



*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED  
General Certificate of Education  
2011**

---

## **Religious Studies**

**Assessment Unit A2 1**

*assessing*

The Theology of the Gospel of Luke

**[AR211]**

**THURSDAY 19 MAY, AFTERNOON**

---

**MARK  
SCHEME**

## **GCE Religious Studies**

### **A2 Mark Scheme (A2 1 – A2 8)**

#### **Levels of Response**

The specification requires that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the learning outcomes and skills set out in 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.

In addition, for synoptic assessment, A Level candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the connections between different elements of their course of study.

- Critically evaluate and justify a point of view through the use of evidence and reasoned argument.

In addition, for synoptic assessment, A Level candidates should relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to 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 opposite, the band in which the candidate has performed, the examiner should then decide on the appropriate mark within the range for the band.

## A2 BANDS

### AO1 (30 marks)

<p><b>Band 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A full and highly informed response to the task.</li><li>• Demonstrates comprehensive understanding and accurate knowledge.</li><li>• A very high degree of relevant evidence and examples.</li><li>• A very sophisticated style of writing set within a clear and coherent structure.</li><li>• An extensive range of technical language and terminology.</li><li>• An almost totally faultless use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li></ul>	<b>25–30</b>
<p><b>Band 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A reasonable and well informed response to the task.</li><li>• Demonstrates a high degree of understanding and almost totally accurate knowledge.</li><li>• A very good range of relevant evidence and examples.</li><li>• A mature style of writing set within a mainly clear and coherent structure.</li><li>• A wide range of technical language and terminology.</li><li>• A mainly accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li></ul>	<b>19–24</b>
<p><b>Band 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A good response to the task.</li><li>• Demonstrates a reasonable degree of understanding and mainly accurate knowledge.</li><li>• A good range of relevant evidence and examples.</li><li>• A reasonable mature style of writing with some coherent structure evident.</li><li>• A good range of technical language and terminology.</li><li>• Reasonably accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li></ul>	<b>13–18</b>
<p><b>Band 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A limited response to the task.</li><li>• Demonstrates some knowledge and understanding.</li><li>• A basic range of evidence and/or examples.</li><li>• Style of writing is just appropriate.</li><li>• Structure is disorganised in places.</li><li>• Limited range of technical language and terminology.</li><li>• Limited command of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li></ul>	<b>7–12</b>
<p><b>Band 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A very basic response to the task.</li><li>• Demonstrates minimal knowledge and understanding.</li><li>• Little, if any, use of evidence and/or examples.</li><li>• Inappropriate style of writing within a poor structure.</li><li>• A very basic range of technical language and terminology.</li><li>• Very poor use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li></ul>	<b>0–6</b>

**AO2 (20 marks)**

<b>Band 5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A comprehensive and coherent response demonstrating an excellent attempt at critical analysis, supported by a high awareness of scholarly views.</li><li>• Very good personal insight and independent thought expressed through a highly developed argument which is set, where necessary, in the context of wider aspects of human experience.</li><li>• An extensive range of technical language and terminology.</li><li>• An almost totally faultless use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li></ul>	<b>17–20</b>
<b>Band 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A very good response demonstrating a very good attempt at critical analysis, supported by a good awareness of scholarly views.</li><li>• Good personal insight and independent thought expressed through a developed argument which is set, where necessary, in the context of wider aspects of human experience.</li><li>• A wide range of technical language and terminology.</li><li>• A mainly accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li></ul>	<b>13–16</b>
<b>Band 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A reasonable response demonstrating a good attempt at critical analysis, supported by an awareness of the views of some scholars.</li><li>• Some personal insight and independent thought expressed through reasonable argument which is set, where necessary, in the context of wider aspects of human experience.</li><li>• A good range of technical language and terminology.</li><li>• Reasonably accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li></ul>	<b>9–12</b>
<b>Band 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A limited response demonstrating a modest attempt at critical analysis, with limited awareness of scholarly views.</li><li>• Limited personal insight and independent thought expressed through some argument.</li><li>• A good range of technical language and terminology.</li><li>• Reasonably accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li></ul>	<b>5–8</b>
<b>Band 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A very basic response demonstrating little attempt at critical analysis, with minimal awareness of scholarly views.</li><li>• Poor personal insight and/or independent thought.</li><li>• Shallow argument.</li><li>• Limited range of technical language and terminology.</li><li>• Limited command of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</li></ul>	<b>0–4</b>

## Section A

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

- 1 (a) Candidates may wish to include some of the following, e.g.:
- a definition of Source Criticism
  - the development of Source Criticism and its contribution to the Synoptic Problem
  - reference to a range of key critics and their theories, e.g. J.J. Griesbach, B.H. Streeter, W.R. Farmer, 2-source theory, 4-source theory, priority of Mark
  - identification and discussion of sources used by Luke – Mark, Quelle, special L
  - Luke’s treatment of Mark, i.e. evidence of redaction, Markan omissions
  - Luke’s treatment of Q material
  - the contribution of L material to an understanding of Luke’s characteristics
  - discussion of the Proto-Luke theory and how it contributes to an understanding of Luke’s structure, and to his reliability as an historian
  - value of Source Criticism as applied to Luke’s Gospel. [30]
- (b) A critical evaluation of the view may include some of the following, e.g.:
- reference to different types of Biblical Criticism and their contribution to an understanding of Luke’s message
  - the value of Source Criticism in highlighting Luke as a careful investigator and so emphasising the trustworthiness of his message
  - how Redaction Criticism helps the reader understand Luke’s special theological interest
  - the uniqueness of special L material and how this reflects Luke’s particular interests, i.e. universalism, Jesus as a compassionate Saviour
  - the irrelevance of the issue of sources or forms from the perspective of other types of Biblical Criticism such as Narrative which focuses on reading the final text as a whole
  - the evidence of Luke’s message of universalism to the careful reader regardless of a knowledge of Biblical Criticism
  - how some types of Biblical Criticism could undermine the reliability of the message and cause the reader to doubt the message
  - the value of Form Criticism in exploring the oral period and how the tradition was “preserved” or “created” by the Early Church. [20]

50

- 2 (a)** Candidates may wish to include some of the following, e.g.:
- historical meaning and development of the title
  - Old Testament background to the title such as Daniel 7v13–14
  - the use of the title in distinct ways in Luke, e.g.
    - the earthly Son of Man – 5v24, 6v5, 7v34, 9v58, 19v10, 22v48;
    - the suffering Son of Man – 9v22, 9v44, 11v30, 18v31, 22v22;
    - the Son of Man in eschatological glory – 9v26, 17v30, 18v8, 21v27, 22v69
  - discussion of how the title contributes to an understanding of the person of Jesus in relation to the categories above
  - discussion of Jesus' preferred self use of the title.
- NB: Biblical references are not exhaustive [30]

- (b)** A critical assessment of the claim may include some of the following, e.g.:
- the mysterious nature of the title which is rooted in the Old Testament and appears inaccessible today
  - the need for contemporary readers to understand the theological significance of the title in order to see its relevance today
  - how the title suggests his humanity and so he can identify with human weaknesses
  - consideration of the ways in which Jesus was a suffering Son of Man, e.g. he suffered rejection, misunderstanding, false accusations, temptation, desertion/betrayal by friends, at his passion – and how people today take comfort from the belief that he understands their suffering
  - contemporary examples of human suffering, e.g. refugees, rejection, false accusation, being misunderstood, humiliation, being an innocent victim, being forsaken by others
  - how followers of Jesus relate the suffering Son of Man to those who are suffering in our world today, i.e. through the work of Christian relief agencies
  - how belief in the Son of Man coming in glory gives hope to the hearer today in relation to the parousia. [20]

50

- 3 (a) Candidates may wish to include some of the following, e.g.:
- a definition of the term “parable of crisis”, for example, a forewarning of coming judgement requiring action to ensure a place in the Kingdom of God
  - an account of any **two** parables of crisis from Luke, for example, the rich fool 12v16–21, the returning master and the watchful servants 12v35–38, the thief and the householder 12v39–40, the faithful or unfaithful servant 12v41–48, the barren fig tree 13v6–9, the narrow door 13v22–30, the rich man and Lazarus 16v19–31, the ten gold coins 19v11–27, the wicked vinedressers 20v9–18 (the tenants in the vineyard)
  - an analysis and discussion of the theological significance of the chosen parables – setting, content, meaning and response
  - a discussion of the nature of the crisis.

NB: this list of parables is not exhaustive [30]

- (b) A critical assessment of the claim may include the following, e.g.:
- a consideration of the challenge of crisis parables and their effect on the original audience
  - discussion about whether or not belief in such judgement still exists or if it is an outdated concept
  - how such belief, if it exists, influences behaviour and attitudes of religious believers today, e.g. Christian philanthropists
  - relevance of warnings about misuse of wealth and the danger of ignoring the spiritual aspects of life
  - discussion about the notion of rewards for faithful disciples. [20]

50

- 4 (a) Candidates may wish to include some of the following, e.g.:
- a definition of salvation history, for example, God who brought salvation to the Old Testament people of God continues to work out his purposes in saving mankind through the Lord Jesus
  - discussion of Hans Conzelmann’s coining of the phrase with reference to the delayed parousia and Luke’s three-stage salvation history
  - reference to other scholars, e.g. Fitzmyer, Marshall
  - discussion of Luke’s methods in presenting this theme
  - evidence from specific passages in Luke’s gospel, for example, healing miracles as evidence of God’s saving activity, Jesus’ power over Satan through exorcisms, Jesus’ power to forgive sins, the universal aspect of salvation
  - possible discussion of how Luke continued the theme of Salvation History into the Book of Acts and how it continues to the present day. [30]

- (b) A critical evaluation of the view may include some of the following, e.g.:
- prophecies about rejection by Simeon
  - evidence of rejection from the beginning of Jesus’ ministry, e.g. in Nazareth
  - specific examples of those who responded positively – sinful woman 7v36–50, Zacchaeus 19v1–10, outcasts such as lepers 17v11–19
  - reference to Jesus’ teaching indicating different responses – the Lost Son 15v11–32, the Pharisee and the Tax Collector 18v9–14
  - examples and exploration of negative responses in Luke with reference to religious leaders, the wealthy, others who reject the message
  - Jesus’ warnings about rejection in the sending out of the Twelve and the Seventy. [20]

**Section A**

50

**100**



## **GCE Religious Studies**

### **A2 Mark Scheme (A2 1 – A2 8)**

#### **Levels of Response**

The specification requires that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the learning outcomes and skills set out in 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. In addition, for synoptic assessment, A Level candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the connections between different elements of their course of study.
- Critically evaluate and justify a point of view through the use of evidence and reasoned argument. In addition, for synoptic assessment, A Level candidates should relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to 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 opposite, 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 areas of study. They should make appropriate use of the content as set out in the subject content for 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 areas 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 areas studied
- religious language and terminology
- major issues and questions arising from the chosen areas of study
- the relationship between the chosen areas 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.

## A2 BANDS

### AO1 (30 marks)

<p><b>Band 5</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A full and comprehensive understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study in relation to the theme.</li><li>• Well integrated response.</li><li>• Clear and critical analysis.</li><li>• Highly accurate use of evidence and examples.</li><li>• Sophisticated style of writing. Very well structured and coherent throughout.</li></ul>	<b>25–30</b>
<p><b>Band 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A high degree of understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study in relation to the theme.</li><li>• A well integrated response.</li><li>• Some very good critical analysis.</li><li>• Mainly accurate use of evidence and examples.</li><li>• Mature style of writing.</li><li>• Well structured and coherent throughout.</li></ul>	<b>19–24</b>
<p><b>Band 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A good understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study in relation to the theme.</li><li>• For the most part an integrated response.</li><li>• Reasonable degree of critical analysis.</li><li>• A good degree of accurate evidence and examples.</li><li>• Reasonably mature style of writing.</li><li>• Some evidence of good structure and coherence.</li></ul>	<b>13–18</b>
<p><b>Band 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A limited understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study in relation to the theme.</li><li>• Mere juxtaposition of the two areas of study, perhaps emphasising one content area at the expense of another.</li><li>• A limited attempt at critical analysis.</li><li>• Insufficient use of accurate evidence and examples.</li><li>• Immature style of writing.</li><li>• Lacking in structure and coherence.</li></ul>	<b>7–12</b>
<p><b>Band 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A basic understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study in relation to the theme.</li><li>• Demonstrating only partially accurate knowledge of the different content areas studied.</li><li>• Little attempt, if any, at critical analysis.</li><li>• Inappropriate style of writing with a very basic structure.</li></ul>	<b>0–6</b>

**AO2 (20 marks)**

<b>Band 5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A comprehensive analysis of the statement in relation to connections made between the areas of study and other aspects of human experience.</li><li>• Very effective comparison and evaluation of scholarly viewpoints.</li><li>• Mature personal insight and independent thought.</li><li>• A very well sustained and critical argument, expressed accurately and fluently with considerable sophistication using a wide range of terminology.</li></ul>	<b>17–20</b>
<b>Band 4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A good analysis of the statement in relation to connections made between the areas of study and other aspects of human experience.</li><li>• Very good comparison and evaluation of scholarly viewpoints.</li><li>• Good personal insight and independent thought.</li><li>• A well sustained and critical argument, expressed accurately, fluently and using a range of terminology.</li></ul>	<b>13–16</b>
<b>Band 3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A reasonable analysis of the statement in relation to connections made between the areas of study and other aspects of human experience.</li><li>• Very good comparison and evaluation of scholarly viewpoints.</li><li>• Some evidence of personal insight and independent thought.</li><li>• A line of argument, expressed accurately and using some relevant terminology.</li></ul>	<b>9–12</b>
<b>Band 2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A limited analysis of the statement in relation to connections made between the areas of study and other aspects of human experience.</li><li>• Some comparison and evaluation of scholarly viewpoints.</li><li>• Limited personal insight and independent thought.</li><li>• Little evidence of critical argument.</li><li>• Inaccuracies evident.</li></ul>	<b>5–8</b>
<b>Band 1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A basic analysis of the statement in relation to connections made between the areas of study and other aspects of human experience.</li><li>• Little, if any, comparison and evaluation of scholarly viewpoints.</li><li>• Minimal personal insight and independent thought.</li><li>• A basic attempt to follow a line of argument.</li><li>• Imprecisely expressed.</li></ul>	<b>0–4</b>

## Section B

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

- 5 (a)** In outlining and examining the contribution of some key people to an understanding of the issue of sin, candidates should refer to at least two different areas of study and could consider some of the following, e.g.:
- identification of key people and their views/attitudes towards sin
  - their definition and categorising of sin
  - their warnings/teachings about sin and its consequences
  - their attitudes toward and punishment of sinners
  - reference to those who were regarded as “sinners” or to those who sinned
  - means of forgiveness/making amends as set out by key people
  - reference to particular writings of individuals
  - conflicts between individuals on the issue of sin and the effects of such conflict. [30]
- (b)** In critically assessing the view, candidates should refer to other aspects of human experience and could consider some of the following, e.g.:
- a range of consequences of sin both for the offender and the victim
  - the possibility of exclusion from religious life and from society
  - human judgement, i.e. judicial system and punishments meted out
  - Divine judgement and future, eternal punishment
  - guilty conscience/self-loathing
  - effects on one’s character or reputation
  - physical, emotional and spiritual consequences
  - consequences of sin for others
  - how consequences of sin can be dealt with, i.e. the need for forgiveness, restitution, restoration
  - short-term/earthly benefits of sin
  - sin as an irrelevant concept
  - use of historical and/or contemporary examples. [20]

**Section B**

**Total**

50

**50**

**150**