A-level
RELIGIOUS STUDIES
7062/1

Paper 1 Philosophy of Religion and Ethics

Mark scheme

June 2022

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 how Paley's design argument encourages people to believe 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.

Paley's design argument is based on what can be observed about the world and the universe, namely that they are complex, for example the complexity of the eye, and that they display regularity, for example in the orbits of the planets. Complexity and regularity together suggest purpose, so it makes sense for people to believe that complexity and regularity show the purpose of a designer God as the cause of everything seen.

Paley offers a simple but clear analogy between the properties of a watch and those of the universe. A watch has complex parts that were clearly put together for a purpose, so some believe that it must have been designed by a watchmaker. Similarly the universe has parts that function for a purpose, so people can believe in the existence of a universe maker. The universe is far more wonderful than a watch, so people can believe that it was created by a divine watchmaker: God.

Paley's design argument is scientific, and therefore will encourage people in this scientific age to believe in God. For example, Paley's argument can explain evolution as a process brought about by an all-powerful God: evolution obeys the laws of science designed by God. Paley has produced a reasoned inductive argument based on what can be observed, and this can lead people to believe in God.

Maximum Level 3 if only one aspect is covered.

0 1 . 2   **'Religious experiences can be verified.'**

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 the consideration of the following specification content: The challenges of verifying religious experiences; The challenges to religious experience from science; Religious responses to those challenges; Swinburne's principles of credulity and testimony.

There are many different types of religious experiences such as visions, mystical experiences and experiences of the Holy. For some, the variety and intensity of such experiences means that they can be verified as coming from God. However, psychology suggests that all such experiences are the product of the human mind, brought about by the fear of the unknown / of death. Scientific experiments suggest that religious experiences are produced by the brain and not received from God.

Swinburne's Principle of Testimony argues that for the most part the experiences of others are probably as they report them. Where reliable witnesses report having religious experiences, then they should be believed and accepted as verified. However, most religious experiences are first-person private: a person cannot see or experience another person's thoughts to verify them. Even if a witness is reliable, it cannot be verified that what they believe they experienced was from God.

The psychologist William James, for example, argues that religious experiences can be verified by their structure: experiences which show the common core of being ineffable, noetic, transient and passive, can all be understood as God meeting each individual on the basis of their personal concerns. However, there is little agreement among scholars as to the precise nature of the supposed 'common core', so the argument for verification falls apart.

0 2 . 1   **Examine both realist and anti-realist understandings of miracles.**

[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.

Realist understandings of miracles hold that miracles are a real part of what happens in the world. They are brought about by God, or somebody empowered by God, such as great religious figures in history. Miracles are seen as evidence of God's existence and of God's care for the world. Further, a realist holds that these things are true despite the fact that people do not understand everything about miracles, such as how they relate to the laws of nature.

Anti-realist understandings of miracles reject realist understandings on the grounds that people can have no knowledge of a world that is independent of their minds, so what some class as a miracle by God is just their interpretation of what has happened. Miracles are events that lift the spirit or transform a community of people. When anti-realists talk about miracles, they are saying something about the state of their minds, and are not making a claim about the event itself.

Realists may, for example, understand extraordinary coincidences of a beneficial nature as miracles brought about by God. Realists often see such acts as violations of natural law. David Hume takes a realist approach to miracles and uses it to insist that miracles do not happen. The anti-realist approach of Maurice Wiles understands miracles as being about the fight against evil: miracles are events from which people learn something about God's intentions for the world.

Maximum Level 3 if only one aspect is covered.

0 2 . 2   **'The falsification principle shows that religious language is meaningless.'**

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 the consideration of the following specification content: The challenge of the falsification principle to the meaningfulness of religious language; Responses to these challenges.

The falsification principle claims that meaningful language must be falsifiable in principle. Since religious statements are about a metaphysical/heavenly realm there can be no evidence against them, so they are in principle unfalsifiable and therefore meaningless. However, a religious believer can argue that all claims about the universe are metaphysical, including scientific claims, so falsificationism fails its own test because there is no evidence to count against it.

Falsificationists claim that religious believers will allow nothing to falsify their beliefs: they ignore or qualify every factual challenge to their claim that 'God is love', for example, by saying that God's love is different to human love, but in effect this makes such claims meaningless. However, Hare rejects this by arguing that religious claims are non-cognitive 'Bliks'; Bliks are deeply meaningful to those who have them but are not factual claims, so the falsificationist challenge is irrelevant.

Falsificationists may argue that unless religion ultimately asserts something factual, then its claims are meaningless. For example, the Parable of the Gardener illustrates this: an invisible, intangible, eternally elusive God is in effect no different from no God at all. However, believers can reply with reference to Wittgenstein's language game theory that meaning is governed by use, and religious statements are ultimately meaningful for those who adopt the religious language game.

| 0 | 3 | . | 1 | **Examine the approach to moral decision making taken by situation ethics.**

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

[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.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: situation ethics with reference to Fletcher.

Situation ethics is an ethical theory according to which all moral decisions must be made situationally, without reference to moral rules aside from the law of agape. According to Fletcher's approach, all moral decisions must be pragmatic, relative to the situation, positivist (based in God's love) and personalist, since people come before laws. According to Fletcher, conscience is a verb rather than a noun, which means to apply the law of love in any situation.

There is only one absolute, intrinsically good thing: agape love. Love is the only norm. Love and justice are the same; love wills the neighbour's good, and only the end (the most loving result) justifies the means, so love's decisions are made situationally, not prescriptively. Applied to theft, the agent must decide the end to be sought, the means used to obtain it, the motive behind the act, and the foreseeable consequences.

These criteria may be used to consider Fletcher's illustration of the impoverished student who wants to buy a new thesaurus, and considers whether he should steal, borrow or buy the book. Some may compare gratuitous theft, such as stealing objects or money for personal gain, with agapeistic theft, such as stealing milk to feed a starving baby. They may refer to Fletcher's principle that we cannot refuse to do a good deed just because it entails doing something that is generally considered wrong.

Maximum Level 3 if only one aspect is covered.

0 3 . 2 **'Situation ethics cannot justify the use of animals in blood sports.'**

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 the consideration of the following specification content: situation ethics with reference to Fletcher; Issues of non-human life and death: blood sports.

Non-human animals are biologically similar to humans, so situation ethicists may argue that animals should be treated agapeistically, which includes not being used for a form of human entertainment in which the non-human animal suffers greatly. However, one of the main features of situation ethics is personalism, which is concerned with persons rather than animals, so the theory does not automatically rule out blood sports.

Situation ethics may argue that a practice is either agapeic or it is not, and blood sports are not. Moreover the motive of those who take part is personal enjoyment at the suffering of other creatures. However, situation ethics might justify a case that fox hunting can be agapeic, on the grounds that foxes can inflict great damage on chickens, lambs and other livestock. Moreover, hunting foxes is less unloving than factory farming and it also helps to conserve the environment.

Some may argue that there are no situations in which blood sports can be agapeic, since the animal suffers unjustified pain. Moreover, the effects of blood sports on those who take part in them can make them insensitive to all forms of suffering, including those involving other people. However, situation ethics holds that all decisions must be made situationally, so there can be no rules that always apply to the treatment of animals in blood sports such as bullfighting, game hunting and the like.

0 4 . 1 **Examine the approaches of libertarianism and hard determinism to free will.**
[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.

Libertarianism is the view that human beings are free moral agents. This approach is usually taken by mind-body dualists who hold the Cartesian view that the mind is a separate substance which interacts with the brain to enable free decisions for thought, action and morality. By contrast, hard determinists generally agree that there is only one substance, and this substance is material: the brain is a physical structure which produces the mind, so all thought must be physically determined.

Libertarians do not assume that humans are completely free, since heredity, social situation and the physical environment incline people to act in some ways rather than in others. Nevertheless, behaviour is not compelled by external causes, and humans are essentially free. Scientific hard determinism assumes the opposite: free will is an illusion produced by brain processes. Psychological hard determinism holds that all behaviour is conditioned by genetic and environmental conditions.

Libertarians generally hold that free will is necessary for society to function, since if determinism is true, then it would seem pointless to punish or reward people for what they cannot avoid doing. Psychological determinists may argue that free will is an illusion, so people should be conditioned to avoid behaviours that have bad consequences, and to repeat behaviour where the results are beneficial.

Maximum Level 3 if only one aspect is covered.

| 0 | 4 | . | 2 |

'**Virtue ethics is not a good way of making moral decisions.'**

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 the consideration of the following specification content: virtue ethics with reference to Aristotle.

Some argue that virtue ethics gives no real guidance on matters of right and wrong. Other ethical theories, such as natural moral law, have clear rules and principles to follow. Those who prefer this type of ethics are left in no doubt as to what they should do. However, virtue ethics does have helpful guidelines of a different kind. For example, people can copy the behaviour of the wisest people in a community. People can also follow the doctrine of the mean.

Some argue that virtue ethics is not good at dealing with modern moral issues, particularly those to do with medicine. For example, virtue ethics finds it difficult to decide what is virtuous in relation to voluntary euthanasia and assisted suicide. However, some moral theories may give advice that could be inappropriate, for example by forbidding voluntary euthanasia, whereas virtue ethics could allow voluntary euthanasia in some situations.

Virtue ethics can be criticised on the grounds that the virtues can conflict with each other. For example, situations often arise in which it is not clear whether it is better to be honest with somebody or to be kind. Also, virtues can differ between societies. However, others think that it is possible to develop a broad set of virtues to include all people, for example a concept of what makes all humans flourish. A set of virtues of this kind may be seen as absolute, giving clear guidance.