

Question paper 2

Candidate 13 – Origins (Question 1)

The candidate was awarded **20/20 marks**.

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

Knowledge and Understanding (KU)	10
Analysis	5
Evaluation	5

Commentary

'Life was created.' How far do you agree?

The candidate begins by outlining a Christian response to the statement. The Genesis narrative was described, and used to present a Christian viewpoint. The candidate was awarded knowledge marks for description and use of sources, and analysis marks for explaining the implications of these sources for Christians.

The candidate went on to describe literal and symbolic interpretations of Genesis, using the analytical phrase 'as a result of this' in order to explain the implications of both stances for Christians. Personal evaluation is given and supported clearly.

The candidate was awarded further knowledge marks for their description of the theory of evolution, however the quotation was not sourced and, as a result, no knowledge marks were awarded for this. The candidate presented the evidence for evolution by describing common ancestor and vestigial organs, again making good use of analytical stems, such as 'as a result' and 'an implication of'. Personal evaluation was again credited.

The candidate gives an overall conclusion on the question, using analytical arguments about compatibility. The essay finishes with a quotation from Albert Einstein, which was correctly sourced.

Overall this is an excellent response to the question.

Candidate 14 – Origins (Question 1)

The candidate was awarded **16/20 marks**.

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

Knowledge and Understanding (KU)	10
Analysis	2
Evaluation	4

Commentary

'Life was created.' How far do you agree?

This response is extensive, and often very repetitive. The candidate presented a supported evaluation point at the beginning of the essay and was credited for this. There is a wealth of knowledge about the theory of evolution, and some supported evaluation. However, analysis was not present in the first few paragraphs, which are very descriptive.

The candidate then went on to present the religious arguments. Literal and symbolic interpretations were discussed, and sources used to support this. Again, analysis was limited with the candidate only picking up one mark for this skill by explaining the implication of a source.

Although the candidate's conclusion is lengthy and detailed, it basically repeated what had already been discussed. As such, only one additional evaluation mark was awarded here.

Candidate 15 – The existence of God (Question 2)

The candidate was awarded **14/20 marks**.

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

Knowledge and Understanding (KU)	7
Analysis	4
Evaluation	3

Commentary

'God exists.' How far do you agree?

This candidate presented a well-argued essay showing ability in all three skills areas. This section continues to prove challenging for many candidates as the average mark for this section remains at 12/20. However, this candidate does very well to access 7/10 KU marks, all of which are relevant and developed as well as making a strong attempt to analyse the issues arising from the argument that they used. Evaluation was done well and the candidate did not rely on skills phrases to score marks. This is a very good example of an answer to this question.

Candidate 16 – The existence of God (Question 2)

The candidate was awarded **12/20 marks**.

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

Knowledge and Understanding (KU)	8
Analysis	1
Evaluation	3

Commentary

'God exists.' How far do you agree?

The candidate begins by describing Aquinas' cosmological argument. Knowledge marks were awarded for their description of the three ways, but there was no analysis of these arguments. The candidate's evaluation was weak; they made some 'half' points, but did not fully get to grips with supported judgements. For example: 'The world is far larger and greater than a Child'.