



---

**AS**  
**RELIGIOUS STUDIES**  
**7061/1**

Paper 1 Philosophy of Religion and Ethics

---

**Mark scheme**

June 2019

---

Version: 1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://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

- |                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <b>Level 5</b><br><b>13-15</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Knowledge and understanding is accurate and relevant and is consistently applied to the question.</li><li>• Very good use of detailed and relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate.</li><li>• The answer is clear and coherent and there is effective use of specialist language and terminology.</li></ul> |
| <b>Level 4</b><br><b>10-12</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Knowledge and understanding is mostly accurate and relevant and is mostly applied to the question.</li><li>• Good use of relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate.</li><li>• The answer is mostly clear and coherent and specialist language and terminology is used appropriately.</li></ul>               |
| <b>Level 3</b><br><b>7-9</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Knowledge and understanding is generally accurate and relevant and is generally applied to the question.</li><li>• Some use of appropriate evidence and/or examples which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate.</li><li>• The answer is generally clear and coherent with use of specialist language and terminology.</li></ul> |
| <b>Level 2</b><br><b>4-6</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Knowledge and understanding is limited and there is limited application to the question.</li><li>• Limited use of appropriate evidence and/or examples which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate.</li><li>• Limited clarity and coherence and limited use of specialist language and terminology.</li></ul>                    |
| <b>Level 1</b><br><b>1-3</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Knowledge and understanding is basic.</li><li>• Isolated elements of accurate and relevant information.</li><li>• 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 AS-Level – AO2**

- Level 5**  
**13-15**
- A very well-focused response to the issue(s) raised.
  - 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**
- A well-focused response to the issue(s) raised.
  - Reasoned and evidenced chains of reasoning, with some critical analysis, supporting different points of view.
  - Evaluation based on some of the reasoning.
  - The answer is largely clear and coherent with specialist language and terminology used appropriately.
- Level 3**  
**7-9**
- A general response to the issue(s) raised.
  - 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 limited response to the issue(s) raised.
  - A point of view relevant to the issue(s) with limited supporting evidence and chains of reasoning.
  - Limited clarity and coherence and limited use of specialist language and terminology.
- Level 1**  
**1-3**
- A basic response to the issue(s) raised.
  - A point of view is stated with some evidence or reasons in support.
  - Some clarity and coherence and basic use of appropriate subject vocabulary.
- 0**
- No accurate or relevant material to credit.

**Question 1**

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

**Explain the approach taken by the design argument to proving the existence of God.**

**[15 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 consideration of the following specification content: Paley's analogical argument.

The design argument is an a posteriori argument: it is based on observation/sense experience. The argument draws conclusions about the world from these observations. The design argument uses inductive reasoning: the premises drawn from particular occurrences are applied to general occurrences in the conclusion. As it is based on evidence the conclusion may or may not be true.

The argument is based on observation of regularity, order and purpose in the world. The reasoning is that if the universe has regularity, order and purpose then it was designed. The designed requires an intelligent designer. Paley gives a list of examples such as the purpose of the eye for sight, the gills of fish for underwater, the feathers and wings of birds for flight and the regularity of the planets for orbit.

Paley's design argument uses analogy: he proposes that were a watch found on a heath, the observation that the watch had complex parts with a function and the parts work together for a specific purpose, one would infer that the watch had been designed, in the same way observation of complex parts of the universe working together implies a designer of the universe. As the design of the universe far exceeds the design of the watch, the designer must be far greater than humanity. So the designer is God.

**[15 marks] AO1:4**

0 1 . 2

**‘The free will defence solves the problem of evil.’**

**Assess this view.**

**[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 consideration of the following specification content: the free will defence.

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

The free will defence gives a morally sufficient reason for God to allow evil and suffering. God was right to create a being with which to have a genuine relationship; such a being must have free will. Free will must involve the possibility of choosing evil. However, God’s nature is such that He could have created a being that was free and always chose the good.

In the face of evil and suffering, the development of second order goods such as love and compassion happens, as in Hick’s vale of soul making. This supports the claim that without free will these would not be possible. However, the argument relies entirely upon a libertarian account of free will. A hard determinist would argue that human behaviour is determined by other factors, not free will.

The free will defence solves the logical problem of evil as it gives a rational account of why evil would still occur in a world created by God: to enable a genuine relationship with Him. However, some may argue that it still does not address the evidential problem of evil, whilst free will explains why there is evil, it does not explain why so much variety and profusion.

**[15 marks] AO2**

**Question 2**

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

**Explain the nature of mystical experiences.****[15 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 consideration of the following specification content: mystical experiences: William James; non-sensuous and non-intellectual union with the divine as presented by Stace.

Mystical experiences are rooted in a mystical state of consciousness according to James. He identifies four criteria for identifying mystical experiences: ineffability is the inability to describe the experience, as there is no shared vocabulary; passivity is the inability for the experient to have any control during the experience; noetic quality is the way in which the experience gives rise to new knowledge which is intuitively realised; transiency is the temporary nature of the experience.

Mystical experiences are non-sensuous and non-intellectual according to Stace. He claims that the experient feels that they become lost in pure consciousness; the experience entirely transcends anything that the individual may have experienced before. There are two types of mystical experiences: introvertive experiences in which the individual experiences suppression of the senses and is lost to the outer world; extrovertive experiences in which the experient sees the world in a different and transfigured way.

Mystical experiences may be considered numinous. Otto explains numinous experiences as an experience of the wholly other: they are sui generis, they are non-rational and so he uses the phrase 'mysterium, tremendum et fascinans' meaning it inspires a unique kind of feeling of fear, awe and fascination that is overwhelming. The experience focuses on God as transcendent.

**[15 marks] AO1:1**

0 2 . 2

**‘Religious experiences have great value for religious faith.’**

**Assess this view.**

**[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 consideration of the following specification content: the influence of religious experiences and their value for religious faith.

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

Religious experiences can be seen to have value for religious faith as the experiences can be seen to confirm faith and belief, and create places of pilgrimage. However, these experiences may only have value for one particular denomination or faith and be irrelevant or challenging to the beliefs of other faiths or denominations.

Religious experiences can be seen to have value as they are evidence to support the believing framework, for example they may be seen as proof of the existence of God. However, religious experiences may have natural explanations, and the claims of religious experience are contradictory in nature, so they are of no value in convincing others of the truth of one particular faith.

Religious experiences are valuable as foundational experiences in that they change lives and provide a basis for organised religion. However, some believers would argue that there are philosophical problems with a transcendent and benevolent being choosing specific groups of people to receive assistance and not others. This implies that God’s benevolence is not universal but depends upon favouritism.

**[15 marks] AO2**

**Question 3**

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

**Explain how natural moral law could be applied to lying.****[15 marks]**

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

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 consideration of the following specification content: natural moral law and the principle of double effect with reference to Aquinas.

Natural moral law would consider lying to be a direct contradiction of the primary precept to 'live in an ordered society', since if truth were not a necessity, society would not be ordered. So 'do not lie' would be considered a secondary precept. Revealed teaching of the Decalogue, which Aquinas takes into account, also instructs 'do not bear false witness'.

In a situation where a lie is necessary in order to save someone's life or prevent harm, natural moral law may look for a way round this, such as withholding truth rather than directly telling a lie, or providing misleading truths. Aquinas claimed that to lie to save someone's life is not lawful, but withholding truth is permitted.

According to the doctrine of double effect, a bad act cannot be used to achieve a good outcome. A direct lie would not be acceptable but other options might be considered permissible. Some proportionalists would argue that in some circumstances a greater evil could be avoided by lying.

Maximum Level 2 for answers that only explain natural moral law.

**[15 marks] AO1:2**

0 3 . 2

**‘Virtue ethics has too many weaknesses to be effective.’****Assess this view.****[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 consideration of the following specification content: virtue ethics with reference to Aristotle.

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

Virtue ethics offers no direct guidance or rules and relies heavily on people developing practical wisdom, and so is ineffective as a clear moral guide. However, some would argue that this is an advantage because it can then be applied to different times, issues and contexts in order to be used effectively. The use of role models makes it easier to develop practical wisdom.

Virtue ethics is weak because it is out of date. It was primarily developed for Greek males and their understanding of human flourishing. It does not take account of the diversity of gender, sexuality, ethnicity and culture in 21st century society. However, some would argue that virtue ethics is flexible enough to be reinterpreted for a modern understanding of human flourishing.

Virtue ethics is entirely anthropocentric and takes no account of animal ethics. This is not in keeping with 21st century values which see animals as worthy of ethical consideration. However, others would argue that the treatment of animals is covered by virtue ethics because the practice of any kind of cruelty negatively impacts on human character, and is addressed by the doctrine of the mean and existing virtues.

**[15 marks] AO2**

**Question 4**

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

**Explain why situation ethics may lead to different conclusions about the use of animals for organ transplants.**

**[15 marks]**

**Target: AO1:3:** Knowledge and understanding of causes 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 consideration of the following specification content: situation ethics with reference to Fletcher.

Situation ethics is focused on relativism which could be seen to justify the use of animals for organ transplants. It could be argued that the net agapeic gain from using an animal for organ transplants would justify the use of the animal. However, it would depend entirely upon the situation, so if there were a way to meet the needs of the patients without recourse to animal transplants, this may be considered preferable because then no pain is caused to the animal.

If using an agapeic calculus would show the total amount of suffering would be reduced, the most loving action may be to allow the use of animals for organ transplant. However, this would be entirely dependent upon its success as pragmatism is also key. The chances of failure and risk to humans would need to be minimised. Some may argue that even trialling these procedures amounts to too much risk and chance of failure, and should not be explored.

Some situation ethicists would argue that agape extends to all animals or to beings with social and cognitive functions such as primates. They may argue that the most loving action would be to only use the bodies of consenting humans to avoid mistreating another living thing. Some would argue that agape only extends to humans and so animals may be used without concern as they are not deserving of agape which is intended for humans alone.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that only refer to one conclusion about the use of animals for organ transplants.

**[15 marks] AO1:3**

0 4 . 2

**'Situation ethics does not provide clear guidance about the issue of 'designer' babies.'**

**Assess this view.**

**[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 consideration of the following specification content: the application of situation ethics to 'designer' babies.

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

As a relativist theory there is no one clear guideline relating directly to 'designer' babies as the technology moves so quickly and is so technical. One could argue that situation ethics is unclear as to how best to proceed with such an unknown quantity. However, others would argue that a less flexible ethical theory may rule out research or the use of embryos altogether and potentially lose valuable life changing discoveries and so a relativistic theory whilst unclear in elements is still better than a rigid approach.

Being able to work out the right thing to do may be impossible as things such as real consequences cannot be known in advance. 'Designer' babies could impact genetics for many generations to come and situation ethics cannot truly know future impact. However, having love at the centre of any decision would surely prevent unnecessary suffering and keep everyone focused on being careful in their decision making rather than callous.

**[15 marks] AO2**