

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

Paper 1 Philosophy of Religion and Ethics

---

**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](http://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 below about using Levels of Response mark schemes.
8. Be prepared to award the full range of marks. Do not hesitate to give full marks when the answer merits full marks or to give no marks where there is nothing creditable in an answer.
9. No half marks or bonus marks are to be used under any circumstances.
10. Remember, the key to good and fair marking is **consistency**. Do **not** change the standard of your marking once you have started.

## Levels of Response Marking

In 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 Lead Examiner.

## Assessment of Quality of Written Communication

Quality of written communication will be assessed in all components and in relation to all assessment objectives. Where students are required to produce extended written material in English, they will be assessed on the quality of written communication. The quality of written communication skills of the student will be one of the factors influencing the actual mark awarded within the level of response. In reading an extended response, the examiner will therefore consider if it is cogently and coherently written, ie decide whether the answer:

- presents relevant information in a form that suits its purposes
- is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate, so that meaning is clear
- is suitably structured and that the style of writing is appropriate.

## LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

### Levels of Response: 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 criticisms of the ontological argument from Gaunilo and Kant.****[15 marks]**

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

Note: This content is indicative rather than prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to all the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Gaunilo criticised Anselm by proposing an ontological argument for the existence of a perfect lost island. He argued that it is possible to conceive of the most perfect and real island, since it is greater to exist in reality than to exist only in the mind. Therefore, the most perfect island must exist in reality. Gaunilo claimed that Anselm's argument can be used to prove the existence of an endless number of perfect things and so his argument fails.

Kant criticises the ontological argument first by attacking Anselm's use of existence as a predicate. A real predicate adds further knowledge to a concept, whereas to say that something exists adds nothing new. Kant uses the example of a coin, where each predicate of a coin gives further information, for example 'round', 'metallic', 'having an image'. To then add that they exist adds nothing new to the concept of the coin. Kant argues that the ontological argument does this with the concept of God and so adds nothing new to the knowledge of God.

Kant also criticises the ontological argument by undermining the conclusion that God exists necessarily. For example, a triangle is defined as a geometric figure with three sides and three angles, but that does not entail, of itself, that any particular triangles must exist. Equally, God can be defined as a being who exists necessarily, but that does not entail, of itself, that such a being exists: it states merely that if the concept of God is instantiated, then God exists necessarily.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not address all parts of the question.

**[15 marks] AO1.1**

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

**‘Criticisms of the cosmological argument prove that Aquinas was wrong.’**

**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 the consideration of the following specification content: Arguments for the existence of God: Cosmological: Criticisms: Hume and Russell.

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

Russell proves that the cosmological argument is wrong because it commits the fallacy of composition. Using the analogy of motherhood, he demonstrates that just because all things in the universe are contingent does not mean that the universe itself is contingent. However, not all arguments using the fallacy of composition are wrong, for example, in the case of ‘the wall is made of brick, therefore the wall is brick’, it is clear that sometimes this type of argument can lead to a correct conclusion.

Hume and Russell argue that Aquinas was wrong by disputing that any being can be necessarily existent. Hume argues that all questions of existence can only be true synthetically but not analytically. However, Aquinas is not arguing that the statement ‘God exists’ is a logically necessary truth, but that it is metaphysically necessary. Aquinas argues that metaphysical necessity is about the way things are, so without a necessary being to explain the existence of all contingent things, they remain unexplained.

Russell proves the cosmological argument wrong by arguing that the universe itself could exist eternally and be uncaused without the need for a necessary being. For example, he suggests that the existence of the universe could be ‘brute fact’. However, it could be argued that using the principle of sufficient reason, even a universe that exists eternally and is uncaused still lacks sufficient explanation because it cannot be assumed merely to exist.

**[15 marks] AO2**



---

**Question 2**

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

**Explain why Process Theodicy and the Free Will Defence respond differently to the problem of evil and suffering.**

**[15 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.

One difference is in their reasoning for why God allows evil to exist. The Free Will Defence justifies God allowing evil to exist because evil is needed to allow humans to understand and choose good over evil. Process Theodicy justifies God allowing evil to exist because Griffin argues that God is not omnipotent based on his interpretation of the creation story. God did not create the universe out of nothing but instead from pre-existing chaotic matter which can resist God's will, leading to evil and suffering.

Another difference is in the way that God is constrained in both arguments. The Free Will Defence argues that God cannot prevent evil because to do so would make it logically impossible for humans to choose good freely. Process Theodicy argues that God is in a panentheistic relationship with creation and can only persuade matter into order. This gives rise to evil and suffering which God cannot prevent.

One final difference is the way in which the complexity of human experience arises. The Free Will Defence argues that human choices lead to a range of goods and evils. Logically, humans are able to enjoy good only through engaging with the complexity of good and evil. Process Theodicy argues that complexity arises as a result of God persuading pre-existent matter into more complex forms. As a result, humans can experience more complex good but also more complex evil.

Maximum Level 2 for answers that only explain different views without reference to difference.

**[15 marks] AO1.3**

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

**‘Religion responds effectively to the challenges of verifying religious experiences.’**

**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 the consideration of the following specification content: The challenges of verifying religious experiences; Religious responses to those challenges.

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

Religion responds effectively to these challenges by claiming that although it is not possible to investigate the religious experience itself, external after-effects can be demonstrated. For example, some religious experiences change the way people live their lives. However, there may be natural explanations for external effects. A change in lifestyle could be the result of psychological need and not a religious experience, and so religion has not responded effectively to the challenges.

Religion responds effectively to the challenges by arguing that although the experiences are private and subjective, this does not make them false. People have many private and subjective experiences that are considered to be valid, for example, pain, fear, anxiety, elation. However, this argument does not prove that religious experiences are true, only that there is a feature of these experiences that prevents empirical investigation and verification.

Religion also responds effectively to the challenges by arguing that although religious experiences seem to reflect different religions, thereby contradicting each other, they can still be genuine. Differences can be explained by culture and context. However, this response is unconvincing when differences in culture and context lead to the widely different conceptions of the meaning and purpose of life found in the different world religions.

**[15 marks] AO2**

---

**Question 3**

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

**Explain teleological approaches to moral decision making.****[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.

Teleological approaches to moral decision making are focused upon the telos of an action, the purpose or end goal. In the case of Situation Ethics, the purpose of all action is to achieve the most loving outcome. Virtue Ethics can also be considered teleological in that the end goal of ethics is to achieve eudaimonia. In Teleological approaches what is good is that which works towards the purpose or end goal most effectively.

Teleological approaches to moral decision making are also consequentialist. They look to achieve the best consequence in any situation. For example, in Situation Ethics all options and their possible outcomes need to be considered. For Fletcher, a good outcome is one which achieves agape love. The best consequence is the one which achieves the most love. This can be assessed by using an agapeic calculus.

Teleological approaches to moral decision making measure moral goodness in relative terms. There can be no absolute judgements, such as 'theft is always wrong'. In Situation Ethics, principles can be applied but each moral situation needs to be considered personally and pragmatically. What may be right in one case may not be right in another. Every moral decision is therefore situational.

**[15 marks] AO1.4**

0	3	.	2
---	---	---	---

**‘It is morally justifiable to use animals as a source of organs for transplants.’**

**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 the consideration of the following specification content: The application of Natural Moral Law, Situation Ethics and Virtue Ethics to: [...] Issues of non-human life and death: [...] animals as a source of organs for transplants.

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

According to Natural Moral Law it could be morally justifiable to use animals as a source of organs for transplants because Aquinas believed that animals do not have souls, making them of inferior moral worth. Humans have thus been given dominion over the natural world for their own purposes. However, irrespective of whether animals have souls, humans have been given the responsibility of stewardship because of their unique ability to reason. Ending animal life prematurely for organ donation is not the act of a benevolent steward, and is not morally justifiable.

One of the four working principles of Situation Ethics is personalism. Transplanting animal organs to save the life of a human is putting the person at the centre of the moral decision. This is more loving than allowing a human to die and is morally justifiable. However, transplanting animal organs could lead to damaging outcomes for humans. Therefore, using animal organs for transplants cannot lead to a personalist, loving outcome.

According to Virtue Ethics, using animals for organ transplants is morally justifiable because doing so may save human lives, which shows the virtue of compassion. However, using animals for organ transplants could be seen as a morally deficient act, because it is callous to kill an animal prematurely for this purpose. It could lead to individuals and society developing a callous attitude toward animals.

**[15 marks] AO2**

**Question 4**

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

**Explain how Virtue Ethics might influence moral decision making.****[15 marks]**

**Target: AO1.2:** Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief, including influence 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.

Virtue Ethics may influence moral decision making by encouraging people to develop character so that they work towards becoming more virtuous. Rather than focusing on the act or the intention, Virtue Ethics focuses on the character of the decision maker, since right decision making follows on from developing the right character. Decisions should be made on the basis of how far they develop character rather than focusing on the action itself or its outcome.

Another way Virtue Ethics may influence moral decision making is through the doctrine of the mean. According to Aristotle, a moral decision is one that lies between the vices of excess and deficiency. For example, courage is the virtue which lies in a mean between the excess of rashness and the deficiency of cowardice. A morally good person should use reason to judge the right action which lies in a mean between the excess and deficiency of a virtue.

A third way that Virtue Ethics may influence moral decision making is by emphasising the importance of reason when making moral decisions. Aristotle argues that a virtuous person makes good moral decisions as a result of lifelong training and practice. The practical wisdom of the virtuous person enables them to use reason to make a good decision rather than relying on rules or predicted outcomes.

**[15 marks] AO1.2**

0	4	.	2
---	---	---	---

**‘Situation Ethics can never approve of intensive farming.’**

**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 the consideration of the following specification content: Normative ethical theories: Teleological: Situation Ethics with reference to Fletcher; The application of [...] Situation Ethics [...] to issues of non-human life and death: [...] intensive farming.

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

Some argue that Situation Ethics can never allow intensive farming because it allows the exploitation of animals. The conditions of factory farming are considered cruel and unjust and cannot lead to a loving outcome. However, Situation Ethics is relativistic. Claiming that it can never allow intensive farming is an error, because any action may be considered if it achieves the most loving outcome. In the case of intensive farming, feeding the hungry could count as the most loving outcome.

Intensive farming has led to damage to the environment and global resources through population increase in humans and animals. This leads to suffering for all, which cannot be a loving outcome. However, personalism is a key feature of Situation Ethics. If intensive farming prevents the death of a starving family, then it might be the most loving outcome in that particular situation.

Some argue that intensive cultivation of food crops rather than rearing animals might lead to a better outcome for humanity and solve world hunger. Cultivating crops could be considered pragmatic and positivist because it puts the hungry person at the centre of the decision. However, others argue that humans have dominion over animals so feeding hungry human beings through intensive rearing of animals is pragmatic, relativist, personalist and positivist.

**[15 marks] AO2**