

Commentary on candidate evidence

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

Candidate 1

Question 1 – ‘Capital punishment is morally acceptable.’

How far do you agree?

The candidate was awarded **23 out of 30 marks**.

Knowledge and understanding **10 marks**

Analysis **7 marks**

Evaluation **6 marks**

Knowledge and understanding

The question set was valid, clearly aligned to course content, and provided an accessible entry point for candidates. It allowed learners to demonstrate both breadth and depth of knowledge while engaging with key themes from the course. The wording was straightforward, which ensured accessibility for the full range of candidates, and it offered scope for extended analysis and evaluation in line with course requirements.

In response to the question, the candidate made effective use of a wide range of sources, which were skilfully integrated and consistently relevant. Knowledge and understanding is accurate, detailed and well developed throughout the essay, which demonstrated strong command of the material.

Analysis

Analysis was evident across the response and remained closely aligned to the overall line of argument. It was varied in approach, clearly signposted through analytical language, and added depth to the discussion. At times, however, the analysis became somewhat repetitive, which lessened its overall impact.

Evaluation

Evaluation was present and applied at appropriate points in the essay, though it was not as strong or sustained as the analysis. Evaluation often relied on restating knowledge and understanding and analysis rather than extending the argument further. The conclusion provided a clear summary of the main points discussed but did not significantly move beyond what was already covered.

Candidate 2

Question 2 – To what extent do religious and non-religious views agree with capital punishment?

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 successfully identified and described a range of moral issues throughout the assignment. Religious perspectives (Christianity) were explained with accuracy and clarity, while non-religious perspectives (utilitarian and humanist) were also described in detail. These were supported with well-chosen quotations, which

strengthened the quality of the knowledge and understanding. Knowledge and understanding was consistently accurate, relevant and detailed, which demonstrated a secure grasp of the material and strong subject knowledge.

Analysis

The essay is structured clearly and logically, with detailed knowledge and understanding followed by corresponding analysis of the issues and viewpoints identified. Analytical points were consistently signposted using appropriate analytical language, for example, 'this suggests...', which supports the flow of argument. In some sections however, the relevance of the analysis was uneven, with points not always developed as fully as they could have been, which limited the overall impact.

Evaluation

Evaluation was evident throughout and was generally well applied. The candidate engaged with different viewpoints in a balanced way, which clearly evaluated their strengths and weaknesses in relation to the question. In most cases, evaluation was supported effectively, with counterarguments introduced to challenge or extend key points. This demonstrated an ability to move beyond description into critical engagement, though in some areas, evaluation could have been taken further to avoid repetition and provide more depth.

Overall, the response demonstrated strong knowledge, a clear and logical structure and consistent evidence of analysis and evaluation. With more precise development of analysis in places, and greater depth in evaluation, the work could have been further strengthened.

Candidate 3

Question 3 – How far can religious and scientific views on origins be compatible?

The candidate was awarded **25 out of 30 marks**.

Knowledge and understanding **10 marks**

Analysis **9 marks**

Evaluation **6 marks**

Knowledge and understanding

The candidate made effective use of a wide range of consistently relevant sources, all of which were carefully selected and integrated into the assignment. Knowledge and understanding is accurate, detailed and well developed, and has been deployed directly in response to the question. This ensured that the essay remained succinct and tightly focused throughout, with no digression from the central issue.

Analysis

Analysis was evident across the assignment and demonstrated the candidate's ability to identify and explore specific issues directly linked to the question. The candidate explained a range of different viewpoints with clarity and depth and made sophisticated links between them. Quotations and perspectives were not only described but also analysed, which showed a strong ability to interpret their meaning and relevance within the context of the argument.

The candidate's concluding paragraph was a particular strength. It brought together the discussion effectively, offering clear and well-reasoned judgements on compatibility. This provided a confident and convincing end to the essay.

Evaluation

There was evidence of evaluation across the assignment, particularly in two paragraphs where viewpoints were weighed against one another with sophistication. However, evaluation was minimal in comparison to the strength of the knowledge and understanding and analysis. At times, evaluation relied on brief assertions rather than fully developed judgements, meaning that opportunities to extend the quality of argument were not always maximised.

Candidate 4

Question 4 – To what extent is war morally justifiable?

The candidate was awarded **12 out of 30 marks**.

Knowledge and understanding **6 marks**

Analysis **3 marks**

Evaluation **3 marks**

Knowledge and understanding

The candidate demonstrated some knowledge and understanding of several different types of war and their consequences, showing awareness of a range of issues within the topic. Religious responses were included and supported with quotations, but these were often only loosely connected to the points being made. In addition, the sources of quotations were not consistently cited, which limited their effectiveness and weakened the authority of the argument. While some moral issues were described, these sections tended to lack depth and became repetitive, reducing the overall impact of the discussion.

Analysis

There were attempts to analyse quotations and viewpoints, with phrases such as 'This shows...' and 'This helps to show...' being used. However, the explanations provided were overly simplistic and generalised, which prevented the analysis from adding sufficient insight. The same issues were also identified repeatedly, rather than extending into new or more nuanced aspects of the topic, which further limited the sophistication of the response.

Evaluation

Evaluation was attempted throughout the essay, and the candidate did make some judgements in relation to the material presented. However, these judgements tended to remain general and lacked depth, with repetition of earlier points rather than sustained or developed evaluation. The use of counterarguments was limited, and opportunities to weigh up the strengths and weaknesses of different perspectives were not fully realised.

The absence of an overall conclusion was a key weakness. The question clearly lent itself to a concluding judgement and without this, the essay felt unfinished. A conclusion would have allowed the candidate to bring together their knowledge, analysis and evaluation into a clear final position, which would have strengthened the overall coherence of the assignment.