



**General Certificate of Education
June 2012**

Religious Studies

RSS02

Religion and Ethics 2

AS Unit B

Final

Mark Scheme

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 students' 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 students' 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 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools and 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 and colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the school or college.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Examination Levels of Response

Religious Studies (Advanced Subsidiary) AS Level Descriptors

Level	AS Descriptor AO1	Marks	AS Descriptor AO2	Marks	AS Descriptors for Quality of Written Communication in AO1 and AO2
7	A thorough treatment of the topic within the time available. Information is accurate and relevant, and good understanding is demonstrated through use of appropriate evidence / examples	28-30	A well-focused, reasoned response to the issues raised. Different views are clearly explained with supporting evidence and argument. There is some critical analysis. An appropriate evaluation is supported by reasoned argument.	14-15	Appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of information; appropriate and accurate use of specialist vocabulary; good legibility; high level of accuracy in spelling punctuation and grammar.
6	A fairly thorough treatment within the time available; information is mostly accurate and relevant. Understanding is demonstrated through the use of appropriate evidence / example(s)	24-27	A mostly relevant, reasoned response to the issues raised. Different views are explained with some supporting evidence and argument. There is some analysis. An evaluation is made which is consistent with some of the reasoning.	12-13	
5	A satisfactory treatment of the topic within the time available. Key ideas and facts are included, with some development, showing reasonable understanding through use of relevant evidence / example(s).	20-23	A partially successful attempt to sustain a reasoned argument. Some attempt at analysis or comment and recognition of more than one point of view. Ideas adequately explained.	10-11	
4	A generally satisfactory treatment of the topic within the time available. Key ideas and facts are included, showing some understanding and coherence.	15-19	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.	7-9	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.
3	A summary of key points. Limited in depth or breadth. Answer may show limited understanding and limited relevance. Some coherence.	10-14	A basic attempt to justify a point of view relevant to the question. Some explanation of ideas and coherence.	5-6	
2	A superficial outline account, with little relevant material and slight signs of partial understanding, or an informed answer that misses the point of the question.	5-9	A superficial response to the question with some attempt at reasoning.	3-4	Little clarity and organisation; little appropriate and accurate use of specialist vocabulary; legibility and level of accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar barely adequate to make meaning clear.
1	Isolated elements of partly accurate information little related to the question.	1-4	A few basic points, with no supporting argument or justification.	1-2	
0	Nothing of relevance.	0	No attempt to engage with the question or nothing of relevance.	0	

RSS02: Religion and Ethics 2

Question 1 Kant and ethics

0	1
---	---

Explain how Kant's deontological approach to ethics contrasts with teleological approaches.

- Expect reference to rules/laws in deontological systems / Kant's emphasis on rules derived from universalizability / the categorical imperative.
- Teleological systems also produce moral rules, but the emphasis is on the consequence of obedience to the rule rather than on the intrinsic value of the rule itself: with deontological ethics, actions are right in themselves, irrespective of any benefit or harm they bring about as a consequence.
- Deontological approaches emphasise duty, motive and obligation, and students should be able to illustrate this in Kant's ethics, in contrast, for example, with the utilitarian emphasis on happiness. For Kant, happiness is the product of doing one's duty, and not an end in itself.
- Broadly speaking, deontological approaches are absolutist, whereas teleological approaches are relativist: hence Kant's rules have no exceptions.
- For Kant/deontology, right and wrong are determined primarily by reason, whereas teleological approaches tend to emphasise the role of experience in achieving the best outcome.
- Some might take the view that different systems of ethics have both deontological and teleological features, although perhaps one aspect is favoured above the other. In particular, some might say that Kant's system does have teleological features, for example in its focus on the kingdom of moral *ends*, and on the *summum bonum* as an eschatological state encompassing the perfect congruence of duty and happiness.

(30 marks) AO1

0	2
---	---

'Kant's deontological approach to ethics works better than teleological approaches.' How far do you agree?

Agree

- Some will defend this viewpoint by suggesting that deontological systems are intrinsically superior to teleological systems anyway, since (for example) agent-centred ethical systems do not have to second-guess consequences, and are not exposed to individual preferences.
- Defence of Kant on more specific grounds might come from a number of directions: for example the strength of the principle of universalizability; the appeal to reason; the fact that a society following Kantian principles would be morally secure, and so on.

Other views

- Most are likely to argue that in modern thought-systems, it is generally seen as unacceptable to ignore the consequences of one's actions, for whatever reason. Hence teleological systems might be described as more realistic, more in-tune with the modern world, and so on. Some will refer to Christian situation ethics as a teleological system, albeit one that is based on an absolute principle.
- Some might argue that different societies work naturally with different ethical systems, so neither one is superior to the other; it depends on social evolution as to which is preferred.
- Some might argue in favour of hybrid ethical systems which combine deontological and teleological principles, such as Rule Utilitarianism.

(15 marks) AO2

Question 2 Natural Law and ethics**0****3****Explain the principle of double effect and its use in Aquinas' Natural Law Ethics.**

- The law/rule/principle/doctrine of double effect examines the effect of an action which follows the principles of Natural Law yet causes an effect which would generally be avoided: e.g. saving the life of a pregnant woman where the effect entails the death of the foetus. Aquinas discussed it in connection with self-defence against a homicidal maniac.
- The principle is sometimes expressed by saying that so long as one follows the principles of Natural Law, one can 'benefit' from any *unintended* consequences.
- A common modern example is that strategic bombing that harms civilians with foresight but *without intent* is an accepted effect of destroying a legitimate military target. Conversely, intentionally bombing civilians to secure victory in war, however good that victory might be, is not legitimate.
- Four conditions have to be met in order for an act to be morally permissible: the action itself must be morally good (or at least indifferent); the good effect must not be achieved by pursuing the bad effect; the bad effect must be no more than an unintended side-effect; the good effect must outweigh in importance the bad effect.
- Students are likely to use examples from war, euthanasia, and abortion/ectopic pregnancy.

(30 marks)**AO1****0****4****'Aquinas' principle of double effect does not work in practice.' Assess this claim.****Agree**

- Students might agree with this by using specific examples, for example DE forbids the practical and safe practice of ectopic pregnancy through laser surgery on the grounds that the primary intention is to kill the child and not to save the mother's life. Critics see this as a linguistic fudge, since the only way to save the mother's life is still to kill the child, and it seems empty to argue that this is not in the mind of those who underwent the surgical procedures that were normal before the advent of laser treatment.
- Thus some might argue on more general grounds that DE is nothing more than a reluctant admission that consequences *do* matter, so the whole theory is suspect.

Other views

- Some might take the Proportionalist modification of NL / DE, where the agent is justified in choosing the lesser of two evils, whilst at the same time arguing that although an act can be proportionately right, it nevertheless remains intrinsically wrong.
- Others might defend DE in specific cases, for example in permitting certain acts during a war. In self-defence, for example, it would be impermissible to kill intentionally someone who was planning to kill you; nevertheless it would be permissible to kill somebody in self-defence, if that killing was an unavoidable consequence of defending yourself. Sacrificing your life to save others would be morally permissible, because you do not intend to kill yourself; by contrast suicide would be indefensible, since that act is done with the specific intention of ending your own life.

(15 marks)**AO2**

Question 3 Religious views of the created world

0	5
----------	----------

Explain narratives about the creation of the world by God. You may refer to one or more religion(s) in your answer.

Answers to this question will of course depend upon the religion or religions chosen. In practice, most students are likely to choose one or more of the theistic religions, where the processes of creation are initiated and brought about by the activity of God. For example, in the Judaeo-Christian tradition, the world was created in a specific order, reflecting the intentions of God. Students are likely to discuss principally the material in Genesis, and perhaps that in the Psalms, which reflects more generalised cosmogonic myths. Other concepts for discussion might include: the role of humans as stewards of creation; the concept of God as the sustainer of creation (particularly in the Psalms); God's control of evolution; the corruption of perfect creation through the agency of a satanic figure and by human agency, and so on.

(30 marks) AO1

0	6
----------	----------

'Religious narratives about creation undervalue the status of the non-human world.' Assess this view.

Agree

- Answers will depend on the narratives discussed. In the theistic religions, for example, students might argue that describing humans as the pinnacle of creation overvalues humans, and thus undervalues the non-human world.
- Creation as a whole is described as 'perfect', so humans cannot / should not claim a status any greater than that of the non-human world.
- Notions about stewardship do not go far enough to protect the non-human world: this is clear from the treatment of the non-human world, where the rhetoric about protection does not translate into effective action from religious authorities as a whole.
- Evolutionary biology shows that humans are merely part of what has evolved, and so have no special status by comparison with other life forms.
- In the latter respect, religious narratives (being pre-scientific) have little to say about the ecology of the planet as a whole, either living or non-living.
- Comments about Deep Ecology, etc.

Other views

- Buddhist scriptures, for example, have far more to say than the theistic religions about the integral structure of the world / the universe.
- Ideas about stewardship might be held to accord sufficient status to the non-human world.
- Examples from religious creation narratives about the beauty / value / inter-relationship of creation as an act of God.
- It is not the narratives that undervalue the non-human world, but those who interpret those narratives to that effect.

(15 marks) AO2

Question 4 Environment, both local and worldwide

0	7
---	---

Explain both how and why attempts have been made to preserve the environment. Include reference to religious views in your answer.

For the 'why', students are likely to refer to a range of threats to the environment, such as: the threat from global warming and its effects on sea levels; loss of habitable land; pollution of seas and rivers from spillage, effluent, toxic waste, sewage, etc.; loss of trees from acid rain, made worse by deliberate clear-felling; loss of habitat for wildlife / loss of bio-diversity, etc.

Students might also refer to some of the following:

- religious teachings about protection/preservation of the environment / harm to God's originally-perfect world / stewardship;
- general ethical ideas about the environment;
- the argument that, as the dominant species, humans have both a right and a responsibility to preserve the environment;
- utilitarian arguments about preserving the environment for future generations;
- concern about the extinction of species;
- aesthetic concerns.

For the 'how':

The range of possible answers is large, and might include, for example:

- strategies directed at reducing the impact of global warming;
- strategies to reduce pollution of air, sea and land;
- attempts to regulate the economic output of developing industries;
- conservation of forest, woodland, wetland, etc.;
- protection of endangered species, etc.

N.B. There is no requirement for students to address the attempts made by religious bodies to preserve the environment, although these, of course, are relevant.

Students who do not address both the 'how' and the 'why' will not achieve higher than Level 4.

Students who do not refer to religious views will not achieve higher than Level 4.

(30 marks)

AO1

0

8

'Preservation of the environment must be for the benefit of the environment as a whole.' How far do you agree?

Agree

e.g.

- Religious arguments about the value of both humans and the environment as a whole / stewardship, etc.
- Arguments from Deep Ecology about the inter-dependence of living and non-living elements of the environment / arguments against speciesism.
- Aesthetic arguments about the intrinsic value of the environment.

Other views

e.g.

- Atheistic arguments which place decisions about 'benefit' purely within the domain of human reason.
- Utilitarian arguments (e.g. Benthamite) that the indicator of moral worth is the ability to feel pleasure and pain. The non-living environment is therefore outside the moral domain, and need not be given the same consideration.
- The argument that since they are not sentient, questions of benefit cannot apply to non-living things.

(15 marks)

AO2

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion