

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each element of this assignment.

Candidate 1

The candidate was awarded **30 out of 30 marks**.

Knowledge and understanding	10 marks
Analysis	10 marks
Evaluation	10 marks

Knowledge and understanding

The essay demonstrates a comprehensive and accurate understanding of the topic. The key concepts, theories and viewpoints are explained in depth. Information is relevant, well-organised, and clearly linked to the question.

Analysis

The essay breaks down and explores different aspects of the issue in depth. The connections between ideas, theories, and arguments are clearly made. The response considers different interpretations, showing depth of thought. The candidate goes beyond description and provides meaningful discussion.

Evaluation

The essay offers a balanced and justified judgment on the issue. The conclusion is logical and well-supported by evidence and reasoning. The candidate engages with criticism and justifies their position.

The candidate also signposts their analysis and evaluation very clearly which allows them to ensure they remain on task and in line with the question.

Candidate 2

The candidate was awarded **28 out of 30 marks**.

Knowledge and understanding	10 marks
Analysis	9 marks
Evaluation	9 marks

Knowledge and understanding

The candidate demonstrates thorough and accurate knowledge of the topic. Key concepts, theories and viewpoints are clearly explained. Information is relevant, detailed, and structured logically.

Analysis

The candidate analyses the key arguments and perspectives in depth. Clear links are made between different ideas, showing good reasoning. Multiple interpretations are explored. However, in some places, the analysis lacks specificity — one or two points are not fully developed.

Evaluation

The candidate provides a well-structured evaluation with a balanced judgment. Strengths and weaknesses are weighed with relevant reasoning. A clear conclusion is given however, some evaluative points lacked depth.

This is still an excellent essay — it is just missing out on full marks due to a lack of depth in some areas. Had the candidate provided more precise examples, deeper explanation or more developed counterarguments, they could have achieved full marks.

Candidate 3

The candidate was awarded **14 out of 30 marks**.

Knowledge and understanding	5 marks
Analysis	5 marks
Evaluation	4 marks

Knowledge and understanding

The candidate includes some relevant points and demonstrates a basic understanding of the topic. They have attempted to structure their essay using signposting (KU in the margin), showing awareness of the skill. However, their points remain superficial and lack depth — statements are often too general, missing key factual details or examples. There is limited development of ideas, meaning explanations do not fully demonstrate breadth or depth of knowledge.

Analysis

The candidate has attempted analysis but lacks depth in breaking down arguments. They state different viewpoints but do not critically engage with them

or explain why one argument is stronger or weaker than another. The response tends to be descriptive at times, rather than analytical, with arguments being outlined rather than explored.

Evaluation

The candidate attempts evaluation but does not fully justify their judgments. The conclusion is more of a summary rather than an attempt to address new justifications for their overall judgement. Evaluative points are generic and lack engagement with evidence to support the final judgment.

Candidate 4

The candidate was awarded **24 out of 30 marks**.

Knowledge and understanding	10 marks
Analysis	9 marks
Evaluation	5 marks

Knowledge and understanding

The candidate shows clear evidence of relevant and accurate knowledge and understanding (KU) and uses a range of sources. The KU is detailed, developed and consistent throughout the essay.

Analysis

The analysis just falls short of the top band, as some areas lacked depth. However, the response maintained a clear line of focus throughout, with strong and well-evidenced analysis.

Evaluation

The question asked was 'Evaluate religious and non-religious responses to moral issues arising from capital punishment' – it was felt that this candidate didn't manage to do this throughout the essay focusing more on the moral issue, and wasn't able to fully make the link between the response and the moral issue.