Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of this course assessment component.

Candidate 1

Medical ethics

12(a)
The candidate does very well with their KU question on assisted dying, scoring more than the required 5 marks. They demonstrate a solid understanding of what assisted dying is and give a very comprehensive account.

12(b)
The candidate adeptly applies analytical language to deconstruct the meaning of the source, skilfully guiding the marker through key analytical points with phrases such as 'implication,' 'the quote suggests,' and 'the quote implies.' This strategic use of language ensures that the candidate remains focused on analysis rather than merely presenting learned Knowledge and Understanding (KU).

12(c)
The candidate skilfully initiates their response by asserting, "I agree with parts of the source," exemplifying a commendable approach to addressing evaluative questions. This shows the candidate's capacity for rendering personal judgments. Subsequently, they offer five basic yet impactful evaluations of the source, substantiating their agreement or disagreement with well-justified responses.

Candidate 2

Philosophy of Religion 1

4(a)
The candidate did a great job with the KU question on Kalam Cosmological argument, scoring well above the 5 marks needed. They showed a clear understanding of the Kalam Cosmological argument and gave a thorough explanation.

4(b)
The candidate adeptly tackles the question by methodically dissecting each component of the source, employing a highly effective analytical approach. While not securing full marks, their response showcases a clever and sophisticated method of scrutinising each aspect of the source.

4(c)

The candidate struggles to evaluate in their answer, only managing to score 2 marks. This is an example of a candidate who is a high B / low A overall. This candidate would have done better had they used key phrases such as 'I agree with this because' or 'I disagree with this because' to ensure they remained on the evaluative path rather than falling into the trap of being analytical in places.

Candidate 3

Philosophy of Religion 2

4(a)

The candidate struggles to fully explore what the Kalam Cosmological argument is and presents vague KU in places. This candidate would benefit from simply asserting the key points, eg:

♦ Everything that begins to exist has a cause.
♦ The universe began to exist.
♦ Therefore, the universe has a cause.

4(b)

The candidate does an excellent job analysing the source, again using the technique of breaking down parts of the source and using analytical language throughout.

4(c)

Same as 4(b), this candidate makes a very good attempt of evaluate the different parts of the source, scoring 4/5 and uses language such as 'I agree' and 'I disagree' which sign posts the marker to their own personal judgment being utilised.

Candidate 4

Religious Experience

8(a)

The candidate excelled in addressing the (KU) question related to psychological accounts of religious experience by obtaining the full 5 marks. They demonstrated a logical comprehension of these accounts by providing a comprehensive and detailed explanation.

8(b)

The candidate effectively addresses the question by systematically examining each element of the source, utilising a highly successful analytical approach. They achieved a perfect score, and their response highlights a sharp and sophisticated technique in scrutinising every aspect of the source.

8(c)

The candidate only manages to score 3/5 for this question with the section in the middle of their answer not deemed able to score any marks as it was felt that their points were not fully justified/lacked depth and always left the marker asking, 'why' at the end of each sentence.