AQA

A-level
RELIGIOUS STUDIES
7062/1

Paper 1 Philosophy of Religion and Ethics

Mark scheme

June 2021

Version: 1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Methods of Marking

It is essential that, in fairness to students, all examiners use the same methods of marking. The advice given here may seem very obvious, but it is important that all examiners follow it as exactly as possible.

1. If you have any doubts about the mark to award, consult your Team Leader.
2. Refer constantly to the mark scheme throughout marking. It is extremely important that it is strictly adhered to.
3. Remember, you must **always** credit **accurate**, **relevant and appropriate** answers which are not given in the mark scheme.
4. Do **not** credit material that is irrelevant to the question or to the stated target, however impressive that material might be.
5. If a one-word answer is required and a list is given, take the first answer (unless this has been crossed out).
6. If you are wavering as to whether or not to award a mark, the criterion should be, 'Is the student nearer those who have given a correct answer or those who have little idea?'
7. Read the information on the following page about using Levels of Response mark schemes.
8. Be prepared to award the full range of marks. Do not hesitate to give full marks when the answer merits full marks or to give no marks where there is nothing creditable in an answer.
9. No half marks or bonus marks are to be used under any circumstances.
10. Remember, the key to good and fair marking is **consistency**. Do **not** change the standard of your marking once you have started.

Levels of Response Marking

In A-level Religious Studies, differentiation is largely achieved by outcome on the basis of students' responses. To facilitate this, levels of response marking has been devised for many questions.

Levels of response marking requires a quite different approach from the examiner than the traditional 'point for point' marking. It is essential that the **whole response is read** and then **allocated to the level** it best fits.

If a student demonstrates knowledge, understanding and/or evaluation at a certain level, he/she must be credited at that level. **Length** of response or **literary ability** should **not be confused with genuine religious studies skills**. For example, a short answer which shows a high level of conceptual ability must be credited at that level. (If there is a band of marks allocated to a level, discrimination should be made with reference to the development of the answer.)

Levels are tied to specific skills. Examiners should **refer to the stated assessment target** objective of a question (see mark scheme) when there is any doubt as to the relevance of a student's response.

Levels of response mark schemes include either **examples** of possible students' responses or **material** which they might use. These are intended as a **guide** only. It is anticipated that students will produce a wide range of responses to each question.

It is a feature of levels of response mark schemes that examiners are prepared to reward fully, responses which are obviously valid and of high ability but do not conform exactly to the requirements of a particular level. This should only be necessary occasionally and where this occurs examiners must indicate, by a brief written explanation, why their assessment does not conform to the levels of response laid down in the mark scheme. Such scripts should be referred to the Lead Examiner.

Assessment of Quality of Written Communication

Quality of written communication will be assessed in all components and in relation to all assessment objectives. Where students are required to produce extended written material in English, they will be assessed on the quality of written communication. The quality of written communication skills of the student will be one of the factors influencing the actual mark awarded within the level of response. In reading an extended response, the examiner will therefore consider if it is cogently and coherently written, ie decide whether the answer:

- presents relevant information in a form that suits its purposes
- is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate, so that meaning is clear
- is suitably structured and that the style of writing is appropriate.

	Levels of Response: 10 marks A-Level – AO1
Level 5 **9–10**	• Knowledge and critical understanding is accurate, relevant and fully developed in breadth and depth with very good use of detailed and relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate • Where appropriate, good knowledge and understanding of the diversity of views and/or scholarly opinion is demonstrated • Clear and coherent presentation of ideas with precise use of the appropriate subject vocabulary
Level 4 **7–8**	• Knowledge and critical understanding is accurate and mostly relevant with good development in breadth and depth shown through good use of relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate • Where appropriate, alternative views and/or scholarly opinion are explained • Mostly clear and coherent presentation of ideas with good use of the appropriate subject vocabulary
Level 3 **5–6**	• Knowledge and critical understanding is generally accurate and relevant with development in breadth and/or depth shown through some use of evidence and/or examples which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate • Where appropriate, there is some familiarity with the diversity of views and/or scholarly opinion • Some organisation of ideas and coherence with reasonable use of the appropriate subject vocabulary
Level 2 **3–4**	• Knowledge and critical understanding is limited, with limited development in breadth and/or depth shown through limited use of evidence and/or examples which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate • Where appropriate, limited reference may be made to alternative views and/or scholarly opinion • Limited organisation of ideas and coherence and use of subject vocabulary
Level 1 **1–2**	• Knowledge and critical understanding is basic with little or no development • There may be a basic awareness of alternative views and/or scholarly opinion • Isolated elements of accurate and relevant information and basic use of appropriate subject vocabulary
0	• No accurate or relevant material to credit

Levels of Response: 15 marks A-Level – AO2	
Level 5 **13–15**	• A very well-focused response to the issue(s) raised • Perceptive discussion of different views, including, where appropriate, those of scholars or schools of thought with critical analysis • There is an appropriate evaluation fully supported by the reasoning • Precise use of the appropriate subject vocabulary
Level 4 **10–12**	• A well-focused response to the issue(s) raised • Different views are discussed, including, where appropriate, those of scholars or schools of thought, with some critical analysis • There is an appropriate evaluation supported by the reasoning • Good use of the appropriate subject vocabulary
Level 3 **7–9**	• A general response to the issue(s) raised • Different views are discussed, including, where appropriate, those of scholars or schools of thought • An evaluation is made that is consistent with some of the reasoning • Reasonable use of the appropriate subject vocabulary
Level 2 **4–6**	• A limited response to the issue(s) raised • Presentation of a point of view relevant to the issue with some supporting evidence and argument • Limited attempt at the appropriate use of subject vocabulary
Level 1 **1–3**	• A basic response to the issue(s) raised • A point of view is stated, with some evidence or reason(s) in support • Some attempt at the appropriate use of subject vocabulary
0	• No accurate or relevant material to credit

0 1 . 1 **Examine the logical problem of evil and how it influences people's belief in God.**

[10 marks]

Target: AO1.2: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including influence of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

The logical problem of evil is formed by putting together three statements: God is omnipotent; God is omnibenevolent; evil exists. Taken together, these statements lead to a logical inconsistency: an omnipotent God would be able to remove evil; an omnibenevolent God would wish to remove evil; yet evil exists. There seems to be a contradiction here: if God is both able and willing to remove evil, then evil should not exist.

Many people believe that a God who allows evil is not worthy of worship, so is not really God. Some people are influenced in this way to deny that God is all-powerful. For example, Process theologians believe that God exists panentheistically with the universe, and cannot be separated from matter, so God's power is limited by matter, which has the ability to resist God. Some reject this, arguing that a limited God is not worthy of being believed in or worshipped.

Others prefer to argue that God allows evil to exist because a universe with evil in it is of more value than a universe without evil. Some are influenced to accept one or more versions of the free will defence, which argues that freedom is a higher order good: if God compelled people to believe in him, then this kind of belief would be worthless. Some might accept Hick's soul-making theodicy: God allows evil to exist because being at an epistemic distance from God allows people to choose God and the good freely.

Maximum Level 3 if only one aspect is covered.

| 0 | 1 | . | 2 | **'The design argument fails to prove the existence of God.'**

Evaluate this claim.

[15 marks]

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to consideration of the following specification content: Paley's analogical argument; criticisms: Hume.

Answers may present, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments:

The design argument is inductive, so is an argument based on probability rather than proof, and in that sense cannot prove the existence of God; so even if Paley's watchmaker exists, the argument cannot prove that the watchmaker is God. However, some argue that an inductive argument is as close to a proof as humans can achieve. Design arguments in general make a convincing case, for example those based on the anthropic principle and the fine-tuning argument.

Hume puts forward a series of convincing arguments to show that the design argument fails. For example, he comments that the universe is more like a vegetable than a machine, and this is backed up by evolutionary theory in which nature designs itself without reference to God. However, evolution does not explain itself. Its processes are dependent on the laws of physics, biology and chemistry, and those laws may depend on the existence of a higher being, God.

Hume suggested that the cause of the appearance of design in the universe needs only to be proportional to the effect. Even if the universe appears to be designed, there is too much evil in the world for the designer to be the omnibenevolent God of classical theism. However, others argue that the existence of evil in the world may itself be a designed feature, since theodicies argue that God allows evil to exist because evil serves a greater good, as in the free will defence.

| 0 | 2 | . | 1 | **Examine Otto's understanding of numinous religious experiences.**

[10 marks]

Target: AO1.1: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including religious, philosophical and ethical thought and teaching.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Otto argued that all experiences of the world are mediated by consciousness. Religious experiences are those where consciousness encounters the holy or the sacred. The idea of the holy is not limited to moral perfection. Rather, it goes beyond the domain of ethics into a sphere that he termed the wholly other. An example of this kind of experience is the prophet Isaiah's encounter with God in the Jerusalem Temple.

Otto termed such experiences as numinous, which refers to the power or presence of a deity. Otto claimed that this is common to all religious experience. Human feelings about the numinous are *sui generis*, of their own kind, and are inherently different from anything and everything else. There is a special faculty in human minds which recognises the holy and responds to it with feelings of awe.

Numinous feelings are non-rational in the sense that the mind cannot understand and explain them. For example, the experiencer encounters a *mysterium tremendum et fascinans*, a tremendous and fascinating mystery. Its tremendous power evokes feelings of awe, majesty, dread, fear, terror, dumb astonishment, inadequacy and creatureliness. Such feelings can induce a sense of rapture and love, and feelings of nothingness in the face of transcendent power.

| 0 | 2 |.| 2 | **'Religious language should be viewed non-cognitively.'**

Evaluate this claim.

[15 marks]

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to consideration of the following specification content: The issue of whether religious language should be viewed cognitively or non-cognitively.

To argue that religious language should be viewed non-cognitively is to suggest that it is not based in, or reducible to, factual empirical knowledge. It is inappropriate to ask whether or not it is factual. Religious language cannot be shown to be about a factually existent being, so should be seen as non-cognitive. However, religion does make cognitive claims, and these can be defended by religious philosophy, for example in the claim that God exists as a factual hypothesis to explain the universe.

Some believers accept the claim that religious language is non-cognitive, and might illustrate this with reference to Hare's argument that religious statements reduce to non-verifiable, non-cognitive Bliks. However, most believers consider their beliefs to be cognitive, since if religion contains no cognitive beliefs, its value reduces to statements of psychology or sociology. Believers are likely to claim that 'there is a God' is a factual assertion.

Some are likely to argue that religious language is non-cognitive because it does not meet the challenge of the verification principle. Religious language cannot be verified in sense experience, so must be cognitively meaningless. However, others accept Hick's argument that religious language is cognitive and verifiable eschatologically. Others use Tillich's view, for example, that religious language is symbolic and non-cognitive but still makes one cognitive claim, that God is 'being-itself'.

0 3 . 1 **Examine the approach to moral decision making taken by Natural Moral Law.**

You must illustrate your answer with reference to the issue of capital punishment.

[10 marks]

Target: AO1.4: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including approaches to the study of religion and belief.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

With Natural Moral Law, reason leads to primary precepts such as the preservation of innocent life and living in an ordered society, together with secondary precepts such as the forbidding of both abortion and consensual sex outside marriage. The purpose of the primary precepts is to lead to human happiness or flourishing, and to union with God. Some might discuss how far such precepts allow or forbid capital punishment.

Aquinas holds that capital punishment is legitimate, for example arguing that if it is lawful to kill a wild beast that is harmful to the community, then it must be lawful to kill a human evil-doer in order to protect the community. This cannot be done by private individuals, since this would become mere personal revenge. To administer capital punishment must be the responsibility of a public authority.

Historically, the Catholic Church, following Aquinas, has allowed capital punishment: for example, in order to defend innocent humans against an unjust aggressor. Today, the Catholic Church is generally against capital punishment on the grounds that it goes against the commandment not to murder, and it violates the precept to preserve human life. Other Catholics acknowledge that the Bible specifies the death penalty for some crimes, so there may be justification for its use in exceptional circumstances.

Maximum Level 3 if only one aspect is covered.

| 0 | 3 | . | 2 | **'Utilitarianism provides a correct meaning of right and wrong.'**

Evaluate this claim.

[15 marks]

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to consideration of the following specification content: Introduction to meta ethics: the meaning of right and wrong; Naturalism: Utilitarianism – right is what causes pleasure, wrong is what causes pain; key ideas of Bentham about moral decision making.

Answers may present, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments.

Utilitarianism is a naturalist meta-ethical theory. Naturalist theories hold that moral values can be described correctly in terms of natural properties such as love or happiness. These are clearly objective and are in the world. Bentham's version of the theory sees happiness as the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of pain. These determine the meaning of right and wrong. However, some become happy by inflicting pain on others, which is not good for the majority. Moreover happiness varies too much between people to define it.

The principle of utility argues that the right way to act is to seek the greatest happiness or pleasure for the greatest number. For example, Bentham attempts to quantify pleasure through the hedonic / felicific calculus. This measures, for example, the intensity, duration, certainty and extent of pleasure. However, others reject this approach, arguing that it places too much emphasis on the consequences of actions. Some prefer Kant's approach, for example, holding that morality is about a good will.

Utilitarians claim that it is self-evident that all people desire pleasure and seek to avoid pain. Pleasure is good, so people ought to seek it. However, ethical non-naturalist theories argue that Utilitarianism here commits the naturalistic fallacy of deriving an ought from an is. Hume, for example, argued that it is not possible to go from what is the case to what ought to be the case. Intuitionists hold that the correct meaning of right and wrong can be known only through a moral intuition.

0 4 . 1 **Examine the role of conscience in making moral decisions with reference to adultery.**

[10 marks]

Target: AO1.1: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including religious, philosophical and ethical thought and teaching.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

One view of the conscience is religious. For example, Aquinas' Natural Moral Law condemns adultery as a sin through improper reasoning. If a man's reason makes the mistake of telling him that he can go to another man's wife, then that mistaken reason is evil. It comes from ignorance of the divine law that he should know. In Situation Ethics, conscience is agape love which makes moral decisions situationally. An example of this is Fletcher's story of Mrs Bergmeier's sacrificial adultery.

A second view sees conscience in sociological terms. Social conditioning occurs through sanctions that the group brings to bear on an individual. In terms of the collective conscience, an act is bad because society disapproves of it, so adultery is right or wrong simply in terms of the group's perception of it. Moreover, perceptions change, so whereas adultery was commonly seen as a sin against God's laws, it is now more commonly seen in terms of keeping or breaking a contract between two married partners.

A third view sees conscience in psychological terms. For example, some might refer to Freud's view that conscience is an aspect of the super-ego. Civilisation was invented to keep the instinctive drives of death and sexuality in check. However, making laws against adultery created a paradox, because these laws frustrate the instinctive human drive for sexual gratification. This might suggest that the decision of conscience will depend on which drive is most firmly rooted. In any case adultery may not be seen as morally wrong in itself.

Maximum Level 3 if only one aspect is covered.

| 0 | 4 | . | 2 | **'Virtue ethics cannot solve the issues raised by using animals as a source of organs for transplants.'**

Evaluate this claim.

[15 marks]

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to consideration of the following specification content: Virtue ethics with reference to Aristotle: The application of Virtue ethics to: issues of non-human life and death: animals as a source of organs for transplants.

Answers may present, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments:

Using animals as a source of organs for transplants invariably involves the death of the donor animal, and is necessarily done without the animal's consent. For those who argue that animals are members of the moral community, all such organ transplants are therefore immoral and unacceptable. However, Aristotle's virtue theory does not need to address these issues. It holds that animals are not rational beings, and so cannot have moral equality with humans, so they can be used as a source of organs for transplants.

Virtue ethics cannot solve the risk factors associated with using animals as a source of organs for transplants. It is possible that transplant procedures may introduce undesirable changes in the human genome together with the risk of rejection. However, a virtue ethicist might consider the risk to be worth taking, since the potential benefits to humans include increased scientific knowledge, and this avoids the ethical issues of procuring human organs.

With Virtue ethics, it is not possible to apply the doctrine of the mean consistently to solve the problems of using animals for transplants. It is impossible to know where virtues lie when procedures are done without consent, and there are no consistent procedures for controlling animal pain. However, the virtue ethicist may claim that all of these issues can be solved through future scientific advances, which may benefit the animal kingdom as well as humans.