

Commentary on candidate evidence

Candidate 1

Question: 'Euthanasia morally acceptable' How far do you agree?

This candidate was awarded **12 marks**.

Knowledge and understanding (KU) (20 marks)

The knowledge and understanding (KU) was awarded **7 marks**. The aims have been explained and are partially achieved throughout the essay. The KU is evident throughout, but it lacks relevance, depth and accuracy. The KU is lacking in evidence-based knowledge, and it also lacks the necessary sources to allow more marks to be awarded.

Analysis (15 marks) and Evaluation (15 marks)

Analysis and evaluation are lacking throughout and the KU that is presented does not do enough to allow the candidate to fully analyse or evaluate. An essay which focuses on morality should identify the moral issues and focus on that as the basis for answering their question. Analysis was awarded **3 marks** and evaluation awarded **2 marks**.

Candidate 2

Question: Who holds moral responsibility over capital punishment?

This candidate was awarded **34 marks**.

This dissertation clearly demonstrates a solid understanding of the nature of this task. However, what lets them down at the very first stage is the question they have chosen. This question causes problems for the candidate as they have given themselves a closed question which often limits their ability to evaluate. However, the candidate makes a very good attempt to try and answer this question.

Knowledge and understanding (20 marks)

The candidate was awarded **14 marks** for KU, this is an example of a candidate who demonstrates skills in both boxes (15-20 and 10-14). The KU is consistently supported by strong research which is under the 15-20 box however, the rest of the KU falls in the 10-14 box. Their aims are explained and mainly achieved. The KU throughout is mainly relevant, accurate and in-depth and sources are used regularly.

Analysis (15 marks) and Evaluation (15 marks)

The analysis is the same as the KU as it falls across two boxes, however, the analysis was in the 12-15 box for supporting and developing KU & evaluation was in the 8-11 box for its relevance and depth. The candidate was awarded **12 marks** for analysis. The evaluation continues to remain the more difficult skill for many candidates. This scored clearly in the 8-11 box as it just manages to hit the criteria but lacks depth and consistency throughout. The candidate was awarded **8 marks** for evaluation.

Candidate 3

Question: To what extent is God responsible for evil and suffering?

This candidate was awarded **47 marks**.

This is an example of a very strong dissertation; the candidate sets a good question. All three skills marks are from the top boxes on the marking grid.

Knowledge and understanding (20 marks)

This candidate was awarded **19 marks** for KU as the aims are evident and explained. The candidate shows their KU is consistent throughout and relevant to the question, supported by research throughout and sources permeate throughout the dissertation.

Analysis (15 marks)

The analysis made is relevant, accurate and in-depth throughout. It builds on KU beautifully and links to evaluation. The candidate was awarded **15 marks** for analysis.

Evaluation (15 marks)

This candidate was awarded **13 marks** for evaluation as it is very good, simplistic and related to the question throughout the essay. In-depth judgements are made with justified reasons attached.