9.8 Corporal Punishment: Religious Arguments For and Against: 30-minute Pack

AQA 8062 · about 30 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer ALL questions.

1 Explain two contrasting religious beliefs about corporal punishment, Theme E contrasting views.

(Total for Question 1 is 4 marks)

2 Explain the religious importance of protecting human dignity when discussing corporal punishment, Theme E explanation.

(Total for Question 2 is 6 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

3 Explain two religious teachings about corporal punishment. Refer to a sacred writing or another source of religious belief and teaching in your answer, Theme E required reference.

(Total for Question 3 is 5 marks)

4 Evaluate the view that corporal punishment should never be used by the state in any circumstances. In your answer you should give reasoned arguments to support this statement, give reasoned arguments to support a different point of view, refer to religious arguments, reach a justified conclusion. Include spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG) assessment worth 3 marks.

(Total for Question 4 is 15 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Mark scheme · 9.8 Corporal Punishment: Religious Arguments For and Against: 30-minute Pack

Question 1

point 1: some religious believers support corporal punishment as a just, retributive response to wrongdoing, oe	**B1**
development for point 1: this is supported by readings such as Exodus 21:24 'an eye for an eye', which can be taken to justify equivalent punishment, oe	**B1**
point 2: other religious believers oppose corporal punishment on grounds of human dignity and mercy, oe	**B1**
development for point 2: this view appeals to the sanctity of the person and teachings about compassion, for example Jesus teaching to turn the other cheek, oe	**B1**

Answer: E.g. support as retribution based on Exodus 21:24, versus opposition based on human dignity and Jesus's teaching to turn the other cheek.

Question 2

Level 3 A well-developed answer that explains multiple reasons why protecting human dignity matters in religious responses to corporal punishment, supported by accurate religious teaching and clear links to practice.	**5-6**
Level 2 An answer that explains at least one reason with some supporting religious detail, and makes limited links to corporal punishment.	**3-4**
Level 1 One or two simple, relevant points are made with little or no religious support.	**1-2**
Level 0 No relevant content.	**0**

Indicative content:

- The idea that humans are made in the image of God, Imago Dei, gives theological grounds for respecting bodily integrity and opposing bodily harm.
- Christian teachings about love, compassion and care for the vulnerable can be used to argue that corporal punishment degrades human dignity rather than restores it.
- Islamic teachings that emphasise mercy and justice can be invoked to argue that even where corporal punishments exist, dignity should be preserved through strict safeguards and humane application.
- Protecting dignity supports rehabilitative approaches, aiming to restore offenders rather than inflict humiliation, which many religious traditions favour.
- Practical examples: faith-based charities and churches often promote restorative justice programmes that seek to uphold dignity while addressing harm.

Question 3

point 1: Exodus 21:24 is often cited to justify a retributive approach, 'an eye for an eye', oe	**B1**
development for point 1: this can be interpreted as limiting punishment to an equivalent, preventing excessive revenge, oe	**B1**
point 2: Matthew 5:39 is often used to argue against corporal or retaliatory punishment, 'but I tell you, do not resist an evil person', oe	**B1**
development for point 2: Jesus's teaching to turn the other cheek supports forgiveness and non-violence, opposing physical retaliation, oe	**B1**
explicit, accurate reference to the named sacred writing or source, eg Exodus 21:24 and Matthew 5:39, cao	**B1**

Answer: E.g. Exodus 21:24 used for retributive justification; Matthew 5:39 used to support non-retaliation and opposition to corporal punishment.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Question 4

Level 4 A well-structured, balanced evaluation that offers several developed reasons for and against the view, refers to religious teachings and sources accurately, and reaches a supported conclusion.	**10-12**
Level 3 A reasoned argument with some development on both sides, reference to religious ideas, and a conclusion, though some points may be less developed.	**7-9**
Level 2 Some relevant points made for and/or against the view with limited development or religious reference; conclusion may be weak or implicit.	**4-6**
Level 1 Little knowledge or undeveloped comment with little or no attempt to evaluate; no meaningful conclusion.	**1-3**
Level 0 No relevant content.	**0**

Indicative content:

- Arguments agreeing that corporal punishment should never be used: it violates human dignity and the sanctity of the person; it risks abuse, miscarriages of justice and degrading treatment; Jesus's teaching in Matthew 5:39 supports non-retaliation and forgiveness; modern human rights frameworks and many religious leaders call for alternatives focused on rehabilitation.
- Arguments disagreeing, supporting limited use: some religious readings of Exodus 21:24 permit retributive measures, and some argue that corporal punishment can deter crime and bring justice swiftly, protecting society; in some Muslim-majority contexts hadd punishments are seen as divinely ordained and necessary to uphold moral order.
- Religious nuance: within Christianity there is diversity, with some traditions emphasising restorative justice and others historically supporting corporal sanctions; within Islam classical jurisprudence includes strict evidential rules that are intended to limit misuse, showing complexity in application.
- Practical considerations: evidence on deterrence is mixed, and risks of misuse and long-term harm weigh against corporal punishment; restorative and rehabilitative measures may better align with many religious teachings about forgiveness and transformation.
- Conclusion guidance: a balanced conclusion might argue that absolute prohibition is justified to protect dignity and prevent abuse, while also recognising the religious reasons some cite for limited, regulated measures; a strong conclusion will be supported by religious examples and ethical reasoning.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk