

# Commentary on candidate evidence

## Candidate 1

### Question 13 — Analyse non-religious responses to moral issues arising from deterrence.

The candidate was awarded **9 out of 10 marks**.

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each element of this question paper component:

- Knowledge and understanding is awarded **6 marks (even though 8 KU marks were credited)**.
- Analysis is awarded 3 marks.

In response to the question, the candidate was able to draw upon their knowledge and understanding to describe the aims of deterrence as a purpose of punishment. They then described two moral issues arising from deterrence in reasonable detail. Finally, the candidate also achieved marks for accurate descriptions of two non-religious responses: Amnesty international and utilitarianism.

The candidate achieved analysis marks for making clear links between the non-religious responses and the moral issues.

## Candidate 2

### Question 1 — Analyse the relationship between tanha and the Three Root Poisons.

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 10 marks**.

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each element of this question paper component:

- Knowledge and understanding is awarded **6 marks**.
- Analysis is awarded **0 marks**.

The candidate clearly and accurately described what is meant by tanha and its links to suffering and enlightenment. However, attempted analysis that followed focussed on the significance/importance of tanha, rather than analysing the relationship to the Three Root Poisons. The candidate provided a wealth of knowledge and understanding on the Three Root Poisons. The candidate did attempt to analyse the relationship between tanha and the Three Root Poisons in the final paragraph but simply repeated already awarded knowledge and understanding.

## Candidate 3

### Question 2 — Evaluate the relevance of meditation to Buddhists.

The candidate was awarded **17 out of 20 marks**.

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each element of this question paper component:

- Knowledge and understanding is awarded 10 **marks (even though 11 KU marks were credited)**.
- Analysis is awarded 2 marks.
- Evaluation is awarded 5 marks.

The candidate presented a wealth of knowledge and understanding which focused specifically on samatha and vipassana meditation. The candidate described how Buddhists carry out meditation practices and the purpose of these. There was however, some inaccurate knowledge and understanding which was not awarded marks. The candidate achieved analysis marks for their explanation of the purpose of meditation and the consequences of meditating however, this could have been developed more fully. The candidate focused the final part of the essay on clearly evaluating the relevance of meditation and achieved full marks for this skill.

## Candidate 4

### Question 13 — Analyse non-religious responses to moral issues arising from deterrence.

The candidate was awarded **7 out of 10 marks**.

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each element of this question paper component:

- Knowledge and understanding is awarded **6 marks**.
- Analysis is awarded **1 mark**.

The candidate provided a brief description of deterrence followed by identification of a moral issue and a non-religious viewpoint. However, the attempted analysis that followed is directed towards deterrence as a purpose of punishment and ignored the moral issue and non-religious viewpoint, therefore no marks were awarded. The candidate attempted to evaluate deterrence as a purpose of punishment which was not in response to the question, therefore no marks were awarded. The candidate provided a second moral issue, which was developed, and a second non-religious response. The analysis which followed was directly linked to the moral issue and non-religious response and was therefore awarded marks. Again, the candidate attempted to evaluate deterrence as a purpose of punishment which was not in response to the question, therefore no marks were awarded.

## Candidate 5

### Question 14 — Evaluate religious responses to moral issues arising from responses to crime.

The candidate was awarded **13 out of 20 marks**.

The evidence for this candidate has achieved the following marks for each element of this question paper component:

- Knowledge and understanding is awarded 10 marks (**even though 11 KU marks were credited**).
- Analysis is awarded 3 marks.
- Evaluation is awarded 0 marks.

The candidate presented relevant knowledge and understanding in the form of custodial and non-custodial sentences, which is what we expected from this question (as per course specification). The candidate began with non-custodial sentences – they provided a definition and example, before going on to describe a relevant moral issue. The religious response provided is a source which is awarded marks as it is accurate and relevant. The candidate then provided some analysis of the religious response, which tied in with the moral issue. Evaluation was attempted but not awarded marks as the candidate stated their viewpoint, but did not support this with any reasons. The second paragraph focused on another example of non-custodial sentences and a moral issue, both of which were awarded marks. The religious response that followed did not really link to the moral issue, nor do any subsequent analysis – furthermore, the evaluation which followed did not focus on the religious response to the moral issue. In the third paragraph, the candidate focused on custodial sentences – knowledge and understanding marks were awarded for a definition, examples given and the moral issue identified. The religious responses were inaccurate, therefore not awarded marks however, the candidate still picked up an analysis mark for analysing the moral issue. No further evaluation marks were awarded, given that the religious response was not credited.