

# Commentary on candidate 7 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 **18 marks** because the essay is focussed on the question at times but drifts into general comments about the topic. Knowledge and understanding is mainly accurate and three or four issues have been correctly identified but weighs heavily on the science of the topic. The knowledge and understanding is mainly in depth and relevant and there is clear evidence that the candidate has drawn together mainly relevant information from some sources or perspectives (**7 marks**). Analysis identifies a mix of specific and general issues related to the question however, there is insufficient depth. The issues are explained and there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the question, but in general terms at times (**6 marks**). The evaluation in the scientific criticisms is weaker than the rest of the topic. There are some relevant judgements on the issues discussed and there is an attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth (**5 marks**).

## Question 3

### Section 2 – Religious Experience

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

The candidate was awarded **11 marks** because the essay is more focussed on the topic rather than the question. The information from sources should have been used to relate to the question, but it has not achieved this. Knowledge and understanding has inconsistent depth but is mainly accurate and relevant. There is evidence that the candidate has attempted to draw together relevant information, but references to sources and perspectives are general in nature and are limited (**5 marks**). The analysis identifies some general issues related to the question and there is insufficient depth or explanation. The issues are briefly explained and there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the topic but not to the question (**4 marks**). There is limited valid evaluation but is not clearly reasoned and lacks sufficiency. There are judgements on the issues but there is some brief reasoning behind them (**2 marks**).