



A-level
RELIGIOUS STUDIES
7062/1

Paper 1 Philosophy of Religion and Ethics

Mark scheme

June 2024

Version: 1.0 Final



2 4 6 A 7 0 6 2 / 1 / M S

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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

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 © 2024 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 Anselm's ontological argument for the existence of God.

[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.

Anselm holds that God's existence can be deduced from his definition. Anselm defines God as 'a being than which nothing greater can be conceived'. The claim that 'God exists' is a priori / deductive: it can be known to be true without reference to sense experience simply by thinking about God's nature. In the proposition 'God exists', the subject, 'God', contains the predicate 'exists', so God must exist. God's existence is a necessary truth, and not a contingent one.

Anselm develops his argument by suggesting that even a fool can understand the definition of God as 'a being than which nothing greater can be conceived', even though the fool does not understand it to exist in reality. There is a clear difference between having an idea in the mind and knowing that this idea exists in reality. For example, a painter has an idea of what to paint, but only when it has been painted can the painter see that the idea now exists both in the mind and in reality.

From this, Anselm goes on to claim that it is greater to exist both in the mind and in reality than to exist only in the mind. If God existed only in the mind, then one could think of something greater, namely a God who existed in reality and who possessed every great-making quality. Anselm concluded that in order to be the greatest conceivable being, God must exist both in the mind and in reality.

0 | 1 | 2

‘Anselm’s argument for the existence of God has been disproved.’**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: Arguments for the existence of God. Ontological. Criticisms: Gaunilo and Kant.

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

Gaunilo claimed that Anselm’s argument failed because it could be used to prove the existence of absurdities such as ‘the most real and perfect lost island’. Such a concept is undefinable, so Anselm’s argument disproves itself. However, Anselm replied that ‘That which can be conceived not to exist is not God’. Islands are contingent, so cannot exist necessarily. Necessary existence is a predicate of God, not of physical things, so Gaunilo’s argument fails as a disproof of God’s existence.

Some may refer to Kant’s rejection of the argument on the grounds that ‘existence is not a predicate’. For example, the only way to know that Thalers exist as a unit of currency is to experience them. Equally the only way to know that God exists is by sense experience, not logic. However, although some may accept this as a decisive argument, since it is only possible to talk about things that are experienced, others might argue that God is a special case. The fact that anything exists at all otherwise cannot be explained.

Some may refer to Kant’s second objection, that although the proposition ‘exists necessarily’ applies only to God, it does not follow from this that God exists in reality. For example, if there are unicorns, they will be horses with a horn, but that does not entail that unicorns exist. Equally, if God exists, God exists necessarily, but God may not exist. However, some might claim that no argument can amount to a disproof, and that the totality of arguments for the existence of God strengthens Anselm’s ontological argument.

Question 2

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

Examine different understandings of the relationship between the body and the soul.

[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: Self, death and the afterlife: The body/soul relationship.

The philosopher Descartes proposed a dualist theory of the body/soul relationship. He theorised that in humans the body is physical whereas the soul is non-physical. He proposed that body and soul interact in the pineal gland, and argued that the mind can survive the death of the body. Modern science shows that the main function of the pineal gland is to produce the hormone melatonin, which modulates sleep patterns, and that its existence tells us nothing about the body/soul relationship.

A different understanding is the view that the mind is not separate from the body, but is merely the sum of sense experience, brain activity and behaviour. Functionalism, for example, describes this in terms of the brain's input, function and output. Input is sense experience, function is information processing by the brain, and output is behaviour. On this view, there is no body / soul relationship because there is no separate soul.

Another possibility is that mind and brain are two aspects of the same, as yet unknown, substance. One aspect, mind, is first-person subjective awareness/consciousness (qualia). The other is third-person objective experience. For example, a brain scanner can see the brain states of somebody reacting to eating chocolate, but it cannot know the first-person qualia of the taste and smell of the chocolate. It is far from clear how qualia should be understood or interpreted. Qualia may bear no religious or scientific relation to the idea of a soul that is distinct from its body.

Maximum L2 for answers with only one understanding

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

‘Hare’s theory of Bliks shows that religious language is meaningful.’

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: Religious language. Other views of religious language; language as an expression of a Blik with reference to R.M. Hare.

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

Hare’s theory of Bliks argues that religious Bliks are common and powerful views that are deeply meaningful to those who hold them, even though their factual status is unknown, for example that there is a God. However, this is not a wholly successful response to the falsification principle, which argues that a sentence is factually significant if and only if there is some kind of evidence that might count against it. For example, Flew uses the ‘Parable of the Gardener’ to imply that religious language is meaningless. There is no gardener, so there is no God.

Hare defines Bliks as assumptions about, or views of, the world. Everybody has a set of non-cognitive Bliks which they use as a framework to make religious language meaningful. Bliks are so powerful that they cannot be falsified. They can survive an infinite number of tests, since the Blik is logically prior to the facts. However, this seems unconvincing. If all Bliks are non-cognitive and non-falsifiable for those who have them, then there are no reliable criteria by which we can judge between different Bliks about the world and its meaning.

For Hare, the concept of Bliks is compatible with the use of language in the context of religious belief, since religious beliefs are assumptions about the world that on the whole derive from non-verifiable beliefs. Being assumptions, Bliks are completely convincing to those who have them, so they cannot be overthrown, as can be seen, for example, through Hare’s ‘Parable of the Lunatic’. However, this argument fails. Such a view seems to ignore what may be obvious to others, in particular that some religious language may simply be wrong, misleading or meaningless.

Question 3

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

Examine the approach to the meaning of right and wrong taken by Utilitarianism.

[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.

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. Naturalism: Utilitarianism – right is what causes pleasure, wrong is what causes pain.

Utilitarianism is the ethical theory which claims that right is what causes pleasure and wrong is what causes pain. For Bentham, pain and pleasure are the two 'sovereign masters' that describe everything that should be done and everything which ought not to be done. Ethical action should therefore seek to maximise pleasure and minimise pain. To consolidate this approach, Bentham developed a pleasure calculus designed to measure pleasure by its intensity, duration, certainty, proximity, productiveness, purity and extent.

Utilitarianism is therefore a naturalist theory of ethics. Happiness is a realist/objective quality, and it is discovered in this world rather than in any abstract measure of right and wrong. As a realist theory, Utilitarianism does admit that philosophers and politicians can be mistaken about what constitutes right and wrong for humans. If people are asked what they want, the almost universal response is that they want to experience pleasure and to achieve happiness. The main utilitarian maxim is therefore the greatest happiness principle: 'act by doing that which secures the greatest happiness for the greatest number'.

A modified form of Utilitarianism argues that happiness and pleasure are hierarchical. For example, this is the basis of Mill's Rule Utilitarianism. This sees higher, cultural pleasures, such as art, music and philosophy, as superior to lower pleasures such as gluttony and sexual excess. Right and wrong therefore correspond to the quality of life rather than the quantity of pleasure advocated by Bentham. Overall, moral rules are of utilitarian value because they have been shown to provide a balance of pleasure over pain.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that only describe Utilitarianism.

0 3 . 2

‘Virtue ethics cannot solve the moral problems of voluntary euthanasia and assisted suicide.’

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; Issues of human life and death: voluntary euthanasia and assisted suicide.

Note: voluntary euthanasia and assisted suicide may be treated as a single idea.

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

There can be no overall answer to the problem of voluntary euthanasia, since it depends on the dispositions and character of those concerned, and on the situation itself. Aristotle might generally have rejected voluntary euthanasia as an example of cowardice/inability to deal with pain from honourable injuries inflicted during war. However, voluntary euthanasia might instead be seen as a brave response by those incapacitated by injury or disease and not wishing to be a burden on family or state. In this way, virtue ethics may solve the problem of voluntary euthanasia.

Assisted suicide refers to those who deliberately help people to end their own lives. The legal and social effects of assisted suicide cannot be solved by an appeal to the virtue of the person who is responsible for the death of another human being. The moral problems are potentially impossible to solve, since the assisting persons may or may not have a direct and culpable intention to cause death. However, in terms of virtue ethics, assisting the death of someone who is suffering may be seen as a compassionate decision made by a virtuous person.

Some might argue that all people, whether virtuous or not, make individual decisions which raise moral concerns. For this reason, virtue ethics cannot solve the problems of voluntary euthanasia and assisted suicide. However, others might argue that in the Aristotelian tradition, virtue operates at a society level rather than at an individual level. The moral problems of voluntary euthanasia and assisted suicide can be solved within a virtuous society where moral norms are clearly defined and accepted.

Question 4

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

Examine the causes and significance of different beliefs about conscience.**[10 marks]**

Target: AO1.3: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including 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.

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.

One cause of different beliefs about conscience is that some religious people see conscience as God-given, whereas non-religious people look elsewhere. For example, Augustine believed that an omnipotent and omnibenevolent God must have put conscience into human minds in order to give them an innate knowledge of moral rules. Non-religious people look to different sources of beliefs about conscience that are grounded instead in human thought and behaviour.

Another cause of different beliefs about conscience is that some see conscience as personal/psychological, whereas others see it as the outcome of social forces. Those who see it as personal/psychological might argue that all perceptions are filtered by the individual's mind, and minds/beliefs differ from person to person. For others, the main influence is the society in which the individual lives, so the individual's conscience is formed by the beliefs and practices of different societal groups.

One significance of these different beliefs is that society educates and judges people. Therefore, the fear of being rejected by society causes people to develop feelings of guilt and shame when they privately disagree with what society teaches but publicly conform to it. For example, this might be the case with militaristic/authoritarian regimes where individuals are punished or killed for conscientiously challenging the beliefs of those in power.

Another significance of these different beliefs might be that punishment may be used to enforce compliance. People who do not believe, or disagree on the grounds of conscience, may be subject to exclusion or retribution for failing to conform. This may lead to religious persecution, which has been constant throughout history, and is still prevalent in many parts of the world. Conscience cannot solve the significant problem of religious disagreement.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that only cover one aspect.

0 4 . 2

‘People should not be rewarded or punished for their moral decisions.’**Evaluate this claim.****[15 marks]****Target: AO2:** Analyse and evaluate aspects of, and approaches to, religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study.

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in 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. The relevance of moral responsibility to reward and punishment.

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

For hard determinists, all events are determined and unavoidable, so people’s moral decisions are themselves determined and unavoidable. Therefore, people should neither be rewarded nor punished for moral decisions, since they could not have done otherwise. However, libertarians argue that moral decisions are freely taken, so feelings of shame, guilt and regret make reward and punishment meaningful.

Hard determinists vary in their treatment of moral decision making. For example, Skinner argued that punishing people for antisocial behaviour is largely ineffective, since once punishment is over, people will go back to their previous behaviour. Society should therefore be engineered so that punishment is no longer required. However, libertarians reject this approach because it dehumanises people, treating them as robots without choice or dignity. People’s choices matter to them, so they should be rewarded or punished as fits their decisions.

Many hard determinists believe that decision making is controlled by determined brain processes. This is evidenced, for example, by experiments performed by the neuroscientist Libet. This suggests that neither reward nor punishment is appropriate for moral decisions. However, people should be rewarded and punished for moral choices because there is evidence that they can be held responsible for their decisions. For example, Libet showed that the brain probably has the freedom to veto pre-conscious intentions.