
**A-level
RELIGIOUS STUDIES
7062/1**

Paper 1 Philosophy of Religion and Ethics

Mark scheme

June 2019

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 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

Copyright information

For confidentiality purposes acknowledgements of third-party material are published in a separate booklet which is available for free download from www.aqa.org.uk after the live examination series.

Copyright © 2019 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 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.

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

0 1 . 1**Examine the key ideas of David Hume and of Maurice Wiles on miracles.****[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.

Hume:

As a realist and an empiricist, David Hume defines a miracle as ‘a transgression of a law of nature by a particular volition of the Deity, or by the interposition of some invisible agent.’ However, since all our experience of the laws of nature shows us that they do not get broken, Hume therefore assumes that there can in fact be no miracles. Repeated experiments and tests show us that we cannot walk on water, for example, so any such reports must be false.

This brings Hume to his key (inductive) argument about miracles. By definition, miracles must be the most improbable of all events. Where witnesses claim to have seen a miracle, it must therefore always be more likely that the witnesses are lying or mistaken than that a miracle has occurred. If this is the case, miracles cannot be used as the foundation for any religion.

Hume gives a number of other key arguments against miracles based on psychology: miracles are the product of weak education; humans are naturally credulous and like to believe such stories. Miracle stories come from weak and barbarous nations, and where they are found in civilised countries this is only because those nations had weak and barbarous ancestors. Further, the miracle stories claimed by different religions often contradict each other, and so must all be false.

Wiles:

By contrast with Hume’s realist/empiricist understanding of miracles, Maurice Wiles takes a basically anti-realist approach. Although the act of creation itself was the one ‘real’ miracle, the true value of miracles for Wiles is their personal and religious importance. Hume’s interventionist approach is therefore irrelevant for Wiles, who interprets miracles within the framework of Christian belief.

Wiles believes that the interventionist approach to miracles *must* be rejected, because otherwise the problem of evil has no credible answer. A God who intervenes miraculously by breaking natural laws would be an immoral God, because there could be no explanation of why God intervenes for some but not for others. For Wiles, God preserves human freedom by not intervening in this way.

Wiles’ key idea, then, is that language about miracles is symbolic and mythical. Miracle stories in the Bible, for example, are largely about the fight against evil. For example, in the temptation narratives, Wiles makes the point that Jesus refused Satan’s trap of trying to use a miracle as evidence of divine power. Miracles are myths presented to express important ideas about God – for example that God is powerful and loving.

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

0 **1** . **2** ‘There can be no life after death.’

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 nature and existence of the soul; Descartes' argument for the existence of the soul; the body/soul relationship; the possibility of continuing personal existence after death.

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

Some might deny the possibility of life after death on physical grounds: for example that humans are embodied, and experience shows that bodies die and corrupt after death. However, some might argue that technology might be able to engineer human bodies and brains so that they do not die. Equally, some will use scripture-based arguments to support the idea of a physical life after death, and these might be supported by referring to John Hick's ideas about eschatological verification.

Materialists may reject life after death on the grounds that there is no soul and reject Descartes' argument for the soul's existence. Some might also argue that the concept of disembodied existence is nonsensical. However, there is a range of evidence that may support personal existence after death, such as religious experiences.

Some believe that there is life after death in the sense that 'life after death' amounts to nothing more than 'psychological continuity' with one's ancestors and children, for example using arguments about the nature of persons. In all such arguments, the basic questions raised are likely to be: 'What is a person?', and 'Once defined, what is there about persons that might survive death?'

0 2 . 1**Examine different understandings of religious experience.****[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.

Note that answers may, but need not, be limited to the consideration of the following specification content: The nature of religious experiences: Visions: corporeal, imaginative and intellectual; Numinous experiences: Otto; an apprehension of the wholly other; Mystical experiences: William James; and non-intellectual union with the divine as presented by Stace.

Note also that different understandings of religious experiences could include views about whether they are real or not, for example, some understand them to be illusions.

Visions may be interpreted as religious experiences. Corporeal visions involve sense experiences, particularly vision and hearing, so they are to be understood as a supernatural vision of something that is really present. Other visions are understood as imaginative, seen by the eye of the mind rather than by direct sight. Further, intellectual visions are understood as being imageless, nevertheless as uncovering reality itself.

Religious experience may also be described as the idea of the Holy/the experience of the numinous, as in the writings of Rudolf Otto. The numinous is God/the ‘wholly other’, and God is beyond the natural world, beyond apprehension, and beyond comprehension. Numinous feelings are unique: a special faculty in our minds that recognises and responds to the Holy; they are a ‘tremendous and fascinating mystery’ through which we understand our nothingness in the face of God’s transcendence. Religious experience can chill and numb; it can inspire feelings of awe, majesty, dread, fear, terror, inadequacy and humility: a mystery that evokes rapture and love.

Further, some religious experiences are considered mystical. For William James, this means that religious experiences are primary. For Stace it means that experiences are non-sensuous and non-intellectual union with the divine. In particular they are to be understood as a route to union with God. Religious experiences can be seen as genuine experiences of God since they have a common core, being passive, ineffable, noetic and transitory, and through these experiences God meets individuals through their personal concerns, regardless of whether they are ‘sick souls’ or ‘healthy-minded’.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not cover more than one understanding.

0 2 . 2**'Process theodicy solves the problem of evil.'****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: Responses to the problem of evil and suffering: Process theodicy as presented by Griffin.

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

The problem of evil is that although an all-powerful and all-loving God must be able to control evil, both natural and moral evils exist. Process theodicy's solution to the problem of natural evil argues that God did not create the material universe, and natural evil is simply a part of what matter does; and what matter does includes evils such as supernova explosions and diseases. This is a realistic solution to the problem of evil. However, the theodicy fails because it does not defend an all-powerful and all-loving God.

Process theodicy's solution to the problem of moral evil is that God is not entirely powerless, but can influence both mind and matter by a slow process of persuasion. God has persuaded the universe into increasing order, with the intended result of evolving creatures such as ourselves, with a capacity for love and intellectual achievement. However, the more complex the creature, the more ability it has to resist persuasion, so moral evil is humanity's rejection of God's plan. However, some argue that if the plan has no guarantee of success, then why did God take the risk of creating destructive beings such as humans?

For some, the greatest evil is death. Process theodicy solves this problem by suggesting that after death, all beings live in God's mind for ever. This solves the problem of who goes to heaven or to hell: these are not real places, but are metaphors for human ideas about moral responsibility and judgement. However, some argue that this solves nothing, because those who live lives of moral and physical torment can never be compensated by merely living on in God's mind.

Maximum Level 2 for answers dealing only with the problem of evil without correct reference to theodicy.

0 3 . 1**Examine why Bentham and Kant might reach different decisions on moral issues.****[10 marks]**

Target: AO1:3 Cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice.

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.

Kant's approach to morality is mainly deontological, and it deals with moral issues by applying universal rules by which moral duties can be carried out, such as: 'Do not steal, do not murder,' etc. Because these rules are universal, they apply at all times and in all places, which means that the particular situation is not taken into account. Despite his need to earn a living, a grocer who is kind to his customers because he wants their money is not acting morally: his motive must be that being considerate to customers is a universal moral duty.

Bentham's Act Utilitarianism, however, is mainly consequential, and it deals with moral issues in specific situations. Since each situation is different, universal rules are not practical, so Bentham uses a pleasure calculus literally to decide what action will lead to a balance of pleasure over pain/happiness over misery. Whereas Kant holds that all people must be treated with equal moral consideration, for Bentham the only rule is that moral issues should be decided by calculating which action brings the greatest happiness for the greatest number.

Looking at the moral issue of lying or making a false promise, for example, Kant concludes that it is never right to lie or make a false promise, because if this were to be universalised, promise-keeping would itself become impossible. On Bentham's approach, however, it would be permissible to lie/make a false promise in order to achieve the best outcome/the net balance of pleasure over pain in the situation. Equally, in a situation where killing one person could save a number of other lives, Bentham could allow this in order to save the majority, because in his view the rights of the majority outweigh the rights of the individual.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that only explain different views.

Maximum Level 2 if the answer only deals with Bentham or Kant.

0 3 . 2**'Meta ethics shows that moral values are facts.'****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: Introduction to meta ethics: the meaning of right and wrong: Divine Command Theory – right is what God commands, wrong is what God forbids. Naturalism: Utilitarianism – right is what causes pleasure, wrong is what causes pain. Non-naturalism: Intuitionism – moral values are self-evident. The strengths and weaknesses of these ideas.

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

This claim would be supported both by naturalists and non-naturalists, since both argue that moral values are facts, and in moral disputes perhaps most people believe that their moral opinions are based in fact. However, ethical naturalists (eg Utilitarians) face a strong challenge from the 'naturalistic fallacy' – the argument that we cannot derive moral values from facts/we cannot derive an 'ought' from an 'is'. Also, naturalists seem to have different ideas about what the moral facts are. For example Utilitarians think they are about pain and pleasure, whereas Situation Ethicists think they are about agape-love.

Some will argue in favour of the statement by accepting non-naturalism, eg Intuitionism, which holds that moral values are factual and self-evident, but cannot be defined. For example, some Intuitionists will argue that it is an obvious moral intuition that murder is wrong, and if you have to ask, 'Why?', then you have missed the point: it simply is. For Divine Command Theory, murder is wrong simply because God says so. However, some will object that Intuitionism cannot explain why we can have conflicting intuitions. For example some will intuit that capital punishment is morally wrong, but others will intuit the opposite.

Some might argue that moral values are not about facts at all, but instead are just the way we express emotions. For example, a thief will think that theft is good/right, whereas somebody who has been a victim of theft will think that it is bad/wrong. There are no facts involved in emotions. However, many will reject this and will argue that unless we act as if moral views are facts, then society will disintegrate. Some might therefore support modern forms of naturalism which argue that moral values do have a factual basis because they are intended to bring about complete well-being. We can therefore see the facts of morality in how people contribute to complete well-being in the world.

0 4 . 1**Examine differing ideas about the nature of the conscience.****[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.

Answers to this question are likely to refer to different religious understandings of the conscience. Some might refer also to psychological explanations of the conscience, for example that conscience amounts to feelings of guilt.

Some understandings of the conscience might be analysed in terms of social conditioning, such as the power that the group brings to bear on the individual. Some might explain the idea of conscience in terms of society's powers, whose moral authority we feel compelled to obey.

Religious understandings of the conscience vary considerably. Some will see the conscience as the direct voice of God guiding human affairs, and since God is omnipotent and omniscient, that voice must be obeyed. Alternatively, others will understand the religious conscience as the gift of reason, arguing that reason is sufficient to bring the individual to the understanding of God's moral requirements. Others see the religious conscience as a reflective faculty – a kind of moral intuition.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that refer to only one idea.

0 **4** . **2****'The conscience has no value as a moral guide.'****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 value of conscience as a moral guide.

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

For those who view conscience as the voice of God 'whispering in the ear', then conscience has ultimate value as a moral guide, since the dictates of an omnipotent, omniscient and wholly good God must be followed without question. However, it may be argued that there are conflicting claims about what 'God' is apparently telling people to do. Also, there is no universally accepted evidence for the existence of God, so the value of conscience in this sense is limited to those with very particular beliefs.

The conscience has value as a moral guide because following it removes fear of death and of judgement. However, although this means that it meets a psychological need, it does not mean that what it says about moral values is true.

The socially conditioned conscience has value as a moral guide because it unites society by making people conform to society's norms. However, there are so many different societies with conflicting norms that they may not all be good guides to moral conduct.