



---

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

Paper 1 Philosophy of Religion and Ethics

---

**Mark scheme**

June 2020

---

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 © 2020 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 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

- Level 5**  
**13–15**
- Knowledge and understanding is accurate and relevant and is consistently applied to the question.
  - Very good use of detailed and relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate.
  - The answer is clear and coherent and there is effective use of specialist language and terminology.
- Level 4**  
**10–12**
- Knowledge and understanding is mostly accurate and relevant and is mostly applied to the question.
  - Good use of relevant evidence which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate.
  - The answer is mostly clear and coherent and specialist language and terminology is used appropriately.
- Level 3**  
**7–9**
- Knowledge and understanding is generally accurate and relevant and is generally applied to the question.
  - Some use of appropriate evidence and/or examples which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate.
  - The answer is generally clear and coherent with use of specialist language and terminology.
- Level 2**  
**4–6**
- Knowledge and understanding is limited and there is limited application to the question.
  - Limited use of appropriate evidence and/or examples which may include textual/scriptural references where appropriate.
  - Limited clarity and coherence and limited use of specialist language and terminology.
- Level 1**  
**1–3**
- Knowledge and understanding is basic.
  - Isolated elements of accurate and relevant information.
  - Basic use of appropriate subject vocabulary.
- 0**
- No accurate or relevant material to credit.

**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 different approaches of the design and ontological arguments to proving that God exists.**

**[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 the 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: Design: Presentation: Paley’s analogical argument; Ontological: Presentation: Anselm’s a priori argument.

The design argument is a posteriori: based upon sense experience as evidence. Paley’s argument is based on observations of complexity and regularity, from which he infers that things have been purposefully designed and that the designer must be God. The ontological argument on the other hand is a priori: an argument prior to and independent of sense experience. The ontological argument is based on analysis of the concept of God as ‘that than which nothing greater can be conceived’ and concludes that God therefore exists necessarily.

The design argument uses inductive reasoning: it takes details about the natural world and leads to the possibility of a designer. The conclusion that evidence of design implies a designer is not necessarily true as there could be other explanations. The ontological argument uses deductive reasoning: Anselm argues that since God is that than which none greater can be conceived, and it is greater to exist in reality than in the mind alone, God must exist. Also that the greatest being is that which cannot even be thought of as not existing, so God must necessarily exist.

The design argument is an analogical argument as it uses the analogy of the discovery of a watch and its order, regularity and purpose as being similar to the natural world. As the finder of a watch would assume a designer so observers of nature should assume a designer as a result of similar observations of order, regularity and purpose. The ontological argument is an analytical argument as it attempts to use logic to assert that God’s existence must be true based on the definition of what God is, so ‘God exists’ is true by definition.

Maximum Level 3 if answer does not cover both aspects.

**[15 marks] AO1.4**

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

**‘The cosmological argument is a strong argument for the existence of God.’**

**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 the 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: Cosmological: Presentation: Aquinas’ Way 3. The argument from contingency and necessity; Criticisms: Hume and Russell; students should study the basis of each argument in observation or in thought, the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments, their status as ‘proofs’, their value for religious faith and the relationship between reason and faith.

The cosmological argument is a strong argument for the existence of God due to the approach the cosmological argument takes, being an inductive and a posteriori argument which is supported by evidence. Inductive reasoning based on sense experience is argued by empiricists to be amongst the strongest forms of reasoning to be relied upon to give reliable knowledge about the world. However, others such as Hume would argue that the conclusion that God is the Uncaused Cause is not supported by evidence and could be otherwise. Conclusions from inductive arguments are not necessarily true.

The cosmological argument is a strong argument for the existence of God due to the conclusion that there must have been a necessary being, in order for the contingent world we observe to come into existence. This logic is sound and appears valid. Russell however, would argue that the fact that all humans had a mother does not mean that there is one mother for humanity as a whole, so, the fact that all existing things had a cause does not mean that there is one cause for everything.

The cosmological argument is a strong argument for the existence of God as it builds upon the common idea that there must be an explanation for the universe, rather than just accepting the possibility for infinite regress which is not a satisfactory conclusion for most people. However, Russell would disagree and argued that the ‘universe is a brute fact’ in other words a fact that cannot be explained further as there is no valid empirical evidence to conclude otherwise.

**[15 marks] AO2**



**Question 2**

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

**Explain how the existence of evil challenges beliefs about God.****[15 marks]**

**Target: AO1.2:** Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including 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 the mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

The logical problem of evil argues that the existence of evil challenges beliefs about God as it causes a logical problem for the believer who asserts that God is omnipotent and benevolent. As Hume demonstrates in the inconsistent triad the existence of evil and those two beliefs cannot be held simultaneously so God is either not omnipotent or not benevolent. Both these claims would challenge belief in God as in both cases such a God would not be worthy of worship.

The evidential problem of evil argues that the existence of evil challenges beliefs about God as the existence of pointless evil is convincing evidence that no such God exists as why would God allow pointless evil. The evidential argument also asserts that the variety and profusion of evil is also evidence that it is more likely that there is not a God as why would God create a world so full of evil and suffering.

The existence of natural evil in the world can be said to challenge beliefs about God as natural evil refers to events such as disease, death and natural disasters which cause huge amounts of suffering and appear to be beyond human control. Natural evil also predates the existence of humanity and so cannot be the fault of humanity and can only be the fault of a creator.

**[15 marks] AO1.2**

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

**‘Hick’s soul making theodicy fails to solve 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 the 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 problem of evil and suffering: Hick’s soul making theodicy.

Hick’s soul making theodicy fails to solve the problem of evil as it fails to justify the very worst of evils, such as the Holocaust or Rwandan genocide. However, were any restrictions placed on the freedom of the individual it would threaten the epistemic distance by making God’s existence self-evident. It would also limit human responsibility, which, in turn, would limit soul making. Soul making is worthwhile that it justifies allowing evil to exist.

Hick’s soul making theodicy also fails to solve the problem of evil as it asserts universal salvation which some people would argue is unjust as it fails to deal with the extreme extent to which some commit evil such as Hitler’s acts. It also undermines the purpose of life if the judgement or outcome is already certain. However, others would argue that it is eternal damnation that is unjust and ultimate universal salvation is the only logical conclusion if beliefs about God’s benevolence are to remain intact.

Hicks’ soul making theodicy also fails to solve the problem of evil as it may account for human suffering but fails to explain animal suffering. Animals have no possibility of learning and developing second order goods so the suffering of animals would be unjustified. However, Hick uses the argument from epistemic distance to suggest that animal suffering is beyond our understanding and necessarily so. Humanity can develop compassion and a sense of responsibility for the environment through being aware of animal suffering.

**[15 marks] AO2**

**Question 3**

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

**Explain the approach taken to moral decision making by virtue ethics.****[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 the 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: virtue ethics with reference to Aristotle.

Virtue ethics is character-based as rather than looking solely at the outcomes or the intention or the intrinsic nature of objects and acts, it looks at the character of the moral decision maker. When making a moral decision an individual must do what a virtuous character would do. This means it is also relativist because it takes into account all aspects of a decision.

Virtue ethics is not based entirely on reason, rules or emotions but rather on the individual who has to practise virtues and virtuous acts in order to habituate virtue. This begins with education and applying the doctrine of the mean which is a method of judging the nature and extent of a virtue to use in any specific situation, for example behaving courageously rather than with bravado or cowardice. This is then perfected throughout life until one develops the necessary virtues to achieve eudaimonia.

Virtue ethics is also teleological as Aristotle asserts that everything has a purpose, and for all humans this is working towards the same goal of eudaimonia, flourishing or living well. So when making a moral decision, the virtues required for achieving eudaimonia are exactly those that are used to determine the right thing to do. For example, when deciding whether or not to steal, considering your purpose of 'living well' is the same as thinking what is the right thing to do.

**[15 marks] AO1.4**

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

**‘Virtue ethicists should never approve of capital punishment.’**

**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 the 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 virtue ethics to capital punishment.

Virtue ethics requires virtuous people to act in a way that is consistent with the virtues, but capital punishment seems to reflect hatred and revenge rather than any virtue. However, some would argue that virtue ethics could approve of capital punishment for use with the worst crimes. By murdering others for example, the criminal has demonstrated that they are not virtuous and prevent others from achieving eudaimonia. It is also the expression of the virtue of justice, ensuring that someone faces punishment for the worst crimes.

Some virtue ethicists would argue that everyone should have the opportunity for reform and rehabilitation. In this way, the contribution to the community is more beneficial as the criminal could develop virtues and flourish. However, other virtue ethicists may argue that a safe community is an essential part of achieving eudaimonia, and capital punishment is the best way to keep a community safe from criminals.

Virtue ethicists should never approve of capital punishment, as the possibility of innocent people being executed would be a major injustice and risk to achieving eudaimonia. However, some virtue ethicists may argue that in some serious crimes, for example, murder or genocide, capital punishment is the only way to warn others of the serious nature of such vicious behaviour, and maintain the value of virtue in the community.

**[15 marks] AO2**

**Question 4**

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

**Explain why natural moral law and situation ethics may reach different conclusions about the issue of theft.**

**[15 marks]**

**Target: AO1.3:** Knowledge and understanding of religion and belief including 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 the 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: natural moral law and the principle of double effect with reference to Aquinas; proportionalism; situation ethics with reference to Fletcher.

Natural moral law comes to different conclusions to situation ethics as it is primarily deontological and focuses on working out duty based on the secondary and primary precepts and following Church teaching and rules. In the case of theft, the duty not to steal fulfils the precept to live in an ordered society so would be wrong. Whereas situation ethics would focus on whether the most loving outcome would be achieved in each case of theft as it is teleological and consequentialist. So in the case of a theft done for the needs of another theft may be right. The decision maker is responsible for making that judgement.

Natural moral law comes to different conclusions to situation ethics as the right thing to do is the action which follows the rule in place. So for example in the case of whether to steal, a decision maker's first concern should be what is God's law. In situation ethics the right thing to do is the action which is motivated by agape love so the individuals affected by the theft are more important to the outcome than any rules that may be in place.

Natural moral law would come to different conclusions about theft to situation ethics because it also acknowledges the role of scripture. Theft is forbidden in the Ten Commandments so should be taken into account when considering any theft. Situation ethics also focuses on scripture but would focus on the agapeic principle as seen in the New Testament. That means that no act is entirely ruled out in the name of agape.

**[15 marks] AO1.3**

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

**‘Natural moral law makes moral decision making easy.’**

**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 the 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: natural moral law and the principle of double effect with reference to Aquinas; proportionalism; the strengths and weaknesses of this way of making moral decisions.

Natural moral law does make moral decision making easy since it has clear rules to guide all decision making such as living in an ordered society or to defend the innocent. These can easily be applied to any situation to determine the right action. However, others would argue that in the case of some rules there is contradiction. Forbidding contraception upholds the principle of preservation of life yet could cause an increase of HIV infection in mothers and babies.

Natural moral law does make moral decision making easy as it recommends things that most societies would agree on, such as defending innocent life or educating the young. However, this is difficult to apply in today’s society because modern understandings of human nature are generally more diverse. As a result, attempting to apply narrower beliefs about what is natural to human beings risks undermining an ordered society, causing offence and division.

Natural moral law explains real and apparent goods, and outlines vices and virtues. This makes moral decision making easy as there are plenty of guidelines and approaches to help. However, others would argue that it is less easy because there are many ways to determine the right action such as deriving secondary precepts from primary precepts. It does not focus on one set of clear rules.

**[15 marks] AO2**