



Teacher Resource Bank

GCE Religious Studies

Unit A (RSS01) *Religion and Ethics 1*

June 2009 Examination Candidate Exemplar Work:

- Candidate A



2009 (June) Unit A Religion and Ethics 1

Example of Candidate's Work from the Examination

Candidate A

- 1 (a) Explain Mill's Utilitarianism and how it may be applied to one ethical issue other than abortion or euthanasia.

(30 marks)

AO1

Candidate Response

1a) Utilitarianism is that an action would be judged right or wrong by that action causes great happiness for the greatest number of people. Mill's approach to Bentham's original ~~idea~~ idea of the theory was more of an improvement on what Bentham described. It was simplistic but with Mill, it is more of a quantitative ~~than~~ than qualitative approach in which Bentham saw. Quantitative thinking of the number/person while qualitative thinks of the quality the action should bring. Mill saw ~~that~~ that utilitarian should ^{always} ~~not~~ think of just the action of keeping to the teleological view of the theory rather than just think of the actions and not about the consequence.

Mill described that Utilitarianism is that it is more than just pleasure and pain and keeping within the balance he described that one must remember the principle of utility, the rule of Utilitarianism. Mill basically improved the

Utilitarianism so that it is not too simplistic and that it is complex and the issues it represents are not to be ~~taken~~ ^{taken} ~~lightly~~ taken lightly. A Utilitarian must always remember that an action can only be judged right, if

the act itself brings great happiness/good to ~~the~~ the greatest number.

With applying it to an ethical issue would be that Capital punishment can have many utilitarianistic views. Capital Punishment is very well known, it is banned in many countries including Great Britain, however still allowed in the USA if the crime is one of dire result e.g. murder. Capital Punishment is basically the man or woman who committed such crime are put to death, in the old days it was hanging etc. But the punishment is electric chair or an injection that kills instantly while the chair may take seconds longer.

With a utilitarianism, when capital punishment maybe for seen they ~~it~~ would decide whether it is right or wrong to do this by laying down the rules and thinking whether the punishment would be greatest good for the greatest ^{number} or whether it would be good for a while the number is not that great.

They will look at action of criminal and see the consequence, did the murder bring great good/happiness for a great number or is just plain simple murder.

Utilitarianist would be more in favour of capital punishment because of the consequence, or that it is the only option in which will ensure safety of the society the criminal lived in a whole society itself, and that regression will not be the greatest good for the greatest number but capital punishment. But must make sure that it is quantitative rather than qualitative.

Commentary

AO1 (30 marks)

The question makes two demands on the candidate, and the first is to explain Mill's utilitarianism. The trigger word 'Explain' means that the focus is on understanding, and that candidates should expand on key points with reasons, examples or illustrations.

This answer begins with a basic definition of utilitarianism. There is confusion between the terms 'qualitative' and 'quantative', and the statement that 'qualitive (sic) thinks of the quality the action should bring' is vague and adds little.

There is use of the technical term 'teleological' and brief, accurate, explanation of what it means for utilitarianism, but this should have been developed. The next section is largely a repetition of what has already been stated: that Mill's theory is not so simplistic and is based on the greatest happiness principle.

The second demand required candidates to show **how** Mill's theory can be applied. Obviously candidates could introduce more explanation of the theory into this part of their answer. The issue is introduced and different forms of capital punishment are identified. The discussion could have made very effective use of this material, but it is an opportunity that is wasted.

Some positive consequences of using the death penalty are suggested and there is a brief reference to the idea about how much suffering the crime actually caused. It is not clear what the candidate intended by 'regression' in the final section, so the point of the sentence is lost.

The quality of the answer has to be judged:

- according to the level descriptors,
- in the light of the novelty of the demand on the candidates in this first June sitting for the new AS award,
- always bearing in mind that the answer is produced under examination conditions.

Level 2 (5-9 marks) reads: 'A superficial outline account, with little relevant material and slight signs of partial understanding.'

Level 3 (10-14 marks) reads: 'A summary of key points limited in depth or breadth. Answer may show limited understanding and limited relevance. Some coherence.'

Awarded 10 marks – Level 3, JUST.

The grade descriptor for AO1 at grade E at AS reads:

Candidates characteristically:

- Select limited but relevant material.
- Show a basis understanding of relevant features or key ideas, supported by occasional examples and/or sources of evidence.
- Show limited accurate use of technical language and terminology.

This ideally would match an award of 12/30 (40% of available marks).

Level 3 (10 marks)

(b) Assess the claim that Mill's Utilitarianism is too difficult to apply as a system of moral decision-making.

(15 marks)

AO2

Candidate Response

1B.) Well the claim that mill's ^{utilitarianism} utilitarianism cannot apply because it is too difficult, in many ways is right but in many other ways, wrong. firstly, wrong being that the utilitarianism that mill introduced and describe is not too difficult to apply, in an in many ways be easily applied to the system of moral decision-making. A person would always look at the action and consequences and determine whether in view of utilitarianism if the act was right or wrong, simple, again they look at the quantitative approach not the qualitative.

However the theory is still in many ways simplistic and that when making moral decision it she not

only based on "the greatest good for the greatest number", the view in many ways is simplistic when making a decision they should focus on whether the act was on purpose or an accident whether it is morally right if i.e. someone was hanging off a cliff and you have to save them and there is ~~50/50~~ 50% chance you will both die or live, A utilitarian would view that the person should let the guy hang and wait for rescue (after calling) since again 50% chance one will still be alive afterwards afterwards, this view is so morally unright a person should always in my sense try to save the person, it is morally wrong to decide that at least one person would survive and leave some good for a number of people when it is too difficult because it is view ultimately look at the consequence of a family losing someone.

In a way it is too simplistic, but the theory is still able to make precise decisions since they have to make sure that ~~the~~ the decision they made ^{will} have the correct response.

But all together the claim in my opinion is right, it is still too simplistic and it does not look at the

results of the consequence, towards there future decision making it in fact is difficult to apply as a system of moral decision-making.

Commentary

AO2 (15 marks)

There are some points here e.g.

- It is easy to look at consequences.
- The system is too simplistic – you need to look at whether the act is purposeful or accidental.
- Example of person hanging over the cliff – some problems with expression here and meaning is not totally clear, but the argument appears to be a rejection of the decision a ‘utilitarian’ (sic) would make on the grounds that it is too difficult to make the decision to leave the man hanging and not do anything to support him.
- A conclusion is stated, although not clearly: ‘The claim in my opinion is right, the theory is still too simplistic and it does not look at the results of the consequence.’

AO2 answers at AS are not expected to be long, and the length of this answer is not an issue.

The quality of the answer has to be judged:

- according to the level descriptors,
- in the light of the novelty of the demand on the candidates in this first June sitting for the new AS award,
- always bearing in mind that the answer is produced under examination conditions.

The level 3 descriptor reads:

A basic attempt to justify a point of view relevant to the question. Some explanation of ideas and coherence.

The descriptor for the AO2 objective at grade E at AS reads:

Candidates characteristically:

- Demonstrate minimal organisation and /or limited coherence.
- Offer mainly descriptive answers with little argument, justification or evaluation.
- Use language and expression that lacks precision.

This ideally would match an award of 6/15, 40% of the available marks, level 3.

Level 3 (6 marks)

- 2 (a) Examine how Fletcher's four presumptions guide the situationist in making moral decisions.

(30 marks)

AO1

Candidate Response

2a.) Fletcher's theory was ~~situational~~ situation ethics other wise known as the love ethic has four working ~~principles~~ principles to describe how a situationist would approach an decision. Positivism, Relativism, Personalism and Realism, all in which help one to make a decision.

In all ways the bases of an decision towards a situationist is that it is hypothetical, they're only judging these decision on the bases of what they think might happen after making their decision. They presume that everything will be alright after with no bad consequence. They base their decision on whether the act was done out of love, so if murder they would still look a decide whether the person did it out of love, all for other reasons.

A situationist will always base their moral decision making on love, "thou shalt love thy neighbour", they believe that, ~~st~~ one must not follow a rule of law, if the rule is wrong to them and needs to be looked at from a different view. All rules have flaws in which a situationist will expose so that love is rather the rule/law of decision, one must put aside a rule, if the rule is not needed.

	Altogether a situationist bases it
	on love in which the four principles
	help guide, opioning if it great position;
	that it has relativism and that personalism
	is of not much prose, all which
	stay on 1002, L3

Commentary

AO1 (30 marks)

The trigger word 'Explain' means that the focus is on understanding, and that candidates should expand on key points with reasons, examples or illustrations. The use of examples to explain points was essential for a high-scoring answer, but even very well informed candidates often omitted examples altogether.

In paragraph one, the candidate gets one of the four terms wrong – this would not be a critical error if the later explanation indicates that it was merely a slip.

The next paragraph correctly identifies the importance of the expected outcome of the decision: 'they are only judging their decision on the basis of what they think may happen', and the motive for the action 'out of love'. The reference to murder suggests an understanding that 'love' may justify some unexpected actions according to this theory. Expression is quite weak in places, as is legibility.

The idea that the basis of the moral decision should be 'love' rather than law is clearly stated, as is the idea that laws have 'flaws' in them, so 'one must put aside a rule if the rule is not needed'.

The last paragraph is very unclear.

In summary, the candidates has shown a basic understanding of the 'love ethic', the importance of consequences and motive, that the love motive could even apply to murder, that love is higher than law, so law should be set aside if it is not needed. These ideas are not explicitly linked to the four presumptions, but are clearly related to them.

The quality of the answer has to be judged:

- according to the level descriptors,
- in the light of the novelty of the demand on the candidates in this first June sitting for the new AS award,
- always bearing in mind that the answer is produced under examination conditions.

Level 2 (5-9 marks) reads: 'A superficial outline account, with little relevant material and slight signs of partial understanding.'

Level 3 (10-14 marks) reads: 'A summary of key points limited in depth or breadth. Answer may show limited understanding and limited relevance. Some coherence.'

This is a level 3 answer (just) so 10/30.

Level 3 (10 marks)

- (b) 'Situation Ethics is not compatible with other Christian approaches to moral decision-making.' Assess this view.

(15 marks)

AO2

Candidate Response

2B The view that it is not compatible is again very true, and in some way wrong. The view is right because the ethics of are too simplistic compared to a Christians moral decision making, Christians will look at every angle of action not just from one point of view, in many ways a situationist is too easy on the decision and that their decision can be completely wrong to the situationist, where more than here Christians moral decisions have good etc consequences and so therefore right, and they look at the situation as a whole not

a hypothetical role.

However, love is seen to enter the bible in which it is described to us of how Jesus will dismiss a rule and recognise love as to take care and decide about a person, it is see in some of the bible Jesus dismissing and say "then shalt love thy neighbour".

The decisions of a situationist is too simplistic and they dismiss legal laws to basically get their own way morally incorrect.

While Christians use legal law to help within their decision, making it in my opinion morally right. ✓

Therefore the claim/view is in my opinion ~~is~~ right, it is not compatible it for too ~~is~~ simplistic and in ~~at~~ many ways morally incorrect. Christians look at it with all angles, situationist do not. The view is correct, since all in all when making a decision a situationist is only hypothetical, which is naive and easily makes the wrong decision. L4

Commentary

AO2 (15 marks)

The first paragraph includes a number of statements, agreeing with the stimulus statement, not all of which are clear. Some of these points are repeated or developed later in the answer, and the whole needs to be read before deciding what the candidate means by what is said.

The second paragraph counters the first. Jesus' law of love is cited and it is noted that Jesus will dismiss a law. No conclusion is drawn from this.

The statement that situationists 'dismiss legal laws to basically get their own way, morally incorrect' needed explanation and evidence.

The contrasting statement 'Christians use legal law to help within their decision, making it in my opinion morally right' is also presented as a point of view and lacks evidence or development. The basic contrast is creditworthy.

The final paragraph states a conclusion which repeats many of the points made above.

To understand the point about Situation Ethics being 'hypothetical' we have to go back to the explanation given in part (a). The candidate is contrasting a decision based on likely consequences with one based on the 'law'. The first is said to be 'simplistic', 'naive' (sic) and easily the wrong decision.

Summary

The candidate understands some of the issues involved in this debate and has some understanding of one basic difference between Situationism and more traditional Christian decision-making. No evidence is provided for this.

The candidate is aware that Jesus taught 'love' and can refer to actual teaching in support of this idea; the candidate is also aware that Jesus broke (or dismissed) law. No example is offered to support this. No conclusion is drawn from this evidence about Jesus' teaching and example.

The quality of the answer has to be judged:

- according to the level descriptors,
- in the light of the novelty of the demand on the candidates in this first June sitting for the new AS award,
- always bearing in mind that the answer is produced under examination conditions.

This answer is not easy to assess, because it glosses over a range of ideas. It borders level 3 and 4 because of its passing recognition that there is a different point of view.

The level 3 AO2 descriptor reads:

A basic attempt to justify a point of view relevant to the question. Some explanation of ideas and coherence.

The level 4 AO2 descriptor reads:

A limited attempt to sustain an argument, which may be one-sided or show little ability to see more than one point of view. Most ideas are explained.

Just level 4 8/15.

This gives the whole answer a mark of 18/45.

Ideally grade E would be represented by a mark of 40% = 18/45.

On the summer 2009 paper the grade E mark was 34/90, which this paper represents.

Level 4 (8 marks)