



---

A-level  
RELIGIOUS STUDIES  
7062/1

PAPER 1: PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION AND ETHICS

---

**Mark scheme**  
**2018 Specimen**  
Version 1.0

---

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](http://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 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.

## LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

### Levels of Response: 10 marks A-Level – AO1

- |                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <b>Level 5</b><br><b>9-10</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Where appropriate, good knowledge and understanding of the diversity of views and/or scholarly opinion is demonstrated</li> <li>• Clear and coherent presentation of ideas with precise use of the appropriate subject vocabulary</li> </ul> |
| <b>Level 4</b><br><b>7-8</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Where appropriate, alternative views and/or scholarly opinion are explained</li> <li>• Mostly clear and coherent presentation of ideas with good use of the appropriate subject vocabulary</li> </ul>                                     |
| <b>Level 3</b><br><b>5-6</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Where appropriate, there is some familiarity with the diversity of views and/or scholarly opinion</li> <li>• Some organisation of ideas and coherence with reasonable use of the appropriate subject vocabulary</li> </ul>       |
| <b>Level 2</b><br><b>3-4</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and critical understanding is generally accurate and relevant 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</li> <li>• Where appropriate, limited reference may be made to alternative views and/or scholarly opinion</li> <li>• Limited organisation of ideas and coherence and use of subject vocabulary</li> </ul>                        |
| <b>Level 1</b><br><b>1-2</b>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and critical understanding is basic with little or no development</li> <li>• There may be a basic awareness of alternative views and/or scholarly opinion</li> <li>• Isolated elements of accurate and relevant information and basic use of appropriate subject vocabulary</li> </ul>   |
| <b>0</b>                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No accurate or relevant material to credit</li> </ul>  |

**Levels of Response: 15 marks A-Level – AO2**

- |                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Level 5</b><br><b>13-15</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A very well-focused response to the issue(s) raised</li><li>• Perceptive discussion of different views, including, where appropriate, those of scholars or schools of thought with critical analysis</li><li>• There is an appropriate evaluation fully supported by the reasoning</li><li>• Precise use of the appropriate subject vocabulary</li></ul> |
| <b>Level 4</b><br><b>10-12</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A well-focused response to the issue(s) raised</li><li>• Different views are discussed, including, where appropriate, those of scholars or schools of thought, with some critical analysis</li><li>• There is an appropriate evaluation supported by the reasoning</li><li>• Good use of the appropriate use of subject vocabulary</li></ul>             |
| <b>Level 3</b><br><b>7-9</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A general response to the issue(s) raised</li><li>• Different views are discussed, including, where appropriate, those of scholars or schools of thought</li><li>• An evaluation is made that is consistent with some of the reasoning</li><li>• Reasonable use of the appropriate subject vocabulary</li></ul>  |
| <b>Level 2</b><br><b>4-6</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A limited response to the issue(s) raised</li><li>• Presentation of a point of view relevant to the issue with some supporting evidence and argument</li><li>• Some attempt at the appropriate use of subject vocabulary</li></ul>   |
| <b>Level 1</b><br><b>1-3</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A basic response to the issue(s) raised with some evidence in support</li></ul>  |
| <b>0</b>                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No accurate or relevant material to credit</li></ul>   |

## Section A: Philosophy of Religion

### Question 1

0	1
---	---

 . 

1
---

**Examine how faith in God may be challenged by natural and moral evil.**

**Target:** AO1:1 Knowledge and understanding of religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching.

Answers may include some of the following ideas, but all valid material must be credited.

- The logical problem of evil, as expressed through the ‘inconsistent triad’: an all-powerful and all-loving God must possess both the power and the will to remove both natural and moral evils from the world, so the continued existence of evil challenges belief in such a God.
- The evidential problem of evil points to the incontrovertible evidence of evil in the world; likely examples will include war, famine, disease, natural disasters etc.
- Some might link the evidential problem with the Design Argument for the existence of God. Natural evil appears to show a flaw in God’s design which is inconsistent with the idea of an all-knowing and all-powerful God.
- Similarly, some might refer to the view that whereas moral evil might be seen as the acceptable result of free will, God has no excuse for allowing natural evils, since these show a lack of benevolent design.
- Some evils can be seen as pointless / unjustifiable – William Rowe’s example of a fawn dying in agony in a forest fire. Unjustifiable evils go against the moral convictions of theists and atheists alike, and so point to the non-existence of God.
- For some, it is the extent of evil that provides the greatest challenge to belief in God, as in Dostoyevsky’s references to the extreme sufferings of children (‘The Brothers Karamazov’).

**[10 marks] AO1**

**0 1** . **2** 'The freewill defence is inadequate as a theodicy.'

**Evaluate this claim.**

**Target:** AO2: Analysis and evaluation of aspects and approaches to religion and belief.

Answers may include some of the following ideas, but all valid material must be credited.

Note: no summary of the free will defence is required.

There are various presentations of the free will defence, which students might present through its general themes or through the ideas of one or more named scholars. Students may propose, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments. All valid arguments must be credited.

- The free will defence collapses if free will is denied, eg by philosophers who favour some version of determinism. In response, Christian philosophy argues that freedom is God's gift to humans, and without it, much of human life becomes pointless.
- Some will argue that freedom is not worth the price if the price involves innocent suffering; others will claim that if the purpose of suffering is to reach heaven, then even the suffering of innocents can be justified.
- Some might make specific reference to the use of the free will defence in John Hick's Irenaean theodicy, where the suffering of innocents is necessary to maintain an epistemic distance between God and the world. Others might argue that God intervenes in the world through miracles, through religious experiences, and by responding to prayer; in which case he should respond also to innocent suffering.
- Some might claim that a meaningful context for the exercise of free will must include one in which actions have consequences for which human beings can be responsible, and this entails natural law and the possibility of pleasure and pain. Against this, it could be argued that if this is the case, then the levels of pain are set too high.
- Some might refer to debates about the free will defence between named scholars; for example Mackie's view that as a theodicy, the free will defence is illogical, because an all-powerful God could have made everybody make free, good choices / contrasted with Hick's argument that this would be logically impossible, and God cannot do the logically impossible.
- Some consideration of 'inadequate' (either implicit or explicit) would be expected for the higher Levels. Some might argue on the basis of particular strengths or weaknesses that the free will defence is intellectually satisfying, is a complete explanation, or else is inadequate.

**[15 marks] AO2**

**Question 02**

**0 2** . **1** **Examine how the meaningfulness of religious language has been challenged.**

**Target:** AO1:1 Knowledge and understanding of religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching.

Answers may include some of the following ideas, but all valid material must be credited.

- The meaningfulness of religious language has been challenged in particular by Hume's claim that meaningful statements are either empirical or based on the relation between ideas, and since it can be argued that religious language falls under neither category, then it is meaningless.
- The Logical Positivists developed Hume's ideas by means of the Verification Principle, eg through Ayer's challenge that statements are deemed to be meaningful if and only if they are verifiable in sense experience; religious statements are non-empirical, so statements about God are meaningless.
- Some might develop this further through 'Strong' and 'Weak' verification, eg Ayer's claim that religious statements are not even verifiable weakly (ie through any kind of empirical evidence that would make them probable).
- The challenge of the Falsification Principle is considered by some to be a stronger challenge: that unless there is some evidence that could in principle falsify a statement, then it is meaningless, illustrated perhaps through Wisdom's Parable of the Gardener.
- The challenge from falsification is also likely to be illustrated through Flew's argument that where a religious believer makes statements about God's love, the believer will allow no evidence to falsify that claim. This might be illustrated through Flew's example of a child dying from inoperable cancer, where statements about God's love for the child 'die a death of a thousand qualifications'.
- Some might refer to an anti-realist view of religion which denies the objective reality of God as the object of religious language.

**[10 marks] AO1**

**0 2** . **2** 'Language game theory shows that religious language is meaningful.'

**Evaluate this claim.**

**Target: AO2:** Analysis and evaluation of aspects and approaches to religion and belief.

Students may propose, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments. All valid arguments must be credited.

- In practice, students are likely to refer to Wittgenstein's concept of language games. There is no requirement to describe the concept, although in practice students are likely to do so in order to assess whether or not it shows religious language to be meaningful, and if so, in what way.
- Some might refer to Wittgenstein's comments in the 'Tractatus', where he asserts that language about God is senseless, because it refers to what lies beyond the world. Students might contrast this with the view of Christian theism, where God is in different ways manifest within the world, eg through the incarnation, through miracles, and through religious experiences. These are different understandings of the meaning of religion, and students might defend one, both or neither.
- In the 'Philosophical Investigations', Wittgenstein asserts that there is a multiplicity of language games, each rule-governed and self-contained. Applied to religion, the religious language game is equally self-contained and meaningful by its use, and cannot be judged by the rules of any other language game, such as science. Some are likely to take issue with this, since where believers claim to make scientific statements about the creation of the universe, it can be argued that religion has used the scientific language game in a meaningless way.
- Wittgenstein argues that belief in God is different from other kinds of belief: it is pointless to claim that 'God exists' in the same way that an object exists. Rather, it expresses a shared form of life between religious people who share the rules; so believers cannot be mistaken about their beliefs or practices, because 'religious believing' is not the same as scientific or historical believing. If believers cannot be mistaken, then their beliefs must always be meaningful; yet for scholars like Swinburne, the coherence of religion and religious language is meaningful in an entirely different way: as an explanation of existence and purpose.
- Some might argue that language game theory is fideistic, in that it defends religious language from attack by those who see it as meaningless; others might reject this as a simplistic assessment of Wittgenstein, who was trying to point out the uniqueness of the context of religious language.
- It would be legitimate for students to argue that religious language is meaningful (or meaningless) in other ways than through language game theory.

**[15 marks] AO2**

## Section B: Ethics and Religion

### Question 3

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 0 | 3 |
|---|---|

 . 

1
---

**Examine the differences between a deontological and a teleological approach to religious ethical decision-making. Illustrate your answer with reference to lying.**

**Target:** AO1:4 Knowledge and understanding of approaches to the study of religion and belief

Answers may include some of the following ideas, but all valid material must be credited.

#### **Deontological**

- In deontological religious ethical systems, acts derive their moral value from the agent's intentions.
- The emphasis is on doing one's duty by obedience to moral rules.
- Actions are intrinsically right or wrong, as in Natural Moral Law and in Divine Command Theory.
- The consequences are not directly relevant to the agent's duty to obey moral rules.
- With Natural Moral Law, lying is never right regardless of the consequences.
- With a Proportionalist approach to Natural Moral Law, Proportionalists would argue that there are extreme situations where it would be right to lie.

#### **Teleological**

- In teleological systems, acts derive their moral value from their consequences.
- With Situation Ethics, the only absolute rule is the law of 'agape' love. All other rules can be accepted or rejected as agape and the situation demand.
- Lying is therefore neither intrinsically right nor intrinsically wrong.
- The agapeic action is discovered by deciding on the course of action which is positivistic, personal, pragmatic and relative, and which is in line with Fletcher's proposals about agape.
- With Situation Ethics, then, lying can be morally right if the decision to lie has been made using this decision-making process..

**[10 marks] AO1**

**0 3** . **2** 'A deontological system of ethical decision-making is unsatisfactory.'

**Evaluate this claim.**

**Target:** AO2: Analysis and evaluation of aspects and approaches to religion and belief

Students may propose, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments. All relevant arguments must be credited

- A deontological system is too rigid and uncompromising, and can often lead to immoral / unloving results. Some might dispute this on the grounds that Natural Moral Law does consider consequences, through both Double Effect and through those who accept Proportionalism.
- Deontological systems are generally out of date: for example the Bible is pre-scientific and has no concept of the ethical dilemmas brought about by modern medical techniques. Some might argue that ethical principles are timeless, eg the Sanctity of Life Principle, and such principles can be used to formulate the right laws, as with Natural Moral Law.
- Someone following Christian Situation Ethics would clearly agree with the statement on the grounds that all rules and principles are subject to the overriding rule of agape. Against this, many Christians argue that Situation Ethics is far less satisfactory than any deontological system, because it places too much responsibility on individuals, and ignores scripture and the authority of religious experience, etc.
- Some might argue that the Bible is a moral guide rather than a rule book; moreover Divine Command Theory fails because of the Euthyphro Dilemma. Some might argue that religious ethics naturally combine elements of deontology and teleology, so 'unsatisfactory' can be qualified in a number of ways.

**[15 marks] AO2**

**Question 04**

**0 4 . 1** Examine differing views about the use of conscience as a guide to moral decision-making.

**Target:** AO1:1 Knowledge and understanding of religious, philosophical and/or ethical thought and teaching.

Answers may include some of the following ideas, but all valid material must be credited.

- Augustine believed that the conscience is the innate voice of God, so as a guide to moral decision-making it is infallible, although it has to be helped by God's grace; moreover conscience works only if your motive is love of God.
- For Aquinas, what is innate is God-given reason. Conscience is reason making right decisions in accordance with synderesis, working out the difference between real and apparent goods.
- For Bishop Butler, conscience is a God-given reflective faculty which can give an effective balance between love of self and love of others.
- The question allows reference to non-religious views of the conscience, eg those of Freud, who theorised that what he called the superego internalises the disapproval of others and creates the guilty conscience. In this sense, the conscience has no authority other than being a means of reaching social conformity through internalising social or familial standards.
- Other psychological / sociological views of the conscience might include Piaget, who links the development of conscience to the developing cognitive ability; Fromm, who sees the humanistic conscience as a process by which we develop integrity and other values'; Kohlberg, who believed that the conscience is the final stage in a developmental process leading to respect for universal principles, although most people get no further than the stage of obeying the law.

**[10 marks] AO1**

**0 4** . **2** 'Virtue Ethics has no satisfactory answer to the ethical problems of embryo research.'

**Evaluate this claim.**

**Target:** AO2: Analysis and evaluation of aspects and approaches to religion and belief

Answers may refer to any religious theory or teaching.

Students may propose, analyse and evaluate some of the following arguments. All relevant arguments must be credited.

- The ethical problems of embryo research focus generally on the status of the embryo. If the embryo is considered to be a person, then it has the rights that accompany personhood. If it does not, then potentially, spare embryos can be used and discarded for embryo research.
- Whereas in most religious theories of ethics, research that uses embryos as a means to an end, or which kills the embryo, is condemned as murder, Virtue Ethics has no clear rule to follow, since the theory focuses on becoming a virtuous person and not on rules or guidelines concerning how this might be achieved. Many regard this lack of guidance as unsatisfactory.
- Embryo research has been very useful in IVF treatments, and has wide potential in curing a range of diseases such as Parkinson's, diabetes and heart disease. Freedom from these diseases would enable individuals to achieve the virtues that Aristotle considers necessary to achieve *eudaimonia*. Against this, some might argue that an embryo should be considered as another person, so to achieve eudaimonia at the expense of another person is unethical.
- Students might identify specific virtues such as courage, ambition and justice, as being particularly relevant to addressing the ethical problems of embryo research. Some might conclude that whether or not stem cell research is virtuous depends on the context/situation. Others might argue that any situation involving the death of an embryo cannot be virtuous. Some might temporize by suggesting that the 14-day rule concerning embryo experimentation satisfies the requirements of virtue and of religion, since without the development of the primitive streak, an embryo cannot sensibly be called a person.

**[15 marks]**

**AO2**