

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 3(a)

The candidate demonstrated excellent knowledge and understanding of the teleological argument. **(5 marks)**

Question 3(b)

The candidate analysed the source in five main sections and then attempted to make analysis points for each. **(5 marks)**

Question 3(c)

The candidate attempted to evaluate each phrase that they had analysed which meant that they were repetitive at points and did not evaluate in enough depth to access all the available marks. **(2 marks)**

Candidate 2

Philosophy of Religion

Question 3(a)

The candidate demonstrated some knowledge and understanding of the teleological argument but was a little repetitive. **(3 marks)**

Question 3(b)

The candidate analysed the source in five main sections and then attempted to analyse each. Some points were unclear or vague. **(2 marks)**

Question 3(c)

The candidate attempted to show they were evaluating as they tried to show they were making a judgement. However, the points made were analytical or unclear. **(0 marks).**

Candidate 3

Religious experience

Question 6(a)

The candidate was able to apply their clear understanding of 'James' accounts of religious experience' to systematically pick up all available marks. The candidate gave overall points about James' understanding then went into specific details. **(5 marks)**

Question 6(b)

The candidate was awarded full marks because they broke the source into five parts to analyse, focussing on the implications of each. **(5 marks)**

Question 6(c)

The candidate made clear judgements overall but drifted into further analysis. **(4 marks)**

Candidate 4

Medical ethics

Question 9(a)

The candidate demonstrated clear knowledge and understanding of abortion and gave five specific points. **(5 marks)**

Question 9(b)

The candidate split the source into three sections to make their analysis clear. They used language explicitly to signpost where they were systematically developing analytical points: 'suggests', 'implies', 'highlights', 'a consequence'. **(5 marks)**

Question 9(c)

The candidate made some judgements on the topic rather than the source and made further analysis. Evaluation marks were awarded when they were of the source. **(2 marks)**

Candidate 5

Medical ethics

Question 9(a)

The candidate demonstrated clear knowledge and understanding of abortion and gave four specific points. The fifth point they attempted to make tried to cover a broader area but lacked clarity. **(4 marks)**

Question 9(b)

Rather than analysing the given source, the candidate gave Knowledge points about the violinist analogy. **(0 marks)**

Question 9(c)

The candidate was awarded 2 marks where it was clear that they were making relevant judgements of the source. **(2 marks)**