



A-level
RELIGIOUS STUDIES
7062/1

Paper 1 Philosophy of Religion and Ethics

Mark scheme

June 2023

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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 below 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.

LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

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.

Question 1

0	1	.	1
---	---	---	---

Examine how Process Theodicy influences responses to the problem of evil and suffering.

[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 this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Many people believe that God is both all-powerful and all-loving. This leads to a logical problem for believers, because such a God should be able to control or remove evil and suffering, yet both evil and suffering still exist. Process Theodicy solves this problem by arguing that God is all-loving, but is not all-powerful. Believers who accept this view are therefore influenced to abandon belief in God's omnipotence. By doing so, they do not have to blame God for the existence of evil and suffering.

Process Theodicy argues that both God and the space-time universe exist necessarily and panentheistically. Just as humans have embodied minds, it makes sense to think of God as the soul of the universe. In this way, God experiences all evil and suffering, both natural and moral, so this influences believers to take comfort by understanding that God is 'the fellow sufferer who understands'. Also, they can believe that at death they will have objective immortality, existing as treasured memories in the mind of God.

Just as the human mind cannot control the internal workings of its body, Process theologians hold that God cannot control the physical structures of the universe. Nevertheless, God can persuade matter, over long periods of time, to develop increasingly complex structures such as galaxies and human beings. There are risks in doing this, since human beings become more able to resist God and to become increasingly evil. This might influence some to blame God for the extent of evil that this brings about.

0 1 . 2

‘Swinburne’s principles of testimony and credulity can verify religious experiences.’

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 this 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: Verifying religious experiences: Swinburne’s principles of credulity and testimony.

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

Swinburne’s principle of credulity claims that with normal sense experiences, if a reliable witness claims that x is present, then probably x is present. Equally, then, if the same witness has a religious experience and claims that God is present, then probably God is present. However, going from verifying claims about everyday experiences of touch, taste, smell, hearing and sight to verifying claims about a God who is beyond sense experience may be seen as too great a leap.

Swinburne’s principle of testimony is a counterpart to his principle of credulity. He claims that in the absence of special considerations, such as the testimony of someone who lies habitually, the testimony of those who report religious experiences is probably reliable. However, this does not verify religious experiences as being experiences of God. Belief that someone’s testimony is true does not show that it is true.

Swinburne uses a cumulative argument. He claims that where the testimony of a great number of people agrees that religious experiences are experiences of a really-existing God, then this weight of testimony verifies religious experiences. However, the cumulative argument does not work: history records many examples of arguments that were held by most people to be true but turned out later to be false.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that only cover one aspect.

Question 2

0	2	.	1
---	---	---	---

Examine Hick’s argument that religious language is meaningful because it will be verified eschatologically.

[10 marks]

Target: AO1.1: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including religious, philosophical and/or 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 this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

The verification principle holds that religious language is meaningless, because statements such as, ‘God exists’, or ‘God has a plan for humans’, cannot be verified either in practice or in principle. There are no facts in this world that could verify or falsify them. Hick’s response is that the Christian concept of God is verifiable eschatologically. Eschatology is the doctrine of the Last Judgement, so Hick is claiming that the beliefs of the Christian religion will be verified or falsified after death.

Hick holds that the meaning of life’s journey will be revealed at the end of life, both to believers and non-believers. For example, he uses the parable of the Celestial City to explain his argument. Two men are travelling along a road. One of them believes that it leads to a celestial city, so every part of the journey, pleasant or unpleasant, has meaning and purpose. The other believes that the journey is an aimless ramble. Nevertheless, at the last bend in the road it will be seen that all along, one of them was right and the other wrong. The meaning of life’s journey will be revealed, so the religious language of belief in God and the afterlife will be verified eschatologically.

Hick’s argument is not accepted by all believers because normal factual claims are verified or falsified by the sense experiences of living people. If Hick’s claims about resurrection of the body are true, then they will of course be verified when the individual wakes up in a resurrection world; but if they are false they can never be falsified, because the individual will never wake up from death to know that they are false.

0 2 . 2

‘Miracles can happen.’**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 this 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: Miracles.

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

Miracles can be seen as real events brought about by an all-loving God who cares for the world and who has the power to break the laws of nature. God might bring about a miracle in response to prayer, or in order to fulfil a purpose. However, Hume argues that breaking a law of nature is the least probable of all events, so it is always more likely that the witnesses are lying or mistaken than that a miracle has happened. Hume claims that miracle stories are the product of ignorance and superstition, and occur most often in barbarous nations.

Miracles are found in religious texts such as the Bible, where miracles are powerful deeds, wonders and signs. For example, the miracles of Jesus point towards the central and real miracle of God’s resurrection of Jesus, without which there can be no human resurrection after death. However, Wiles rejects realist understandings of miracles because they cannot explain the problem of evil. A God who performs miracles to help some but not others would be evil rather than good. The only real miracle for Wiles is that of creation.

Scholars such as Wiles, Tillich and Holland argue that miracles can happen if they are understood in an anti-real sense. They are events that reveal something about God’s intentions for the world, inspiring people to overcome evil and suffering. However, it is not obvious that anti-realist approaches to miracles are any more successful than realist approaches. Tillich understands the significance of miracles as primarily personal and psychological, which some see as one way of saying that they cannot really happen.

Question 3

0	3	.	1
---	---	---	---

Examine the approach taken to moral decision making by Aristotelian Virtue Ethics.

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

[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 this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

For Aristotle, every action aims at some good. Eudaimonia, the good, is an activity of the soul in accord with virtue, and where several virtues are involved, in accord with the best one. Moral virtues are formed by habit and by imitating virtuous people, acting with a thorough knowledge of the situation. Virtues lie in a mean between the vices of excess and deficiency. The mean is relative to the natural disposition of the individual agent. Virtues include: courage, generosity, high-mindedness, right ambition and truthfulness.

Applied to abortion, Aristotle takes account of special cases and general ethical principles. For Aristotle, the virtue of justice has no excess or deficiency, so aborting a malformed foetus would be a just act to save a child from a life of pain, and enable the parents to show the practical wisdom and courage to allow an abortion. Aristotle believed that abortion would also be the action of a virtuous character living in a community threatened with a population explosion. For Aristotle, a general principle might be to reject abortion after the third month, because by then the foetus is animate.

Some might include arguments that are Aristotelian in the wider sense; for example, Hursthouse argues that answers to the question, 'Which acts are virtuous?' depend on a sense of duty. Abortion is not a question of women's rights: rights do not guarantee virtuous actions. Nor is it about what constitutes a person, which is too difficult to answer. What is important is how the mother lives her life well, so any virtuous reason for an abortion has to be important, and has to include emotional factors such as love for a child.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that only cover one aspect.

0 3 . 2

‘Situation Ethics cannot solve the moral issue of “designer” babies.’**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 this 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: Normative ethical theories: Teleological: Situation Ethics with reference to Fletcher. The application of [...] Situation Ethics to: issues of human life and death: [...] ‘designer’ babies.

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

It is an important religious belief that human life is created in the image of God. Producing ‘designer’ babies involves the alteration or removal of genes, so changes God’s design for humans, therefore Situation Ethics cannot claim that this is the most loving act. However, Situation Ethics can argue that love is pragmatic, positivist and personal, so where genetics provides the technology to remove genes that cause damaging genetic diseases in people, pursuing that technology can be the most loving act.

‘Designed’ babies are likely to be more intelligent, better-looking and stronger, but those without genetic selection could be discarded or seen as second-rate humans. Situation Ethics cannot solve this problem because it is human nature to choose what benefits the individual rather than to do what is agapeic. However, Fletcher argues that Situation Ethics can solve this because it adapts to new technologies, whereas legalistic ethics might ban them because they contradict pre-scientific beliefs about the nature of the body.

Arguably, the most controversial aspect of ‘designer’ babies is the genetic editing of germ cells, cells of the egg or sperm. Unpredicted changes to these cells can be passed on to future generations, and the results could be catastrophic. Situation Ethics never knows which germline changes will be beneficial and which will be the reverse. However, Situation Ethics can solve this problem by arguing that agape is relativistic: it avoids words like ‘never’ and ‘always’, so genetic research should proceed, albeit with great caution.

Question 4

0	4	.	1
---	---	---	---

Examine Libertarianism and Compatibilism.**[10 marks]**

Target: AO1.1: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including religious, philosophical and/or 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 this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Libertarianism is the view that free will is logically incompatible with a deterministic universe: humans are free moral agents. For example, many Libertarians accept a Cartesian view of the mind as a separate substance able to interact with the physical world through the brain. Deterministic processes such as heredity and environment do influence humans to act in certain ways, but human behaviour is not determined by external causes.

For a Libertarian, a choice is free if and only if the moral agent could have chosen otherwise. The advantage of the Libertarian position is its positivity: Libertarians feel that they are deliberating rationally about achievable moral goals as opposed to following a path predetermined by past events. Libertarians see their position as governed by a common sense feeling of moral freedom, although determinists see this as an illusion.

Compatibilism takes several forms. Generally it is the view that determinism and free will are compatible. An action is free if it is caused by wishes or desires that are uncompelled. In answering the question 'Could I have done otherwise?', a Compatibilist must answer 'Yes, if I had desired to do otherwise.' If the agent is not physically restrained, for example, then there is a free choice to move or to remain at rest.

For Compatibilists, freedom requires determinism, because if the agent's wishes were simply random, then the order of life would be lost. For example, for Hume, order is seen in the 'constant conjunction' of everyday events; these form the ordered background without which life would be meaningless. For the Hard Determinist, however, Compatibilism is false, because 'wishes and desires' are themselves the product of absolute causal forces.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that only cover one aspect.

0 4 . 2

‘The religious conscience offers the best guide to moral decision making.’**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 this 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: Conscience: Differing ideas, religious and non-religious, about the nature of conscience.

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

One view sees conscience as the innate voice of God. As a guide to moral decision making, God must be the best guide. This was the view of Augustine, who describes conscience as the innate voice of God giving perfect knowledge and guidance concerning God’s moral commands. However, this religious explanation does not explain why there is so much disagreement about the conscience, or why an all-powerful and all-loving God does not make moral guidance clear, or why so many people ignore it.

A more developed explanation of the religious conscience sees it as God’s gift of reason. For example, Aquinas argued that reason works through the principle of Natural Moral Law, and the conscience uses this as a guide to understand what is right or wrong in any given situation. However, many reject the Natural Moral Law theory and suggest that sociological or psychological explanations of the conscience are the best guide to moral decision making.

Some might argue that Situation Ethics offers the best guide to moral decision making. Fletcher argues that conscience is agape love making decisions situationally, and agape can be used as a religious principle. However, there is no guarantee that a religious understanding of love will be the same as a secular interpretation. Also, love might be seen as too narrow an understanding of conscience. For example, it is not clear what love demands when applied to issues of human life and death.