

# Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each section of this project-dissertation.

## Candidate 1

### **To what extent are St Thomas Aquinas' three ways the most convincing cosmological argument?**

The candidate was awarded **50 marks** as this dissertation was consistently relevant, accurate and in-depth. The candidate chose a clear, open question and set out their aims as questions that they intended to and did, examine. The skills of analysis and evaluation were signposted, and the response was relevant to the question and aims throughout. Sources were used extensively as an integral part of the dissertation and clearly referenced. The use of sources was central to demonstrating the candidate's understanding but also led to in-depth analysis of arguments and counter arguments and then lent itself to supporting evaluative judgements and conclusions throughout the dissertation.

Knowledge and Understanding: 20 marks

Analysis: 15 marks

Evaluation: 15 marks

## Candidate 2

### **To what extent is God responsible for evil and suffering?**

The candidate was awarded **36 marks**. The candidate chose an open question but this resulted in them trying to cover too much content. The aims were apparent but they were not reflected in the structure of the dissertation, the structure instead reflected the contents page. This led to the candidate losing focus on the question and their personal aims at times. The knowledge and understanding covered a broad range of topics but this breadth had an impact on the depth of analysis. Overall, the evaluation was mainly relevant but underdeveloped due to the breadth the candidate attempted to cover was.

Knowledge and Understanding: 16 marks

Analysis: 13 marks

Evaluation: 7 marks

## Candidate 3

### **'The God of Classical Theism is incoherent.' To what extent do you agree?**

The candidate was awarded **41 marks**. The candidate selected a clear, open question and set out clear, straightforward aims which were then reflected in the structure and content of the dissertation. Knowledge and understanding was consistently relevant, accurate and in-depth and was supported by evidence of independent research. Analysis was consistently deployed, particularly to support and develop knowledge and understanding points. The candidate made a good attempt at evaluation, mainly through making judgements and conclusions that consistently referred back to the question and aims throughout the dissertation.

Knowledge and Understanding: 17 marks

Analysis: 15 marks

Evaluation: 9 marks

## Candidate 4

### **To what extent is the treatment and use of embryos morally acceptable?**

The candidate was awarded **32 marks**. They chose an open question but it was not fully focused on as the dissertation developed, partially due to a lack of aims. Knowledge and understanding was relevant, accurate and in-depth and there was clear evidence of strong research. The analysis and evaluation were mainly relevant to the topic but were not directly focused on the issues raised by the candidate's own question.

Knowledge and Understanding: 17 marks

Analysis: 8 marks

Evaluation: 7 marks

## Candidate 5

### **Is assisted dying morally acceptable?**

This candidate was awarded **25 marks**. Knowledge and understanding was mainly relevant and supported by strong research. The candidate referenced and used many sources throughout their dissertation but there was a lack of depth of analysis. The aims referred to unspecified key issues. Evaluation was attempted but was mainly brief, underdeveloped judgements.

Knowledge and Understanding: 13 marks

Analysis: 8 marks

Evaluation: 4 marks

## Candidate 6

### **“Abortion is immoral and should be illegal” Discuss.**

The candidate was awarded **33 marks**. Clear overall aims were set out and covered with consistency. The aims were relevant, accurate and demonstrated in-depth knowledge and understanding. Strong research was evident. Analysis was mainly relevant and used to develop knowledge and understanding. The judgements and conclusions for the evaluation were brief, under-developed and not always relevant to the question as the wording of the question had presented the candidate with additional challenge as they had chosen to ‘discuss’ potentially two statements.

Knowledge and Understanding: 16 marks

Analysis: 10 marks

Evaluation: 7 marks

## Candidate 7

### **Conversion experiences are the most convincing arguments for religious experience’. How far do you agree?**

The candidate was awarded **50 marks**. The dissertation is a clearly structured response. Aims were tied in throughout the essay and the candidate referred back to their question throughout. Sources were skilfully deployed and used to demonstrate in-depth understanding and to develop analysis further. This enabled the candidate to evaluate consistently and in depth.

Knowledge and Understanding: 20 marks

Analysis: 15 marks

Evaluation: 15 marks

## Candidate 8

### **To What extent are Religious Experiences Best Explained by Psychology?**

The candidate was awarded **48 marks**. They selected a straightforward, open question and set out in their aims how they would approach their question, Knowledge, understanding and analysis were consistently relevant, accurate, in-depth and supported by strong research. At points the analysis and evaluation were interwoven, and the level of argument was sophisticated.

Knowledge and Understanding: 20 marks

Analysis: 15 marks

Evaluation: 13 marks