



A-LEVEL

RELIGIOUS STUDIES

7062/2B Christianity
Report on the Examination

7062
June 2022

Version: 1.0

Further copies of this Report are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2022 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.
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.

General comments

All questions were marked with direct reference to the published Level Descriptors for AO1 and AO2. For the 2022 summer exam series, topic level Advance Information was provided to schools by the exam board as directed by Ofqual.

There were some very accomplished scripts for this paper, and some outstanding individual answers. Students demonstrated AO1 knowledge and understanding of topics generally comparable to previous years, and most were able to discuss alternative views for AO2 answers.

01.1 Examine why there are different Christian views about celibacy and marriage.

[10 marks]

There were some excellent responses which answered the question directly and fully. They gave reasons for different views, discussing them with relevant evidence and examples. Such answers easily met the level descriptors for full marks. Although the majority of students had some knowledge of views about celibacy and marriage, a surprising number failed to focus on examining why these different views exist. Answers which merely described different views were restricted in the mark scheme to a maximum L2, 4 marks.

Note: All assessment Objectives are examined in every exam series. AO1.3 requires students to “Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including cause and significance of similarities and differences in belief, teaching and practice”. This question was clearly focused on the cause of differences.

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

Evaluate this claim. [15 marks]

The majority of students were able to write answers which considered two views. References to the law of love, sanctity of life and the concept of stewardship provided most arguments to support the statement, and these were countered with references to Just War theory, dominion and Situation Ethics. Some students referred to the teachings of specific churches, including the Pope’s views in Roman Catholicism, and Quaker pacifism. Some students were able to construct a well evidenced argument with critical analysis. Weaker answers sometimes attempted to insert a formulaic attempt at critical analysis by adding on to each paragraph “This is a weak/ strong argument” with little or no supporting content. Some students assumed that Aquinas wrote specifically with weapons of mass destruction in mind, and in some essays there was evidence of anachronistic application of Just War conditions.

02.1 Examine the significant ideas of Daphne Hampson and Rosemary Radford Ruether about the patriarchal nature of Christianity. [10 marks]

Those students who had learnt the material on these two scholars produced some excellent answers. The best discussed Hampson’s post-Christian views, informed by Enlightenment thinking, that Christianity is historical, “irredeemably sexist” and “fascist”. They explained that the idea that Jesus Christ had a unique relationship with God is unsupportable. They also explained

Ruether's understanding of Christianity as forward-looking and liberation-focused, based on biblical criticism. They discussed her view on the androgyny of Christ and his relationships with women and the marginalised. They considered her understanding of women as closer to God's nature. The weakest answers merely discussed sexism in the Bible and patriarchy in modern society. Some students referred to these scholars as 'Daphne' and 'Rosemary', and it would be better to refer to them by their surnames.

02.2 'Jesus is very important as a role model for Christians.'

Evaluate this claim. [15 marks]

The specification says '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'. The majority of answers to this question focused only on Christology and different understandings of Jesus' authority. These were fully credited where they pointed to understandings of Jesus as a role model, but some did not do so. These therefore failed to reach the higher levels. The best answers showed good critical analysis and also considered either that Jesus was too close to God to be a helpful role model, or that aspects of his life made him a limited role model. A few considered whether the biblical accounts were reliable as sources of information about Jesus as a role model. All of these approaches were creditable. As with 1.2, the best answers showed good critical analysis, but weaker ones often took a formulaic approach which did not always work.

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]

This was the more popular of the Philosophy dialogues options, chosen by more than two thirds of candidates. There were some excellent answers which fully deserved full marks. Most students were able to demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding and discuss two views. Some students chose to put the AO1 content first and then construct an argument, others integrated AO1 and AO2 content. Both approaches were equally successful for accessing the full range of marks.

AO1 element: Good answers showed sound understanding of different Christian views about life after death, and considered Descartes and Plato, materialism and militant atheism. The best also considered a range of philosophical critiques of Christian views and the relevance of language and religious experience, and considered the range of Christian views with reference to process theology and bodily/ physical resurrection, with relevant evidence. Weaker answers were vague about Christian beliefs and/ or philosophical views on life after death, and sometimes attributed ideas to the wrong scholars.

AO2 element: Most answers included two different views, even those which drew on limited knowledge and understanding. The majority made an evaluation, either at the start or at the end of the essay. The best answers showed excellent critical analysis, setting views of philosophers in perceptive discussion one with another and with Christian beliefs. This kind of argument usually led to a wholly appropriate evaluation fully supported by the arguments presented. Weaker answers sometimes attempted to insert a formulaic attempt at critical analysis by adding on to

each paragraph “This is a weak/ strong argument” with little or no supporting content. Weaker evaluations were sometimes little more than partially reasoned opinion.

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]

This was the less popular Philosophy option, but those who chose it produced some very strong answers. Most students were able to demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding and discuss two views. Some candidates chose to put the AO1 content first and then construct an argument, others integrated AO1 and AO2 content. Both approaches were equally successful for accessing the full range of marks.

AO1 element: Almost all answers made clear reference to inclusivism and exclusivism, and most also discussed pluralism. Weaker answers did not always address philosophical views, and where they did, tended to focus mainly on critiques from militant atheism. Some weaker answers were limited to arguments in favour of religious tolerance and drew mostly on secular, social evidence rather than referring to religions. The best answers gave detailed examples of similar and contrasting beliefs, and drew on philosophy of religious language, religious experiences and arguments for the existence of God for evidence, often with good examples.

AO2 element: The best answers often began with a perceptive discussion on the validity of religious beliefs in general. They critically analysed different approaches with appropriate reference to scholarship and religious teachings, and often produced well-nuanced evaluations. Weaker answers took a more polarised approach focused on inclusivism and exclusivism, and had rather vague evaluations which amounted to little more than ‘I agree’ or ‘I disagree’. A few answers took a very limited approach that merely argued in favour of religious tolerance, and these failed to reach the higher levels. As with other AO2 elements, weaker answers sometimes attempted to insert a formulaic attempt at critical analysis with little or no supporting content.

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]

This was the most popular of the all dialogues options, chosen by more than three quarters of candidates. There were many excellent answers which fully deserved 25 marks. Most students were able to demonstrate at least some relevant knowledge and understanding and discuss two views. Some candidates chose to put the AO1 content first and then construct an argument, others integrated AO1 and AO2 content. Both approaches were equally successful for accessing the full range of marks.

AO1 element: Almost all students were able to describe the key elements of Bentham’s ethics, and compare them to some elements of Christian ethics. The best answers gave a full account of Act Utilitarianism and compared and contrasted it with Natural Moral Law, Situation Ethics and approaches to ethics informed by Divine Command Theory and the example of Jesus’ life. Weaker answers usually showed some understanding of Bentham, but showed a limited knowledge of Christian ethics. They sometimes included Aristotle’s Virtue Ethics in the mistaken belief that it

represents a Christian approach to ethics, and Mill's Rule Utilitarianism. These were rarely creditable.

AO2 element: The best answers used a sound understanding of Act Utilitarianism as the basis for comparison with a range of Christian ethical approaches, with excellent critical analysis. They included as evidence good examples of ways that different approaches to ethics lead to different decisions using appropriate examples. Most of the weaker answers took a more superficial view that Bentham's ethics is similar to Situation Ethics and differs from Natural Moral Law, but failed to give examples. There was sometimes misunderstanding of the details of ethical theories, which confused the arguments made. As with other AO2 elements, weaker answers sometimes attempted to insert a formulaic attempt at critical analysis with little or no supporting content.

06.1 '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]

This was the least popular of the all dialogues options, chosen by fewer than a quarter of students. There were some excellent answers which fully deserved 25 marks. Most students were able to demonstrate some knowledge and understanding and discuss two views. Some students chose to put the AO1 content first and then construct an argument, others integrated AO1 and AO2 content. Both approaches were equally successful for accessing the full range of marks.

AO1 element: The best answers showed a clear and thorough understanding of Kant's ethics, and were able to show that it never allows lying. They then compared this with the teleological approach of Situation Ethics and Natural Moral Law. Many showed a good understanding of primary and secondary precepts and proportionalism, and the reasoning that might allow lying in exceptional circumstances. Many also referred to the Ten Commandments and the teachings of Jesus. Weaker answers were often rather confused by Kant's ethics and showed limited knowledge and understanding of Christian ethics. A few failed to discuss lying at all, and this meant that they were unable to access the higher levels.

AO2 element: The strongest answers showed well developed critical analysis and perceptive reasoning when comparing Kant's ethics with Christian approaches. Well exemplified, relevant arguments led to appropriate evaluation, showing a nuanced understanding of the issues. Weaker answers sometimes compared a superficial or confused understanding of Kant with a narrow understanding of Christian ethics, leading to a limited evaluation. Some answers assumed Kant was the originator of Utilitarianism, and were therefore unable to address the issue in the question with any success. As with other AO2 elements, weaker answers sometimes attempted to insert a formulaic attempt at critical analysis with little or no supporting content.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results Statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.