

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each section of this question paper.

Candidate 1

‘Arguments from intelligent design fail to prove that God exists.’ How far do you agree with this statement?

The candidate was awarded **20 marks**. The candidate broadly interpreted ‘intelligent design’ and then applied it to a range of arguments demonstrating strong knowledge and understanding, although they have muddled the names of Darwin and Dawkins. The breadth of their response had an impact on the depth of analysis and evaluation. The candidate clearly showed that they were attempting to answer the given question throughout their essay.

Candidate 2

‘The Kalam argument fails to prove that God exists.’ How far do you agree with this statement?

The candidate was awarded **30 marks** because they clearly answered the question. Knowledge and understanding was consistently in depth, accurate and relevant, using specific sources. The candidate identified and explained specific, relevant issues in depth. They evaluated clearly and explicitly, referring to the question and concluding throughout the essay.

Candidate 3

‘James’ ideas are central to our understanding of religious experience.’ To what extent do you agree?

The candidate was awarded **28 marks**. The knowledge and understanding was in-depth throughout the essay. The candidate used relevant and appropriate information from specific sources. The analysis was focused on James and linked in Otto, clearly identified specific issues and demonstrated a clear understanding of their relevance to the question. The candidate demonstrated that they were answering the question throughout the essay and their evaluation showed insightful and valid judgements.

Candidate 4

‘The treatment and use of embryos is morally unacceptable.’ To what extent do you agree?

The candidate was awarded **19 marks**. Their knowledge and understanding was mainly in depth and focused on the topic, drawing together a range of relevant sources. A wide range of issues were identified but these were analysed in insufficient depth which was then reflected in the evaluation.

Candidate 5

'End of life care is not a moral issue.' To what extent do you agree?

The candidate was awarded **17 marks**. The candidate deployed knowledge and understanding that was mainly in depth, accurate and relevant to the topic. When analysing, the candidate identified a mix of specific and general issues but focused more on the issues surrounding assisted dying and euthanasia. This then had an impact on evaluation. The candidate made a good attempt to draw their essay back to the question in the conclusion.