



AS

Religious Studies

7061/1 Philosophy of Religion and Ethics

Mark scheme

7061

June 2017

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

Copyright © 2017 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.

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

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| Level 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and understanding is accurate and relevant and is consistently applied to the question |
| 13-15 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and understanding is mostly accurate and relevant and is mostly applied to the question |
| 10-12 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and understanding is generally accurate and relevant and is generally applied to the question |
| 7-9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and understanding is limited and there is limited application to the question |
| 4-6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited use of appropriate evidence and examples which may include textual /scriptural references where appropriate • Some clarity and coherence and limited use of specialist language and terminology |
| Level 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge and understanding is basic |
| 1-3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isolated elements of accurate and relevant information, and basic use of appropriate subject vocabulary. |
| 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No accurate or relevant material to credit |

LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Levels of response: 15 marks AS-Level – AO2

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| Level 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 |
| 13-15 | |
| Level 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasoned and evidenced chains of reasoning, with some critical analysis, supporting different points of view • Evaluation based on some of the reasoning • Specialist language and terminology is used appropriately • The answer is largely clear and coherent |
| 10-12 | |
| Level 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 |
| 7-9 | |
| Level 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A point of view relevant to the question with supporting evidence and chains of reasoning • Some clarity and coherence and limited use of specialist language and terminology |
| 4-6 | |
| Level 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A basic response to the question with reasons given in support • Isolated elements of accurate and relevant information, and basic use of appropriate subject vocabulary. |
| 1-3 | |
| 0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No accurate or relevant material to credit |

Section A: Philosophy of Religion**Question 01**

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

Explain the approach to proving the existence of God taken by Anselm's ontological argument.

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.

Anselm's approach is an a priori argument, it is based on thought alone, not on observation of the world around us. It argues that the statement 'God exists' is analytically true. Its starting point is the definition of God accepted by 'the fool' who denies that God exists. Anselm defines God as 'that than which none greater can be conceived'.

The argument draws out the implications of that definition to show that it is a contradiction to accept this definition of God and think that God does not exist. It argues that since it is greater to exist in reality than in the mind alone, God must exist in reality. Here, Anselm is using a reductio ad absurdum argument – showing that it would be absurd to say that God was only imaginary because saying that God was only imaginary would be saying that the greatest conceivable being was not the greatest.

Anselm then argues that the greatest conceivable being must exist so truly that he cannot even be thought of as not existing – he must have necessary existence. Again this is because to think of God as having a lower quality of existence would involve a contradiction, God, the greatest conceivable being, would not be the greatest because it would be possible to think of something greater than God. Some may also comment on the idea that Anselm's argument is faith seeking understanding.

[15 marks]

AO1

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

‘The design argument proves the existence of God.’

Assess this view.

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.

Answers may, but need not, refer only to Paley’s version of the design argument.

A range of arguments may be presented, analysed and evaluated including the following:

A proof is a deductive argument in which the conclusion is shown to be entailed by the premises, but the design argument is an inductive argument which can only establish that the conclusion is reasonable, not that it is true. Analogical arguments may be used to support this point. However inductive arguments may be accepted as providing adequate reason to believe, and some refer to them as ‘personal proofs’.

There is a natural explanation for all the apparent signs of design. This may also be expressed as the argument that the analogy between the watch and the world is poor – the universe is more like a vegetable. However, the match between the conditions required by humanity and the nature of the universe seems intuitively purposeful to many people – they do not regard the natural explanation as adequate.

The argument may give an adequate reason to believe that the universe was designed but that is not the same as proving that God was the designer. Examples from David Hume’s criticism of the argument may be used, such as: there may be more than one designer, the designer(s) may have had many practice attempts, the design may be far from perfect. However, there is no need to assume the existence of any more than one designer and there may be a justifiable reason why God created a world exactly as we find it.

[15 marks]

AO2

Question 02

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

Explain the free will defence.

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.

This can be approached in a variety of ways, the defence exists in various forms. There may, but need not, be reference to natural evil because not all versions of the argument reference it. Answers may refer to some of the following:

The free will defence argues that God is justified in allowing evil in order to preserve genuine free will, and that free will is worthwhile because it allows humanity to develop into moral and spiritual beings capable of a relationship with God.

Our experience of pain, or observation of suffering, enables us to develop second order goods such as courage and generosity. These are valuable because we freely chose to develop them, but that freedom also allows us to develop second order evils such as greed and delight in the pain of others. The opportunity to develop good qualities entails the possibility of developing evil qualities.

Moral evil is the result of the misuse of free will – it is not the work of God; natural evil may be seen as the punishment for such actions, or a necessity to make our free moral choices significant and meaningful: such choices, and the resulting moral and spiritual development, are only necessary and worthwhile in world where pain can be experienced and actions have consequences.

[15 marks]

AO1

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

‘Natural evil is a greater challenge to faith in God than moral evil.’

Assess this view.

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.

A range of arguments may be presented, analysed and evaluated including the following:

Natural evil far exceeds the scale of moral evil and much of it seems pointless. Answers may refer to the example of the fawn caught in the forest fire used by Rowe. However, the scale of such atrocities as the Holocaust and the possibility of nuclear warfare suggests that moral evil can exist on a similar scale, and be equally pointless. Dostoevsky’s example of the child abused by her parents may be referenced here.

It appears that the existence of moral evil can be justified: Moral evil can be attributed to the agent (the human being) rather than to God, and, for those who accept the value of free will and the opportunity it brings, evil or suffering may be seen as a worthwhile price to pay. However, some argue that God could and should have created us as beings who always freely chose to do right and that God’s failure to do so means that God cannot be all loving, powerful and knowing. If successful this means that the challenge of moral evil is too great to be overcome. However, the idea of free beings made so that they can only ‘choose’ to do right may be considered logically incoherent.

Some suggested explanations for, and justification of the existence of natural evil, are weak: these include the suggestion that natural evil was introduced as a punishment for the sin of Adam and Eve, since many find it impossible to believe the idea that earth was a paradise before humanity existed. However, the explanation that we need a world with natural laws in which consequences are built in to all of our actions may satisfy some, as may Hick’s counterfactual hypothesis.

[15 marks]

AO2

Section B: Ethics**Question 03**

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

Explain the approach to moral decision making taken by situation ethics. Your answer must be illustrated with reference to theft.

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.

This may be approached in a variety of ways.

Agape love is the only absolute in situation ethics and this law of love has to be applied to every individual situation in which a moral decision is required. For that reason, theft is neither right nor wrong, it will be right in a particular situation if it maximises love, and wrong if it does not. These are the principles of relativism and pragmatism.

Situation ethics prioritises people not laws (Personalism). In any situation the needs of those involved have to be assessed as well as the likely outcome of the decision. This may also be expressed in terms of the four factors Fletcher requires people to consider when making a decision: the 'end', 'means', motive and consequence, all should be loving. In judging consequences, Fletcher suggests the application of the agapeic calculus which is parallel to the hedonic calculus.

Possible example: If the purpose (end) of the theft was to feed a starving family; the 'means', the most loving option; the motive, love for the family; the consequence that the family survived and the person stolen from did not miss what was stolen, then the act may be justified.

In contrast, if the purpose was to possess something that did not belong to you, such as picture; the means, an armed attack on those guarding it; the motive selfish (the pleasure of possession); the likely consequence injury or death and denying others the pleasure of seeing the picture, then in that situation theft is wrong.

Maximum Level 3 for answers that do not deal with both aspects of the question: situation ethics and theft.

[15 marks]**AO1**

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

‘Situation ethics cannot approve of the use of non-human animals for food.’

Assess this view.

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.

A range of arguments may be presented, analysed and evaluated including the following:

As a relativistic ethic, situation ethics might argue that it depends on the situation since no actions are intrinsically right or wrong. Even cannibalism could be justified as loving in certain circumstances, so meat eating is not intrinsically wrong.

There are differing views about whether animals are deserving of agape, but the principle of personalism implies that the needs of people would override any suffering of animals in this situation. However, in a situation in which the human need for food could be met by vegetarianism, the suffering of animals used for food would need justifying. It is not intuitively loving to kill an animal if it is not necessary to do so.

The provision of animals for food presently often involves mass production of animals (factory farming); the consequences of this for human welfare may be considered harmful and so unloving. For example it leads to increased populations which in turn creates a greater demand for meat – this is an unsustainable vicious cycle; also pollution increases with meat production. However, with many people already starving, if meat is not produced there will be many deaths in the short term and therefore improvements in the mass-production of animals and use of resulting waste products could be more loving options.

[15 marks]

AO2

Question 04

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

Explain how virtue ethics may be applied to the issue of assisted suicide.

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 this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels of response.

Note that the answer may, but need not, refer only to Aristotle's understanding of Virtue Ethics.

Virtue ethics requires decision makers to consider the virtues that would be displayed by the sufferer and others involved. For example courage may be shown, by both sufferer and others, in coping with the pain or loss of dignity, but compassion and love may be shown by ending the suffering. There are competing virtues here so the theory may be applied in different ways.

Murder is regarded by Aristotle as an unjustifiable action, contrary to justice. If assisted suicide is actually murder then it cannot be justified. The same action (eg smothering someone) may be murder, so in order for assisted suicide to be justified the decision-makers must examine their motives because killing in self-defence is not intrinsically wrong, nor is ending suffering, the intention of the agent must be virtuous.

The individual being killed may already be unable to experience human flourishing (eudaimonia), this may influence decision-makers because they may see no purpose or value in extending physical life once that life cannot fulfil its purpose.

Maximum Level 2 for an answer that explains only the ethical theory.

[15 marks]

AO1

0 4 . 2

‘From the perspective of natural moral law, abortion is always wrong.’

Assess this view.

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.

The answer may, but need not, refer only to Aquinas’ presentation of natural moral law, and may, but need not, refer to proportionalism.

A range of arguments may be presented, analysed and evaluated including the following:

Aquinas’ primary precept of self-preservation / protection of life seems to rule out abortion as does the precept of worshipping God, because abortion appears to run contrary to the command of God recorded in scripture. However, if the mother’s life is threatened by the foetus, then the primary precept can be used in her favour.

Aquinas described the killing of an ‘animated foetus’ as homicide (murder). He believed that a human person with a soul is present in the womb after 60-80 days. Some assume that this means that before 60 days the pregnancy can be terminated without sin – but Aquinas does not say that.

The principle of double effect accepts morally good actions that will have the unintended consequence of the death of the foetus. For example a life-saving operation to remove the womb or, in the case of ectopic pregnancy, the fallopian tube. This may not be seen as abortion, however, because the intention was not to end the life of the foetus.

[15 marks]

AO2