



A-LEVEL Religious Studies

7062/1 - Paper 1: Philosophy of religion and ethics
Mark scheme

June 2018

Version/Stage: 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 Assessment Writer.

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 AS 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 Principal 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No accurate or relevant material to credit

Levels of Response: 15 marks A-Level – AO2	
Level 5 13-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No accurate or relevant material to credit

Section A Philosophy of Religion**Question 1**

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

Examine Hick’s soul making theodicy and how it influences attitudes to evil and suffering.

[10 marks]

Target: AO1:2 Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including influences 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.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: The problem of evil and suffering; Hick’s soul making theodicy.

Hick’s theodicy encourages a positive attitude to suffering. Both natural and moral evil are seen as essential for soul making. Natural evil challenges humans to develop themselves, for example by developing knowledge to understand how nature causes suffering and how it may be overcome, and the consequences built in to human actions require people to take responsibility for them. The benefits of this may be illustrated with reference to the counterfactual hypothesis which imagines a world lacking any causes of suffering (natural or moral evil) and depicts it as morally static and pointless.

Natural evil conceals God and God’s work, so it preserves the epistemic distance. Humans are not forced into knowledge of God or of the purpose of life, they are left free to choose because the evidence for God is deliberately ambiguous. Humans can choose to become God-like or not; they are not programmed to make the ‘right’ choices; they are free to make their own choices and have to take responsibility for them. Moral evil is the price of that freedom.

Suffering should be seen as a means to an end. Suffering develops positive qualities of character such as courage, forbearance, compassion and generosity. As humanity faces the challenge of suffering it becomes more god-like. For every human being this will finally result in the ability to have a meaningful relationship with God when the soul is sufficiently developed. The purpose of creation is therefore fulfilled through suffering.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not cover both aspects.

[10 marks] AO1

0 1 . 2

‘The ontological argument proves 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 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: Anselm’s a priori argument; criticisms from Gaunilo and Kant.

Anselm’s ontological argument can be seen as a proof of the existence of God if the premise is accepted that God is that than which none greater can be conceived, since such a being must have necessary existence, so must necessarily exist. However this is faulty logic, since as Kant shows, although ‘having necessary existence’ is a part of God’s definition, this does not entail that such a being exists really, only that *if* God exists, God exists necessarily. Kant also argues that existence is not a predicate, so adding ‘existence’ to God’s predicates adds nothing to the concept of God.

Gaunilo’s ‘perfect lost island’ objection to Anselm gives further cause to reject the argument: Anselm’s argument can be used to ‘prove’ the existence of any commodity – even a perfect lost cricket bat, so the argument becomes a *reductio ad absurdum*. In itself, however, Gaunilo’s objection is not a refutation of Anselm’s argument, since Anselm had a simple reply: perfect lost islands are contingent, so the logic of the ontological argument does not apply to them; whereas God existence is necessary, so God cannot be thought to not-exist.

Some interpret Anselm’s argument to be a reflection on a religious experience in which he encountered and therefore understood God. If so then only those who have had such an experience have an adequate concept of God and the argument follows from that concept, but no other. It could therefore be argued that believers can have an ‘illumination’ which atheists lack, and that by this means they can accept the argument as a logical proof. The atheist can reply that faith and logic are two completely different things, and that only logic can lead to proof.

[15 marks] AO2

Question 2

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

Examine the meaning of each of the following:

- **Religious language is symbolic.**
- **Religious language is analogical.**

[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 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: religious language as symbolic with reference to Tillich; religious language as analogical with reference to Aquinas.

Religious language is symbolic

By arguing that language about God is symbolic, Tillich wants to show that religious language is non-cognitive: it cannot be literal – God is not ‘a being’ – because this would reduce God to the human level, as one being among many. Instead, God is ‘Being-Itself’, and language about God examines the question of what it means to be, ie to exist. In order to discover the meaning of religious language, its main context must be considered, namely that of religious experience. Religious language is rooted specifically in the language of religious experience, where religious symbols are seen as pointing to a reality beyond themselves: symbols are self-transcending.

To say that God is love is not to talk about God as a separate entity / a supernatural being called ‘God’: it is the idea that in the experience of love people encounter a reality that transcends their particular circumstances: God is the reality revealed by love. The religious symbol is a direct consequence of that conviction about God, and of the nature of religious experience. An ordinary word becomes a symbol when it offers insight into the nature of reality itself.

Religious language is analogical

Aquinas argued that language used to describe God's nature should do so analogically. In other words, the meaning of a word when applied to earthly things could be extended to be used of God, once it was recognised that it was being used analogically, and not in a literal or univocal way. To use univocal language about God limits God by making him like the ordinary things referred to in the world. Equally, if language about God were used equivocally, it could mean nothing to us.

Aquinas’ use of the analogy of attribution suggests that to say ‘God is good’ is not asserting God’s moral goodness, but means that God is good in whatever way it means for God to be good. Further, the analogy of proportionality suggests that if we call God ‘powerful’ and a human being ‘powerful’, the word ‘powerful’ in each case is proportional to the respective natures of God and humans. It is therefore possible to talk meaningfully about God.

The use of analogy pushes meaning beyond its ordinary use. Analogy uses ordinary human experience and qualities to explain something [God] that transcends them. To say that language about God is analogical is to say that it is cognitive, and so avoids the problems of non-cognitivism.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not cover both aspects.

[10 marks] AO1

0 2 . 2

‘Religion has no satisfactory response to the challenge of the verification principle.’

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: eschatological verification with reference to Hick; language as an expression of a Blik with reference to RM Hare; religious language as a language game with reference to Wittgenstein.

The verification principle claims that meaningful language is either synthetic (testable by sense experience) or analytic (true by definition); religious language is neither synthetic nor analytic, so is meaningless. One obvious religious response is that the verification principle fails its own test, since it is verifiable neither synthetically nor analytically. Moreover its criterion of meaningfulness is far too narrow, since it cuts out art, poetry, music and history, for example, and these are clearly meaningful, as is religious language.

Hick’s theory of eschatological verification argues that religious language claims such as ‘there is an afterlife’ are verifiable and therefore meaningful. However, such statements are only verifiable after death. This meets the requirement of the verification principle that one should be able to state the conditions under which the statement can be verified. Statements about this life such as ‘this life is a preparation for the next’ are either true or false, but their status is impossible to determine during this life. However the statements are not falsifiable because if there is no life after death neither verification nor falsification are possible. Whether there is sufficient evidence in this life to make belief in an afterlife reasonable is debatable.

For some, the debate centres on how much (or how little) the verificationists should claim. Some accept a weak version of the verification principle: verification in principle – it is enough to know how in theory a statement can be verified to render it meaningful. However, some argue that religious language is not verifiable even in principle. Religious scholars can see this as an empty challenge, since scriptural statements can in principle verify religious claims.

RM Hare responds to the claims of the verification principle by suggesting that religious statements are meaningful but non-verifiable and non-cognitive Bliks. For Wittgenstein, meaning is governed by use: religious language is meaningful in the context of its use by the believing community.

[15 marks] AO2

Section B Ethics and Religion**Question 3**

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

Examine the approach taken to moral decision making by virtue ethics. You must illustrate your answer with reference to the issue of lying.

[10 marks]

Target: AO1:4 Demonstrate 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.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: virtue ethics with reference to Aristotle. The answer must be illustrated with reference to lying.

Aristotelian virtue ethics argues that the human good is a function of the soul in accord with virtue. Reasoning well means exercising virtue (moral excellence). Virtue is a characteristic marked by choice; it is a mean with respect to two vices – those of excess and deficiency. A proper intention (and not desire, or wish or opinion) is needed to do a virtuous action. Virtuous behaviour is developed both situationally and habitually over a lifetime, and is aided by following the example of those in society who are known for their practical wisdom.

The specific virtues of honesty and truthfulness forbid lying. The virtue of courage might be needed to tell the truth, and that of justice to admit a fault, to produce the kind of society in which people habitually tell the truth. Lying distorts reality, because people use it for their own benefit. In speeches and actions, Aristotle claims that “what is false is based on the blameworthy, whereas what is true is noble and praiseworthy.” Lying comes in the area of ‘truth and self-expression’, so is about how people interact socially with each other.

Those who are habitually truthful will be honest about their own strengths and weaknesses and this honesty will spill over into all aspects of life. Aristotle sees all the Virtues as part of a whole. For example, to achieve truthfulness, temperance, courage and friendliness are required. This combination of virtues would guide decision makers in difficult situations such as lying to a murderer searching for his victim. Telling the truth would contradict the virtues of friendship, compassion and loyalty. In this situation the mean for the decision maker is to tell a lie.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not cover both aspects.

[10 marks] AO1

0 3 . 2

‘Virtue ethics provides no clear guidance for 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: virtue ethics with reference to Aristotle.

This appears to be true on the face of things, since virtuous behaviour comes about largely by habit – by practising the virtues so that they become second nature. In doing this, people follow the example set by the man of practical wisdom. This leaves no room for being given specific guidance on specific situations. Alternatively, it can be argued that the example of the man of practical wisdom is the clearest kind of guidance that a person could be given, since such a person exemplifies all the qualities required for a virtuous and just society.

In a modern context, however, it seems difficult to apply virtue ethics to moral dilemmas such as embryo research and cloning. Virtue is practised over a complete lifetime, whereas moral issues require immediate answers, radically different ways of thinking, and specific guidance. How true is this, however? The issue with moral dilemmas is that they are *not* solvable by specific guidance, otherwise they would not be dilemmas in the first place. Synergistic virtuous behaviour offers a realistic and holistic approach to morality.

Virtue ethics has no clear cut rules, so it cannot lead to consistent moral behaviour. People have to work out how to behave virtuously in each different situation, and this is very difficult to do. For thousands of years the human race has followed simple moral rules such as, ‘Do not steal’, ‘Do not murder’ – rules which everybody can understand and follow. Again, however, this may be false thinking. Virtue ethics does offer the specific guidance of following the mean *relative to the situation*. Moreover virtue ethics does not ignore the value of rules – rules codify what humans have learned about virtuous behaviour over thousands of years. The virtuous person knows, however, when a rule should be broken.

[15 marks] AO2

Question 4

0 4 . 1

Examine the meaning of right and wrong in:

- **Divine Command Theory**
- **Intuitionism.**

[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 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: Divine Command Theory – right is what God commands, wrong is what God forbids; Intuitionism – moral values are self-evident.

Divine Command Theory

In its simplest form, Divine Command Theory says that what is right is what God commands and what is wrong is what God forbids. On this view, the work of a human being is not to make decisions, but to find and apply an existing God-given law. As the Creator, whatever God commands must be good and whatever he forbids is evil, so Divine Command Theory is a cognitivist theory: good is a factual property. The main principle of the Divine Command Theory of ethics is that people should act in a way that reflects the will of God for them, as they best understand it.

This requires people to know what God's moral commands are. For Protestants, for example, they are known through Scripture. For Catholics, God's commands are seen also in the authority given by Jesus to the Church, which includes the authority to decide on matters of ethics. Religions such as Christianity, Islam and Judaism may agree about some of God's commands but disagree about others. Divine Command Theory includes the end-goal of heaven, as the reward for moral obedience.

Intuitionism

This is the view that we can know that certain things or actions are good or bad, right or wrong, by intuition. This means that neither reason nor consequences can identify what is right and what is wrong, instead it is down to our moral sense. The moral sense identifies moral **facts**, although there is a discussion about how far intuitionism is subjective and relative. Example: The moral sense of people in the 18th century may have felt that 'slavery is right' was a moral fact.

A decision based on intuition is not based on reasoned argument, although we may try to find reasons to believe that our moral sense is correct. Example, abortion: We may feel that it is permissible in a specific case and find reasons to support our feeling – but the moral sense that it is right was not, and is not, based on that reasoning. Intuitionism is seen at work in decisions where reason gives no support for a particular decision but a decision has to be made. Competing views about what is right or wrong are disputes about how refined our own moral sense may be,

and such disputes cannot be resolved.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not cover both aspects.

[10 marks] AO1

0 4 . 2

‘Humanity has no moral responsibility for its actions.’

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: the extent of moral responsibility: libertarianism, hard determinism, compatibilism.

This is a claim that is likely to be made by those who accept hard determinism as the most likely solution to the problem of free will and moral responsibility. Scientific determinism holds that all events, mental as well as physical, are the results of antecedent causes, so there can be no freely-chosen moral decisions and no moral responsibility. However, hard determinism is unproven and assumes a materialistic view of humanity, but the law recognises that individuals are not always in control of their actions and so not always responsible for what they do.

Libertarians argue that human beings do have moral responsibility because humans do have some degree of free will. It is true that causal, genetic, cultural and other factors influence what we do, nevertheless humans feel that they are free, and human laws and punishments assume that they are free. Libertarians tend to ‘find’ this kind of freedom somewhere in the quantum mechanical operation of the brain, although neuroscience has so far not been able to identify such structures within the brain through which we might be morally responsible beings.

Compatibilists / soft determinists argue that humanity has limited moral responsibility because humans are free to act according to their desires or motives without interference from outside agencies. Humans are free if they are not in physical chains. Some reject this position as incoherent and argue that it reduces free will to the absence of restraints and makes ‘moral responsibility’ simply our recognition that there are penalties for certain actions – that knowledge becomes one of the factors determining our decision.

[15 marks] AO2