

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of this course assessment component (Morality and Belief: Justice).

Candidate 3

Question 25(a)

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

The candidate identifies custodial sentencing. They recognise that this is prison, and it is for serious crimes as well as giving examples. This is a developed point and was awarded 2 marks. They then develop this point further with the idea of people feeling safer, so an additional mark was given here. The candidate then identifies fines. They give an example and explain that it is a deterrent, so this was awarded 2 marks. They were given five ticks in total, but the maximum marks they could be awarded was 4.

Question 25(b)

The candidate was awarded **6 marks**.

The candidate identifies the fact that wealthy people are not deterred by paying fines. This is a developed point and was given 2 marks. They then give the example of a mother stealing to care for her family and then being given a fine. This again is a developed point and worth 2 marks. They then give the example of the cost of a rehabilitation drug centre and point out that it costs a lot of money to treat the criminal whereas the person who has been offended against gets very little spent on them. This is another developed point for 2 marks. There is an additional mark at the end for the idea that there might be a waste of time, but it isn't needed as the candidate has already achieved full marks.

Question 26

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**.

There is no mark for simply stating protection. 1 mark was given for the point that the person is placed in prison. A second mark was given at 'protect victims from perpetrators' and a final mark at 'abuse' at the end of this paragraph. (Alternatively, a triple tick could be given at 'abuse' for a well-developed point.)

Again, no mark was given for stating reformation, but the next sentence makes two valid points 'placed in rehab centres to stop reoffending' and 'they get education or a hobby' 2 marks. The candidate then moves on to deterrence. Here they say that it puts people off committing crimes and then give the example of prison, so 2 marks were awarded for this section.

Question 27

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**.

1 mark was awarded for the point that the teachings of Jesus can be interpreted in many different ways. They then give an example of someone committing an act of vandalism. It was felt that this was a weak point, however, it was given 1 mark with Marker's Discretion.

Question 28

The candidate was awarded **6 marks**.

The candidate identifies their point of view as the Christian one which is an acceptable way to answer the question. They point out that the Christian point of view is for a second chance but with capital punishment they would be dead; this was awarded 2 marks. 1 mark was given for the point that God is the only one who decides when people are taken off this planet. The point about committing crimes and repenting is fair, but similar to the first point given in this answer, which is repetition. A mark was not awarded because benefit of the doubt had already been given in question 27. The point that for crimes like murder they may not deserve a second chance was given 1 mark. The last sentence gives two valid points worth 1 mark each: protection of everyone and the idea of closure for victims families.