

# Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each part of the assignment.

## Candidate 1

The candidate was awarded **11 out of 20 marks**.

### Standard A

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because there are a number of valid points and there is some development, especially in the case study. For full marks the candidate would have needed to make a more deliberate attempt to address the standard explicitly.

### Standards B, C and D

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because the report was thin on analysis and explanation, and there are a number of inaccuracies in the presentation of the viewpoints and the use of the religious sources. Use of a range of sources can be inferred, but these could have been more clearly identified and put to better use. Nonetheless, there was enough useful content to justify 4 marks.

### Standards E and F

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because although there is no final conclusion, the candidate has made a good attempt to comment on the arguments presented in the course of the report, and their view is clear and justified.

## Candidate 2

The candidate was awarded **16 out of 20 marks**.

### Standard A

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because the significance and impact is clear and woven throughout, and there is a good level of detail, for example, in the exploration of the implications of a wrong prognosis. This is also included within the viewpoints, which take consequences into account.

### Standards B, C and D

The candidate was awarded **8 marks** because the three standards were consistently done well with good detail, and skilful application of information was gathered relating to the issue in question. However, the candidate could have evidenced their use of sources of information more clearly, and so the mark was awarded from the lower half of the available range.

### Standards E and F

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because there are a number of conclusions presented throughout, and these showed the candidate's view and justification clearly. It was not especially well presented, hence why 4 marks were awarded rather than 5.

## Candidate 3

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

### Standard A

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because significance and impact was dealt with explicitly at the start, but also within the course of the report. The Sikhism and Humanism parts were especially well focused on significance and impact.

### Standards B, C and D

The candidate was awarded **8 marks** because there was good application of information, though the identification of some sources could have been clearer. A good range of viewpoints on the issue was identified. There was evidence in the report of genuine research, and there was good analysis and explanation of the arguments presented. Most aspects of these standards were done well.

### Standards E and F

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because the conclusion was well justified, but there was not quite enough for 6 marks to be awarded. The idea that believing in life after death is comforting is certainly a reason for belief, but not an argument for belief in life after death being 'reasonable', which was what the assignment was exploring.

## Candidate 4

The candidate was awarded **14 out of 20 marks**.

### Standard A

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because significance and impact is dealt with directly at the start, but also throughout, including in implications of viewpoints.

### Standards B, C and D

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because although the report included a lot of good detail and explanation, especially of viewpoints, it went off track from time to time into how to make the world a better place, rather than focusing on implications for belief in God. Accurate information means the candidate had to be referring to at least one source, but the report does not say where the information was found, so this aspect was assessed as 'limited'.

### Standards E and F

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because there were good concluding points in relation to whether suffering is an essential part of life, but the final conclusion got a bit side-tracked into why people cause suffering and what should be done about it.

## Candidate 5

The candidate was awarded **9 out of 20 marks**.

### Standard A

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because almost the entire report dealt with significance and impact, and there are a number of developed points. Although the title relates only to the possession of nuclear weapons, the candidate includes the significance and impact of their possible use as a common argument against nuclear deterrence, and therefore can be awarded marks.

### Standards B, C and D

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because although there is some accurate detail on background information, the report did not get into the moral debate, which should have been its main focus. Viewpoints are present, but thin on detail and there is very little analysis or explanation. Overall, it is rather descriptive.

### Standards E and F

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because a conclusion is presented, however, it is very brief, and the justification is thin on detail.

## Candidate 6

The candidate was awarded **12 out of 20 marks**.

### Standard A

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because there are a few references to significance and impact, for example, purpose of life; the special nature of humans; implications of infallibility of scripture. However, there is not enough to be classed as 'well explained'.

### Standards B, C and D

The candidate was awarded **5 marks** because the report includes some accurate specialist knowledge. Although there has been no explicit reference to sources, it is clear that the candidate used at least one source. The report deals with three perspectives, and includes some analysis of the implications of these views, however, there were a few inaccuracies and some aspects of the issue could have been developed further to improve breadth, for example, non-literal approaches to Genesis.

### Standards E and F

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**. The conclusion came right at the start of the report, and on its own would have been worth 3 marks, however, there was more reasoning offered in the course of the report, which resulted in the mark being increased by 1. The final conclusion added nothing to what had already been said.

## Candidate 7

The candidate was awarded **11 out of 20 marks**.

### Standard A

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**. The candidate tackled the issue from a Christian point of view, so the evidence was marked for that aim, as the focus was sustained throughout. There are a number of points about significance and impact in the course of the report, for example, referring to recent votes, changes in Christian attitudes and the current debate within the church, but these were presented as background information rather than a clear attempt to give a full explanation of significance and impact.

### Standards B, C and D

The candidate was awarded **5 marks**. The use of sources and explanation and analysis are inconsistent. There are a lot of quotations, but it is not clear where they have come from, and they were not particularly well applied. Some information was accurate, but some lacked detail or was unclear, and it was felt that the candidate struggled to interpret some of the source material they were working with.

### Standards E and F

The candidate was awarded **3 marks** because although the conclusion is not substantial, their view and justification are valid and clear, which means it has to be awarded 3 marks. It was not developed enough for 4 marks.

## Candidate 8

The candidate was awarded **19 out of 20 marks**.

### Standard A

The candidate was awarded **4 marks** because the report deals with a range of consequences of abortion, as well as implications of religious and non-religious views, and it easily meets the standard for full marks.

### Standards B, C and D

The candidate was awarded **9 marks**. Although there are a few errors, there was a good variety of viewpoints and moral arguments, explored in depth, and skilfully supported with reference to sources. This part was awarded 9 instead of 10 marks because the candidate did not make it clear enough that they had selected information from a range of different sources, and it was possible to identify one website as the source for a significant amount of the information presented.

### Standards E and F

The candidate was awarded **6 marks**. The concluding section on the last page is worth 3-4 marks on its own, but there is also a supported judgement on the candidate's first and second page about intolerance towards women who have had a termination, which deserves marks. This judgement also applies to the discussion of the advantages of a pro-choice position, so taking conclusions presented as a whole, this part is awarded full marks.