

Commentary on candidate evidence

The evidence for these candidates has achieved the following marks for each section of this course assessment component.

Candidate 1

Question 2

The candidate was awarded **21/30 marks**.

The candidate provided relevant, accurate and detailed descriptive information in relation to Kantian Ethics that clearly addresses the question. They gave a rich analysis of the scenario and how Kantian Ethics can be applied to assess it. They explained the main features of Kantianism, analysed and discussed Kant's advice with reference to the situation in the context of the categorical imperative. The candidate's explanation of the theory shows a clear knowledge of the principles of Kantian Ethics and how it should be used to help make moral decisions and competently addresses the question asked. In particular, the application of the 2nd formulation to show why lying is wrong for Kant, shows depth of understanding.

The candidate provided some fair and relevant points of evaluation, which are explained but these could be developed and explained further.

A candidate gaining a top mark in this essay would engage more fully with the evaluative comments and these would form more of a discussion than presented here.

Candidate 2

Question 2

The candidate was awarded **4/30 marks**.

The candidate's essay is very confused and shows very little knowledge of the course content. They began by mixing up Utilitarianism with Kantianism. There is very little accurate comment made, although the candidate has attempted to answer the question and shows some understanding of other moral theories, which are applied to the scenario showing a very superficial understanding. This essay is very poor and so falls into the 0-4 marks range. It therefore gains 1 mark for each relevant point up to a maximum of 4 marks and just manages to achieve this.

Candidate 3

Question 3

The candidate was awarded **18/30 marks**.

The candidate provided a considerable amount of relevant, mainly accurate and detailed descriptive information in relation to the moral theory. They clearly address the question and considered some of the issues raised by the quotation. The candidate competently explained some key features of Kantian ethics. They explained the idea of duty and its application in morality, as opposed to inclination which, in the main, shows detail and relevance. Their explanation of the Categorical Imperative and its formulations is good, although the discussion of the Contradiction in the will is a bit unclear.

The candidate provided several well-explained evaluative comments in relation to Kantian ethics, though these are somewhat superficial. They mostly do address the question raised by the quotation but this could be more focused in their discussion to draw a more coherent line of argument.

Candidate 4

Question 3

The candidate was awarded **30/30 marks**.

The candidate showed a thorough, in depth and accurate knowledge and understanding of the theory, application and reasonable interpretation of Kantian Ethics. They presented a detailed, methodical and sophisticated response to the issues raised by the quotation with evaluative comments woven throughout their essay in response to the points of theory they described. Their line of argument directly addresses the question and unpacks the different elements of the quotation, addressing the criticism that Kantian ethics is cold and also that it is detached from real life separately.

There is considerable evaluative discussion through the course of the essay and a well-supported personal position on the issues raised by the quotation is shown by the candidate. This is an excellent essay.

Candidate 5

Question 3

The candidate was awarded **12/30 marks**.

The candidate demonstrated their understanding of the basic principles of Kantian Ethics. They described the focus on duty rather than inclination along with a superficial explanation of the universal law formulation of the Categorical Imperative. They showed a basic understanding of this principle but failed to show a full understanding of how the contradiction in conception or the will would be used to develop the moral law.

There is some limited evaluative comments, making a comparison with Utilitarianism, but the candidate only connects this with the question asked very tentatively.