AQA

AS
RELIGIOUS STUDIES
7061/1

PAPER 1 : PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION AND ETHICS

Mark scheme

2017 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

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.

LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Levels of Response: 15 marks AS-Level – AO1

Level 5 **13-15**	• Knowledge and understanding is accurate and relevant and is consistently applied to the question • Very good use of detailed and relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate • The answer is clear and coherent and there is effective use of specialist language and terminology
Level 4 **10-12**	• Knowledge and understanding is mostly accurate and relevant and is mostly applied to the question • Good use of relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate • The answer is mostly clear and coherent and specialist language and terminology is used appropriately
Level 3 **7-9**	• Knowledge and understanding is generally accurate and relevant and is generally applied to the question • Some use of appropriate evidence and/or examples which may include textual /scriptural references where appropriate • The answer is generally clear and coherent with use of specialist language and terminology
Level 2 **4-6**	• Knowledge and understanding is limited and there is limited application to the question • Limited use of appropriate evidence and examples which may include textual /scriptural references where appropriate • Some clarity and coherence and limited use of specialist language and terminology
Level 1 **1-3**	• Knowledge and understanding is basic • 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 AS-Level – AO2

Level 5 **13-15**	• Reasoned and evidenced chains of reasoning supporting different points of view with critical analysis • Evaluation is based on the reasoning presented • The answer is clear and coherent and there is effective use of specialist language and terminology
Level 4 **10-12**	• Reasoned and evidenced chains of reasoning, with some critical analysis, supporting different points of view • Evaluation based on some of the reasoning • Specialist language and terminology is used appropriately • The answer is largely clear and coherent
Level 3 **7-9**	• Different points of view supported by evidence and chains of reasoning • The answer is generally clear and coherent with use of specialist language and terminology
Level 2 **4-6**	• A point of view relevant to the question with supporting evidence and chains of reasoning • Some clarity and coherence and limited use of specialist language and terminology
Level 1 **1-3**	• A basic response to the question with reasons given in support • Isolated elements of accurate and relevant information, and basic use of appropriate subject vocabulary.
0	• No accurate or relevant material to credit

Section A: Philosophy of Religion

Question 01

| 0 | 1 | . | 1 | **Explain the differing approaches to proving that God exists taken by the cosmological and ontological arguments.**

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

Students may include some of the following points, but all other relevant points must be credited:

Cosmological
Note that students may, but need not, refer only to Aquinas' Way 3.

- Cosmological arguments are inductive and are based on observation of the cosmos, which is then interpreted in the light of a given religious framework.
- For Aquinas that framework was the medieval worldview: movement and change, causation and contingent things require the existence of an unmoved mover, an uncaused cause, and a necessary being: God.
- Way 3 is based on the observation that everything is contingent – it comes to be and ceases to be depending on other factors
- Aquinas argued that the chain of dependency has to have a beginning and that only a necessary being could begin it. The beginning might be seen as linear, or else as 'vertical' in terms of the activity of a necessary being here and now.

Ontological
Note that students may, but need not, refer only to Anselm's version.

- Ontological arguments are deductive, so if their premises are true, then the conclusion must be true. Ontological arguments attempt to establish the existence of God from the idea of 'God'.
- The necessary being of ontological arguments is logically necessary, whereas the necessary being in Way 3 is factually necessary.
- Anselm argued that to think of God while denying God's existence is a contradiction: it is the 'fool' who says, 'There is no God'.
- Defining God as 'that than which none greater can be conceived' means that God must exist necessarily, since perfect / the greatest form of existence is necessary existence.

[15 marks]   AO1

0 1 . 2 **'Philosophical arguments for the existence of God have no value for religious faith.'**

Assess this view.

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

There may be an analysis of 'proof' in higher-level answers.
Note that a summary of the argument(s) is not required.
Note that students may, but need not, refer only to the arguments of Aquinas, Anselm and Paley.

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

- It may be argued that faith is not based simply on philosophical arguments, and some may conclude that faith should be independent of reasoning. Against this, others might argue that it is always wrong to believe something that cannot be defended rationally. Aquinas held that God's existence can be shown by reasoning. In Roman Catholic teaching, rational thinking and philosophical discourse make faith in God possible without denying the need for faith. This allows believers to support their faith perspective and give reasons for others to believe, but risks reducing faith to 'belief that'.
- Some might argue that faith is not intellectual assent ('belief that', but amounts to 'belief in' the value of a way of living and thinking. The God of the philosophers is very different than the God of faith, so even if the arguments succeeded they would not confirm the specific God of any particular religion, or give reasons to trust God. Against that, 'belief in' supposes that there is something to believe in.
- Some might argue that God is not a being whose existence can be proved or disproved. Others might argue that faith can be a response to reasoning, or an interpretation of the conclusions of reasoning. Some might refer to Anselm's comments on 'faith seeking understanding', ie that faith is prior to reasoning.

[15 marks]   AO2

Question 2 Religious Experience

0 2 . 1 **Explain religious views about the nature of the following type of religious experience: visions.**

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

Students may include some of the following points, but all other relevant points must be credited:

- Religious views vary – specification lists corporeal, imaginative and intellectual, and these are likely to be explained with examples.
- With corporeal visions, it is understood that what is seen is external to the mind; has physical form and may leave physical traces; and may be seen by many at the same time.
- Imaginary visions: eg dreams. These are internal to the mind – may be 'seen' when the eyes are closed.
- Intellectual visions include the sense of the presence of a being, but nothing is seen either internally or externally.
- Visions could also be explored in terms of Swinburne's classification, but this is not required, eg: empirical experiences of God mediated through a common public sense object (such as a rainbow); an uncommon public sense object (such as the burning bush at the call of Moses; or through an object that cannot be described empirically (such as Peter's vision at Joppa).
- Some religious believers see all or some 'visions' as illusions: as natural phenomena wrongly interpreted as religious.

[15 marks]   AO1

0 2 . 2 **'Science makes it unreasonable to believe that visions are a form of religious experience.'**

Assess this view.

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

There may be some explicit discussion of 'unreasonable' as against reason or unsupported by reason. Answers should be supported with reference to evidence and examples. Reference to scholars is not required but may be credited.

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

- The main challenge from science is that neither visions nor any other kind of religious experience can be verified. The scientific method involves observation, hypothesis and testing, and it is not possible to use this method to verify religious visions, even where these are corporate rather than individual. Against that, some will argue that by definition science cannot observe a non-empirical reality (God), so visions cannot be explained away by science.
- Science gives alternative physical and psychological explanations for such experiences. One common explanation is that the effects of religious experiences are often described in similar terms to the use of drugs like LSD and mescaline, and in particular entheogenic drugs such as psilocybin. In response to this, some might argue that religious visions involve altered brain states, so if these happen through a drug, this does not mean that the experiences are not from God.
- A common scientific challenge is that religious visions can be caused by temporal lobe epilepsy, so all accounts of such visions can be explained as abnormal brain functions. This claim is often made with reference to St Paul's vision on the road to Damascus, since there is some evidence that Paul suffered from epileptic fits. Some might reject this on a number of grounds, eg: it is impossible to claim that all religious visions are the result of epilepsy; also, there is again no reason why a vision that starts in epilepsy cannot be a real vision from God. The effects of such visions are undeniably real, as with St Paul.
- Experiments in neuro-science claim to have replicated features of religious experiences, eg Persinger's Helmet, so there is now no need to include God as an explanation for such an experience. In reply, again, the fact that physical changes occur in the brain does not prove a causal link, those changes may only accompany the experiences. Scientific explanations do not deal with the meaning of religious visions.

[15 marks]   AO2

Question 03 Natural Moral Law

| 0 | 3 | . | 1 | **Explain why followers of Natural Moral Law may reach different conclusions about the issue of theft.**

Target: AO1:3 Knowledge and understanding of cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice.

Students may include some of the following points, but all other relevant points must be credited:

- Aquinas considered theft as wrong because it contradicted the primary precepts of Natural Law. The primary precepts do not admit exceptions.
- The basis of Natural Moral Law is: 'good is to be done and evil avoided.' The primary precepts include 'love God', and 'live in an ordered society' – both of which appear to rule out theft.
- However, the priority of preserving human life may necessitate theft, eg to take a gun from a suicidal individual or from a maniac who is threatening others.
- There is debate in the modern Roman Catholic Church as to whether acts such as theft are intrinsically evil or whether it can sometimes be morally right to perform an act which is justified by a proportionate reason. Proportionalists argue that an act may be objectively wrong but morally right, or else objectively right but morally wrong, so theft could be justified through a proportionate reason.
- Others might explain that theft is ruled out through the principle of Double Effect, since it is never justified to do a morally wrong act to achieve a good end.

[15 marks]   AO1

| 0 | 3 | . | 2 | **'Natural Law is not an effective way of making moral decisions.'**

Assess this view.

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.

- Natural Law is a deontological ethical theory, so it suffers from the same problems that affect all deontological theories, such as: ignoring the situation when the situation is crucially important; allowing no exceptions, when exceptions are called for; taking away an individual's ability to act freely, whereas a free choice is the essence of developing morally good behaviour. Some might argue that allowing any exceptions makes the theory less effective, since once exceptions are made, the authority of Natural Law is lost.
- In particular, some might argue that Natural Law is based on the idea that humans have a common nature, so what is right for one person is right for all. This is frequently challenged, eg by those who claim that some humans have a homosexual nature, so the Natural Law approach to homosexuality is not an effective way of treating homosexuals. Some might defend Natural Law here on the basis of scripture.
- Similarly, some might argue that with the precepts governing procreation, it is difficult or impossible to agree that the sole purpose of sexual acts is procreation. Some might defend Natural Law on the grounds that its approach puts the emphasis where it should be – on a loving family.
- The objection that Natural Law ignores the consequences of actions can be countered by pointing out that the principle of Double Effect does effectively allow consequences to be considered. Equally, some might argue that Proportionalism addresses many of the issues with Natural Law.
- There might be some consideration of the meaning of 'effective', ie as to whether 'effective' means 'workable', or 'reasonable', or some such qualification.

[15 marks]   AO2

Question 04

| 0 | 4 | . | 1 | **Explain how Situation Ethics might be applied to the ethical issues surrounding embryo research.**

Target: AO1:2 Knowledge and understanding of influences of beliefs, teachings and practices on individuals, communities and societies.

Students may include some of the following points, but all other relevant points must be credited:

- Students may offer some background information about the issues surrounding embryo research, and/or a Christian legalistic position that rules it out, in order to explain the key feature of the approach of Situation Ethics: the over-riding of a law when love, and the situation, demands it.
- There is no requirement to outline the theory, although in practice students are likely to outline and then to apply those of Fletcher's key principles (the law of love, the 4 presuppositions and the 6 propositions) that they consider to be relevant to the question.
- Particular situations might include the use of saviour siblings, and embryo research into a variety of conditions such as cancer and Parkinson's disease.
- In any particular situation, there could be (for example) a consideration of whether or not an embryo is a person to whom justice is due; the situation itself (for example a consideration of the potential benefits of the embryo research to individuals or to the human race in general), and the pragmatic value of the decision made: whether or not what is decided will work.

[15 marks]   AO1

| 0 | 4 | . | 2 | **'Situation Ethics does not provide decision-makers with effective guidance about capital punishment.'**

Assess this view.

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

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

- Situation ethics requires decision-makers to make their decision situationally not prescriptively, so blind obedience to an existing moral law is ruled out. This is clear, but it tells them more about what they should **not** do, rather than what they should.
- It tells them to work out the which decision will result in the most loving outcome, and the immediate 'loving' consequences of a decision to allow capital punishment in a specific case may be obvious – perhaps as a deterrent, removal of a threat, or even preventing what the prisoner might see as the pointless suffering of prison. However, the long term consequences could be very different because capital punishment can create martyrs whose death then inspires others. Human fallibility therefore makes the method of decision making ineffective
- The guidelines require the decision-maker to distribute love among those involved in the situation, since justice is love distributed. This seems to ensure that everyone's interests are taken into account which seems clear and effective. However, the interests of those involved may be completely conflicting. For example 'love' for society as a whole could justify the execution of an innocent person if the death of that individual prevents a greater harm. A method which gives way to the demands of the majority regardless of how reasonable or unreasonable they might be is not 'effective.
- In an effective system, there would be a universally accepted understanding of Christian love which would then act as the basis for decision making. In fact the definition seems vague and subjective so decision makers cannot agree on how it should be implemented. Jesus' teaching and example of Christian love focused on life saving not life taking making it difficult to justify taking life as an act of Christian love. This however, contrasts with other interpretations of what would be loving (see above).

For answers that deal with general criticisms of Situation Ethics but do not refer to Capital Punishment – max level 2.

[15 marks]   AO2