

**GCE A2**

**Religious Studies**

**January 2010**

**Mark Schemes**

Issued: April 2010



**NORTHERN IRELAND GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION (GCSE)  
AND NORTHERN IRELAND GENERAL CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION (GCE)**

**MARK SCHEMES (2010)**

**Foreword**

***Introduction***

Mark Schemes are published to assist teachers and students in their preparation for examinations. Through the mark schemes teachers and students will be able to see what examiners are looking for in response to questions and exactly where the marks have been awarded. The publishing of the mark schemes may help to show that examiners are not concerned about finding out what a student does not know but rather with rewarding students for what they do know.

***The Purpose of Mark Schemes***

Examination papers are set and revised by teams of examiners and revisers appointed by the Council. The teams of examiners and revisers include experienced teachers who are familiar with the level and standards expected of 16 and 18-year-old students in schools and colleges. The job of the examiners is to set the questions and the mark schemes; and the job of the revisers is to review the questions and mark schemes commenting on a large range of issues about which they must be satisfied before the question papers and mark schemes are finalised.

The questions and the mark schemes are developed in association with each other so that the issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed right from the start. Mark schemes therefore are regarded as a part of an integral process which begins with the setting of questions and ends with the marking of the examination.

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to provide a uniform basis for the marking process so that all the markers are following exactly the same instructions and making the same judgements in so far as this is possible. Before marking begins a standardising meeting is held where all the markers are briefed using the mark scheme and samples of the students' work in the form of scripts. Consideration is also given at this stage to any comments on the operational papers received from teachers and their organisations. During this meeting, and up to and including the end of the marking, there is provision for amendments to be made to the mark scheme. What is published represents this final form of the mark scheme.

It is important to recognise that in some cases there may well be other correct responses which are equally acceptable to those published: the mark scheme can only cover those responses which emerged in the examination. There may also be instances where certain judgements may have to be left to the experience of the examiner, for example, where there is no absolute correct response – all teachers will be familiar with making such judgements.

The Council hopes that the mark schemes will be viewed and used in a constructive way as a further support to the teaching and learning processes.



## CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
A2 1: Module 1	1
A2 2: Module 2	9
A2 3: Module 3	17
A2 4: Module 4	25
A2 5: Module 5	33
A2 6: Module 6	41
A2 7: Module 7	49
A2 9: Module 9	57





*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED  
General Certificate of Education  
January 2010**

---

**Religious Studies**

**Assessment Unit A2 1**

*assessing*

**Module 1: The Theology of  
the Gospel of Luke**

**[A2R11]**

**FRIDAY 8 JANUARY, AFTERNOON**

---

**MARK  
SCHEME**

## **Part 1: Levels of Response**

The specification requires that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the knowledge, understanding and skills set out in Section 3 of the specification.

- Select and demonstrate clearly relevant knowledge and understanding through the use of evidence, examples and correct language and terminology appropriate to the course of study (AO1);
- sustain a critical line of argument and justify a point of view (AO2).

Each of the two assessment objectives has been categorised into five levels of performance relating to the respective abilities of the candidates.

Having identified, for each assessment objective listed below, the band in which the candidate has performed the examiner should then decide on the appropriate mark within the range for the band.



## **(AO1) Knowledge and Understanding**

### **Band 5 ([25]–[30])**

Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and almost totally accurate knowledge of the chosen question area. Their use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is highly accurate and very consistent throughout. The form and style of writing are highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a very high order as are the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 4 ([19]–[24])**

Candidates demonstrate a high degree of understanding and accurate knowledge of the question. Their use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is of a high order and consistent throughout. The form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a high order as are the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 3 ([12]–[18])**

Candidates demonstrate a good understanding and mainly accurate knowledge of the question chosen. They demonstrate a good and, for the most part, accurate use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2. The form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of the writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good.

### **Band 2 ([6]–[11])**

Candidates demonstrate a basic understanding and, for the most part, accurate knowledge and understanding of the question chosen. The response also shows that the candidates can use some evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2. Their form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which prove problematic in conveying meaning.

### **Band 1 ([0]–[5])**

Candidates recall, demonstrate and deploy only basic knowledge and understanding of the question. Their use of supporting evidence, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is restricted and lacks coherence. There is a tendency towards gaps in the response. Their form and style of writing is, for the most part, inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is, therefore, very weak and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear.

## **(AO2) Critical Line of Argument**

### **Band 5 ([13]–[15])**

Candidates make an excellent attempt at interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas, showing an appropriately high awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They are very good at offering personal insights and independent thought. They have a highly developed skill in framing an argument and supporting it with effective references. They show an excellent ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a very high order, as is the legibility of their writing and their use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 4 ([10]–[12])**

Candidates make a good attempt at interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas, making good use of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They show good evidence of being able to offer personal insights and independent thought. They have a well-developed skill in framing and supporting an argument. They show a good ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a high order, as is the legibility of their writing and their use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 3 ([7]–[9])**

Candidates show some ability in interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas. They demonstrate an awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They show some evidence of personal insight and independent thought. They demonstrate some ability to frame an argument and support it by simple reference. They show some ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of their writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good.

### **Band 2 ([4]–[6])**

Candidates show limited ability in interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas. They demonstrate some awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. While there may be some evidence of offering personal insights, this too is rather limited and lacks awareness of other points of view. They show limited ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which prove problematic in conveying meaning.

### **Band 1 ([0]–[3])**

Candidates show little ability to interpret and discuss religious concepts, issues and ideas. They are largely unaware of the views of scholars and schools of thought. While there may be some attempt at offering personal insights, this too is limited. They show little ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is for the most part inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is therefore very weak, and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear.

## **Quality of Written Communication**

All questions require candidates to answer in continuous prose in English. Quality of written communication is incorporated within the assessment objectives and reflected in the above assessment bands. Assistant examiners are instructed to take this criterion into account when allocating marks to candidates' responses.

## **Part 2: Contextual Reference Points**

The generic level of response mark scheme set out above is elucidated in this part of the mark scheme through the provision of contextual reference points in terms of the content appropriate to the particular question under consideration.

		AVAILABLE MARKS
<p><b>1 (a)</b> A discussion of any <b>one</b> type of Biblical Criticism could include, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• clarification of the term “Biblical Criticism” and the selected form of Biblical Criticism, e.g. Narrative Criticism, Form Criticism</li> <li>• identification of key figures and their stated aims</li> <li>• reference to the methods employed</li> <li>• key conclusions of the method of criticism chosen</li> <li>• exemplification from Luke’s Gospel</li> <li>• the contribution of the chosen method to the study of Luke’s Gospel, e.g. insights gained</li> <li>• possible critique of the method chosen</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[30]</p> <p><b>(b)</b> An assessment of the view could include, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• exploration of the critical findings regarding Luke’s editing of his material</li> <li>• exploration of Luke’s redactionary role, e.g. Gentile outreach, concern for the dignity of women, focus on prayer, focus on the Holy Spirit</li> <li>• Luke as historian or theologian</li> <li>• possible reference to his particular audience</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[15]</p>	45	
<p><b>2 (a)</b> A discussion of the nature of discipleship could include, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• possible definition of discipleship</li> <li>• exploration of any stories concerning discipleship in Luke, e.g. call of the first disciples, the Sermon on the Plain, the mission of the twelve and of the seventy-two, the final discourse</li> <li>• parables of discipleship, e.g. the two house builders, the vigilant and faithful servants, the friend at midnight, the unjust judge, the Good Samaritan</li> <li>• renunciation and the demands of discipleship, e.g. prayer, total commitment, need to avoid scandal, faith and their role as witnesses</li> <li>• warnings for discipleship, e.g. against hypocrisy, of physical suffering, against blasphemy, against attachment</li> <li>• rewards of discipleship</li> <li>• role of women, outcasts, sinners</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[30]</p> <p><b>(b)</b> An assessment of the claim could include, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• possible teaching, e.g. that in the Sermon on the Plain – love of enemies, the golden rule, judgement of others</li> <li>• the importance of commitment</li> <li>• renunciation as a challenge</li> <li>• prayer as a challenge</li> <li>• the challenges of faith today</li> <li>• possible relevant contemporary examples of discipleship</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[15]</p>	45	

- 3 (a) A discussion of the main features of the Kingdom of God could include, e.g.
- clarification of the term “Kingdom of God”
  - exploration of the main features of the Kingdom as presented in Luke’s Gospel
  - exploration of the function of parables and miracles within the Gospel
  - critical exploration of selected Lukan parables and miracles as revealing features of the Kingdom, e.g. nature and growth, the Kingdom as present and/or future reality, the coming of the Kingdom, crisis of the Kingdom
- [30]

- (b) An assessment of the claim could include, e.g.
- exploration of the ongoing relevance of the parables of Jesus
  - possible critique of Jesus’ parables as outdated and/or irrelevant to the modern reader
  - consideration of difficulties encountered in interpreting the message of the parables
  - possible reference to particular parables with a view to their revision
- [15]

- 4 (a) A discussion of Luke’s portrayal of Jesus as one who presents a universal message could include, e.g.
- the composition of the twelve disciples
  - healing miracles, e.g. the cure of the lepers, centurion’s servant, crippled woman
  - outreach to women, sinners, outcasts, gentiles, samaritans, tax collectors, the poor
  - teaching on the proper use of wealth
  - the incident of the good thief
  - universal aspect of parables, e.g. the lost son, the great feast.
- [30]

- (b) An assessment of the claim could include, e.g.
- consideration of the main opposition faced by Jesus including that of the Jewish religious authorities
  - exploration of selected conflict/controversy stories
  - exploration of the role of a true Prophet, notably one of rejection and suffering for their message
  - how Jesus’ message was greeted by those who did not have a “hardness of the heart”
- [15]

**Total**

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

45

45

**90**





*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED  
General Certificate of Education  
January 2010**

---

## **Religious Studies**

**Assessment Unit A2 2**

*assessing*

**Module 2: Selected New Testament Writings:  
A Study of Acts, Galatians and 1 Corinthians**

**[A2R21]**

**FRIDAY 8 JANUARY, AFTERNOON**

---

# **MARK SCHEME**

## **Part 1: Levels of Response**

The specification requires that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the knowledge, understanding and skills set out in Section 3 of the specification.

- Select and demonstrate clearly relevant knowledge and understanding through the use of evidence, examples and correct language and terminology appropriate to the course of study (AO1);
- sustain a critical line of argument and justify a point of view (AO2).

Each of the two assessment objectives has been categorised into five levels of performance relating to the respective abilities of the candidates.

Having identified, for each assessment objective listed below, the band in which the candidate has performed the examiner should then decide on the appropriate mark within the range for the band.



## **(AO1) Knowledge and Understanding**

### **Band 5 ([25]–[30])**

Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and almost totally accurate knowledge of the chosen question area. Their use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is highly accurate and very consistent throughout. The form and style of writing are highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a very high order as are the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 4 ([19]–[24])**

Candidates demonstrate a high degree of understanding and accurate knowledge of the question. Their use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is of a high order and consistent throughout. The form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a high order as are the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 3 ([12]–[18])**

Candidates demonstrate a good understanding and mainly accurate knowledge of the question chosen. They demonstrate a good and, for the most part, accurate use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2. The form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of the writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good.

### **Band 2 ([6]–[11])**

Candidates demonstrate a basic understanding and, for the most part, accurate knowledge and understanding of the question chosen. The response also shows that the candidates can use some evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2. Their form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which prove problematic in conveying meaning.

### **Band 1 ([0]–[5])**

Candidates recall, demonstrate and deploy only basic knowledge and understanding of the question. Their use of supporting evidence, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is restricted and lacks coherence. There is a tendency towards gaps in the response. Their form and style of writing is, for the most part, inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is, therefore, very weak and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear.

## **(AO2) Critical Line of Argument**

### **Band 5 ([13]–[15])**

Candidates make an excellent attempt at interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas, showing an appropriately high awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They are very good at offering personal insights and independent thought. They have a highly developed skill in framing an argument and supporting it with effective references. They show an excellent ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a very high order, as is the legibility of their writing and their use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 4 ([10]–[12])**

Candidates make a good attempt at interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas, making good use of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They show good evidence of being able to offer personal insights and independent thought. They have a well-developed skill in framing and supporting an argument. They show a good ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a high order, as is the legibility of their writing and their use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 3 ([7]–[9])**

Candidates show some ability in interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas. They demonstrate an awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They show some evidence of personal insight and independent thought. They demonstrate some ability to frame an argument and support it by simple reference. They show some ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of their writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good.

### **Band 2 ([4]–[6])**

Candidates show limited ability in interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas. They demonstrate some awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. While there may be some evidence of offering personal insights, this too is rather limited and lacks awareness of other points of view. They show limited ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which prove problematic in conveying meaning.

**Band 1 ([0]–[3])**

Candidates show little ability to interpret and discuss religious concepts, issues and ideas. They are largely unaware of the views of scholars and schools of thought. While there may be some attempt at offering personal insights, this too is limited. They show little ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is for the most part inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is therefore very weak, and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear.

**Quality of Written Communication**

All questions require candidates to answer in continuous prose in English. Quality of written communication is incorporated within the assessment objectives and reflected in the above assessment bands. Assistant examiners are instructed to take this criterion into account when allocating marks to candidates' responses.

**Part 2: Contextual Reference Points**

The generic level of response mark scheme set out above is elucidated in this part of the mark scheme through the provision of contextual reference points in terms of the content appropriate to the particular question under consideration.

		AVAILABLE MARKS
<p><b>1 (a)</b> a discussion may include some of the following, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• context of the speech, the third missionary journey</li> <li>• content of the speech, review of the past, future troubles, commended to care for the flock, farewell</li> <li>• the audience, only speech to Christian audience</li> <li>• Paul’s pastoral concerns, stylistic parallels to epistles</li> <li>• critical issues raised: why did Paul not travel to Ephesus, heresy in the Church, Jewish hostility, parallels with Jesus</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[30]</p> <p><b>(b)</b> A critical evaluation of the view might include, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• passion expressed in his commitment and perseverance, in personal suffering, in his speeches, in missionary journeys</li> <li>• passion expressed in his letters to churches</li> <li>• passionate about preserving the Gospel</li> <li>• passion was directed in other ways: Gentile inclusion, split with Barnabas, Church morality, Church unity, Church leaders</li> <li>• Luke as editor/reporter of speeches</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[15]</p>	45	
<p><b>2 (a)</b> A discussion of the chosen figure could include, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• their apostolic calling</li> <li>• leadership abilities</li> <li>• associated miracles</li> <li>• preaching and ministry, the response</li> <li>• persecution by authorities, others</li> <li>• the Council of Jerusalem, Gentile inclusion</li> <li>• fulfilling of Acts 1:8, the expansion of the gospel</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[30]</p> <p><b>(b)</b> An assessment of the claim could include, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the structure of the narrative, Peter the focus in early chapters, Paul dominates in later chapters</li> <li>• attempts at balance of treatment by Luke</li> <li>• the Church of the Gentiles, the contribution of each</li> <li>• Paul’s relationship with Luke, the ‘we’ passages, access to information from Paul</li> <li>• the ending of Acts, Paul preaching the gospel in Rome</li> <li>• Luke’s real interest is the expansion of the gospel</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[15]</p>	45	

3 (a) A discussion may include some of the following, e.g.

- establishing the context for the two issues raised, reasons for writing letter
- Paul's loving concern for the Church at Corinth
- detailed discussion of two issues dealt with in Corinthians (disunity, sexual morality, meat offered to idols, marriage, worship, spiritual gifts, resurrection)
- contribution of scholars in explaining the issues dealt with [30]

(b) a critical evaluation of the view may include, e.g.

- the ongoing relevance or otherwise of Scripture in the modern world
- the need for sexual morality
- division within the Christian Church then and now
- meat sacrificed to idols and influencing others
- relevance and use of spiritual gifts
- marriage and divorce
- the resurrection as a key Christian teaching [15]

45

4 (a) A discussion of Paul's argument could include, e.g.

- exploration of the central themes in Galatians (Chapters 1–6)
- opposition to Paul's message from Judaizers
- Paul's teaching concerning justification by faith
- the centrality of Christian teaching concerning love
- the triumph of universalism over sectarianism, the conflicting demands of Law and Grace [30]

(b) An assessment of the claim could include, e.g.

- the relevance or otherwise of selected teachings/themes within the Letter for Christians today
- continued controversy concerning the issue of justification by faith
- the significance of unity in Christ/Christian universalism
- the value of Scripture in the modern world
- historical relevance for the whole Church
- Christian freedom and life in the Spirit
- issues of false teaching [15]

45

AVAILABLE  
MARKS





*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED**  
**General Certificate of Education**  
**January 2010**

---

## **Religious Studies**

**Assessment Unit A2 3**

*assessing*

**Module 3: A Study of Selected  
Old Testament Prophets**

**[A2R31]**

**FRIDAY 8 JANUARY, AFTERNOON**

---

**MARK  
SCHEME**

## **Part 1: Levels of Response**

The specification requires that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the knowledge, understanding and skills set out in Section 3 of the specification.

- Select and demonstrate clearly relevant knowledge and understanding through the use of evidence, examples and correct language and terminology appropriate to the course of study (AO1);
- sustain a critical line of argument and justify a point of view (AO2).

Each of the two assessment objectives has been categorised into five levels of performance relating to the respective abilities of the candidates.

Having identified, for each assessment objective listed below, the band in which the candidate has performed the examiner should then decide on the appropriate mark within the range for the band.



## **(AO1) Knowledge and Understanding**

### **Band 5 ([25]–[30])**

Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and almost totally accurate knowledge of the chosen question area. Their use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is highly accurate and very consistent throughout. The form and style of writing are highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a very high order as are the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 4 ([19]–[24])**

Candidates demonstrate a high degree of understanding and accurate knowledge of the question. Their use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is of a high order and consistent throughout. The form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a high order as are the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 3 ([12]–[18])**

Candidates demonstrate a good understanding and mainly accurate knowledge of the question chosen. They demonstrate a good and, for the most part, accurate use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2. The form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of the writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good.

### **Band 2 ([6]–[11])**

Candidates demonstrate a basic understanding and, for the most part, accurate knowledge and understanding of the question chosen. The response also shows that the candidates can use some evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2. Their form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which prove problematic in conveying meaning.

### **Band 1 ([0]–[5])**

Candidates recall, demonstrate and deploy only basic knowledge and understanding of the question. Their use of supporting evidence, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is restricted and lacks coherence. There is a tendency towards gaps in the response. Their form and style of writing is, for the most part, inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is, therefore, very weak and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear.

## **(AO2) Critical Line of Argument**

### **Band 5 ([13]–[15])**

Candidates make an excellent attempt at interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas, showing an appropriately high awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They are very good at offering personal insights and independent thought. They have a highly developed skill in framing an argument and supporting it with effective references. They show an excellent ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a very high order, as is the legibility of their writing and their use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 4 ([10]–[12])**

Candidates make a good attempt at interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas, making good use of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They show good evidence of being able to offer personal insights and independent thought. They have a well-developed skill in framing and supporting an argument. They show a good ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a high order, as is the legibility of their writing and their use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 3 ([7]–[9])**

Candidates show some ability in interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas. They demonstrate an awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They show some evidence of personal insight and independent thought. They demonstrate some ability to frame an argument and support it by simple reference. They show some ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of their writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good.

### **Band 2 ([4]–[6])**

Candidates show limited ability in interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas. They demonstrate some awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. While there may be some evidence of offering personal insights, this too is rather limited and lacks awareness of other points of view. They show limited ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which prove problematic in conveying meaning.

**Band 1 ([0]–[3])**

Candidates show little ability to interpret and discuss religious concepts, issues and ideas. They are largely unaware of the views of scholars and schools of thought. While there may be some attempt at offering personal insights, this too is limited. They show little ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience.

Their form and style of writing is for the most part inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is therefore very weak, and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear.

**Quality of Written Communication**

All questions require candidates to answer in continuous prose in English. Quality of written communication is incorporated within the assessment objectives and reflected in the above assessment bands. Assistant examiners are instructed to take this criterion into account when allocating marks to candidates' responses.

**Part 2: Contextual Reference Points**

The generic level of response mark scheme set out above is elucidated in this part of the mark scheme through the provision of contextual reference points in terms of the content appropriate to the particular question under consideration.

1 (a) A discussion of the encounter could include, e.g.

- context of Micaiah's work
- a prophet of doom
- Micaiah's two oracles
- judgement on the nation
- Micaiah's break from the professional prophets
- the renewal of the Mosaic faith
- the truth of Micaiah's prophecy
- the role of God in history

[30]

(b) An assessment of the claim could include, e.g.

- the prophetic role
- criteria for true and false prophecy
- contrast between professional prophets and those who brought God's judgement
- preaching God's judgement as "the badge of a true prophet"
- the call to revive the Mosaic faith
- historical or modern examples of prophets

[15]

45

2 (a) Candidates may include some of the following, e.g.

- the context of the Songs
- suffering of the people in exile
- themes within each Song
- overall theme of victory through exile and suffering
- the nature of God as revealed to the people in exile

[30]

(b) Candidates may wish to assess some of the following, e.g.

- God's victory over Babylon
- the need for purification through suffering in Babylon
- God's punishment of Israel
- the symbolism of the servant for the suffering community
- identification of Jesus as the suffering servant
- role of suffering

[15]

45

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

3 (a) Candidates could discuss some of the following, e.g.

- context of Nehemiah
- detail of his role in Jerusalem – rebuilding and religious renewal and the reasons for this
- opposition to Nehemiah
- other difficulties he faced
- insights into his character
- his achievements

[30]

(b) Candidates could assess the claim with reference to, e.g.

- positive aspects of Nehemiah’s work and faith
- positive aspects of his character
- negative aspects of his work
- consideration of the relative value of these different aspects for today

[15]

45

4 (a) Candidates could discuss some of the following, e.g.

- attitude to Josiah’s reforms
- condemnation of idolatry and corrupt religious practices
- Babylon as the instrument of God’s judgement
- detail of and commentary on the Temple Sermon
- attitude to the offering of sacrifice
- neglect of the laws of the covenant
- nature of the “New Covenant”
- reference to the Symbolic Actions – Enacted Prophecy
- reference to the autobiographical passages

[30]

(b) Candidates could assess the claim with reference to, e.g.

- nature of God as revealed by Jeremiah: God of Judgement and Justice
- understanding of God as demonstrated by the different themes in the message of Jeremiah: Importance of sincere worship. Opposition to pagan worship. Regard for the laws of Moses. Relationship between cult and conduct.
- nature of God as revealed by other prophets: Example Ezekiel, God of hope and consolation. Example Deutero Isaiah, God of love, forgiveness, mercy. God of Israel but sovereign of all nations. Creator and sustainer of the universe. The all powerful nature of God.

[15]

45

**Total**

**90**

AVAILABLE  
MARKS





*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED**  
**General Certificate of Education**  
**January 2010**

---

**Religious Studies**

**Assessment Unit A2 4**

*assessing*

**Module 4: The Development of the  
Christian Church in the  
Roman Empire to AD 325**

**[A2R41]**

**WEDNESDAY 20 JANUARY, AFTERNOON**

---

**MARK  
SCHEME**

## **Part 1: Levels of Response**

The specification requires that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the knowledge, understanding and skills set out in Section 3 of the specification.

- Select and demonstrate clearly relevant knowledge and understanding through the use of evidence, examples and correct language and terminology appropriate to the course of study (AO1);
- sustain a critical line of argument and justify a point of view (AO2).

Each of the two assessment objectives has been categorised into five levels of performance relating to the respective abilities of the candidates.

Having identified, for each assessment objective listed below, the band in which the candidate has performed the examiner should then decide on the appropriate mark within the range for the band.



## **(AO1) Knowledge and Understanding**

### **Band 5 ([25]–[30])**

Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and almost totally accurate knowledge of the chosen question area. Their use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is highly accurate and very consistent throughout. The form and style of writing are highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a very high order as are the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 4 ([19]–[24])**

Candidates demonstrate a high degree of understanding and accurate knowledge of the question. Their use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is of a high order and consistent throughout. The form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a high order as are the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 3 ([12]–[18])**

Candidates demonstrate a good understanding and mainly accurate knowledge of the question chosen. They demonstrate a good and, for the most part, accurate use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2. The form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of the writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good.

### **Band 2 ([6]–[11])**

Candidates demonstrate a basic understanding and, for the most part, accurate knowledge and understanding of the question chosen. The response also shows that the candidates can use some evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2. Their form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which prove problematic in conveying meaning.

### **Band 1 ([0]–[5])**

Candidates recall, demonstrate and deploy only basic knowledge and understanding of the question. Their use of supporting evidence, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is restricted and lacks coherence. There is a tendency towards gaps in the response. Their form and style of writing is, for the most part, inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is, therefore, very weak and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear.

## **(AO2) Critical Line of Argument**

### **Band 5 ([13]–[15])**

Candidates make an excellent attempt at interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas, showing an appropriately high awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They are very good at offering personal insights and independent thought. They have a highly developed skill in framing an argument and supporting it with effective references. They show an excellent ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a very high order, as is the legibility of their writing and their use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 4 ([10]–[12])**

Candidates make a good attempt at interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas, making good use of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They show good evidence of being able to offer personal insights and independent thought. They have a well-developed skill in framing and supporting an argument. They show a good ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a high order, as is the legibility of their writing and their use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 3 ([7]–[9])**

Candidates show some ability in interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas. They demonstrate an awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They show some evidence of personal insight and independent thought. They demonstrate some ability to frame an argument and support it by simple reference. They show some ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of their writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good.

### **Band 2 ([4]–[6])**

Candidates show limited ability in interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas. They demonstrate some awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. While there may be some evidence of offering personal insights, this too is rather limited and lacks awareness of other points of view. They show limited ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which prove problematic in conveying meaning.

### **Band 1 ([0]–[3])**

Candidates show little ability to interpret and discuss religious concepts, issues and ideas. They are largely unaware of the views of scholars and schools of thought. While there may be some attempt at offering personal insights, this too is limited. They show little ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is for the most part inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is therefore very weak, and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear.

## **Quality of Written Communication**

All questions require candidates to answer in continuous prose in English. Quality of written communication is incorporated within the assessment objectives and reflected in the above assessment bands. Assistant examiners are instructed to take this criterion into account when allocating marks to candidates' responses.

## **Part 2: Contextual Reference Points**

The generic level of response mark scheme set out above is elucidated in this part of the mark scheme through the provision of contextual reference points in terms of the content appropriate to the particular question under consideration.

		AVAILABLE MARKS
<p><b>1 (a)</b> Candidates may include some of the following, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reference to sources which mention Church structure, e.g. Clement of Rome, Ignatius, the Didache, the Shepherd of Hermas, Justin, Hippolytus, Irenaeus, Cyprian</li> <li>• gradual move from two fold to three fold ministry</li> <li>• development of each of the roles during 1st – 4th centuries</li> <li>• idea of a monarchical Bishop</li> <li>• relevant scripture passages may also be drawn on</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[30]</p> <p><b>(b)</b> Candidates may wish to assess some of the following, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• initially great missionary activity accompanied by an energetic zeal to convert people to Christ before the Parousia</li> <li>• great spontaneity led by Apostles and Prophets</li> <li>• emphasis placed on the Holy Spirit – influence of Montanus</li> <li>• gradual development of “organised religion”</li> <li>• leadership roles clearly defined</li> <li>• candidates may refer to contemporary examples</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[15]</p>		45
<p><b>2 (a)</b> Candidates could include some of the following, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• early life and account of his conversion</li> <li>• Constantine’s understanding of God</li> <li>• Constantine’s political considerations</li> <li>• Constantine’s baptism</li> <li>• candidates could consider whether Constantine adopted Christianity as the state religion, gave it equality with the existing religions or gave Christianity favoured status</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[30]</p> <p><b>(b)</b> Candidates could consider some of the following, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Imperial patronage</li> <li>• Christianity and paganism</li> <li>• end of persecution</li> <li>• political involvement</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[15]</p>		45

		AVAILABLE MARKS
<p><b>3 (a)</b> Candidates could include some of the following, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• details on Cyprian’s life, e.g. birth, conversion, election as Bishop of Carthage, martyrdom</li> <li>• his role in the Decian persecution</li> <li>• his work, which tended to be on practical matters, e.g. “On the Unity of the Church” infant baptism, the sacraments</li> <li>• conflict with Stephen of Rome</li> <li>• his contribution to theology [30]</li> </ul> <p><b>(b)</b> Candidates could consider some of the following, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how Cyprian gives an insight into life in the church at that time</li> <li>• how his viewpoints were influential in future generations, e.g. teaching on the Eucharist, role of the Church</li> <li>• how his works were of immense practical value</li> <li>• his dispute with Stephen and how it gives an insight into the difficulties facing Christians</li> <li>• the extent to which some of his work is not relevant today [15]</li> </ul>	45	
<p><b>4 (a)</b> A discussion of this particular persecution could include, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reasons for persecuting the Christians, e.g. blamed them for the decline in the Roman Empire</li> <li>• his policy – one empire, one religion</li> <li>• edicts that were served</li> <li>• Christian response to the edicts</li> <li>• attack on leadership</li> <li>• systematic persecution – was severe on the Church</li> <li>• the problem with the lapsed, schism [30]</li> </ul> <p><b>(b)</b> Candidates could consider some of the following, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• faith can/cannot be strengthened by persecution</li> <li>• possible reference to examples such as the witness of the martyrs, the lapsed</li> <li>• how the Church remained steadfast, survived decades of persecution</li> <li>• historical and/or contemporary examples [15]</li> </ul>	45	
<b>Total</b>	<b>90</b>	





*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED**  
**General Certificate of Education**  
**January 2010**

---

## **Religious Studies**

**Assessment Unit A2 5**

*assessing*

**Module 5: The Celtic Church and its Missionary  
Outreach in the 5th, 6th and 7th Centuries**

**[A2R51]**

**WEDNESDAY 20 JANUARY, AFTERNOON**

---

**MARK  
SCHEME**

## **Part 1: Levels of Response**

The specification requires that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the knowledge, understanding and skills set out in Section 3 of the specification.

- Select and demonstrate clearly relevant knowledge and understanding through the use of evidence, examples and correct language and terminology appropriate to the course of study (AO1);
- sustain a critical line of argument and justify a point of view (AO2).

Each of the two assessment objectives has been categorised into five levels of performance relating to the respective abilities of the candidates.

Having identified, for each assessment objective listed below, the band in which the candidate has performed the examiner should then decide on the appropriate mark within the range for the band.



## **(AO1) Knowledge and Understanding**

### **Band 5 ([25]–[30])**

Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and almost totally accurate knowledge of the chosen question area. Their use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is highly accurate and very consistent throughout. The form and style of writing are highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a very high order as are the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 4 ([19]–[24])**

Candidates demonstrate a high degree of understanding and accurate knowledge of the question. Their use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is of a high order and consistent throughout. The form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a high order as are the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 3 ([12]–[18])**

Candidates demonstrate a good understanding and mainly accurate knowledge of the question chosen. They demonstrate a good and, for the most part, accurate use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2. The form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of the writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good.

### **Band 2 ([6]–[11])**

Candidates demonstrate a basic understanding and, for the most part, accurate knowledge and understanding of the question chosen. The response also shows that the candidates can use some evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2. Their form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which prove problematic in conveying meaning.

### **Band 1 ([0]–[5])**

Candidates recall, demonstrate and deploy only basic knowledge and understanding of the question. Their use of supporting evidence, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is restricted and lacks coherence. There is a tendency towards gaps in the response. Their form and style of writing is, for the most part, inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is, therefore, very weak and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear.

## **(AO2) Critical Line of Argument**

### **Band 5 ([13]–[15])**

Candidates make an excellent attempt at interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas, showing an appropriately high awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They are very good at offering personal insights and independent thought. They have a highly developed skill in framing an argument and supporting it with effective references. They show an excellent ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a very high order, as is the legibility of their writing and their use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 4 ([10]–[12])**

Candidates make a good attempt at interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas, making good use of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They show good evidence of being able to offer personal insights and independent thought. They have a well-developed skill in framing and supporting an argument. They show a good ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a high order, as is the legibility of their writing and their use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 3 ([7]–[9])**

Candidates show some ability in interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas. They demonstrate an awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They show some evidence of personal insight and independent thought. They demonstrate some ability to frame an argument and support it by simple reference. They show some ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of their writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good.

### **Band 2 ([4]–[6])**

Candidates show limited ability in interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas. They demonstrate some awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. While there may be some evidence of offering personal insights, this too is rather limited and lacks awareness of other points of view. They show limited ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which prove problematic in conveying meaning.

### **Band 1 ([0]–[3])**

Candidates show little ability to interpret and discuss religious concepts, issues and ideas. They are largely unaware of the views of scholars and schools of thought. While there may be some attempt at offering personal insights, this too is limited. They show little ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is for the most part inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is therefore very weak, and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear.

## **Quality of Written Communication**

All questions require candidates to answer in continuous prose in English. Quality of written communication is incorporated within the assessment objectives and reflected in the above assessment bands. Assistant examiners are instructed to take this criterion into account when allocating marks to candidates' responses.

## **Part 2: Contextual Reference Points**

The generic level of response mark scheme set out above is elucidated in this part of the mark scheme through the provision of contextual reference points in terms of the content appropriate to the particular question under consideration.

- 1 (a) A discussion could include **some** of the following, e.g.
- chronology of Patrick/Palladius, e.g. conflicting death dates
  - concept of a composite Patrick
  - Prosper’s Chronicle and Contra Collatorem
  - Sources, e.g. Annals of Ulster, Hymn of Fiacc
  - Martyrology of Oengus
  - Patrick’s writings
  - Scholarly views on dating, e.g. Carney, O’Rahilly, Binchy, Esposito, Thomas, Mohrmann, Hanson
- [30]

- (b) An assessment of the claim could include, e.g.
- Reference to sources on Palladius, e.g. Muirchú, Tírechán, Prosper, Annals of the Four Masters.
  - Association of Palladius with Leinster
  - Information on Patrick’s mission, e.g. Confessio, Letter to Coroticus
  - Success of Patrick’s mission, e.g. baptised thousands, ordained a native clergy
  - Determination of Patrick in light of dangers and difficulties of mission
  - Palladius’ mission seen not as successful as Patrick’s
  - Composite Patrick
  - Scholarly views, e.g. Corish, Bieler, Carney, O’Rahilly
- [15]

45

- 2 (a) A discussion could include **some** of the following, e.g.
- Patrick’s establishment of an Episcopal Church
  - relevant sources, e.g. the Canons, Annals, First Synod of Patrick, the Penitentials, secular law tracts
  - the development of monasticism
  - Church in isolation from Rome, conservatism
  - incorporation of the Brehon Laws
  - importance of asceticism and austerity
  - self-sacrifice, the Peregrini
  - private prayer
  - care for the poor, e.g. Brigid
  - love of learning
  - the Bible at the centre of Christian worship
  - oneness with nature, examples from hagiography
  - gender inclusive, e.g. Brigid, Ita, Monine
  - scholarly views, e.g. Hughes, Corish, Ryan, Bieler
- [30]

- (b) An assessment of the view could include, e.g.
- the decline of the Episcopal Church established by Patrick
  - the plague of the 540s
  - influence of Celtic customs, e.g. kinship and kingship
  - influence of economic factors
  - the lack of Roman Imperial structures
  - examples of “thriving” Episcopal churches such as Armagh
  - social and religious needs catered for by monastic lifestyle
  - scholarly views, e.g. de Paor, Hughes, Ryan
- [15]

45

- 3 (a) A discussion could include some of the following, e.g.
- the problem of the dating of Easter
  - the various Paschal tables in use, church decrees, e.g. Nicea, Arles
  - the wearing of the tonsure
  - the consecration of Bishops
  - omission of Chrism in Baptism
  - the impact of the Celtic Peregrini
  - meeting with Augustine
  - sources of the period, e.g. Columbanus' Letters, Bede, Letter of Pope-elect John, Letter of Cummian
  - Synod of Mag-Lena
  - influence of Northumbrian Royal household
  - political issues in North Britain
- [30]

- (b) An assessment of the view could include, e.g.
- the importance of church unity/Ecumenism
  - tolerance of diversity
  - impact of difference in practice, belief and culture
  - relevant religious and cultural differences today, e.g. religious authority, tradition
- [15]

- 4 (a) A discussion could include **some** of the following, e.g.
- details of birth and childhood
  - conversion/vocation to monastic life
  - asceticism of the saint
  - miracles performed by the saint
  - prophecies made by the saint
  - historical detail on the saint's life
  - monastic foundations
- [30]

- (b) An assessment of the claim could include, e.g.
- exaggeration found in such accounts
  - historical accuracy
  - asceticism/austerity of the saint
  - prayer of the saint
  - respect for nature
  - calling down of curses/punishment of enemies
  - the contemporary relevance of the above
  - the views of scholars, e.g. Gwynn, Bury, Binchy, Morris, Hughes
- [15]

**Total**

**AVAILABLE  
MARKS**

45

45

**90**





*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED  
General Certificate of Education  
January 2010**

---

**Religious Studies**

Assessment Unit A2 6

*assessing*

Module 6: A Study of Ethics  
and Contemporary Issues

**[A2R61]**

**FRIDAY 29 JANUARY, AFTERNOON**

---

**MARK  
SCHEME**

## **Part 1: Levels of Response**

The specification requires that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the knowledge, understanding and skills set out in Section 3 of the specification.

- Select and demonstrate clearly relevant knowledge and understanding through the use of evidence, examples and correct language and terminology appropriate to the course of study (AO1);
- sustain a critical line of argument and justify a point of view (AO2).

Each of the two assessment objectives has been categorised into five levels of performance relating to the respective abilities of the candidates.

Having identified, for each assessment objective listed below, the band in which the candidate has performed the examiner should then decide on the appropriate mark within the range for the band.



## **(AO1) Knowledge and Understanding**

### **Band 5 ([25]–[30])**

Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and almost totally accurate knowledge of the chosen question area. Their use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is highly accurate and very consistent throughout. The form and style of writing are highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a very high order as are the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 4 ([19]–[24])**

Candidates demonstrate a high degree of understanding and accurate knowledge of the question. Their use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is of a high order and consistent throughout. The form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a high order as are the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 3 ([12]–[18])**

Candidates demonstrate a good understanding and mainly accurate knowledge of the question chosen. They demonstrate a good and, for the most part, accurate use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2. The form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of the writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good.

### **Band 2 ([6]–[11])**

Candidates demonstrate a basic understanding and, for the most part, accurate knowledge and understanding of the question chosen. The response also shows that the candidates can use some evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2. Their form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which prove problematic in conveying meaning.

### **Band 1 ([0]–[5])**

Candidates recall, demonstrate and deploy only basic knowledge and understanding of the question. Their use of supporting evidence, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is restricted and lacks coherence. There is a tendency towards gaps in the response. Their form and style of writing, is for the most part, inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is, therefore, very weak and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear.

## **(AO2) Critical Line of Argument**

### **Band 5 ([13]–[15])**

Candidates make an excellent attempt at interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas, showing an appropriately high awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They are very good at offering personal insights and independent thought. They have a highly developed skill in framing an argument and supporting it with effective references. They show an excellent ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a very high order, as is the legibility of their writing and their use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 4 ([10]–[12])**

Candidates make a good attempt at interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas, making good use of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They show good evidence of being able to offer personal insights and independent thought. They have a well-developed skill in framing and supporting an argument. They show a good ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a high order, as is the legibility of their writing and their use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 3 ([7]–[9])**

Candidates show some ability in interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas. They demonstrate an awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They show some evidence of personal insight and independent thought. They demonstrate some ability to frame an argument and support it by simple reference. They show some ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of their writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good.

### **Band 2 ([4]–[6])**

Candidates show limited ability in interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas. They demonstrate some awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. While there may be some evidence of offering personal insights, this too is rather limited and lacks awareness of other points of view. They show limited ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which prove problematic in conveying meaning.

### **Band 1 ([0]–[3])**

Candidates show little ability to interpret and discuss religious concepts, issues and ideas. They are largely unaware of the views of scholars and schools of thought. While there may be some attempt at offering personal insights, this too is limited. They show little ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is for the most part inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is therefore very weak, and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear.

## **Quality of Written Communication**

All questions require candidates to answer in continuous prose in English. Quality of written communication is incorporated within the assessment objectives and reflected in the above assessment bands. Assistant examiners are instructed to take this criterion into account when allocating marks to candidates' responses.

## **Part 2: Contextual Reference Points**

The generic level of response mark scheme set out above is elucidated in this part of the mark scheme through the provision of contextual reference points in terms of the content appropriate to the particular question under consideration.

		AVAILABLE MARKS
<p><b>1 (a)</b> A discussion of one approach could include, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reference to either Natural Law or Utilitarianism or Situation Ethics or a Biblically-centred approach</li> <li>• possible origins and development</li> <li>• religious/atheistic presuppositions</li> <li>• key figures</li> <li>• characteristics</li> <li>• examples of application to moral dilemmas</li> <li>• possible reference to merits of the theory</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[30]</p> <p><b>(b)</b> An assessment of the view could include, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• possible reference to various distinctive denomination approaches</li> <li>• Thomist and Reformed approaches</li> <li>• reference to Natural Law, Utilitarianism, Situation Ethics</li> <li>• reference to core Christian principles of dignity, equality, responsibility</li> <li>• the importance of serving the interests of love</li> <li>• emulating the example of Jesus</li> <li>• the issue of varying Christian approaches and how it might be possible to discover the “right” one</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[15]</p>		45
<p><b>2 (a)</b> A discussion of Determinism could include, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• possible definition, e.g. that every event has a preceding cause</li> <li>• different types, e.g. Behaviourism, Psychological Determinism</li> <li>• Hard and Soft Determinism</li> <li>• key figures, e.g. Skinner, Freud</li> <li>• major works</li> <li>• presuppositions</li> <li>• characteristics</li> <li>• major ideas, e.g. on human freedom</li> <li>• forms of Religious Determinism</li> <li>• some awareness of merits and problems</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[30]</p> <p><b>(b)</b> An assessment of the view could include, e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• personal freedom, personal choice</li> <li>• the issue of diminished responsibility, deterministic views</li> <li>• the issue of personal responsibility</li> <li>• influence of environment, genetic make-up</li> <li>• the concept of sin</li> <li>• judgement and punishment</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: right;">[15]</p>		45

- 3 (a) A discussion of the ethical issues could include, e.g.
- the purpose of law and order (the common good)
  - causes of crime e.g. socio-economic factors
  - the purpose of punishment, e.g. retribution as against rehabilitation
  - punishment and proportionality
  - particular problems for the Christian, e.g. retribution or reformation
  - issues pertaining to human dignity, equality
  - utilitarian perspectives
  - connections between Determinism and penology
- [30]

- (b) An assessment of the view could include, e.g.
- arguments for
    - a suitable deterrent
    - society's duty to protect its citizens
    - justice can be seen to be dispensed
    - Biblical precedence
  - arguments against
    - the sanctity of life argument
    - its failure as a deterrent
    - its barbaric nature
    - the problem of the innocent
    - failure of the purpose of the penal system
    - the Fifth Commandment
  - utilitarian perspectives
    - possible justification, e.g. deters others
    - balancing the loss of life against the cost to society of keeping a person in prison for life
- [15]

45

- 4 (a) A discussion of the moral issues could include, e.g.
- definition and types of poverty
  - the North/South divide
  - absolute poverty v. absolute affluence
  - structural poverty
  - issues pertaining to equality, dignity and responsibility
  - human selfishness/sin
  - the unjust distribution of the world's resources
  - the role of education
  - views of writers, e.g.
    - Aquinas (the surplus is a natural right owed to the poor)
    - Kant (the cosmopolitan law)
    - Singer (the global ethic should know no national boundaries)
  - various ethical perspectives, e.g. egoist, utilitarian
  - various religious views, e.g.
    - poverty as a sign of God's disfavour
    - poverty as a symptom of humanity's arrogance, direct result of selfishness and the rejection of God
- [30]

(b) An assessment of the view could include, e.g.

- problems pertaining to apathy and indifference, e.g.
  - the plight of the hungry is not my doing, therefore not my responsibility
  - the issue of property rights
  - the absolute futility of the situation
- rights and responsibilities
- the concept of duty, the obligation to assist
- Singer’s views, e.g. to deliberately allow someone to die is no different from killing them
- religious views, e.g. “I am my brother’s keeper”, the example of Jesus and this preferential option for the poor
- inspirational figures, e.g. Mother Teresa – seeing Jesus in the face of the poor
- the importance of lifestyle choices; Fair Trade; Ethical Consumerism [15]

**Total**

**AVAILABLE  
MARKS**

45

**90**



*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED  
General Certificate of Education  
January 2010**

---

## **Religious Studies**

**Assessment Unit A2 7**

*assessing*

**Module 7: Issues of Religious Belief:  
Competing Claims**

**[A2R71]**

**FRIDAY 29 JANUARY, AFTERNOON**

---

# **MARK SCHEME**

## Part 1: Levels of Response

The specification requires that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the knowledge, understanding and skills set out in Section 3 of the specification.

- Select and demonstrate clearly relevant knowledge and understanding through the use of evidence, examples and correct language and terminology appropriate to the course of study (AO1);
- sustain a critical line of argument and justify a point of view (AO2).

Each of the two assessment objectives has been categorised into five levels of performance relating to the respective abilities of the candidates.

Having identified, for each assessment objective listed below, the band in which the candidate has performed the examiner should then decide on the appropriate mark within the range for the band.



## **(AO1) Knowledge and Understanding**

### **Band 5 ([25]–[30])**

Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and almost totally accurate knowledge of the chosen question area. Their use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is highly accurate and very consistent throughout. The form and style of writing are highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a very high order as are the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 4 ([19]–[24])**

Candidates demonstrate a high degree of understanding and accurate knowledge of the question. Their use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is of a high order and consistent throughout. The form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a high order as are the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 3 ([12]–[18])**

Candidates demonstrate a good understanding and mainly accurate knowledge of the question chosen. They demonstrate a good and, for the most part, accurate use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2. The form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the question is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of the writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good.

### **Band 2 ([6]–[11])**

Candidates demonstrate a basic understanding and, for the most part, accurate knowledge and understanding of the question chosen. The response also shows that the candidates can use some evidence, examples, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2. Their form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which prove problematic in conveying meaning.

### **Band 1 ([0]–[5])**

Candidates recall, demonstrate and deploy only basic knowledge and understanding of the question. Their use of supporting evidence, technical language and terminology, as specified for A2, is restricted and lacks coherence. There is a tendency towards gaps in the response. Their form and style of writing is, for the most part, inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is, therefore, very weak and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear.

## **(AO2) Critical Line of Argument**

### **Band 5 ([13]–[15])**

Candidates make an excellent attempt at interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas, showing an appropriately high awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They are very good at offering personal insights and independent thought. They have a highly developed skill in framing an argument and supporting it with effective references. They show an excellent ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a very high order, as is the legibility of their writing and their use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 4 ([10]–[12])**

Candidates make a good attempt at interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas, making good use of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They show good evidence of being able to offer personal insights and independent thought. They have a well-developed skill in framing and supporting an argument. They show a good ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a high order, as is the legibility of their writing and their use of spelling, grammar and punctuation.

### **Band 3 ([7]–[9])**

Candidates show some ability in interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas. They demonstrate an awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. They show some evidence of personal insight and independent thought. They demonstrate some ability to frame an argument and support it by simple reference. They show some ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response to the question is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of their writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good.

### **Band 2 ([4]–[6])**

Candidates show limited ability in interpreting and discussing religious concepts, issues and ideas. They demonstrate some awareness of the views of scholars and schools of thought. While there may be some evidence of offering personal insights, this too is rather limited and lacks awareness of other points of view. They show limited ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which prove problematic in conveying meaning.

**Band 1 ([0]–[3])**

Candidates show little ability to interpret and discuss religious concepts, issues and ideas. They are largely unaware of the views of scholars and schools of thought. While there may be some attempt at offering personal insights, this too is limited. They show little ability to relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience. Their form and style of writing is for the most part inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is therefore very weak, and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear.

**Quality of Written Communication**

All questions require candidates to answer in continuous prose in English. Quality of written communication is incorporated within the assessment objectives and reflected in the above assessment bands. Assistant examiners are instructed to take this criterion into account when allocating marks to candidates' responses.

**Part 2: Contextual Reference Points**

The generic level of response mark scheme set out above is elucidated in this part of the mark scheme through the provision of contextual reference points in terms of the content appropriate to the particular question under consideration.

1 (a) A discussion could include the following, e.g.

- possible definitions of the term “miracle”
- the empiricist challenge to the term
- central teachings of David Hume concerning the concept e.g. difficulties with the actual concept, Newtonian physics and the Laws of Nature, the problem of witnesses, subsequent transmission of miracles
- development of Hume’s ideas by subsequent thinkers, theistic and atheistic

(b) An assessment of the claim could include, e.g.

- an explanation of the theistic case for miracles, e.g. Locke, Hick, Wilson, Swinborne, Ward, Stannard
- a critique of Hume’s work
- support for Hume’s arguments from modern empirical thinkers
- contemporary evidential approach
- exploration of the importance and significance of miracles for theism

2 (a) A discussion could include the following, e.g.

- clarification of the term “evolution”
- the central teachings of Darwin, e.g. idea of common ancestry; natural selection; his theory of human development, both biologically and psychologically; the place of humankind in creation
- influences on Darwin’s work
- development of Darwin’s work by later writers

(b) An assessment of the claim could include, e.g.

- theistic and atheistic responses to Darwin’s ideas
- the reaction of the institutional church
- Darwin’s challenge to the traditional view of creation
- the Creationist response to Darwin
- the possibility of reconciling Christian belief with evolutionary theory
- possible reference to Teilhard de Chardin and other accommodationist viewpoints, e.g. theistic evolution, intelligent design

3 (a) A discussion could include the following, e.g.

- the primary tenets of Marxism – the pattern of history as one of conflict/class struggle, the emphasis on atheistic materialism
- the reactionary role of religion as prolonging and increasing human alienation
- the rejection of religious leadership as Capitalistic
- the view of Communism as an exclusively atheistic state
- Marxism's rejection of God as delusion, religion as a form of oppression
- religion as "the opium of the people"
- the influence of Hegel, Feuerbach, Bauer, Proudhon etc.

(b) An assessment of the claim could include, e.g.

- humanity's call for spiritual enrichment and Marx's failure to meet profound human needs
- Marx's view of the Proletariat as fundamentally good, his view of Communists as liberators of humanity
- Marx's rejection of the Kingdom in favour of a Utopian dream, a "heaven on earth"
- the failure and collapse of so called Communist/Marxist states
- an exploration of the nature of humanity as evolved species/fallen humanity
- the failure of Marxism to recognise the attraction of religion

4 (a) A discussion could include the following, e.g.

- definition of Utilitarianism, possible reference to different types, e.g. act, rule, preference
- the influence of Hedonism/Epicurius
- key principles, e.g. the principle of utility, the Hedonic Calculus
- a consequentialist/teleological theory
- the views of particular Utilitarians, e.g. Bentham, Mill
- possible critique of the theory, e.g. defining happiness
- possible reference to Christian Utilitarianism

(b) An assessment of the claim could include, e.g.

- consideration of theistic and atheistic responses to the stated claim
- exploration of the relationship between religion and morality
- an exploration of morality in a secular and god-less age
- possible consideration of the view that a foundation for morality is not required
- possible reference to the Euthyrpho Dilemma





*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED**  
**General Certificate of Education**  
**January 2010**

---

## **Religious Studies**

**Assessment Unit A2 9**

*assessing*

**Module 9: Exploring Connections:  
Synoptic Assessment Unit**

**[A2R91]**

**WEDNESDAY 3 FEBRUARY, AFTERNOON**

---

# **MARK SCHEME**

## Levels of Response

The specification requires that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the knowledge, understanding and skills set out in Section 3 of the specification.

- select and demonstrate clearly relevant knowledge and understanding through the use of evidence, examples, and correct language and terminology appropriate to the course of study (AO1); in addition, Advanced GCE candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the connections between different elements of their course of study
- sustain a critical line of argument and justify a point of view (AO2). In addition, Advanced GCE candidates should relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to specified aspects of human experience.

Each of the two assessment objectives has been categorised into five levels of performance relating to the respective abilities of the candidates.

Having identified, for each assessment objective listed below, the band in which the candidate has performed the examiner should then decide on the appropriate mark within the range for the band.

It is important that in the marking of the synoptic assessment unit assistant examiners take account of the candidate's abilities in drawing together strands of knowledge and understanding from at least two different content areas.

Using the chosen theme candidates will be expected to explore connections between elements of the selected area(s) of study. They should make appropriate use of the content as set out in the Focus for Assessment section of each module.

The five strands of knowledge and understanding act as a common and unifying structure for the specification. These are:

- the key concepts within the chosen area(s) of study, (e.g. religious beliefs, teachings, doctrines, principles, ideas and theories) and how these are expressed in texts, writings and/or practices;
- the contribution of significant people, tradition or movements to the area(s) studied;
- religious language and terminology;
- major issues and questions arising from the chosen areas of study;
- the relationship between the chosen area(s) of study and other specified aspects of human experience.

In particular candidates should demonstrate the ability to relate such connections to other aspects of human experience. The synoptic assessment unit accounts for 20% of the total Advanced GCE marks.



## (AO1) Knowledge and Understanding

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

### **Band 5 ([17]–[20])**

The response demonstrates a clear understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study and the chosen theme. There is a comprehensive exploration of the theme with the candidate drawing extensively on knowledge gained from study of at least two different content areas. The use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology is highly accurate and very consistent throughout. The form and style of writing are highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the task is of a very high order as is the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation. Work in this band can be characterised as having a mature approach with sophistication and elegant expression.

### **Band 4 ([13]–[16])**

The response demonstrates a high degree of understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study and the chosen theme. There is a very good exploration of the theme with the candidate drawing competently on knowledge gained from study of at least two different content areas. The use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology is of a high order and consistent throughout. The form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the task is of a high order, as is the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation. Work in this band can be characterised as having a reasonably mature approach with good expression.

### **Band 3 ([9]–[12])**

The response demonstrates a good degree of understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study and the chosen theme. There is a good exploration of the theme with the candidate for the most part drawing accurately on knowledge gained from study of at least two different content areas. The use of evidence, examples, technical language and terminology is good and mainly accurate throughout much of the work. The form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the task is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good. Work in this band can be characterised as showing evidence of some maturity of approach with fair expression.

### **Band 2 ([5]–[8])**

The response demonstrates a basically accurate understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study and the chosen theme. There is a simple exploration of the theme with the candidate for the most part attempting with limited success to deploy knowledge gained from study of at least two different content areas. While the response shows that the candidate can use some evidence, examples, technical language and terminology correctly in some of their work, such use is generally not consistent and may emphasise one content area at the expense of another. The form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation, which prove problematic in conveying meaning. Work in this band can be characterised as showing little evidence of maturity of approach with ideas and information loosely expressed.

**Band 1 ([0]–[4])**

The response demonstrates a very limited understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study and the chosen theme. There is a very poor attempt at exploring the theme with the candidate for the most part demonstrating only partially accurate knowledge of the different content areas studied. They use some evidence, examples, technical language and terminology correctly in some of their work. They demonstrate a limited understanding with minimal analysis of the issues studied. Their form and style of writing is for the most part inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is therefore very weak and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear. Work in this band can be characterised as displaying little maturity of approach, with unsophisticated expression and weak construction. [20]

**(AO2) Critical Line of Argument****Band 5 ([17]–[20])**

The response demonstrates a full understanding and analysis of the connections between the selected areas of study and the chosen theme. There is also evidence of an excellent attempt to make connections with other aspects of human experience. Candidate makes full and effective use of evidence to sustain a critical line of argument and justify a point of view, anticipating and counteracting views to the contrary. They can effectively compare, contrast and evaluate the views of scholars and schools of thought, and are very good at offering personal insights and independent thought. The form and style of writing are highly appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the task is of a very high order, as is the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation. Work in this band can be characterised as having a mature approach with sophisticated and elegant expression.

**Band 4 ([13]–[16])**

The response demonstrates a very good understanding and analysis of the connections between the selected areas of study and the chosen theme. There is also evidence of a very good attempt to make connections with other aspects of human experience. There is some very good use of evidence to sustain a critical line of argument and justify a point of view often anticipating and counteracting views to the contrary. They make a good attempt in comparing, contrasting and evaluating the views of scholars and schools of thought. They show good evidence of being able to offer personal insights and independent thought. The form and style of writing is appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the task is of a high order as is the legibility of writing and the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation. Work in this band can be characterised as having a reasonably mature approach with good expression.

**Band 3 ([9]–[12])**

The response demonstrates some understanding and analysis of the connections between the selected areas of study and the chosen theme. There is also evidence of a good attempt to make connections with other aspects of human experience. There is good use of evidence to sustain a critical line of argument and justify a point of view sometimes anticipating and counteracting views to the contrary. They show some ability to compare, contrast and evaluate the views of scholars and schools of thought, but not consistently. The form and style of writing is generally appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of the response to the task is of a generally good order, as is the legibility of writing. Use of spelling, grammar and punctuation is generally good. Work in this band can be characterised as showing evidence of some maturity of approach with fair expression.

**Band 2 ([5]–[8])**

The response demonstrates a basically accurate understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study and the chosen theme. There is also some evidence of a limited attempt to make connections with other aspects of human experience. There is a simple exploration of the theme with the candidate for the most part attempting, with limited success, to deploy knowledge gained from study of at least two different content areas. While the response shows that the candidate can use some evidence, examples, technical language and terminology correctly in some of their work, such use is generally not consistent and may emphasise one content area at the expense of another. The form and style of writing is just appropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is limited in some respects, which may mean that the reader has to make a greater effort to understand the message being conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or some weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which prove problematic in conveying meaning. Work in this band can be characterised as showing little evidence of maturity of approach with ideas and information loosely expressed.

**Band 1 ([0]–[4])**

The response demonstrates a very limited understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study and the chosen theme. There is evidence of a very poor attempt to make connections with other aspects of human experience. There is a very poor attempt at exploring the theme with the candidate for the most part demonstrating only partially accurate knowledge of the different content areas studied. They use some evidence, examples, technical language and terminology correctly in some of their work. They demonstrate a limited understanding with minimal analysis of the issues studied. Their form and style of writing is for the most part inappropriate to purpose and subject matter. The clarity and coherence of their response is therefore very weak, and the reader may not understand the message conveyed. There may be poor legibility of writing and/or significant weakness in the use of spelling, grammar and punctuation which render meaning unclear. Work in this band can be characterised as displaying little maturity of approach, with unsophisticated expression and weak construction.

[20]

40

**Total**

**40**

