it could be argued that they are untainted by changing times and are therefore persuasive.
- Specific reference may be made to the persuasiveness or not of ontological arguments, but the question is wider than that alone.

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