



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2024

**AS (NEW)
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - UNIT 2
SECTION B - AN INTRODUCTION TO THE
PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION**

2120U20-1

About this marking scheme

The purpose of this marking scheme is to provide teachers, learners, and other interested parties, with an understanding of the assessment criteria used to assess this specific assessment.

This marking scheme reflects the criteria by which this assessment was marked in a live series and was finalised following detailed discussion at an examiners' conference. A team of qualified examiners were trained specifically in the application of this marking scheme. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners. It may not be possible, or appropriate, to capture every variation that a candidate may present in their responses within this marking scheme. However, during the training conference, examiners were guided in using their professional judgement to credit alternative valid responses as instructed by the document, and through reviewing exemplar responses.

Without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers, learners and other users, may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that this marking scheme is used alongside other guidance, such as published exemplar materials or Guidance for Teaching. This marking scheme is final and will not be changed, unless in the event that a clear error is identified, as it reflects the criteria used to assess candidate responses during the live series.

GCE AS RELIGIOUS STUDIES – UNIT 2

SECTION B - AN INTRODUCTION TO THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

SUMMER 2024 MARK SCHEME

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

Positive marking

It should be remembered that candidates are writing under examination conditions and credit should be given for what the candidate writes, rather than adopting the approach of penalising him/her for any omissions. It should be possible for a very good response to achieve full marks and a very poor one to achieve zero marks. Marks should not be deducted for a less than perfect answer if it satisfies the criteria of the mark scheme.

Exemplars in the mark scheme are only meant as helpful guides. Therefore, any other acceptable or suitable answers should be credited even though they are not actually stated in the mark scheme.

Two main phrases are deliberately placed throughout each mark scheme to remind examiners of this philosophy. They are:

- “Candidates could include some of the following, but other relevant points should be credited.”
- “This is not a checklist, please remember to credit any valid alternatives.”

Rules for Marking

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

Banded mark schemes

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

Banded mark schemes stage 1 – deciding on the band

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

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

Banded mark schemes stage 2 – deciding on the mark

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

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

Awarding no marks to a response

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

AS Generic Band Descriptors

Band	<p style="text-align: center;">Assessment Objective AO1 – Part (a) questions [30 marks]</p> <p><i>Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching</i> - <i>influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies</i> - <i>cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice</i> - <i>approaches to the study of religion and belief.</i>
5	<p style="text-align: center;">25-30 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thorough, accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • An extensive and relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response shows an excellent standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • The response demonstrates extensive depth and/or breadth. Excellent use of evidence and examples. • Thorough and accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language /vocabulary in context. • Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4	<p style="text-align: center;">19-24 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A detailed, relevant response which answers the specific demands of the question set. • The response shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth. Good use of evidence and examples. • Accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar.
3	<p style="text-align: center;">13-18 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainly accurate and relevant knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. • A satisfactory response, which generally answers the main demands of the question set. • The response shows a satisfactory standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • The response demonstrates depth and/or breadth in some areas. Satisfactory use of evidence and examples. • Mainly accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar.
2	<p style="text-align: center;">7-12 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Basic level of accuracy and relevance. • A basic response, addressing some of the demands of the question set. • Partially accurate response, with some signs of coherence, clarity and organisation. • The response demonstrates limited depth and/or breadth, including limited use of evidence and examples. • Some accurate reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1	<p style="text-align: center;">1-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very limited knowledge and understanding of religion and belief. Low level of accuracy and relevance. • A very limited response, with little attempt to address the question. • Very limited accuracy within the response with little coherence, clarity and organisation. • The response demonstrates very limited depth and/or breadth. Very limited use of evidence and examples. • Little or no reference made to sacred texts and sources of wisdom, where appropriate. • Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary • Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the meaning and clarity of communication. <p>N.B. A maximum of 2 marks should be awarded for a response that only demonstrates 'knowledge in isolation'</p>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant information.

Band	Assessment Objective AO2- Part (b) questions [30 marks] <i>Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.</i>
5	<p style="text-align: center;">25-30 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confident critical analysis and perceptive evaluation of the issue. • A response that successfully identifies and thoroughly addresses the issues raised by the question set. • The response shows an excellent standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • Thorough, sustained and clear views are given, supported by extensive, detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Thorough and accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Excellent spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4	<p style="text-align: center;">19-24 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful analysis and effective evaluation of the issue. • The main issues raised by the question are identified successfully and addressed. • The response shows a very good standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • The views given are clearly supported by detailed reasoning and/or evidence. • Accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Very good spelling, punctuation and grammar.
3	<p style="text-align: center;">13-18 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory analysis and relevant evaluation of the issue. • Most of the issues raised by the question are identified successfully and have generally been addressed. • The response shows a satisfactory standard of coherence, clarity and organisation. • Most of the views given are satisfactorily supported by reasoning and/or evidence. • Mainly accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Satisfactory spelling, punctuation and grammar.
2	<p style="text-align: center;">7-12 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some valid analysis and inconsistent evaluation of the issue. • A limited number of issues raised by the question set are identified and partially addressed. • Partially accurate response, with some signs of coherence, clarity and organisation. • A basic attempt to justify the views given, but they are only partially supported with reason and/or evidence. • Some accurate use of specialist language and vocabulary in context. • Some minor, recurring errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1	<p style="text-align: center;">1-6 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic analysis and limited evaluation of the issue. • Very limited accuracy within the response, with little coherence, clarity and organisation. • An attempt has been made to identify and address the issues raised by the question set. • Little attempt to justify a view with reasoning or evidence. • Some grasp of basic specialist language and vocabulary. • Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar affect the meaning and clarity of communication.
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No relevant analysis or evaluation.

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

3. (a) Explain David Hume's challenges to teleological arguments.

[AO1 30]

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

- Candidates need to explain the various points raised by Hume which challenge the numerous teleological arguments. This may be done in either breadth or depth.
- Hume's empirical objections such as his critique of linking cause and effect raises issues. We may do this because of habit or laziness whereas in actual fact we cannot say that an effect (universe) has been caused (by God.) Similarly, like causes do not mean like effects, so even if the watch and the world were similar, it does not mean that they both had similar causes. We cannot go from part to whole. It is an inductive leap to say that things in the universe have a designer to concluding that the universe has a designer. This commits the fallacy of composition.
- He also said that the analogy between the universe and the watch is weak, thus challenging the entire argument. He comments that the universe is really nothing like a mechanical object. Even if we did accept that analogy then that would lead to some rather unsavoury conclusions particularly with reference to the nature of God. Also, there are better analogies. He said the universe has greater similarity to a vegetable than to a mechanical object, something that grows of its own accord, not needing a designer.
- He commented, in his Epicurean hypothesis that the universe was bound to have an appearance of design, even though it 'just is.' This is because the universe over time produced itself to be as it is out of the 'spring of order.'
- He accepted that we may end up with a designer, but this designer is certainly not necessarily the God of classical theism. It is more likely that there may have been a team of gods, just as many contribute to the design of a watch. For Hume, this would suggest that polytheism is more reasonable than monotheism. Alternatively, we may end up with an old god or an absent god, who has left its design or considering the disorder in the world, a young apprentice god who produced 'the first rude essay of an infant deity.'
- Also, we infer that a house or a ship has builders as we can infer this from past experience. However, we have no experience of universes being made so we cannot comment on the design of this one.

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

3. (b) 'Inductive arguments for God's existence are persuasive.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Candidates may refer to the cosmological and/or teleological arguments for God's existence as examples of inductive arguments.
- A particularly persuasive aspect of inductive arguments could be that they do allow for the possibility or even probability of an answer, including leading to the possibility of God's existence. Many would argue that this is better than there being no chance at all!
- However, others may argue that the fact that inductive arguments are not 100% undeniable proofs means that they are unpersuasive as a method of argument.
- Inductive arguments rely on experience which is universal and testable. For example, it is evident that 'all mechanical objects' have a designer. This empirical approach can enhance the credibility of an argument, including an argument for God's existence based upon inductive arguments.
- The arguments are flexible and can in fact support a number of conclusions which appeals to many. However, the lack of a definitive conclusion can also be seen as a major drawback of inductive arguments. It is more than possible to accept all of the premises that an inductive argument is based upon but then to reject the conclusion. This makes it a very shaky method to use when attempting to prove God's existence.
- Having said that, the fact that the premises can in fact support a conclusion shows that the overall structure of inductive arguments is a rational one. If one can accept the premises then one may be justified in accepting the conclusion also.
- The fact that inductive arguments can allow for the chance of error can also be seen as a persuasive aspect of them. Lines of reasoning can be changed to account for different findings.
- Candidates may argue that deductive arguments are more persuasive than inductive arguments as they are based on reason and logic not experience.

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

4. (a) Outline the problem of evil with reference to Epicurus and John L. Mackie.

[AO1 30]

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

- Epicurus presents the logical problem of evil in its classical form. He states that 'Either God wants to abolish evil, and cannot; or he can, but does not want to. If he wants to, but cannot, he is impotent. If he can, but does not want to, he is wicked. If God can abolish evil, and God really wants to do it, why is there evil in the world?' This raises a philosophical contradiction in relation to the characteristics of the God of Classical Theism.
- Epicurus presents a problem in terms of contradictions or compromises regarding the attributes of God, both of which jeopardise belief in the God of Classical Theism.
- Candidates may exemplify their explanation by referring to the types of evil. If the universe was created ex nihilo by a God with the attributes of the God of Classical Theism (all-powerful, all-loving and all-knowing) then how can the world be so dysfunctional in terms of natural evil? If God made all humans in his image then why are there so many acts of moral evil?
- With regard to Mackie, 'The Inconsistent Triad' suggests evil should not exist if God is all-loving and omnipotent. This is a pure logical problem of evil argument. If God were all loving he would want to stop suffering. If he were omnipotent he would be able to. Evil clearly exists so all three statements cannot be held to be true simultaneously. The three statements held together would entail a logical inconsistency. Expect stronger answers to explain this in logical stages.
- His argument revolves around free will. Evil goes hand in hand with good, one cannot exist without the other. God cannot create the impossible. Evil is necessary to bring about goodness. Therefore, evil is necessary for free will. God did not create free humans who always chose what was right. That is illogical. Mackie therefore deals with the logical problem of evil.
- He referred to 'the Paradox of Omnipotence.' This he believes is an illogical aspect of theodicies. It is illogical to say that God is omnipotent yet there are things that God cannot do. He believes that theodicies state that they retain God's omnipotence, but in actual fact limit it. Whichever way we look at it, God's unqualified omnipotence as a being that continues through time is compromised. If God is not in time, Mackie argues that giving God any characteristic associated with time (for example, omnipotence) is tenuous.
- If we say that there are things that an omnipotent God can make that he cannot then control, he is not omnipotent. If we say that an omnipotent God cannot make things that he cannot then control then again, God is not omnipotent.
- Higher band answers are expected to note a definite difference between Epicurus and Mackie, as opposed to conflating both their views which results in weaker candidates stating that they are expressing exactly the same views.
- Candidates may include points related to Rowe and Gregory S. Paul in their responses. It must be noted that these can be credited as additional information, but not instead of commenting on Epicurus and Mackie.

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

4. (b) 'There is no problem of evil for religious believers.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- For those without a belief in God, there may well be no problem of evil. Yes, there is evil present in the world; that is undeniable. However, there is no 'problem' as such as there is no God to build into the equation, a God that one needs to justify the existence of. Indeed, perhaps for some members of Eastern religions there is no 'problem' as such as evil can be explained by the workings of karma.
- However, for theists it is clear that there is a problem if they want to maintain the characteristics of the God of Classical Theism. God's characteristics are inconsistent with the existence of evil and suffering.
- Some would claim that we can diminish the characteristics traditionally ascribed to God. We can say that God is not all loving yet is all powerful. This eliminates the problem as God does not want to stop the suffering.
- However, for many, this would be an unacceptable compromise as God must love and for many this would simply not be responding to the problem, rather it is just an easy way out.
- Another line of reasoning would suggest that God is not all powerful. God did not have the power to create ex nihilo and does not have the power to stop evil now. Again, for many, this would be unacceptable if they are unwilling to give up their belief that God did create out of nothing. Equally it could be argued that a God with limited power is no God at all. Hence, this does not remove the 'problem' it just diverts around it.
- Mackie's reasoning says that God can exist without one of those attributes. In that sense, there is no problem of evil as such.
- It could be argued that the fact that God does not stop evil does not present us with a problem because we do not know the intentions of God. Suffering may all be part of a grand plan and is a necessary part of life. God's view of things is unchanging unlike the views of humans which succumb to changing times.
- Or it could be said that God not stopping evil does not make him wicked, rather simply 'not bothered' much like people who do not donate to charity are not wicked, just apathetic.
- A different approach could state that evil as a 'thing' does not exist thus the 'problem' disappears. Evil is just a name for the manifestations of some malfunction or could all be to do with perceptions. What one person calls evil may not be the same as what another person calls evil.
- However, for many this is belittling the presence of evil which is a real and living presence in the lives of many, in an emotional and/or physical sense. To simply deny its existence is ludicrous and is dodging the problem.
- Some would agree with scholars such as Rowe and Paul, giving evidential and statistical arguments against the existence of God. It could be argued that the sheer amount and intensity of suffering of both humans and animals makes the problem of evil a very real and insurmountable one. Some suffering might be beneficial, but there is pointless suffering which is inconsistent with the existence of the God of Classical Theism.

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