

Commentary on candidate evidence

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

Candidate 1

Philosophy of religion

Question 3(a)

The candidate demonstrated excellent knowledge and understanding of atheism and scored beyond the 5 marks awarded.

Question 3(b)

The candidate analysed the source in three main sections and then attempted to make two to three analysis points for each in order to develop some depth of analysis (**5 marks**).

Question 3(c)

The candidate used key phrases such as, 'I agree' and 'I disagree with the source' which helped them to stay focused on evaluating. They were repetitive at points but still reached 5 evaluative points overall (**5 marks**).

Candidate 2

Religious experience

Question 6(a)

The candidate was able to apply their general understanding of 'Scientific accounts of religious experience' to systematically pick up 3 of the 5 marks available.

Question 6(b)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they selected two parts of the source to analyse and made a clear point for each. However, no further marks were awarded as it was felt that the candidate either lacked the knowledge or confidence to go onto analyse the sources.

Question 6(c)

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**. They made judgements but tended to refer to weaknesses. Their evaluation would have been clearer if they had phrased their points as 'I agree/disagree', this could have helped them focus on

developing their evaluation as they would then have had to back up their views in more detail.

Candidate 3

Medical ethics

Question 9(a)

The candidate demonstrated clear knowledge and understanding of organ procurement and gave more than 5 specific points **(5 marks)**.

Question 9(b)

The candidate split the source into three sections to make their analysis clear. They used language such as 'this shows' to signpost where they developed the implications and potential consequences of the source.

Question 9(c)

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**. They used the same excerpts as they had for analysis and made a good attempt to evaluate each part in turn. They also made clear judgements but these were repetitions of their analysis so no further marks awarded.