

---

A-level  
RELIGIOUS STUDIES  
7062/1F

1F: SIKHISM AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

---

**Mark scheme**  
2018 Draft Specimen  
Version 0.1

---

Draft

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)

Draft

## 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 good use of relevant evidence and /or examples</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 and /or examples</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</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</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**

- 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 use of 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
  - Some attempt at the appropriate use of subject vocabulary
- Level 1**  
**1-3**
- A basic response to the issue(s) raised with some evidence in support
- 0**
- No accurate or relevant material to credit

**Levels of Response: 25 marks A-Level - Global**

- Level 5**  
**21-25**
- Critical analysis of the dialogue between philosophy/ethics and religion which consistently engages with the question
  - Knowledge and critical understanding is accurate and relevant and fully developed in breadth and depth with good use of relevant evidence and/or examples
  - 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
  - Clear and coherent presentation of ideas with precise use of the appropriate subject vocabulary
- Level 4**  
**16-20**
- Critical analysis of the dialogue between philosophy/ethics and religion which mostly engages with the question
  - Knowledge and critical understanding is accurate and mostly relevant with good development in breadth and depth shown through good use of relevant evidence and /or examples
  - 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
  - Mostly clear and coherent presentation of ideas with good use of the appropriate subject vocabulary
- Level 3**  
**11-15**
- Some critical analysis of the dialogue between philosophy/ethics and religion relevant to the question
  - 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
  - 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 Some organisation of ideas and coherence with reasonable use of the appropriate subject vocabulary
- Level 2**  
**6-10**
- A limited attempt to analyse the dialogue between philosophy/ethics and religion
  - 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
  - Where appropriate, limited reference may be made to alternative views and/or scholarly opinion

- Presentation of a point of view relevant to the issue with some supporting evidence and argument
  - Limited organisation of ideas and coherence and use of subject vocabulary
- Level 1**  
**1-5**
- A basic attempt to analyse the dialogue between philosophy/ethics and religion
  - Knowledge and critical understanding is basic with little or no development
  - There may be a basic awareness of alternative views and/or scholarly opinion
  - A basic response to the issue(s) raised with some evidence in support
  - Isolated elements of accurate and relevant information and basic use of appropriate subject vocabulary
- 0
- No accurate or relevant material to credit

Draft



**Section A: Study of Religion****Question 01**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 0 | 1 |
|---|---|

 . 

1
---

**Examine how Sikh teaching helps Sikhs respond to the challenge of secularisation.**

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

- Students should apply their knowledge and understanding of the challenges of secularisation, a summary is not required.
- Secularisation may be defined – perhaps in terms of the replacement of the authority /explanatory role of religion with science or the loss of the relevance and significance of religion in the modern world.
- A wide range of teachings and of contexts may be considered.
- Sikhism responds to challenges as they arise – Secular society / secularisation provides new challenges and new contexts for practising faith.
- Concern for equality, social teaching has much in common with some non-religious values, attitudes to other faith supports living in secular society
- Science is not always seen as a threat.
- Reaffirmation of Sikh identity provides security and support.

**[10 marks] AO1**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 0 | 1 |
|---|---|

 . 

2
---

**‘Religion has a positive impact on society.’**

**Assess this view with reference to Sikhism.**

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

- This can be approached with reference to range of societies and traditions and may take account of Marx’s analysis of the function of religion.
- Belief in karma can lead to passive acceptance of social situation / place in life. Depending on perspective this can be positive or negative.
- Role in national life – depends on the social context referenced, and perceptions vary.
- Strong moral teaching and social values.
- Contributes to business and cultural life.

**[15 marks] AO2**

**Section B: Philosophy of Religion****Question 02**

**0 2** . **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.**

- The inconsistent triad / logical problem of evil.
- Argued that no form of evil would exist alongside an all loving and all powerful God so moral evil should not exist.
- 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.
- The evidential problem of evil.

**[10 marks] AO1**

**0 2** . **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: significance.**

Note: no summary of the defence is required.  
There are various presentations of this theodicy – look for general themes.

**In support**

- Nothing can justify the suffering of innocents or the apparent refusal of God to intervene in extreme circumstances
- Free will may be an illusion
- The benefit of free will may not be worth the cost.

**Other views**

- Free will is essential to a meaningful relationship with God and it is that which is the purpose of life
- Free will entails the possibility of moral evil
- A meaningful context for the exercise of free will must include one in which actions have consequences for which human beings can be responsible, this entails natural law and the possibility of pleasure and pain.

**[15 marks] AO2**

**Question 03**

**0 3** . **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.**

- The verification principle e.g. Ayre– statements about God do not translate into empirically testable statements therefore is empty of meaning.
- Falsification principle – statements about God rule nothing out – there is nothing that would count against them. They suffer ‘death by 1000 qualifications’. E.g. Wisdom and Flew.

**[10 marks] AO1**

**0 3** . **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: significance.**

Note: there is no requirement to outline the theory.

**In support**

- Language game theory gives meaning to religious language within the game – between religious people who share the rules
- The game represents a form of life and language has a special function within that form.

**Other views**

- The language used within a ‘game’ needs translating or interpretation to make it meaningful for others
- Much of the language within the game may be non-cognitive – e.g. evocative
- The language game could be moral (as Braithwaite)
- As a ‘private’ discourse within religion it may make little sense to others and move towards an anti-realist view of religion.

**[15 marks] AO2**

**Section C: The dialogue between Philosophy and Religion**

**Question 04**

0	4
---	---

 . 

1
---

 'Belief in an afterlife is reasonable.'

**Critically discuss and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Sikhism and Philosophy.**

**Target: AO1:4 Knowledge and understanding of approaches to the study of religion and belief. (10 marks)**

**Target: AO2: Analysis and evaluation of aspects and approaches to religion and belief: study. (15 marks)**

This debate may be approached in a variety of ways:

- The belief may be supported using scriptural evidence and the evidence of personal experience.
- An attack on the belief appears therefore to be an attack on the sources of authority and wisdom that underlies it.
- Others would support it with reference to secular evidence such as Near Death Experiences, Ghosts, recollection of past lives, the sheer weight of such evidence may make it more probable than not that the afterlife is real.
- Statements about the afterlife may be considered meaningless and unverifiable.
- Where belief in an afterlife demands belief in a soul, the evidence and arguments for a soul may be challenged.
- The supposed pieces of evidence are open to challenge through natural explanations and the possibility of error and deceit.
- Freud would challenge the belief as being the result of wishful thinking.
- If a 'reasonable' belief is one that is consistent with the evidence then this belief may be reasonable, whether it is the best explanation of the evidence is open to debate and both these positions are far removed from a conclusion that there is an afterlife.

**[25 marks] AO1/AO2**

**OR**

**Question 05**

**0 5** . **1** **'Religious experience gives us knowledge of God.'**

**Critically discuss and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Sikhism and Philosophy.**

**Target: AO1:4 Knowledge and understanding of approaches to the study of religion and belief. (10 marks)**

**Target: AO2: Analysis and evaluation of aspects and approaches to religion and belief: study. (15 marks)**

This issue may be approached in a variety of ways

- There are accredited reports in scripture and religious tradition of God communicating truths through supernatural means - propositional revelation.
- Such 'knowledge' consists of transmitted words, the divine being may still be very remote from human experience.
- Other reported experiences lead to an intuitive awareness of the divine based on a personal encounter.
- This presents God as immanent – a view not shared by all.
- The experiences themselves may be challenged for the reliability of witnesses, the possibility of alternative explanations and the degree to which, if any, there is justification for using 'God' as the best explanation for what has happened.
- The issue of whether the experience is evidence of a brain state or of an external reality.

**[25 marks] AO1/AO2**