



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2024

**AS (NEW)
RELIGIOUS STUDIES - UNIT 2
SECTION A - AN INTRODUCTION TO RELIGION
AND ETHICS**

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 A - AN INTRODUCTION TO RELIGION AND ETHICS
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.

1. (a) Explain how Robert Adams modified Divine Command Theory.

[AO1 30]

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

- Divine Command Theory is an absolutist theory which claims that some actions are always right and others are always wrong.
- Divine Command Theory sees God as the origin and regulator of morality – what is good is what God says is good.
- A moral action is therefore one which God commands – and these commands can be seen through revealed scriptures.
- Right and wrong are seen as eternal, objective truths based on God's will as the divine lawgiver, and stem from his omnipotence – since God is all-powerful, there can be no moral standard outside of God's control.
- These objective truths based on God's will, should form the foundation of any human system of morality as certain actions will always be right or wrong, regardless of what different human societies may argue to the contrary.
- The Euthyphro dilemma may be discussed to illustrate the theory and to explain why Adams develops the theory with his modified version. The Euthyphro dilemma asks whether something is holy because it is approved by the Gods (i.e. within God's control) or whether the Gods only approve what is holy (that which is independent of God).
- Adams' version overcomes the criticism of arbitrariness (recognised by Augustine and William of Ockham). If to be moral is to be approved by God, what is to stop morality being simply the whim of God at the time?
- Adams' version of Divine Command Theory states that morality is grounded in the character of God. As God is perfectly good (omnibenevolent), God's commands must be perfectly good.
- God's commands must reflect his omnibenevolence and therefore God would not make arbitrary or evil commands as this would go against his nature. This addresses the strand of the Euthyphro dilemma that leads to the arbitrariness challenge without having to accept a moral standard outside God's control.

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

1. (b) 'Divine Command Theory is clearly superior to Ethical Egoism.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- Divine Command Theory is rooted in the will and nature of God, who is in Himself the originator of all morality. Therefore, Divine Command Theory is clearly superior to Ethical Egoism, which is based solely on the individual.
- It is also universal and absolute. The morality outlined by Divine Command Theory has served humanity well for hundreds of years and cannot be swayed by human bias, unlike Ethical Egoism.
- However, Divine Command Theory could be seen to be inflexible and unsuited to decision making in the modern era. It does not offer specific guidance about issues such as IVF or abortion, beyond the blanket prohibition of murder. Ethical Egoism is superior as it allows for individual autonomy and makes it possible for differences in approach to be tolerated in matters of private morality.
- Divine Command Theory could be seen to restrict individual autonomy and human development. Surely humans should be allowed to exercise their own reason and judgement in matters of morality rather than being blindly obedient. Ethical Egoism is superior as it requires humans to take responsibility for their own decision-making and to act in a rational manner.
- On the other hand, human decision-making is often flawed. Humans tend to prioritise short-term over long-term interests and struggle to act in unselfish ways. This shows that a structured theory such as Divine Command Theory is superior as it overrides the problem of human nature.
- Divine Command Theory could be seen as superior by religious believers who wish to act in obedience to God's will, but is unlikely to be preferred by non-believers, who would reject the basis of the entire theory. Non-believers may point out the dangers of acting out of 'blind faith' by identifying examples of horrific acts allegedly carried out according to divine commands. They may also point to the difficulty of pluralism, and the problem of identifying which commands, if any, are genuinely divine.
- However, Ethical Egoism may not be seen as superior as it is equally likely to cause conflict over whose interests should be prioritised at any given opportunity, potentially leading to bigotry and intolerance.

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

2. (a) Explain how Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill measure pleasure differently.

[AO1 30]

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

- Both forms of Utilitarianism follow the principle of utility: a good action is one that promotes pleasure and avoids pain.
- Both see this principle as applying equally to all those involved in a given situation, as morality promotes the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people.
- However, the philosophers differ over the role and nature of pleasure used to assess the greatest happiness.
- For Bentham, the type of pleasure is unimportant, it is the quantity of overall pleasure that matters when assessing morality: this view is summarised as 'the quantity of pleasure being equal, pushpin is as good as poetry.'
- This means that Bentham's Act Utilitarianism is focused on measuring the total amount of pleasure generated by an action using the seven criteria of the hedonic calculus: intensity, duration, certainty, remoteness, fecundity, purity and extent. The course of action which creates the greatest overall pleasure is the morally correct one to take.
- This led to criticism of Utilitarianism as leaving humanity no better than pleasure-seeking animals. J.S. Mill responded to this challenge by changing the focus from quantity of pleasure to quality of pleasure.
- Mill distinguished between higher pleasures (generally translated as intellectual pleasure or pleasure of the mind) that were closer to morality, and lower pleasures (generally translated as physical gratification or pleasures of the body.) This followed on from the Aristotelian approach which equated pleasure with human well-being rather than simple gratification.
- Mill argued that experiencing higher pleasures allows humans to develop as thinking beings and sets us apart from animals. People needed to satisfy lower pleasures for survival, but beyond that should aim for higher pleasures.
- Therefore, for Bentham, Utilitarianism is about calculating the quantity of pleasure whereas for Mill, the quantity must be weighed against the quality when deciding on a moral course of action.

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

2. (b) 'Utilitarianism provides a practical basis for making moral decisions for non-believers.'

Evaluate this view.

[AO2 30]

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

- On the one hand it could be seen as a practical basis for moral decision making for non-believers, as there is no requirement to believe in a higher being or divine source of morality.
- All human beings can experience pleasure and pain. Therefore, the basis of the theory is universal and accessible by all. It also fits in with what humans naturally do – seek pleasure and avoid pain, therefore it is practical as it does not go against human nature.
- Also, Bentham's hedonic calculus could be seen as a practical way to weigh up the correct decision in a given circumstance. It gives a clear range of factors to use when working through a moral dilemma.
- However, it could be argued to be impractical as working through the criteria of the hedonic calculus is time-consuming and not always straightforward. Should a high level of certainty outweigh a shorter duration or vice versa?
- Candidates may choose to argue that Mill's Utilitarianism is more practical than Bentham's as he advocates assessing rules based on Utilitarian principles then following the rules. This would make it less time-consuming and easier to apply in the real world.
- However, this may reduce the flexibility of Utilitarianism, which is part of its appeal in the modern world.
- Another line of argument would be that Utilitarianism is practical as it is used in many democracies in the allocation of resources such as healthcare and education. It is impossible to please everybody, so giving happiness to the greatest number is the next best thing.
- However, candidates could argue that this may not meet the needs of minorities and may lead to what Mill calls the 'tyranny of the majority' where a minority can be oppressed if the majority gain pleasure from doing so.
- It is also possible to give examples in which maximising pleasure for the majority would lead to extreme pain for suffering for an individual. This may be practical, but it does not appear moral.
- Therefore, Mill's adaptation to focus on higher pleasures may be seen as more appropriate than Bentham's approach, but may not necessarily be more practical, as it is difficult to ascertain the correct balance between quantity and quality of pleasure.

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