

Commentary on candidate 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 **5 marks** because the essay lacks relevance to the question and the topic. There is minimal knowledge and understanding and no depth to any points made. There is some evidence that the candidate has attempted to draw together relevant or appropriate information but references to sources and perspectives are general in nature (**3 marks**). The analysis identifies a few issues, but they are not clearly related to the question and the coverage is superficial. Issues are briefly explained but there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the topic, but not the question (**2 marks**). There is little or no evaluation (**0 marks**).

Question 3

Section 2 – Religious Experience

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

The candidate was awarded **19 marks** because there is clear structure and the candidate remains focussed on the question in the majority of the essay, but does drift away at times. Knowledge and understanding is good and some of the explanations are of a good quality. The knowledge and understanding is mainly in depth, accurate and relevant. There is clear evidence that the candidate has drawn together mainly relevant and appropriate information from some of the specific sources (**8 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 evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the question which is general at times (**6 marks**). The essay is a little brief and because of this the evaluation is affected. The candidate writes the correct statements, but does not appear clear on how to expand on the evaluation. There has been some attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth. The essay has relevant judgements on the issues however, lacks on reasoning (**5 marks**).