

# Commentary on candidate evidence 1

The candidate was awarded **27 marks**.

Their knowledge of the main features of Utilitarianism is detailed and clear and shows a depth of understanding of the relevant information and the moral theory. They have very successfully used their knowledge of Utilitarianism to provide a detailed, methodical and sophisticated analysis of the situation; identifying how the different aspects of the theory might be applied to it from a Utilitarian point of view.

Their evaluation of the theories makes use of the scenario to raise issues and their comments form a discussion where they consider both strengths and weaknesses. They also consider the effect of the criticisms discussed and also consider some counter-criticisms that might be raised. They give a clear, well-supported personal position on the issues raised by the situation which is fully consistent with the descriptive and evaluative material they have presented in their response.

# Commentary on candidate evidence 2

The candidate was awarded **16 marks**.

They have given a good introduction which describes some of the background to Utilitarianism. They describe Act Utilitarianism competently with good use of the quote from Bentham. They get a little bit muddled when describing Rule Utilitarianism. Their first sentence in paragraph 3 is correct, but then they wrongly associate the idea of Mill's Higher and Lower Pleasures with Rule Utilitarianism. The rest of this paragraph is irrelevant to the scenario. Their reference to the situation shows some understanding of the application of the theories but does not go in to depth.

They give several evaluative comments that are quite superficial and not all directly relevant to the scenario. They miss the opportunity in their discussion of the scenario to point out that the predicted consequences were different from the actual consequences. They give a personal view on issues raised by the situation but with no real support to their position.