

# Commentary on candidate 6 evidence

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

## Section 1 - Philosophy of Religion

### Question 1

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

The candidate was awarded **17 marks** because the essay is clearly focussed on the question, but does, at times, refer generally to the topic. Three or four issues have been correctly identified but the science is over-played. Knowledge and understanding is mainly accurate, relevant and in depth and there is clear evidence that the candidate has drawn together mainly relevant and appropriate information. There is a good use of sources although a couple are inaccurate and a couple should have been identified (**7 marks**). The analysis identifies a mix of specific and general issues that are related to the question; however, there is insufficient depth and explanation of them. There is some evidence of the understanding of their relevance to the question which is general in nature at times (**6 marks**). The evaluation is valid but not clearly reasoned and lacks sufficiency. It has relevant judgements on the issues raised but the evaluation in the scientific criticisms is weaker than the rest and some of the support for conclusions is weak (**4 marks**).

### Question 6

#### Section 2 - Medical Ethics

**To what extent is euthanasia morally unacceptable? (30 marks)**

The candidate was awarded **10 marks** because the essay is uneven. It focusses more on the topic rather than the question. It has an inconsistent focus on the question and does not provide support consistently for its conclusions. The knowledge and understanding is good at times but inconsistent in depth. There is evidence that the candidate has attempted to draw together relevant and appropriate information but references to sources and perspectives are general in nature and limited (**5 marks**). The analysis identifies a few issues but is not clearly related to the question and coverage is superficial. The issues are briefly explained but there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the topic but not to the question (**3 marks**). There is some evaluation but it is not clearly reasoned and lacks sufficiency. There is some judgement on the issues but only brief reasoning behind them. Conclusions are restricted to closing comments (**2 marks**).