

Study of Religion 2019 v1.2

IA1 sample assessment instrument

May 2020

Examination — extended response (25%)

This sample has been compiled by the QCAA to assist and support teachers in planning and developing assessment instruments for individual school settings.

Assessment objectives

This assessment instrument is used to determine student achievement in the following objectives:

1. describe the distinguishing features of religious traditions that inform religious ethics
2. demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which religion informs ethical decision-making processes
3. differentiate between religious traditions through the ways that their beliefs and practices influence decision-making on a social–ethical issue
4. analyse perspectives from *two* of the major world religions that form and inform religious–ethical responses to a social–ethical issue
6. evaluate and draw conclusions about the significance of religious–ethical stances made by adherents to a social–ethical issue
7. create an analytical essay response that communicates ideas or arguments using understandings of religious ethics.

Note: Unit objective 5 is not assessed in this assessment instrument.

Subject	Study of Religion	Instrument no.	IA1
Technique	Examination — extended response		
Unit	3: Religious ethics		
Topic	1: Social ethics		
Conditions			
Response type	Extended response — analytical essay		
Time	2 hours	Planning time	15 minutes
Word length	Written, 800–1000 words	Seen/unseen	Unseen question, unseen stimulus
Other	No notes allowed.		
Instructions			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You may make notes during the planning time, but do not commence your response. Write your response on the lined paper provided. 			
Task			
<p>With reference to the stimulus materials provided, analyse the beliefs and practices within Buddhism and Christianity that should influence an adherent's ethical decision-making processes in response to the asylum seeker issue. To what extent are religious–ethical stances made by adherents in each of these religious traditions significant when considering a response to people seeking asylum in Australia?</p> <p>In your response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> describe the distinguishing features of Buddhism and Christianity in order to explain the ways each religion informs ethical decision-making processes on the asylum seeker issue differentiate between the two religious traditions through analysing beliefs and practices that form and inform a religious–ethical response to the issue evaluate and draw conclusions about the significance of religious–ethical stances of adherents within Buddhism and Christianity to the social–ethical issue. <p>Ensure that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> use of the provided stimulus material is evident in your response you adhere to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the genre conventions of an analytical essay language conventions, including spelling, grammar and punctuation. 			
Stimulus			
See attached			
Criterion	Marks allocated	Result	
Describing and demonstrating understanding Assessment objectives 1, 2	6		
Differentiating and analysing Assessment objectives 3, 4	8		
Evaluating and drawing conclusions Assessment objective 6	8		
Creating Assessment objective 7	3		
Total	25		

Stimulus

Source 1: Asylum seekers

A current social–ethical issue of worldwide significance is the increasing number of displaced people who are seeking asylum outside their own country. Data from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) shows that this increase in asylum seeker numbers seems set to continue. The UNHCR is an organisation that strives to ‘ensure that everyone has the right to seek asylum and find safe refuge in another State, with the option to eventually return home, integrate or resettle’.

From: UNHCR: *The UN Refugee Agency*, ‘What we do’, www.unhcr.org/what-we-do.html. Used with permission.

Source 2: Extract from *The Undesirables*

When boat people (asylum seekers) get to Australia, some of them are sent for ‘off-shore processing’. That is, once they have survived the perils of the sea, we take them by force to Nauru, in order to save them from the risk of drowning. But ‘off-shore processing’ is not what it used to be. Australia has made two things plain: first, those who come to Australia this way will gain ‘no advantage’ over those who simply sit in Indonesia and wait. In practice, we are told, they will be held up for five years before being resettled. Second, none of them will be resettled in Australia. These two features stand in marked contrast to off-shore processing the late 1970s. They present several immediate difficulties, and several predictable consequences.

From: ‘A foreword’ by Julian Burnside in Isaacs, M 2014, *The Undesirables*, Hardie Grant Books, Melbourne, p. xiii. Used with permission.

Source 3: Extract from *The Situation in Nauru and Manus Island*

To stem ‘dangerous’ immigration to Australia by sea, successive Australian governments crafted a system of inhumane detention designed to ... deter further attempts to seek refuge on its shores ... the indefinite and mandatory detention of asylum seekers is designed to intimidate future asylum seekers and deter them from attempting the journey.

From: Global Legal Action Network (GLAN) and Stanford International Human Rights Clinic 2017, *The Situation in Nauru and Manus Island: Liability for crimes against humanity in the detention of refugees and asylum seekers*, Communiqué to the Office of the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court Under Article 15 of the Rome Statute, www.glanlaw.org/single-post/2017/02/13/Communication-made-to-International-Criminal-Court-requesting-investigation-of-Australia-and-corporate-contractors.

Source 4: Buddhist response to the asylum seeker crisis

As Buddhists of many traditions and countries in Europe, we hold loving kindness, compassion, generosity and fearlessness to be among the highest values in life; values we share with those of other religions and none.

Seeing our fundamental interconnectedness with all beings, we recognise the ... ‘asylum-seekers’ now streaming into Europe as people like ourselves, desperately seeking relief from suffering and longing for happiness. Regardless of their ethnicity or religion, may they find open borders and a refuge in Europe.

May all beings find happiness and the causes of happiness.

May they be free from suffering and the causes of suffering.

From: *Lion’s Roar* 2016, ‘How are Buddhists responding to the refugee crisis?’, www.lionsroar.com/how-are-buddhists-responding-to-the-refugee-crisis. Used with permission.

Source 5: Catholic Christian position

13. ... The exercise of the right to asylum proclaimed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Art. 14, 1) should be recognized everywhere and not obstructed with deterrent and punitive measures. A person applying for asylum should not be interned unless it can be demonstrated that he or she represents a real danger, or there are compelling reasons to think that he or she will not report to the competent authorities for due examination of his or her case. Moreover, such people should be helped with access to work and to a just and rapid legal procedure.

No to forced repatriation.

14. Scrupulous respect for the principle of voluntary repatriation is a non-negotiable basis for the treatment of refugees. No person must be sent back to a country where he or she fears discriminatory action or life-threatening situations. In cases where the competent government authorities decide not to accept asylum seekers, arguing that they are not true refugees, these authorities are duty-bound to make sure that such people will be guaranteed a secure and free existence elsewhere. Recent history shows that many people were sent back against their will to a fate that was sometimes tragic; some were pushed back to sea; others were forcibly diverted towards terrains of minefields, where they perished.

From: Etchegaray, R & Cheli, G 1992, 'Refugees: A challenge to solidarity', *Pontifical Council for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant People*, The Vatican, www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/corunum/documents/rc_pc_corunum_doc_25061992_refugees_en.html. *Libreria Editrice Vaticana* 2018. Used with permission.

Instrument-specific marking guide (ISMG)

Criterion: Describing and demonstrating understanding

Assessment objectives

1. describe the distinguishing features of religious traditions that inform religious ethics
2. demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which religion informs ethical decision-making processes

The student work has the following characteristics:	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• distinguishing features of religious traditions that inform religious ethics are correctly identified, comprehensive and relevant• detailed explanations of the ways in which the two religious traditions inform ethical decision-making processes• inaccuracies within explanations are not significant to the response.	5–6
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• some distinguishing features of religious traditions that inform religious ethics are identified and relevant• explanations of the ways in which the two religious traditions inform ethical decision-making processes are provided• some inaccuracies and/or omissions in the response.	3–4
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• simplistic statements on features of religious traditions that inform religious ethics• statements on the ways religious traditions inform religious ethics lack detail and/or relevance• significant inaccuracies within statements are evident throughout the response.	1–2
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0

Criterion: Differentiating and analysing

Assessment objectives

- differentiate between religious traditions through the ways that their beliefs and practices influence decision-making on a social–ethical issue
- analyse perspectives from two of the major world religions that form and inform religious–ethical responses to a social–ethical issue

The student work has the following characteristics:	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">thorough and accurate differentiation between religious traditions through the beliefs and practices that influence decision-making on the social–ethical issuewell-reasoned analysis of perspectives from two major world religions that form and inform religious–ethical responses to the social–ethical issueeffective use of stimulus material in the response.	7–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none">substantial and accurate differentiation between religious traditions through the beliefs and practices that influence decision-making on the social–ethical issueconsidered analysis of perspectives from two major world religions that form and inform religious–ethical responses to the social–ethical issuecompetent use of stimulus material in the response.	5–6
<ul style="list-style-type: none">partial differentiation between religious traditions through the beliefs and practices that influence decision-making on the social–ethical issuesome analysis of perspectives from two major world religions that form and inform religious–ethical responses to the social–ethical issueuse of stimulus material relevant to the response.	3–4
<ul style="list-style-type: none">one or more statements are made on beliefs, practices and/or perspectives within religious traditionssimplistic and/or erroneous understanding of the two major world religions in relationship to the religious–ethical response to the social–ethical issuestimulus material is not used or its use is irrelevant to the response.	1–2
<ul style="list-style-type: none">does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0

Criterion: Evaluating and drawing conclusions

Assessment objective

6. evaluate and draw conclusions about the significance of religious–ethical stances made by adherents to a social–ethical issue

The student work has the following characteristics:	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">discerning judgments are made about the significance of religious–ethical stances made by adherents to the social–ethical issuejudgments are supported by thorough and justified argumentsarguments are consistently established in relationship to the question or hypothesis.	7–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none">considered judgments are made about the significance of religious–ethical stances made by adherents to the social–ethical issuejudgments are supported by reasoned argumentsarguments are generally established in relationship to the question or hypothesis.	5–6
<ul style="list-style-type: none">judgments are made about the significance of religious–ethical stances made by adherents to the social–ethical issuejudgments are supported by basic reasonsinaccurate or irrelevant reasons affect conclusions in response to the question or hypothesis.	3–4
<ul style="list-style-type: none">one or more statements are made on how religion influences responses to a social–ethical issuesimplistic and/or erroneous understanding of religious ethicssignificant inaccuracies and/or irrelevant statements throughout the response.	1–2
<ul style="list-style-type: none">does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0

Criterion: Creating

Assessment objective

7. create an analytical essay response that communicates ideas or arguments using understandings of religious ethics

The student work has the following characteristics:	Marks
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• succinct, with ideas or arguments related to the question or hypothesis conveyed logically• features of the analytical essay genre are consistently demonstrated• minimal errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation.	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• conveys ideas or arguments that are related to the question or hypothesis• features of the analytical essay genre are generally demonstrated• some errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation evident.	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• conveys ideas or arguments that may not be related to the question or hypothesis• features of the analytical essay genre are inconsistently demonstrated• frequent errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation impede communication of ideas or arguments.	1
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• does not satisfy any of the descriptors above.	0