



General Certificate of Education

Religious Studies (5061/6061)

**RS04 *An introduction to
Religion and Ethics***

Mark Scheme

2007 examination - June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Examination Levels of Response

Religious Studies (Advanced Subsidiary) AS Level Descriptors

[Marks for 10-mark questions are shown in brackets]

Level	AS Descriptors for Quality of Written Communication in AO1 and AO2	AS Descriptor AO1	Marks	AS Descriptor AO2	Marks
5	Appropriate form and style of writing, clear and coherent organisation of information, with appropriate and accurate use of specialist vocabulary; good legibility and high level of accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar.	A thorough treatment of the topic within the time available. Information is accurate, and good understanding is demonstrated through use of appropriate evidence / examples.	13-15 [9-10]	A very good response to the issues raised. Different views are clearly explained with supporting evidence and arguments are critically analysed. A process of reasoning leads to an appropriate conclusion.	13-15
4	Appropriate form and style of writing; generally clear and coherent organisation of information, mainly appropriate and accurate use of specialist vocabulary; good legibility and fairly high level of spelling, punctuation and grammar.	A fairly thorough treatment within the time available; information is mostly accurate and relevant. Understanding is demonstrated through the use of appropriate evidence / examples.	10-12 [7-8]	A good response to the issues raised. Different views are explained with some supporting evidence and arguments and some critical analysis. A conclusion is drawn which follows from some of the reasoning.	10-12
3	Mainly appropriate form and style of writing, some of the information is organised clearly and coherently; there may be some appropriate and accurate use of specialist vocabulary. Satisfactory legibility and level of accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar.	A satisfactory treatment of the topic within the time available. Key ideas and facts are included, showing reasonable understanding.	7-9 [5-6]	Main issues are addressed and views are considered, with some supporting evidence. There is some attempt at analysis or comment. Evaluation may not be fully supported by reasoning or evidence.	7-9
2	Form and style of writing appropriate in some respects; some clarity and coherence in organisation; there may be some appropriate and accurate use of specialist vocabulary; legibility and level of accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar adequate to convey meaning.	An outline account, including some relevant material. Limited in depth or breadth. Answer may show limited understanding. Some coherence.	4-6 [3-4]	A simple argument, with some evidence in support.	4-6
1	There may be little clarity and coherence in organisation; little appropriate or accurate use of specialist vocabulary. The legibility and level of accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar may be very limited.	Isolated elements of accurate and relevant information. Slight signs of understanding.	1-3 [1-2]	A few basic points which are relevant, but no real argument.	1-3
0	There may be little clarity and coherence in organisation; little appropriate or accurate use of specialist vocabulary. The legibility and level of accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar may be very limited.	Nothing of relevance.	0	No attempt to engage with the question or nothing of relevance.	0

RS04: An introduction to Religion and Ethics

- 1 **Read this passage and answer parts (a) and (b) which follow.**

'The word 'euthanasia' is derived from the Greek for a good or gentle death. It is clear from the discussions that this subject provokes that the idea of 'a good death' is important to all of us, although religious believers might well interpret a 'good death' differently from the rest of society.'

- (a) Explain how the teaching of one religion you have studied could be applied to the issue of euthanasia.**

Candidates are expected to state and explain the teachings of **one** religion about euthanasia. Answers may make reference to holy books / scriptures, tradition and / or leaders' views to show understanding of these teachings.

e.g. Christianity

- Life is a gift from God.
- God decides when we are born and when we die (Ecclesiastes).
- Life is sacred (teaching of the various churches).
- All life has dignity.
- Death is not the end, and is not a disaster.
- It is up to God whether we live or die, and consequently, when we die.
- Euthanasia is taking someone's life, therefore it is murder and against the commandments.

e.g. Judaism

- Leviticus 19 vs 32 says that the elderly should be shown respect and honour.
- Life has been given by God (Genesis 1 vs 27).
- God decides when we are born and when we should die (Ecclesiastes).
- Whilst all Jews are against active euthanasia, which is seen as murder and against the mitzvoh, some Jews permit passive euthanasia if death is certain and the patient is in severe pain.
- The soldier that helped Saul to kill himself, is in turn killed by David as punishment (2 Samuel).
- The Talmud states that the dying (goses) are still to be regarded as living.
- Although Judaism teaches that all should be done to try and save someone's life, nothing should be done to hinder them from dying.
- A life support machine may be switched off if it is giving the life, rather than merely supporting it.
- Judaism teaches that death is not the end.
- Life in this world is a preparation for the world to come.

Maximum level 3 (6 marks) if no explanation of the application of teaching.

(10 marks) AO1

(b) ***Outline ways in which utilitarianism could be applied to the issue of euthanasia.***

Candidates may use aspects of the views of Bentham or Mill, or both. Candidates may explain Bentham's hedonic calculus and apply aspects of it to making a decision about euthanasia. They may just explain the Greatest Happiness Principle (the greatest happiness for the greatest number) with application to euthanasia. They may debate Bentham's 'quantity of pleasure' views with Mill's 'quality of pleasure' views, i.e. Bentham would say that performing euthanasia would be permissible if the execution of it could be seen to bring more pleasure to more people than it would pain, but Mill would argue that release from pain is a 'lower' pleasure, and that a person wishing to end their own life should be encouraged to seek the 'higher' pleasures.

(10 marks) AO1

2 (a) ***Explain how Mill's account of utilitarianism can be seen as both building on, and as criticising, the ideas of Bentham.***

Candidates should explain how Mill and Bentham differed from one another in their views on utilitarianism, e.g.

- Both Bentham and Mill share the premise that humans seek pleasure and avoid pain.
- Both, in essence, believe in the principle of the greatest happiness for the greatest number.
- However, Mill built upon Bentham's teachings of the utility calculus.
- Mill was more concerned about the quality of pleasure as opposed to the quantity of pleasure, e.g. the story of the sadistic guards.
- Mill distinguished between 'higher' and 'lower' pleasures.
- Mill developed utilitarianism along the lines of 'rules' as opposed to looking at each separate act as Bentham did.

If **only** dealing with building on, or criticising, maximum Level 4 (10 marks) however well done.

(15 marks) AO1

- (b)(i) **Explain how the teaching of one religion you have studied could be applied to the issue of the use of natural resources.**
- (b)(ii) **Assess the claim that this teaching should replace utilitarianism as the dominant approach to the use of natural resources.**

Candidates are expected to state and explain the teaching held by **one** religion about the use of natural resources. Answers may make reference to holy books / scriptures, tradition and / or leaders' views to show understanding of this teaching.

Explain

e.g. Islam

- Muslims see themselves as custodians (Khaliphs) or stewards of the Earth.
- Islam teaches a sense of responsibility, even duty, to stop the destruction of resources.
- Muslims may not destroy, pollute or damage the Earth that has been entrusted to them by God.
- On the day of Judgement, Muslims will be expected to answer questions about their responsibility towards Allah's Earth and his creatures.
- Muslims must not abuse or overuse natural resources which have been given to them by Allah.
- The concept of 'balance' is very important in Islam.

e.g. Christianity

- God created the Earth.
- Christians are in the role of stewards / managers of the Earth and its resources.
- Christians should use what they have been given wisely; working with nature, not against it.
- Christians should live simply.
- God's world has been spoiled and exploited by greed, ignorance and selfishness.

Maximum Level 3 (6 marks) if no explanation of the application of teaching.

Maximum Level 2 (4 marks) if only pollution is referred to.

(10 marks) AO1

Assess

Candidates should debate the merits of using the guiding principles of their chosen religion versus the themes of utilitarianism, in deciding how natural resources should be treated.

e.g. The theological ideas of conservation and stewardship versus the utilitarian idea of using resources up now because people want their comforts today; the idea that if everyone followed religious principles, then that would be the minority view over the majority, and thus against the principles of utilitarianism. Candidates may discuss the problems associated with merely adopting a religious approach to the problem, e.g. within certain religions, there are opposing views, e.g. conservation versus domination in Christianity. Moreover, within Utilitarianism there are contrasting views; Mill's 'higher' pleasures may be more worthwhile and noble to strive for, but people want to feel warm and have a roof over their heads (and these are 'lower' pleasures).

(15 marks) AO2

- 3 (a) Explain how the teaching of one religion you have studied could be applied to the issue of allocation of resources in medicine.**

Candidates are expected to state and explain the teaching held by **one** religion about the issue of allocation of medical resources. Answers may make reference to holy books / scriptures, tradition and / or leaders' views to show understanding of these teachings.

e.g. Islam

- Islam teaches that to be greedy is a sin.
- People should only receive in measure to what they deserve.
- Everyone should be treated equally.
- Looking for preferential treatment, particularly in terms of paying for it, is very wrong in Islam.
- Nevertheless, the needs of a suffering person must be attended to.

e.g. Christianity

- All people deserve to be helped to get better, and should not be judged as to the reasons for their ill health.
- The ability to pay should not be a criterion for medical help.
- The need to act as Christ might have done would be paramount in such situations.
- Some candidates may refer to views such as those of Wyatt, i.e. open and transparent allocation, a concern for the weak and vulnerable in society, an equal and fair allocation of resources, show a caring and holistic approach to the problem, allocate resources on the basis of need and effectiveness, and foster realistic expectations about what medicine can actually do, and a realisation about the finite nature of resources.

Maximum Level 3 (9 marks) if no explanation of the application of teaching.

(15 marks) AO1

- (b) ***Outline Kant's ethical theory, and assess the claim that Kant's theory, rather than religious principles, should determine the way resources in medicine are allocated.***

Explain

Candidates can outline any aspect of Kant's ethical theory. They will probably write about the three formulations of the Categorical Imperative, (universalisation, treating people as ends not means, and living in a Kingdom of Ends). They might also mention Kant's view of Duty and / or his views on 'Good Will', and / or his views on reason.

To achieve Level 3 candidates should be able to successfully outline two out of three formulations of the Categorical Imperative, or one of the formulations and either Kant's theory on Duty or Good Will.

(10 marks) AO1

Assess

Level 3 and above may be awarded if candidates have only debated the application of Kant to the issue, but not if only religious views are debated.

For Level 3 and above, candidates need to have addressed the main issue of debating both Kant and religion with regards to the allocation of medical resources, and explaining some reasons supporting and / or disagreeing with both or either view. There does not have to be a conclusion.

(15 marks) AO2