

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 2

Aquinas' cosmological arguments do not prove God's existence'. To what extent do you agree?

The candidate was awarded **16 marks**. The candidate showed that they had knowledge and understanding of the topic that was mainly in-depth. They mainly focused on Aquinas and the Kalam argument. The analysis identified specific issues but there was insufficient depth which led to limited evaluation of Aquinas' cosmological argument.

Candidate 2

Philosophy of religion – Question 2

Aquinas' cosmological arguments do not prove God's existence'. To what extent do you agree?

The candidate was awarded **30 marks** because they clearly answered the question. Knowledge and understanding was consistently in depth, accurate and relevant, using specific sources. The candidate identified and explained specific, relevant issues in depth. They evaluated clearly and explicitly, referring to the question and concluding throughout the essay.

Candidate 3

Philosophy of religion – Question 1

‘Given the improbability of God, it is unlikely that God exists.’ To what extent do you agree?

The candidate was awarded **30 marks**. The candidate skilfully deployed their skills throughout the essay. Their knowledge and understanding was consistent and they drew together relevant and appropriate sources to support and develop counterarguments throughout the essay, leading to insightful and clearly reasoned evaluation.

Candidate 4

Philosophy of religion – Question 1

‘Given the improbability of God, it is unlikely that God exists.’ To what extent do you agree?

The candidate was awarded **16 marks**. The candidate attempted to answer the given question with a broad interpretation of ‘improbability of God’ which at points meant there were some issues with relevance. Overall, the knowledge and understanding had some depth and drew together appropriate information. The analysis identified some specific issues but there was insufficient depth and explanation which was general in nature at times. The candidate attempted to set out a line of argument, and they did refer back to the question, so some evaluation is valid but not consistently and clearly reasoned and lacks depth.

Candidate 5

Religious Experience – Question 4

How effective are sociological accounts in developing our understanding of religious experience?

The candidate was awarded **24 marks**. The knowledge and understanding was consistently in depth and drew information from specific sources and perspectives. The candidate's line of argument led to a comparison between sociological perspectives and William James, leading to analysis that was mainly good but had uneven depth at times. The evaluation is valid with mainly relevant judgements and clear conclusions.

Candidate 6

Religious Experience – Question 5

How effective are meditative experiences in developing our understanding of religious experience?

The candidate was awarded **30 marks**. The knowledge and understanding was in-depth throughout the essay. The candidate used relevant and appropriate information from specific sources. The analysis was focused on the question and followed a clear line of argument. They clearly identified specific issues and demonstrated a clear understanding of their relevance to the question. The candidate demonstrated that they were answering the question throughout the essay and their evaluation showed insightful and valid judgements.

Candidate 7

Medical Ethics – Question 7

To what extent do you agree that organ allocation is not a moral issue?

The candidate was awarded **12 marks**. Overall, this response was in the 11-15 overview, 'This essay is focused more on the topic rather than the question'. The knowledge and understanding had some depth and drew together some appropriate information. In analysis, general issues were identified that related to the question but were limited in depth. Evaluation was limited but not clearly reasoned and lacking in sufficiency.

Candidate 8

Medical Ethics – Question 8

To what extent do you agree that assisted dying is not a moral issue?

The candidate was awarded **16 marks**. The candidate demonstrated some relevant knowledge and understanding and references to sources and perspectives were general and limited. The candidate identified some specific issues and attempts to go through moral issues systematically but there is insufficient depth and explanation, which is general in nature. Some evaluation is valid but not consistently reasoned but the candidate does manage to pull their essay back to the question at the end.

Candidate 9

Medical Ethics – Question 8

To what extent do you agree that assisted dying is not a moral issue?

The candidate was awarded **23 marks**. The candidate's knowledge and understanding was mainly in depth and focused on the topic, drawing together a range of relevant sources. They have attempted to tackle the question but there is some irrelevance and repetition at points. Specific issues are identified but the depth of analysis is uneven at times. In evaluating, the candidate makes mainly relevant judgments and makes mainly relevant conclusions.