

Study of Religion 2019 v1.2

IA1 annotated sample response

May 2020

Examination — extended response (25%)

This sample has been compiled by the QCAA to assist and support teachers to match evidence in student responses to the characteristics described in the instrument-specific marking guide (ISMG).

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.

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

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

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 issue • well-reasoned analysis of perspectives from two major world religions that form and inform religious–ethical responses to the social–ethical issue • effective 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 issue • considered analysis of perspectives from two major world religions that form and inform religious–ethical responses to the social–ethical issue • competent 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 issue • some analysis of perspectives from two major world religions that form and inform religious–ethical responses to the social–ethical issue • use 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 traditions • simplistic and/or erroneous understanding of the two major world religions in relationship to the religious–ethical response to the social–ethical issue • stimulus 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 issue judgments are supported by thorough and justified arguments arguments are consistently established in relationship to the question or hypothesis. 	7–8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>considered judgments are made about the significance of religious–ethical stances made by adherents to the social–ethical issue</u> <u>judgments are supported by reasoned arguments</u> arguments 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 issue judgments are supported by basic reasons <u>inaccurate or irrelevant reasons affect conclusions in response to the question or hypothesis.</u> 	3–4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> one or more statements are made on how religion influences responses to a social–ethical issue simplistic and/or erroneous understanding of religious ethics significant 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 objectives

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">• <u>succinct, with ideas or arguments related to the question or hypothesis conveyed logically.</u>• <u>features of the analytical essay genre are consistently demonstrated</u>• <u>minimal errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation.</u>	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

Task

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?

Write your response in the form of an analytical essay (800–1000 words). In your response:

- 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.

Ensure that:

- use of the provided stimulus material is evident in your response
- you adhere to
 - the genre conventions of an analytical essay
 - language conventions, including spelling, grammar and punctuation.

Stimulus materials

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 (UNCHR) shows that this increase in asylum seeker numbers seems set to continue. The UNCHR 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.

Sample response

Criterion	Allocated marks	Marks awarded
Describing and demonstrating understanding Assessment objectives 1, 2	6	4
Differentiating and analysing Assessment objectives 3, 4	8	6
Evaluating and drawing conclusions Assessment objective 6	8	5
Creating Assessment objective 7	3	3
Total	25	18

The annotations show the match to the instrument-specific marking guide (ISMG) performance-level descriptors.

<p>Differentiating and analysing [7–8]</p> <p>Effective use of stimulus material in the response.</p>	<p>Rising social and political conflicts in countries through the world is seeing an increasing number of displaced people wishing to seek asylum outside of their own country. Consequently, world leaders face pressure to provide solutions to this human crisis; Australian politicians have crafted a system of detention designed to deter further attempts to seek asylum on their shores — a view supported by the Global Action Network (2017) when investigating Australia’s response to asylum seekers. However, those policies challenge the core beliefs of various religious traditions. Christianity and Buddhism similarly believe asylum seekers and refugees should be granted entry to Australia, however, the way adherents make decisions on this complex ethical issue can be considered through a focus on the sacred texts and Church teachings and the teachings of the Buddha respectively. For Catholic Christians, adherents are called to show compassion and empathy towards refugees and asylum seekers through their core beliefs which are outlined in Catholic Social Teachings. Similarly, Buddhists are called to act in the same way based on the Four Noble Truths contained within the teaching of Buddhism. These teachings are contained within the Dharma which, amongst other things, addresses the alleviation of suffering.</p>
<p>Describing and demonstrating understanding [3–4]</p> <p>Explanations of the ways in which the two religious traditions inform ethical decision-making processes are provided</p>	<p>The Catholic Christians’ perspective on asylum seekers coming to Australia is one of duty. Governments around the world are encouraged to recognise the right to seek asylum as guaranteed by the Universal Declaration on Human Rights. Authoritative bodies should help these asylum seekers coming across the seas; granting them access to work and a just, rapid, legal procedure. At the very least, if the asylum seekers are not granted refugee status, it is the duty of the humanity to ensure that these people are safe and secure elsewhere. “No person must be sent back to a country where he or she fears discriminatory action or life-threatening situations”, and this stems from the inner sense of compassion that makes a person human of heart. This sense of duty ought to drive the Catholic Christian perspective as informed by a deontological ethical framework. This framework is explicitly oriented around a person’s responsibility to help others; made also evident through Biblical sacred</p>
<p>Differentiating and analysing [7–8]</p> <p>Effective use of stimulus material in the response</p> <p>Differentiating and analysing [5–6]</p> <p>Considered analysis of perspectives from two major world religions that form and inform religious-ethical responses to the social-ethical issue</p>	

Describing and demonstrating understanding [5–6]

Distinguishing features of religious traditions that inform religious ethics are correctly identified, comprehensive and relevant

Describing and demonstrating understanding [3–4]

Explanations of the ways in which the two religious traditions inform ethical decision-making processes are provided

Differentiating and analysing [5–6]

Substantial and accurate differentiation between religious traditions through the beliefs and practices that influence decision-making on the social-ethical issue

Evaluating and drawing conclusions [5–6]

Considered judgments are made about the significance of religious-ethical stances made by adherents to the social-ethical issue

Judgments are supported by reasoned arguments

texts. These texts demonstrate the compassion of Jesus himself. This needs to be the basis of a truly "Catholic" Border policy.

Both Theravada and Mahayana Buddhist adherents look to their sacred text, the Dharma, which contains the key teachings of the Buddha to make informed decisions on the ethical dilemma of asylum seekers. In respect to this teaching there is little or no difference between these two main branches of Buddhism and the application to the variety of ethical positions. Buddhism as a whole, generally, takes the viewpoint that acceptance and empathy for all asylum seekers is the best way to uphold the teachings and values of the tradition. We read "loving kindness, compassion and generosity ... to be among the highest values in life". These central values, stemming from the teachings of the Buddha display a clear link between modern decision making by adherents and the religious tradition's sacred texts. One of the most pivotal is the four Noble Truths, as set out in the Dharma. One of these truths is that it is the duty of Buddhist adherents to attempt to alleviate the suffering of others. We can connect the significance of welcoming suffering asylum seekers specifically to this Noble Truth. Buddhists go on to explain that asylum seekers are "suffering and longing for happiness", therefore, making the religious duty of adherents to welcome all people fleeing persecution, "regardless of their ethnicity or religion". By drawing upon Buddhist values and the Dharma, Buddhist adherents come to the conclusion that asylum seekers and refugees should be welcomed and treated with compassion.

This allows for comparisons to be drawn between Buddhist and Catholic decision making processes. Overall, the two major religious traditions of Christianity and Buddhism both look to their key texts and beliefs to come to conclusions on the ethical dilemma of asylum seekers. Both traditions highlight the significance of assisting fellow human beings, drawing on the major teachings of each tradition. Buddhism emphasises the need to welcome all people regardless of ethnicity or religion, however, Christianity on the other hand recognises that each person is made in the image and likeness of God and so deserves respect based on this position. Therefore, both religious traditions are informed by their sacred texts and key beliefs in helping adherents make decisions with regards the ethical dilemma such as the international refugee crisis.

Note:

Differentiating and analysing [5–6]

Substantial and accurate differentiation between religious traditions through the beliefs and practices that influence decision-making on the social-ethical issue are demonstrated throughout the response.

Evaluating and drawing conclusions [3–4]

Across the response, inaccurate or irrelevant reasons affect conclusions in response to the question or hypothesis e.g. only one perspective from within Christianity was addressed when evaluating and drawing conclusions about the significance of religious-ethical stances made

Creating [3]

The response is succinct, with ideas or arguments related to the question or hypothesis being conveyed logically. Features of the analytical essay genre are consistently demonstrated throughout the response. Minimal errors in spelling, grammar and punctuation are evident.