



# **2015 Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies**

## **Advanced Higher**

### **Finalised Marking Instructions**

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2015

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from SQA's NQ Assessment team.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's NQ Assessment team may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.

## **Part One: General Marking Principles for: Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Advanced Higher**

This information is provided to help you understand the general principles you must apply when marking candidate responses to questions in this Paper. These principles must be read in conjunction with the specific Marking Instructions for each question.

- (a)** Marks for each candidate response must always be assigned in line with these general marking principles and the specific Marking Instructions for the relevant question. If a specific candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or detailed Marking Instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your Team Leader/Principal Assessor.
- (b)** Marking should always be positive ie, marks should be awarded for what is correct and not deducted for errors or omissions.

### **GENERAL MARKING ADVICE: Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Advanced Higher**

The marking schemes are written to assist in determining the “minimal acceptable answer” rather than listing every possible correct and incorrect answer. The following notes are offered to support Markers in making judgements on candidates’ evidence, and apply to marking both end of unit assessments and course assessments.

**Part Two: Marking Instructions for each Question**

**SECTION A**

**Philosophy of Religion**

Question	Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
1.	<p><b>Examples of areas covered:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Description of traditional cosmological arguments by Aquinas and Kalam</li><li>• Criticisms of the above by Hume and Russell</li><li>• Analysis and evaluation of scientific explanations which would support the cosmological argument eg Big Bang Theory</li><li>• Analysis and evaluation of scientific explanations which would undermine the cosmological argument: Steady State Theory Quantum Theory</li></ul> <p>The best candidates will distinguish between traditional and contemporary forms of the argument and counter-argument and draw on a range of sources which might include Davies, Swinburne, Hawking, Hick and others.</p> <p>Candidates may disagree with the question and argue that science weakens the First Cause Argument.</p> <p>Come to a personal conclusion based on the analysis and evaluation carried out.</p>	<b>30</b>	

Question	Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
2.	<p><b>Examples of area covered:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The basic argument from design indicates that: the universe has order, regularity and purpose; it is sufficiently complex to show evidence of design; this kind of design infers a designer; the designer of the universe is God.</li> <li>• An explanation of the use of analogy: Aquinas claims that things that lack intelligence cannot move towards their end unless they are directed by someone with knowledge and intelligence; analogy of the watch designer and God.</li> <li>• Analysis and evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the use of analogy: an unsound analogy as similar effects do not necessarily imply similar causes; analogy makes God more human than divine; analogy leads to a non-moral God; allows that there is an analogy between artefacts and natural objects but suggests that we need 'transcendental' arguments.</li> <li>• The impact of evolutionary theory: could the first DNA have happened by chance?</li> <li>• Discussion of whether the uniqueness of the universe excludes our arguing from design</li> <li>• Discussion on whether design gives reason for belief in several gods.</li> </ul> <p>The best candidates will distinguish between traditional and contemporary forms of the argument and counter-argument and draw on a range of sources, which might include Paley, Hume, Dawkins, Stannard, Tennant and others.</p> <p>Come to a personal conclusion based on the analysis and evaluation carried out.</p>	30	

## SECTION B

### Religious Experience

Question	Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
3.	<p><b>Examples of areas covered:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Definitions of religious experience</li><li>• Frequency and status of religious experiences in religions</li><li>• Case studies where religious experience led to faith</li><li>• Case studies where faith comes before a religious experience or none</li><li>• Role of family upbringing leading to faith</li><li>• Cases where religious experience is a source of religious practice eg Sufis</li><li>• Faith confirmed by others' religious experiences</li></ul>	30	
4.	<p><b>Examples of areas covered:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Definition of religious experience</li><li>• Different sociological perspectives from the like of Durkheim, Wilson, Weber</li><li>• Analysis of case studies which support and challenge their findings</li><li>• Comparisons with psychological explanations</li><li>• Comparisons with physiological explanations</li><li>• Strengths and weaknesses in these findings</li><li>• No more evidence for some of the secular theories than from those claiming to have had the experiences</li><li>• Researchers are not always objective</li><li>• Problem of objectively studying subjective material</li></ul>	30	

## SECTION C

### Medical Ethics

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
5.		<p><b>Examples of areas covered:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Examples of current IVF and other fertility treatments</li> <li>• HFEA, UK laws and other legal systems</li> <li>• Implications of IVF</li> <li>• Guidance from medical bodies eg BMA</li> <li>• Views of personhood/Status of the embryo</li> <li>• Definitions of beginning of life</li> <li>• Divine will and purpose</li> <li>• Sanctity of life</li> <li>• Playing God</li> <li>• Rights of unborn</li> <li>• Compassion</li> <li>• Economic considerations</li> <li>• Scientific advances</li> </ul>	30	
6.		<p><b>Examples of areas covered:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision makers – patient, family, medical professional</li> <li>• UK Legislation</li> <li>• Guidance from medical governing bodies, eg BMA</li> <li>• Sanctity of life</li> <li>• Place of 'soul'</li> <li>• Slippery slope</li> <li>• Judgement</li> <li>• Care vs killing</li> <li>• Double effect</li> <li>• Playing God</li> <li>• Definitions of death</li> <li>• Quality of life arguments</li> <li>• Hippocratic oath</li> <li>• Utilitarian &amp; Kantian ethics</li> <li>• Doctor/patient relationship</li> <li>• Economic considerations</li> <li>• Compassion</li> <li>• Consent</li> </ul>	30	

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]