

A-level
RELIGIOUS STUDIES
7062/2B

Paper 2B Study of Religion and Dialogues: Christianity

Mark scheme

June 2022

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 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.

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 © 2022 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 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.

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 why there are different Christian views about celibacy and marriage.
[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: 'celibacy and marriage' may be treated as a single idea.

One reason for the difference depends on the fact that the Bible contains divergent teachings which may guide views. The Old Testament teaches that marriage is good, and several New Testament letters give positive teachings about marriage or treat the married state as normal, but Paul is understood to say that celibacy is the preferred state and marriage is only for those who cannot control themselves. Jesus is quoted as saying that there is no marriage in heaven.

A second reason is that different churches have different teachings. Some churches, for example, the Catholic Church, consider celibacy and marriage to be different holy states. The celibate vocation of monks, nuns and priests is considered superior, but marriage between lay people is a sacrament that is binding until death. Other churches see marriage as a desirable social and legal arrangement which forms the basis for Christian families, and consider life-long celibacy unnecessary.

A third reason depends on how far individual Christians follow traditional church teachings, and how far they follow social norms in their own context. In general, all churches support celibacy outside marriage, and marriage between a man and a woman as the context for sex. However, many western Christians today diverge from tradition, and take a more liberal view based on norms in society where sex before marriage and same sex marriage are acceptable, and marriage is not considered necessary for bearing and raising children.

Maximum Level 2 for answers that only explain different views.

0 1 . 2

‘Christians cannot justify the use of weapons of mass destruction.’

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: Sanctity of life: the concept of sanctity of life; different views about its application to issues concerning...the use of weapons of mass destruction.

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

Christians cannot support the use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) because by definition, they kill many people, which breaks the sixth commandment, and seems to go against the sanctity of life principle, that all life is intrinsically valuable and must be preserved. However, other Christians argue that the exceptional use of a WMD which causes fewer deaths than the alternative may be acceptable as the lesser of two evils, for example, the Hiroshima bombing compared to war continuing indefinitely.

Christians cannot justify using WMD because they are called to be peacemakers. They are taught to love their enemies and to turn the other cheek, and WMD are a feature of warfare, used to attack or retaliate on a massive scale. However, Just War Theory as developed by Augustine and then Aquinas allows for Christians to engage in war under specific constraints, and some might consider that even WMD could be considered proportional as required by Just War Theory.

Christians cannot justify using WMD because they cause widespread suffering and death among innocent civilians, and the results may damage the environment. Chemical, nuclear and biological weapons do not discriminate between combatants and non-combatants, or between civilian and military targets. However, others argue that in order to maintain peace, Christians need to be prepared to use all weapons available to them, including WMD, to preserve their value as a deterrent.

0 2 . 1

Examine the significant ideas of Daphne Hampson and Rosemary Radford Ruether about the patriarchal nature of Christianity.

[10 marks]

Target: AO1.1: Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including religious, philosophical and 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: A comparison of the significant ideas of Daphne Hampson and Rosemary Radford Ruether about the patriarchal nature of Christianity including Hampson's view that Christianity is irredeemably sexist and Ruether's ideas about the androgynous Christ and her view that the female nature is more Christlike than the male.

Daphne Hampson

Hampson argues as a post-Christian theologian that Christianity is subject to patriarchal imagery and attitudes from first century Palestine. It treats men as the norm and women as secondary, and in this sense, Hampson describes Christianity as 'fascist'. It is therefore so sexist that it is unacceptable today, and people should seek to express God in other ways.

Hampson also argues that because Christians look to a patriarchal model for moral decision making, taking instructions from a transcendent God rather than exercising moral choices freely, Christianity is not moral. She believes that basing moral decisions on an impossible one-off event that breaks the laws of nature, or on the teachings of a man who was supposedly related to God differently from all other people, does not make sense.

Rosemary Radford Ruether

Ruether argues as a Roman Catholic feminist, liberation theologian that the message of Christianity is one of liberation, where history, experience and hope all contribute to understanding. She sees parallels between Jesus' teachings and liberation theology, and believes that the Holy Spirit can lead people to an understanding of Jesus for the contemporary world, so Christianity can become a religion of liberation from patriarchy.

Ruether sees Jesus as having many qualities which are traditionally considered female, for example, he was a healer and showed love and care to the weak and outcasts, as well as the male qualities of authority and power. In this sense she sees him as a being who embodies all aspects of human nature, an idea she describes as 'androgynous Christology'.

0 2 . 2

‘Jesus is very important as a role model for Christians.’

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 authority of Jesus: different Christian understandings of Jesus’ authority, including Jesus’ authority as God’s authority and Jesus’ authority as only human; implications of these beliefs for Christian responses to Jesus’ teaching and his value as a role model with reference to his teaching on retaliation and love for enemies in the Sermon on the Mount: Matthew 5:38–48.

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

Many Christians believe Jesus is God incarnate, and therefore the ultimate role model, since, as God on earth, Jesus exemplifies perfected human living. Humans emulate Jesus’ words and actions to become more God-like in the hope of attaining salvation. However, some Christians might find that Jesus’ example of perfection makes him too different from fallible human beings. This would make him less important as a role model for Christians.

For some Protestants who believe that everything necessary for salvation is contained in the Bible, the words and actions of Jesus recorded in the gospels are part of God’s direct teaching to humankind, and he is therefore a very important role model. However, other Christians argue that the gospels were written years after Jesus’ lifetime by writers each with their own specific agenda, and contain material inserted by the early church. This limits how far Jesus as portrayed in the gospels can be seen as a role model.

Biblical literalists assume that Jesus is accurately portrayed in the Bible and therefore see him as the most important role model for all aspects of human living today. They may make everyday decisions based on the question ‘What would Jesus do?’ However, for other Christians, Jesus’ masculinity and the fact that he was a man of his time make him less important as a role model for Christians today. Christians instead should follow the teachings of the church and model their behaviour on the example of the saints.

0 3 . 1

‘Philosophical arguments are irrelevant to Christian beliefs about life after death.’

Critically examine and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Christianity and philosophy.

[25 marks]

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

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects and approaches to religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study. (15 marks)

Material related to AO1 and AO2 may be presented discretely or holistically within the answer. Markers must read the whole of the response before either mark is awarded.

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.

AO1

Christianity

There are varying Christian beliefs about life after death including resurrection of the flesh and spiritual resurrection. Some process thinking offers belief in objective immortality and there are different interpretations of judgement, heaven and hell as physical, spiritual or psychological realities.

Philosophy

There are different views about the nature of the soul and the body / soul relationship, including Descartes' argument for the existence of the soul. The possibility of continuing personal existence after death is broadly discussed.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not include both Christianity and philosophy.

AO2

Philosophical arguments may be considered irrelevant if they fail to prove their case. For example, the argument that there is no soul to be passed on after death, because nothing can be detected using the five senses, fails if the soul is not regarded as something that can be sensed in this way. However, there are philosophical arguments in favour of life after death, or which at least show it to be a coherent possibility. There may be reference to Hick's idea of eschatological verification and to his replica theory here. Religion may consider philosophy relevant when it works in its favour.

Religious belief can be seen as a perspective, not itself based on evidence or reason, from which all evidence is viewed and all experiences interpreted. This likens belief to a 'Blik'. If belief is not based on reason it may be considered immune to rational argument. However, not all believers accept this understanding of faith and regard their position as reasonable and as supported by evidence. This means that philosophical challenges to the way the evidence has been interpreted are entirely relevant.

Philosophical arguments may be considered irrelevant to religious beliefs if religious claims are understood non-cognitively and / or as part of a religious language game in which those within the game can converse between themselves but have no significance for those outside the game. However, many see religion as making truth claims, such as 'there is a heavenly realm', which can be challenged by philosophy, and the analysis of religious language as non-cognitive may be seen as a philosophical argument.

0 4 . 1

‘The beliefs of all religions are equally valid.’

Critically examine and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Christianity and philosophy.

[25 marks]

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

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects and approaches to religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study. (15 marks)

Material related to AO1 and AO2 may be presented discretely or holistically within the answer. Markers must read the whole of the response before either mark is awarded.

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.

AO1

Christianity

There is a range of Christian attitudes to different faiths, including both pluralism and exclusivism, which is often based on John 14:6. Diversity within Christianity is also viewed in different ways. Some see common moral values, and any actions based on them, as more important than the particular belief, or interpretation of a belief, that individuals might hold. On topics such as creation and miracles, some beliefs within Christianity are contradictory.

Philosophy

This can be approached in a variety of ways. For example, philosophy may challenge the validity of all faiths. It may also point out that arguments used by one faith to support, or attack, belief in miracles or religious experiences must be applied to the claims of all faiths in relation to these topics. Mystical experiences may be seen as the common core of all faiths. Similarly, arguments for God's existence relate to God in general, rather than God as specifically understood by Christians, Muslims or Jews, or to Brahman or the Trikaya.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not include both Christianity and philosophy.

AO2

All arguments from philosophy in favour of, or against, a religious belief are common to all faiths where the belief is present, for example, beliefs about miracles, religious experiences and life after death. An argument supporting the possibility of personal existence beyond death, for example, supports all those religions that include that belief and arguments against the existence of a metaphysical dimension to life challenge all faiths that believe that such a dimension exists. This suggests that philosophy finds all faiths equally valid / invalid. However, many of the beliefs are contradictory, which seems to show that they cannot all be valid, and certainly some followers of individual religions claim that they alone know the truth.

The view may be supported by pluralists who see all religions / Christian denominations as historically and culturally relative expressions of the same underlying awareness or path. The individual faiths, on this view, are merely different ways of talking about ultimate reality which enables individuals to deepen their understanding of it, but the one reality lies beyond these. However, some Christians are exclusivists, often basing their view on John 14:6, and argue that they alone have the true faith, and it is very difficult to see some other faiths as expressions of the same underlying reality because of the great differences between them.

Tolerance of other faiths is a characteristic of much Christian teaching, and within a secular context, freedom of religious expression is extended to all faiths. However, there are values and practices in other faiths or denominations which some Christians find intolerable. These vary, but may include, for example, polygamy and animal sacrifice. Divisions on ethical issues such as abortion are also evident. Beliefs that operate in the personal realm but are not expressed in practices may be accepted as 'valid' while acting on them is not.

0 5 . 1

‘Bentham’s way of making moral decisions is compatible with Christian ethics.’

Critically examine and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Christianity and ethical studies.

[25 marks]

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

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects and approaches to religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study. (15 marks)

Material related to AO1 and AO2 may be presented discretely or holistically within the answer. Markers must read the whole of the response before either mark is awarded.

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.

AO1

Christianity

Christian ethics may be unpacked in terms of both law based ethics and situation ethics. There may be reference to the sanctity of life and its application.

Ethics

Bentham's key ideas may be identified as: how consequences of pain or pleasure determine whether an action is right or wrong; the goal of the greatest happiness of the greatest number, the hedonic calculus and the equality of pleasures.

Bentham's approach may be identified as act utilitarianism, meaning that each situation is judged on its own merits rather than any moral rules or laws applied.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not include both Christianity and Bentham's way of making moral decisions.

AO2

There are likely to be many issues on which both Bentham and Christianity would reach the same conclusions, because Christian 'love' for all is easily translated into a desire for the happiness of all, or 'the greatest good for the greatest number'. However, Bentham's system potentially justifies any action as long as it contributes to that goal while the moral teachings of Christianity do appear to prohibit certain actions, such as murder and adultery, regardless of their consequences.

Bentham's way of moral decision making identifies a right action as one that produces happiness, which appears to be consistent with the Christian form of situation ethics as advocated by Fletcher. Fletcher developed an 'agapeic' calculus to operate in the same way as Bentham's hedonic calculus to assess the likely consequences of any action being considered. However, not all Christians would consider situation ethics to be 'Christian' because it, like Bentham, permits actions forbidden by traditional Christian teaching.

Bentham's system treats all sentient beings equally so that the happiness of each individual is taken into account in the decision making process: this appears to be consistent with Christian ethical teaching. However, Bentham's system allows the interests of the minority to be sacrificed to benefit the majority and values all pleasures equally. Christianity values spiritual happiness above all other forms of happiness and can have serious objections to the 'tyranny of the majority'.

0 6 . 1

‘Kant’s way of moral decision making supports Christian beliefs about lying.’

Critically examine and evaluate this view with reference to the dialogue between Christianity and ethical studies.

[25 marks]

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

Target: AO2: Analyse and evaluate aspects and approaches to religion and belief, including their significance, influence and study. (15 marks)

Material related to AO1 and AO2 may be presented discretely or holistically within the answer. Markers must read the whole of the response before either mark is awarded.

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.

AO1

Christianity

There is a range of views about lying within Christianity. Some would take a law-based, deontological, approach, reflecting the Commandments. Others would take a situational approach in which lying is right or wrong in a particular situation depending on whether its consequences are loving or unloving.

Ethics

Kant may be understood to see truth telling as a duty that has to be universalised, and one treats all people as ends in themselves rather than means to a secondary end. For example, the individual cannot be treated as a means to increase overall happiness of those around them. There may be reference to the 'mad axe murderer' dilemma or similar, and Kant's response that even in this situation, lying cannot be justified. Some may argue that Kant's maxims can be contextualised – meaning that the moral duty depends on the circumstances.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not include both Christianity and Kant's way of making moral decisions.

AO2

At first sight, both Christianity and Kant's system forbid lying as evidenced by the Commandments and the debate, for example, about telling the murderer where his victim may be found. Kant defended the imperative 'do not lie' even when the consequences would be the death of an innocent person because that rule had to be universalised. However, Christian ethics, in its situation ethics form, does not treat 'do not lie' as a law, so lying can be justified when it is loving.

Any situation in which lying would save the life of an innocent person would seem to involve a conflict of duties for those using Kant's way of making moral decisions, for example, between 'do not be responsible for the death of an innocent person' and 'do not lie'. This is a dilemma comparable to the one faced by Christians between the duty to love and the 'law' of the Commandments. However, lying to the murderer would be treating him as a means to an end, protecting lives, rather than an end in himself, so many of those using Kant's system would reject this outright, while in situation ethics it would be permissible because people are used to maximise love.

If Kant's system allows for the maxim to be formulated in response to a specific situation, then the universalised rule about lying could allow exceptions such as 'tell the truth' unless lives depend on it. This would bring it more into line with that Christian thinking which prioritises love over blind obedience to a law. Also the imperative 'do not lie' is not the same as 'tell the truth'. It is possible to give a response which does not lead to the death of innocents but does not involve lying, for example, I will not tell you, and such a response might satisfy both Kantians and Christians. However, Kant explicitly rejected the consideration of the consequences of lying as an argument in its favour.