



Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2015

Religious Studies
Assessment Unit A2 6
assessing
Ethics and Society

[AR261]

FRIDAY 22 MAY, AFTERNOON

MARK
SCHEME

Levels of Response

The specification requires that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the learning outcomes and skills set out in the specification.

- Select and demonstrate clearly relevant knowledge and understanding through the use of evidence, examples and correct language and terminology appropriate to the course of study.

In addition, for synoptic assessment, A Level candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the connections between different elements of their course of study.

- Critically evaluate and justify a point of view through the use of evidence and reasoned argument.

In addition, for synoptic assessment, A Level candidates should relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to aspects of human experience.

Each of the two assessment objectives has been categorised into five levels of performance relating to the respective abilities of the candidates. Having identified, for each assessment objective listed opposite, the band in which the candidate has performed, the examiner should then decide on the appropriate mark within the range for the band.

A2 BANDS

AO1 (30 marks)

| | |
|---|--------------|
| <p>Band 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A full and highly informed response to the task.• Demonstrates comprehensive understanding and accurate knowledge.• A very high degree of relevant evidence and examples.• A very sophisticated style of writing set within a clear and coherent structure.• An extensive range of technical language and terminology.• An almost totally faultless use of spelling, punctuation and grammar. | 25–30 |
| <p>Band 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A reasonable and well informed response to the task.• Demonstrates a high degree of understanding and almost totally accurate knowledge.• A very good range of relevant evidence and examples.• A mature style of writing set within a mainly clear and coherent structure.• A wide range of technical language and terminology.• A mainly accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar. | 19–24 |
| <p>Band 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A good response to the task.• Demonstrates a reasonable degree of understanding and mainly accurate knowledge.• A good range of relevant evidence and examples.• A reasonably mature style of writing with some coherent structure evident.• A good range of technical language and terminology.• Reasonably accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar. | 13–18 |
| <p>Band 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A limited response to the task.• Demonstrates some knowledge and understanding.• A basic range of evidence and/or examples.• Style of writing is just appropriate.• Structure is disorganised in places.• Limited range of technical language and terminology.• Limited command of spelling, punctuation and grammar. | 7–12 |
| <p>Band 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A very basic response to the task.• Demonstrates minimal knowledge and understanding.• Little, if any, use of evidence and/or examples.• Inappropriate style of writing within a poor structure.• A very basic range of technical language and terminology.• Very poor use of spelling, punctuation and grammar. | 0–6 |

AO2 (20 marks)

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Band 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A comprehensive and coherent response demonstrating an excellent attempt at critical analysis, supported by a high awareness of scholarly views.• Very good personal insight and independent thought expressed through a highly developed argument which is set, where necessary, in the context of wider aspects of human experience.• An extensive range of technical language and terminology.• An almost totally faultless use of spelling, punctuation and grammar. | 17–20 |
| Band 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A very good response demonstrating a very good attempt at critical analysis, supported by a good awareness of scholarly views.• Good personal insight and independent thought expressed through a developed argument which is set, where necessary, in the context of wider aspects of human experience.• A wide range of technical language and terminology.• A mainly accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar. | 13–16 |
| Band 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A reasonable response demonstrating a good attempt at critical analysis, supported by an awareness of the views of some scholars.• Some personal insight and independent thought expressed through reasonable argument which is set, where necessary, in the context of wider aspects of human experience.• A good range of technical language and terminology.• Reasonably accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar. | 9–12 |
| Band 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A limited response demonstrating a modest attempt at critical analysis, with a limited awareness of scholarly views.• Limited personal insight and independent thought expressed through some argument.• A good range of technical language and terminology.• Reasonably accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar. | 5–8 |
| Band 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A very basic response demonstrating little attempt at critical analysis, with minimal awareness of scholarly views.• Poor personal insight and/or independent thought.• Shallow argument.• Limited range of technical language and terminology.• Limited command of spelling, punctuation and grammar. | 0–4 |

Section A

AVAILABLE
MARKS

1 (a) A consideration of the challenges presented by ethical relativism for the Christian with reference to moral examples may include, e.g.

- a definition of ethical relativism, e.g. morality is contextual in character
- some characteristics/features, e.g. no fixed moral truth, the subjectivist nature of morality, the importance of personal autonomy, the promotion of tolerance, allowing for evolutionary change
- challenges presented by ethical relativism for the Christian, e.g. the rejection of moral absolutes, the dilemma of different moral judgements being equally valid, the promotion of an individualistic ethic, compromising justice, the possibility of the end justifying the means, the problem of moral chaos, antinomianism
- reference to moral examples such as abortion, euthanasia, contraception, adultery, homosexuality
- possible reference to ethical theories seen as relativistic in character, e.g. Situation Ethics, Virtue Ethics, Emotivism
- possible reference to seminal figures, e.g. Nietzsche, David Hume
- the influence of Post Modernism

[30]

(b) An assessment of the view may include, e.g.

- how the contemporary age is increasingly secular in character, is seen as godless with religious authority on the periphery
- the appeal of secular theories of morality (e.g. Utilitarianism) as providing moral guidance so as to avoid moral breakdown if traditional approaches are abandoned
- how in the western liberal world Utilitarianism appears to be the ethic of choice and so influencing developments in medical and sexual ethics
- the attractiveness of other approaches, e.g. Virtue Ethics, Narrative Ethics
- the merits of these approaches, e.g. seeing morality as contextual in character, accommodating personal preference, the utility principle, the rediscovery of virtue in ethics
- problems with secular theories, e.g. rejection of moral certainty, the development of herd morality, compromising justice, the end justifying the means, the dilution of moral standards
- a defence of religious approaches, e.g. the need for moral standards, the value of rules/principles, the continued relevance of Biblical ethics, the strengths of deontological approaches such as Natural Law, the role played by Church teaching
- how theories such as Utilitarianism and Virtue Ethics can work for both secular and religious people

[20]

50

2 (a) A consideration of the secular contribution to the debate on Human Rights may include, e.g.

- the debate surrounding the nature of Human Rights, e.g. the concept of natural rights
- the variety of viewpoint within the secular tradition
- how the secular tradition values dignity, equality and responsibility
- how all human life should be respected and protected
- possible reference to Hobbes and Locke
- Bentham's contribution – how natural rights are “nonsense on stilts”, how they have no foundation, his argument that while humankind may want the conditions that rights supposedly prescribe, e.g. protection from harm, it is “nonsense” to move to the claim there are such rights
- contemporary utilitarian thinking that human rights could be supported if they serve to promote or lead to the best consequences
- Peter Singer's contribution – how rights are not automatic, may have to qualify for them
- the views of Virtue Ethicists who while wishing to promote human flourishing may be concerned about the individualism of rights and their lack of context awareness
- intrinsic views of rights (e.g. Thomas Nagel) as against instrumentalist views of rights (e.g. Allen Buchanan)
- the Feminist contribution (also varied) – ranging from the assertion of women's rights to concern that the rights model is too concerned with individual rights at the expense of context and relationships
- the influence of the Enlightenment
- natural rights v positive rights
- theories of rights, e.g. relativist
- reference to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights
- rights and responsibilities [30]

(b) An evaluation of the view may include, e.g.

- examples where it can be demonstrated that the Christian record on Human Rights has not been good such as the alliance between the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa and the system of Apartheid
- Roman Catholic and Protestant attitudes to slavery during the 18th and 19th centuries – possible justification, the tradition of anti-semitism
- Christianity and women's rights, how some Christians see women as subordinate to men, issues regarding ordained ministry
- Christianity and homosexuality, the treatment of homosexuals by African Christians in countries such as Uganda and Nigeria
- Roman Catholicism and the child abuse scandals, the treatment of the defenceless
- how Christians responded to these issues, e.g. in 1986 the Dutch Reformed Church acknowledged the sin of Apartheid, the repudiation of slavery by the Roman Catholic Church at the Second Vatican Council, the welcoming of female Bishops within the Anglican Communion
- how Christianity was seminal in the development of Human Rights
- the roots of Human Rights in God and creation, the influence of the Decalogue, the influence of Natural Law, of Thomas Paine
- how, historically, the concept of Human Rights grew out of cultures that were profoundly Christian
- the Christian rejection of rationalist and positive interpretations given to Human Rights
- the widespread support amongst Christians for the UNDHR
- the extent to which the human rights of Christians have been infringed [20]

3 (a) An examination of religious teaching on the relationship between animals and humankind with particular reference to the Biblical creation accounts may include, e.g.

- specific reference to the Genesis creation narratives and the relevant issues that arise – dominion v stewardship
- humankind as the pinnacle of God’s creation, as being “Imago Dei”, having God’s spirit
- the views of various philosophers who have influenced Christian teaching, e.g. Aristotle, Augustine, Aquinas, Descartes
- how these views aligned with the absolute dismissal argument – animals do not have any moral significance
- lessons from the ministry of Jesus, e.g. the story of the Gadarene (Gerasene) Swine
- reference to other Old Testament narratives, e.g. the Flood Story
- the legacy of St. Francis of Assisi and his principle of “universal benevolence”
- the views of Andrew Linzey, Christian theologian, who sees animals as “fellow creatures” deserving of protection and rights
- the Papal Encyclical “Evangelium Vitae” (1995) and its recognition of animals having both intrinsic value and a place in Gods kingdom
- the Anglican Lambeth Conference (1998) – creation is a web of inter-dependent relationships ... human beings as co-partners with the rest of creation
- Archbishop Desmond Tutu (2013) – dominion over animals is not supposed to be despotism ... all cruelty to humankind and animals is an affront to civilised living and a sin before God
- developments in animal spirituality, e.g. Sandra Helton
- how the Christian record on animal welfare issues has not necessarily been a good one
- possible reference to other religious traditions and their teaching on animals, e.g. Buddhists

[30]

(b) An assessment of the claim may include, e.g.

- the absolute dismissal argument – animals have no ethical significance and are not part of the moral circle
- the “difference” argument – there is something qualitatively different about human beings
- how this thinking has been influenced and shaped historically, e.g. the views of Greek philosophy; Christian writers such as Augustine, Kant
- ethics as non-existent within the animal kingdom
- animals as having only instrumental value
- the argument that animals should be included in the same moral sphere as humans, the influence of Darwinian thinking
- the equal rights argument, animals as having intrinsic value
- how some animals, e.g. higher order animals such as apes could display characteristics of personhood; public campaigns for according rights to apes
- the views of Peter Singer who argues forcefully for “human animals” and “non-human animals” being treated with equality, how in certain contexts a life of a particular animal like an orangutan could be more valuable than that of a comatose human being, the accusation of specieism

- the view of Tom Regan who campaigns for the “rights” of animals (the same rights as humans), how animal experimentation is not morally acceptable
- the issue of suffering particularly gratuitous suffering
- the view that while the rights of animals may be acknowledged to a certain point, human need takes priority on all occasions
- the views of Roger Scruton, e.g. how animals have no potential for membership of the moral community, how human beings are morally justified in discriminating as they do
- how the UNDHR assumes a clear distinction between humans and non-humans

[20]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

50

4 (a) A discussion of the development of Just War theory with reference to **two** significant contributors may include, e.g.

- the context in which Just War theory emerged with the Roman Empire making Christianity the official religion of the State and the subsequent difficulty of reconciling Christian moral teaching on violence with defence of the State
- reference to Ambrose of Milan (4th century): first to formulate a Christian ethic of war, permitted defensive war, importance of fairness and mercy, influenced Augustine
- reference to Augustine (5th century): drew on the Old Testament notion of war as an instrument of God’s righteousness, the conditions of legitimate authority and just cause, bringing Christian biblical thinking into line with Greek and Roman thought
- reference to Aquinas (13th century): acceptance of Augustine’s two key conditions, the adding of a third – right intention (‘to promote the good and to avoid evil’), the need for proportion in the actions taken, the introduction of the notion of ‘double effect’, emergence of the distinction between jus ad bellum and jus in bello
- reference to Francisco de Vitoria and Francisco Suarez (16th century): three further conditions – last resort, reasonable chance of success, proportionality
- reference to Hugo Grotius (17th century): offered a detailed and systematic elaboration of the just causes of war, war is not only compatible with but sometimes compelled by all three major kinds of law (law of nature, international law, divine law), the right to punish as a just cause, the settling of limits, e.g. one doesn’t have the right to defend oneself against an assailant who is “useful to many” (applies to both individuals and states)
- reference to the Roman Catholic Bishops in America (1983): the clear formulation of Just War theory, the clear distinction between jus ad bellum and jus in bello, non-combatant immunity
- Just War theory as rooted in Natural Moral Law
- Just War theory as providing a rational justification for declaring war and enforcing constraints on what can be done in war, of ensuring justice and the protection of non-combatants
- recent defenders of the theory, e.g. Paul Ramsey, Oliver O’Donovan [30]

(b) An assessment of the view may include, e.g.

- the Realist view of war: how war is brutal and ugly, the need for personal survival and that of the state, how the observance of normal moral standards in war could jeopardise winning the war, the distinction between private morality and public morality
- how assassination, obliteration bombing, rape and deceit can be seen as acceptable tools of war
- the Militarists and the use of war as an expression of personal morality
- problems pertaining to proportionality and discrimination, the difficulty in distinguishing between combatant and non-combatant immunity
- the need for moral conventions to be observed in war, to curb excesses and to protect the innocent
- the indiscriminate nature of modern weaponry, e.g. nuclear warfare, biological and chemical warfare, the problem of collateral damage
- problems presented by particular actions, e.g. the bombing of Hamburg, Dresden, Hiroshima and Nagasaki; the use of carpet bombing and napalm in the Vietnam War
- possible utilitarian justification behind these actions
- criticisms of these actions, e.g. Bishop George Bell (protested against the bombing of German cities as it breached the principle of discrimination); Elizabeth Anscombe (critical of the atomic bombing of the Japanese cities – tantamount to war crimes)
- how Just War theory can enforce constraints on what can be done in war
- how the development of modern weaponry could assist the delivery of JWT, e.g. laser guided weaponry and ‘smart’ bombs provide greater capacity for target discrimination
- the Pacifist response

[20]

Section A

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

50

100

GCE Religious Studies

A2 Mark Scheme (A2 1 – A2 8)

Synoptic Assessment

Levels of Response

The specification requires that candidates demonstrate the following assessment objectives in the context of the learning outcomes and skills set out in the specification.

- Select and demonstrate clearly relevant knowledge and understanding through the use of evidence, examples, and correct language and terminology appropriate to the course of study. In addition, for synoptic assessment, A Level candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the connections between different elements of their course of study.
- Critically evaluate and justify a point of view through the use of evidence and reasoned argument. In addition, for synoptic assessment, A Level candidates should relate elements of their course of study to their broader context and to aspects of human experience.

Each of the two assessment objectives has been categorised into five levels of performance relating to the respective abilities of the candidates.

Having identified, for each assessment objective listed opposite, the band in which the candidate has performed, the examiner should then decide on the appropriate mark within the range for the band.

It is important that in the marking of the synoptic assessment unit, assistant examiners take account of the candidate's abilities in drawing together strands of knowledge and understanding from at least two different content areas.

Using the chosen theme, candidates will be expected to explore connections between elements of the selected areas of study. They should make appropriate use of the content as set out in the subject content for each module.

The five strands of knowledge and understanding act as a common and unifying structure for the specification. These are:

- the key concepts within the chosen areas of study, (e.g. religious beliefs, teachings, doctrines, principles, ideas and theories) and how these are expressed in texts, writings and/or practices
- the contribution of significant people, tradition or movements to the areas studied
- religious language and terminology
- major issues and questions arising from the chosen areas of study
- the relationship between the chosen areas of study and other specified aspects of human experience.

In particular candidates should demonstrate the ability to relate such connections to other aspects of human experience.

A2 BANDS

AO1 (30 marks)

| | |
|--|--------------|
| <p>Band 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A full and comprehensive understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study in relation to the theme.• Well integrated response.• Clear and critical analysis.• Highly accurate use of evidence and examples.• Sophisticated style of writing. Very well structured and coherent throughout. | 25–30 |
| <p>Band 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A high degree of understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study in relation to the theme.• A well integrated response.• Some very good critical analysis.• Mainly accurate use of evidence and examples.• Mature style of writing.• Well structured and coherent throughout. | 19–24 |
| <p>Band 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A good understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study in relation to the theme.• For the most part an integrated response.• Reasonable degree of critical analysis.• A good degree of accurate evidence and examples.• Reasonably mature style of writing.• Some evidence of good structure and coherence. | 13–18 |
| <p>Band 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A limited understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study in relation to the theme.• Mere juxtaposition of the two areas of study, perhaps emphasising one content area at the expense of another.• A limited attempt at critical analysis.• Insufficient use of accurate evidence and examples.• Immature style of writing.• Lacking in structure and coherence. | 7–12 |
| <p>Band 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A basic understanding of the connections between the selected areas of study in relation to the theme.• Demonstrating only partially accurate knowledge of the different content areas studied.• Little attempt, if any, at critical analysis.• Inappropriate style of writing with a very basic structure. | 0–6 |

AO2 (20 marks)

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Band 5 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A comprehensive analysis of the statement in relation to connections made between the areas of study and other aspects of human experience.• Very effective comparison and evaluation of scholarly viewpoints.• Mature personal insight and independent thought.• A very well sustained and critical argument, expressed accurately and fluently with considerable sophistication using a wide range of terminology. | 17–20 |
| Band 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A good analysis of the statement in relation to connections made between the areas of study and other aspects of human experience.• Very good comparison and evaluation of scholarly viewpoints.• Good personal insight and independent thought.• A well sustained and critical argument, expressed accurately, fluently and using a range of terminology. | 13–16 |
| Band 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A reasonable analysis of the statement in relation to connections made between the areas of study and other aspects of human experience.• Very good comparison and evaluation of scholarly viewpoints.• Some evidence of personal insight and independent thought.• A line of argument, expressed accurately and using some relevant terminology. | 9–12 |
| Band 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A limited analysis of the statement in relation to connections made between the areas of study and other aspects of human experience.• Some comparison and evaluation of scholarly viewpoints.• Limited personal insight and independent thought.• Little evidence of critical argument.• Inaccuracies evident. | 5–8 |
| Band 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A basic analysis of the statement in relation to connections made between the areas of study and other aspects of human experience.• Little, if any, comparison and evaluation of scholarly viewpoints.• Minimal personal insight and independent thought.• A basic attempt to follow a line of argument.• Imprecisely expressed. | 0–4 |

Section B

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

5 (a) A consideration of the major issues raised in the debate concerning Religion and State may include, e.g.

- specific reference to major issues involving Religion and State
- should Religion and State be inextricably intertwined (e.g. a theocracy)?
- should Religion and State be separate in principle yet together make one common wealth?
- should Religion and State be kept apart? e.g. Religion concerns itself with the spiritual realm, the State with matters of administration and justice
- issues pertaining to authority, e.g. who is the custodian of morality?
- how is the relationship between religious law and state law to be understood?
- possible areas where Religion and State could come into conflict, e.g. war, medical ethics, sexual ethics, human rights, environmental ethics, poverty, capital punishment, social justice, persecution of religious adherents, treatment of women and minority groups
- reference to at least two areas of study [30]

(b) An evaluation of the view in relation to other aspects of human experience may include, e.g.

- the State as the moral custodian in an increasingly secular age
- how many people interpret State law as having a moral character
- the State as democratically elected and charged with the duty of looking after the common good
- issues where Religion and State have come into conflict, e.g. same-sex marriage, state managed fertility systems, unfair taxes, welfare reforms, institutionalized injustice, the status of religious law (e.g. Canon Law, Sharia Law), the status of Christianity within Britain, the wearing of religious symbols, the protection of the defenceless
- where religious authority has failed to protect its adherents and the State has to be relied on for justice
- where the State has failed to protect its citizens, e.g. Nazi Germany, the Pol Pot regime, Zimbabwe
- the State as not being absolute, so can be challenged
- figures who have challenged the authority of the State, e.g. Oscar Romero, Martin Luther King, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, Cardinal Vincent Nichols
- the challenges presented by aggressive secularism and religious fundamentalism
- reference to historical and/or contemporary examples [20]

Section B

50

50

Total

150

