

# Commentary on candidate 5 evidence

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

## Question 1

### Section 1 – Philosophy of Religion

**“Aquinas’s cosmological arguments prove the existence of a first cause and not the existence of God.” Discuss. (30 marks)**

The candidate was awarded **16 marks** because the candidate has clearly understood what the cosmological argument is and explained it well. The candidate also understands the question, but deviates between the two and evaluation is generally quite superficial. Knowledge and understanding is mainly in depth, accurate and relevant. There is some evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information but references to sources and perspectives tend to be more general and limited (**7 marks**). The analysis identifies a mix of specific and general issues that are related to the question and there is insufficient depth and explanation of them. The issues are explained and there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the question, but this is general in nature at times (**5 marks**). The evaluation is valid but not clearly reasoned and lacks sufficiency. There are relevant judgements or perspectives on the issues however; it is judgement with brief reasoning. An attempt to draw conclusions is evident, but they lack depth (**4 marks**).

## Question 3

### Section 2 – Religious Experience

**“Religious Experience proves the existence of God.” Discuss. (30 marks)**

The candidate was awarded **14 marks** because the essay does not have sufficient evidence to effectively evaluate and support the points made throughout the essay. Knowledge and understanding is correct but there is a lack of depth to analyse and evaluate effectively. The essay is focussed more on the topic rather than the question and it lacks relevance to either the topic or the question. Knowledge and understanding has inconsistent depth but is mainly accurate. There is some evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information but references to sources and perspectives tends to be more general and is limited (**6 marks**). The analysis identifies some general issues related to the question but there is insufficient depth or explanation. There is evidence of some understanding of the relevance to the question but this is generally superficial (**4 marks**). Evaluation is valid but not clearly reasoned and lacks sufficiency. Judgements on the issue have brief reasoning behind them. There has been some attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth (**4 marks**).