



National
Qualifications
SPECIMEN ONLY

SQ30/AH/01

**Religious, Moral and
Philosophical Studies**

Date — Not applicable

Duration — 2 hours

Total marks — 60

SECTION 1 — PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION — 30 marks

Attempt **ONE** question.

SECTION 2 — Part A — RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE — 30 marks

Part B — MEDICAL ETHICS — 30 marks

Attempt **ONE** question from the Part you have chosen.

Write your answers clearly in the answer booklet provided. In the answer booklet you must clearly identify the question number you are attempting.

Use **blue** or **black** ink.

Before leaving the examination room you must give your answer booklet to the Invigilator; if you do not, you may lose all the marks for this paper.



* S Q 3 0 A H 0 1 *

SECTION 1 — PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION — 30 marks

Attempt **ONE** question.

1. The problem of evil and suffering weakens the teleological argument for the existence of God. Discuss.

To what extent are arguments from intelligent design convincing?

30

2. If the concept of God is incoherent then such a God cannot exist. Discuss.

Present a reasoned argument and conclusion.

30

SECTION 2 — 30 marks

Part A— RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE

Attempt this Part if you have studied Religious Experience.

Attempt **ONE** question.

3. How valid are psychological accounts of religious experience?
Present a reasoned argument and conclusion. **30**

4. To what extent are claims of mystical experience credible if they cannot be fully described.
Present a reasoned argument and conclusion. **30**

Part B — MEDICAL ETHICS

Attempt this Part if you have studied Medical Ethics.

Attempt **ONE** question.

5. How far can it be argued that there is never any need for euthanasia?
Present a reasoned argument and conclusion. **30**
6. All methods for the procurement of organs can be morally justified. Discuss.
Present a reasoned argument and conclusion. **30**

[END OF SPECIMEN QUESTION PAPER]



National
Qualifications
SPECIMEN ONLY

SQ30/AH/01

**Religious, Moral and
Philosophical Studies**

Marking Instructions

These Marking Instructions have been provided to show how SQA would mark this Specimen Question Paper.

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purpose, written permission must be obtained from SQA's Marketing team on permissions@sqa.org.uk.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (ie secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the user's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance.

General Marking Principles for Advanced Higher Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies

This information is provided to help you understand the general principles you must apply when marking candidate responses to questions in this Paper. These principles must be read in conjunction with the Detailed Marking Instructions, which identify the key features required in candidate responses.

- (a) Marks for each candidate response must always be assigned in line with these General Marking Principles and the Detailed Marking Instructions for this assessment.
- (b) Marking should always be positive. This means that, for each candidate response, marks are accumulated for the demonstration of relevant skills, knowledge and understanding: they are not deducted from a maximum on the basis of errors or omissions.
- (c) If a specific candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or detailed Marking Instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your Team Leader.
- (d) Where a candidate violates the rubric of the paper and answers both optional 30-mark questions in a Section/Part, all responses should be marked and the better mark recorded.
- (e) Use the full range of marks available for each question.
- (f) The Detailed Marking Instructions are not an exhaustive list. Other relevant points should be credited.
- (g) For credit to be given, points must be relevant to the question asked.

In this Specimen Paper the following skills are assessed:

- Knowledge and understanding
- analysis
- evaluation

All questions will require candidates to integrate these skills with their knowledge, in response to the question or statement. Questions may include the following command words:

- '[Statement].’ Discuss. Present a reasoned argument and conclusion.
- ‘Critically evaluate.’ Present a reasoned argument and conclusion.
- ‘To what extent.’ Present a reasoned argument and conclusion.

	26-30	21-25	16-20	11-15	6-10	0-5
Overview	The essay is clearly focussed on the question at all times.	The essay is clearly focussed on the question, but, at times refers generally to the topic rather than the question.	The essay is focussed on the question at times but drifts into general comments about the topic.	The essay is focussed more on the topic rather than the question.	The essay is focussed more on the topic than on the question and has information that lacks relevance.	The essay lacks relevance to both the question and/or the topic.
Mark Range	9-10	7-8	5-6	3-4	1-2	0
Knowledge and Understanding	KU is consistently in depth, accurate and relevant.	KU is mainly in depth, accurate and relevant.	KU has inconsistent depth but is mainly accurate and relevant.	KU lacks depth overall but is mainly accurate and relevant.	KU lacks depth overall and has issues with accuracy or relevance.	KU is superficial and is not consistently accurate or relevant.
	There is clear evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information from a range of specific sources or perspectives.	There is clear evidence that the candidate has drawn together mainly relevant and appropriate information from some specific sources or perspectives.	There is some evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and/or appropriate information but references to sources and perspectives tend to be more general and limited.	There is evidence that the candidate has attempted to draw together relevant and/or appropriate information but references to sources and perspectives are general in nature and limited.	There is some evidence that the candidate has attempted to draw together relevant and/or appropriate information but references to sources and perspectives are brief, undeveloped and general in nature.	The essay lacks evidence of sources and perspectives and those used lack relevance and accuracy.

Analysis	The analysis clearly identifies specific issue(s) related to the question.	The analysis identifies specific issue(s) related to the question but the depth is uneven at times.	The analysis identifies a mix of specific and general issue(s) that are related to the question and there is insufficient depth and explanation of them.	The analysis identifies some general issue(s) related to the question and there is insufficient depth or explanation	The analysis identifies a few issue(s) but they are not clearly related to the question and coverage is superficial.	Any analysis often fails to identify issues and those that have been identified are not clearly related to the question and superficial.
	The explanation of issues takes account of a range of clearly identified perspectives and demonstrates a clear understanding of their relevance to the question.	The explanation of issues takes account of some perspectives and demonstrates a good understanding of their relevance to the question.	The issues are explained and there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the question which is general in nature at times	The issues are explained and there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the question at times but which is generally superficial.	The issues are briefly explained but there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the topic but not to the question.	There is evidence of some understanding of the topic but not the question.

Evaluation	The evaluation is insightful, valid and clearly reasoned.	The evaluation is valid, may be insightful and is mainly clearly reasoned.	The evaluation is valid but not consistently and clearly reasoned.	The evaluation is valid but not clearly reasoned and lacks sufficiency	There is limited valid evaluation but it is not clearly reasoned and lacks sufficiency	The evaluation either lacks validity or relevance to the issue/question
	It has relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues.	It has mainly relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues.	It has some relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues.	It has relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues however; it is simply a judgement with brief reasoning.	It may have judgements on the issues but there is some brief reasoning behind them.	
	Conclusions have successfully been woven throughout the essay/drawn at the conclusion of the essay.	Mainly clear conclusions have been drawn.	There has been some attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth.	There has been some attempt to draw brief conclusions but they lack depth.	Conclusions may be restricted to closing comments.	

Detailed Marking Instructions for each question

SECTION 1 – PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
1.	<p>25-30 A sophisticated answer that is clearly relevant to the question. KU is in depth, accurate and relevant. There is clear evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information from a range of sources or perspectives. The analysis clearly identifies issue(s) related to the question. The explanation of issues takes account of a number of clearly identified perspectives and demonstrates a clear understanding of their relevance to the question. The evaluation is insightful, valid and clearly reasoned. It has relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. Conclusions have successfully been woven throughout the essay/drawn at the conclusion of the essay.</p>	30	<p>Purpose The purpose of this question is to consider how the argument from intelligent design enhances the evidence for the existence of God.</p> <p><u>Specific instructions</u></p> <p>Knowledge and Understanding may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forms of the design argument • Forms of the anthropic principle • Scientific discoveries • Philosophical argument • Contemporary commentators on design • Criticisms of the intelligent design argument <p>Analysis may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The influences on the argument from intelligent design • The evidence from nature • Philosophical influences • Religious influences • Scientific influences

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>19-24 A good answer that is clearly relevant to the question. KU is mainly in depth, accurate and relevant. There is some evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information from a range of sources or perspectives. The analysis identifies issue(s) related to the question but the depth is uneven. The explanation of issues takes account of a number of perspectives and demonstrates some understanding of their relevance to the question. The evaluation may be insightful, valid and clearly reasoned at times. It has mainly relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. Conclusions have been drawn but lack depth at times.</p> <p>13-18 A borderline answer that is relevant to the question. KU has inconsistent depth but is mainly accurate and relevant. There is some evidence that the candidate has included relevant and appropriate information. The essay has an over-dependence on description. The analysis identifies issue(s) related to the question but coverage is superficial. The issues are explained and there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the question which is often superficial. The evaluation is valid but not clearly reasoned. It has some relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. There has been some attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth</p>		<p>Evaluation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of the quality of arguments in the Anthropic Principle • Evaluation of the interpretation of the evidence supporting ID • Assessment of claims relating to the nature of the intelligence behind design • The strength of criticisms and support of the argument from ID • Discussion of the quality of the arguments and evidence used to ID • Assessment of the impact of philosophical and scientific claims on ID • Assessment of non-religious counter arguments against ID

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>7-12 A weak answer that lacks relevance to the question. KU lacks depth and is not consistently accurate or relevant. The essay is mainly descriptive. The analysis identifies a few issue(s) but they are not clearly related to the question and coverage is superficial. The issues are briefly explained but there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the topic but not to the question. There is limited valid evaluation but it is not clearly reasoned. It has some judgements on the issues. There has been some attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth.</p> <p>0-6 A poor answer that lacks relevance to the question. KU is superficial and is not consistently accurate or relevant. The essay is almost entirely descriptive. Any analysis often fails to identify issues and those that have been identified are not clearly related to the question and superficial. There is evidence of some understanding of the topic but not the question. There evaluation is either absent, invalid or not clearly reasoned. It may have judgements on the issues but there is no clear reasoning behind them. Conclusions may be restricted to closing comments.</p>		

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
2.	25-30A sophisticated answer that is clearly relevant to the question. KU is in depth, accurate and relevant. There is clear evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information from a range of sources or perspectives. The analysis clearly identifies issue(s) related to the question. The explanation of issues takes account of a number of clearly identified perspectives and demonstrates a clear understanding of their relevance to the question. The evaluation is insightful, valid and clearly reasoned. It has relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. Conclusions have successfully been woven throughout the essay/drawn at the conclusion of the essay.	30	<p>Purpose The purpose of this question is to consider how claims for God's existence can be defended against criticisms of God's nature.</p> <p><u>Specific instructions</u></p> <p>Knowledge and Understanding may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The God of Classical Theism • Other concepts of God • The coherence of God • Understandings of God's nature <p>Analysis may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The influences on different concepts of God • Explanations of the nature of God • Reasons behind the criticisms • Reasons behind the support • The role of God's nature in the debate

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>19-24A good answer that is clearly relevant to the question. KU is mainly in depth, accurate and relevant. There is some evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information from a range of sources or perspectives. The analysis identifies issue(s) related to the question but the depth is uneven. The explanation of issues takes account of a number of perspectives and demonstrates some understanding of their relevance to the question. The evaluation may be insightful, valid and clearly reasoned at times. It has mainly relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. Conclusions have been drawn but lack depth at times.</p>		<p>Evaluation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of the quality of arguments about the coherence of God • Evaluation of the interpretations of God’s nature • Assessment of claims relating to the incoherence of God • The strength of criticisms and support of different concepts of God • Discussion of the quality of the arguments and evidence used to show the improbability of certain concepts of God • Assessment of the impact of philosophical and scientific claims about the nature of God • Assessment of the importance of the nature of God in the philosophy of religion

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>13-18 A borderline answer that is relevant to the question. KU has inconsistent depth but is mainly accurate and relevant. There is some evidence that the candidate has included relevant and appropriate information. The essay has an over-dependence on description. The analysis identifies issue(s) related to the question but coverage is superficial. The issues are explained and there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the question which is often superficial. The evaluation is valid but not clearly reasoned. It has some relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. There has been some attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth.</p> <p>7-12 A weak answer that lacks relevance to the question. KU lacks depth and is not consistently accurate or relevant. The essay is mainly descriptive. The analysis identifies a few issue(s) but they are not clearly related to the question and coverage is superficial. The issues are briefly explained but there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the topic but not to the question. There is limited valid evaluation but it is not clearly reasoned. It has some judgements on the issues. There has been some attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth.</p>		

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>0-6 A poor answer that lacks relevance to the question. KU is superficial and is not consistently accurate or relevant. The essay is almost entirely descriptive. Any analysis often fails to identify issues and those that have been identified are not clearly related to the question and superficial. There is evidence of some understanding of the topic but not the question. There evaluation is either absent, invalid or not clearly reasoned. It may have judgements on the issues but there is no clear reasoning behind them. Conclusions may be restricted to closing comments.</p>		

Section 2 - Part A - Religious Experience

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
3.	25-30 A sophisticated answer that is clearly relevant to the question. KU is in depth, accurate and relevant. There is clear evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information from a range of sources or perspectives. The analysis clearly identifies issue(s) related to the question. The explanation of issues takes account of a number of clearly identified perspectives and demonstrates a clear understanding of their relevance to the question. The evaluation is insightful, valid and clearly reasoned. It has relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. Conclusions have successfully been woven throughout the essay/drawn at the conclusion of the essay.	30	<p>Purpose The purpose of this question is to consider the quality of the conclusions psychology has made about religious experience.</p> <p><u>Specific instructions</u></p> <p>Knowledge and Understanding may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The account of Freud • The account of Jung • The account of James • Modern theorists e.g. Fowler, Boyer <p>Analysis may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The influences on psychology of religion • Explanations of different types of experience • Connections between understandings • Research methods

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>19-24A good answer that is clearly relevant to the question. KU is mainly in depth, accurate and relevant. There is some evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information from a range of sources or perspectives. The analysis identifies issue(s) related to the question but the depth is uneven. The explanation of issues takes account of a number of perspectives and demonstrates some understanding of their relevance to the question. The evaluation may be insightful, valid and clearly reasoned at times. It has mainly relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. Conclusions have been drawn but lack depth at times.</p> <p>13-18A borderline answer that is relevant to the question. KU has inconsistent depth but is mainly accurate and relevant. There is some evidence that the candidate has included relevant and appropriate information. The essay has an over-dependence on description. The analysis identifies issue(s) related to the question but coverage is superficial. The issues are explained and there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the question which is often superficial. The evaluation is valid but not clearly reasoned. It has some relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. There has been some attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth.</p>		<p>Evaluation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of the quality of research into religious experience • Evaluation of the interpretations of different psychological explanations of religious experience • Assessment of claims relating to the validity of religious experience by psychology • The strength of criticisms and support of different research methods and conclusions • Discussion of the quality of the arguments and evidence used to explain religious experience from a psychological perspective • Assessment of the impact of modern psychology and science on understanding religious experience • Assessment of the importance of psychology in the debate about religious experience.

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>7-12 A weak answer that lacks relevance to the question. KU lacks depth and is not consistently accurate or relevant. The essay is mainly descriptive. The analysis identifies a few issue(s) but they are not clearly related to the question and coverage is superficial. The issues are briefly explained but there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the topic but not to the question. There is limited valid evaluation but it is not clearly reasoned. It has some judgements on the issues. There has been some attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth.</p> <p>0-6 A poor answer that lacks relevance to the question. KU is superficial and is not consistently accurate or relevant. The essay is almost entirely descriptive. Any analysis often fails to identify issues and those that have been identified are not clearly related to the question and superficial. There is evidence of some understanding of the topic but not the question. There evaluation is either absent, invalid or not clearly reasoned. It may have judgements on the issues but there is no clear reasoning behind them. Conclusions may be restricted to closing comments.</p>		

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
4.	25-30 A sophisticated answer that is clearly relevant to the question. KU is in depth, accurate and relevant. There is clear evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information from a range of sources or perspectives. The analysis clearly identifies issue(s) related to the question. The explanation of issues takes account of a number of clearly identified perspectives and demonstrates a clear understanding of their relevance to the question. The evaluation is insightful, valid and clearly reasoned. It has relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. Conclusions have successfully been woven throughout the essay/drawn at the conclusion of the essay.	30	<p>Purpose The purpose of this question is to consider how far the existence of mystical experiences can be supported.</p> <p><u>Specific instructions</u></p> <p>Knowledge and Understanding may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James' explanations of mystical experience • The nature and types of mystical experience • The qualities of mystical experience • Non-religious interpretations of mystical experience <p>Analysis may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context of mystical experiences • Research into mystical experience • Themes running through mystical experience • Common features of mystical experience • Impact of mystical experience on individuals and community

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>19-24 A good answer that is clearly relevant to the question. KU is mainly in depth, accurate and relevant. There is some evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information from a range of sources or perspectives. The analysis identifies issue(s) related to the question but the depth is uneven. The explanation of issues takes account of a number of perspectives and demonstrates some understanding of their relevance to the question. The evaluation may be insightful, valid and clearly reasoned at times. It has mainly relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. Conclusions have been drawn but lack depth at times.</p>		<p>Evaluation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of the quality of arguments about mystical experience • Evaluation of the interpretations of mystical experiences • Assessment of claims relating to mystical experiences • The strength of criticisms and support for mystical experiences • Discussion of the quality of the descriptions of mystical experience • Assessment of the impact of mystical experience on religions • Assessment of the importance of mystical experience in religion

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>13-18 A borderline answer that is relevant to the question. KU has inconsistent depth but is mainly accurate and relevant. There is some evidence that the candidate has included relevant and appropriate information. The essay has an over-dependence on description. The analysis identifies issue(s) related to the question but coverage is superficial. The issues are explained and there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the question which is often superficial. The evaluation is valid but not clearly reasoned. It has some relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. There has been some attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth.</p> <p>7-12 A weak answer that lacks relevance to the question. KU lacks depth and is not consistently accurate or relevant. The essay is mainly descriptive. The analysis identifies a few issue(s) but they are not clearly related to the question and coverage is superficial. The issues are briefly explained but there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the topic but not to the question. There is limited valid evaluation but it is not clearly reasoned. It has some judgements on the issues. There has been some attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth.</p>		

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>0-6 A poor answer that lacks relevance to the question. KU is superficial and is not consistently accurate or relevant. The essay is almost entirely descriptive. Any analysis often fails to identify issues and those that have been identified are not clearly related to the question and superficial. There is evidence of some understanding of the topic but not the question. There evaluation is either absent, invalid or not clearly reasoned. It may have judgements on the issues but there is no clear reasoning behind them. Conclusions may be restricted to closing comments.</p>		

Section 2 - Part B - Medical Ethics

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
5.	<p>25-30 A sophisticated answer that is clearly relevant to the question. KU is in depth, accurate and relevant. There is clear evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information from a range of sources or perspectives. The analysis clearly identifies issue(s) related to the question. The explanation of issues takes account of a number of clearly identified perspectives and demonstrates a clear understanding of their relevance to the question. The evaluation is insightful, valid and clearly reasoned. It has relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. Conclusions have successfully been woven throughout the essay/drawn at the conclusion of the essay.</p>		<p>Purpose The purpose of this question is to consider whether euthanasia should be an option at all.</p> <p><u>Specific instructions</u></p> <p>Knowledge and Understanding may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Types and methods of euthanasia • The law and euthanasia • The moral issues surrounding euthanasia • The alternatives to euthanasia <p>Analysis may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role of autonomy in the debate • The role of duty in the debate • The role of responsibility in the debate • The role of the sanctity of life in the debate • The purpose of alternatives to euthanasia • End of life care options

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>19-24 A good answer that is clearly relevant to the question. KU is mainly in depth, accurate and relevant. There is some evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information from a range of sources or perspectives. The analysis identifies issue(s) related to the question but the depth is uneven. The explanation of issues takes account of a number of perspectives and demonstrates some understanding of their relevance to the question. The evaluation may be insightful, valid and clearly reasoned at times. It has mainly relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. Conclusions have been drawn but lack depth at times.</p> <p>13-18 A borderline answer that is relevant to the question. KU has inconsistent depth but is mainly accurate and relevant. There is some evidence that the candidate has included relevant and appropriate information. The essay has an over-dependence on description. The analysis identifies issue(s) related to the question but coverage is superficial. The issues are explained and there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the question which is often superficial. The evaluation is valid but not clearly reasoned. It has some relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. There has been some attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth.</p>		<p>Evaluation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of end of life care options • Evaluation of the need to protect all individuals in the process • Assessment of claims relating to personal autonomy • The strength of criticisms and support of different forms of euthanasia • Discussion of the quality of the arguments and evidence used to support the alternatives to euthanasia • Assessment of the validity of the reasons behind euthanasia • Assessment of the importance of the sanctity of life in the debate

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>7-12 A weak answer that lacks relevance to the question. KU lacks depth and is not consistently accurate or relevant. The essay is mainly descriptive. The analysis identifies a few issue(s) but they are not clearly related to the question and coverage is superficial. The issues are briefly explained but there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the topic but not to the question. There is limited valid evaluation but it is not clearly reasoned. It has some judgements on the issues. There has been some attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth.</p> <p>0-6 A poor answer that lacks relevance to the question. KU is superficial and is not consistently accurate or relevant. The essay is almost entirely descriptive. Any analysis often fails to identify issues and those that have been identified are not clearly related to the question and superficial. There is evidence of some understanding of the topic but not the question. There evaluation is either absent, invalid or not clearly reasoned. It may have judgements on the issues but there is no clear reasoning behind them. Conclusions may be restricted to closing comments.</p>		

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
6.	25-30 A sophisticated answer that is clearly relevant to the question. KU is in depth, accurate and relevant. There is clear evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information from a range of sources or perspectives. The analysis clearly identifies issue(s) related to the question. The explanation of issues takes account of a number of clearly identified perspectives and demonstrates a clear understanding of their relevance to the question. The evaluation is insightful, valid and clearly reasoned. It has relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. Conclusions have successfully been woven throughout the essay/drawn at the conclusion of the essay.	30	<p>Purpose The purpose of this question is to consider the morality of a range of forms of procurement of organs.</p> <p><u>Specific instructions</u></p> <p>Knowledge and Understanding may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The law and organ donation • Types of voluntary and non-voluntary donation • Organ trade • The use of beating heart and non-beating heart donors • Living donors <p>Analysis may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donation and altruism • Donation and duty • Donation and compulsion • Duty of care and protection • Using people as a means to an end • Absolute moral laws and donation

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>19-24 A good answer that is clearly relevant to the question. KU is mainly in depth, accurate and relevant. There is some evidence that the candidate has drawn together relevant and appropriate information from a range of sources or perspectives. The analysis identifies issue(s) related to the question but the depth is uneven. The explanation of issues takes account of a number of perspectives and demonstrates some understanding of their relevance to the question. The evaluation may be insightful, valid and clearly reasoned at times. It has mainly relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. Conclusions have been drawn but lack depth at times.</p>		

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>13-18 A borderline answer that is relevant to the question. KU has inconsistent depth but is mainly accurate and relevant. There is some evidence that the candidate has included relevant and appropriate information. The essay has an over-dependence on description. The analysis identifies issue(s) related to the question but coverage is superficial. The issues are explained and there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the question which is often superficial. The evaluation is valid but not clearly reasoned. It has some relevant judgements on the issues and/or perspectives on the issues. There has been some attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth.</p> <p>7-12 A weak answer that lacks relevance to the question. KU lacks depth and is not consistently accurate or relevant. The essay is mainly descriptive. The analysis identifies a few issue(s) but they are not clearly related to the question and coverage is superficial. The issues are briefly explained but there is evidence of some understanding of their relevance to the topic but not to the question. There is limited valid evaluation but it is not clearly reasoned. It has some judgements on the issues. There has been some attempt to draw conclusions but they lack depth.</p>		<p>Evaluation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of the quality of arguments opt in and opt out • Evaluation of the arguments for using beating heart donors • Assessment of claims relating to the condition of the donors • The strength of criticisms and support of different approaches to altruistic giving • Discussion of the quality of the arguments and evidence used to support all forms of organ donation • Assessment of the transparency of organ transplant professionals and organisations

Question	General marking instructions for this question	Max marks	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>0-6 A poor answer that lacks relevance to the question. KU is superficial and is not consistently accurate or relevant. The essay is almost entirely descriptive. Any analysis often fails to identify issues and those that have been identified are not clearly related to the question and superficial. There is evidence of some understanding of the topic but not the question. There evaluation is either absent, invalid or not clearly reasoned. It may have judgements on the issues but there is no clear reasoning behind them. Conclusions may be restricted to closing comments.</p>		

[END OF SPECIMEN MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]