



National
Qualifications
RESOURCE

X854/76/11

**Philosophy
Paper 1**

Marking Instructions

Please note that these marking instructions have not been standardised based on candidate responses. You may therefore need to agree within your centre how to consistently mark an item if a candidate response is not covered by the marking instructions.



General marking principles for Higher Philosophy

Always apply these general principles. Use them in conjunction with the specific marking instructions, which identify the key features required in candidates' responses.

- (a) Always use positive marking. This means candidates accumulate marks for the demonstration of relevant skills, knowledge and understanding marks are not deducted for errors or omissions.
- (b) If a candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or specific marking instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your team leader.



Knowledge and doubt holistic marking criteria

Mark essays holistically according to the criteria using a 'best fit' approach. These must be applied in conjunction with the detailed marking instructions for each question.

A response worth 26–30 marks will typically contain

- a detailed and clear understanding of the relevant information and textual material
- well-developed evaluative comments that are likely to be the basis of discussion rather than just being described
- either implicitly or explicitly, a clear, well-supported personal position on the issue that is fully consistent with the descriptive and evaluative material the candidate presents in their response.

A response worth 21–25 marks will typically contain

- relevant, accurate and detailed descriptive information and textual material that clearly addresses the question
- several well-explained and developed evaluative comments that may themselves be evaluated
- a clear and well-supported personal judgement on the issue (this need not be in the form of a concluding paragraph and may be implicit rather than explicit).

A response worth 18–20 marks will typically contain

- relevant, mainly accurate and detailed descriptive information and textual material that clearly addresses the question
- several well-explained evaluative comments
- a well-supported personal view on the issue, although this will vary in quality.

A response worth 15–17 marks will typically contain

- the essential descriptive and textual material, although this may be undeveloped and contain some inaccuracies
- at least one appropriate evaluative comment
- a personal view on the issue that is not necessarily well supported.

A response worth 12–14 marks will typically contain

- some relevant but basic descriptive material
- fragmented information
- no evaluative comment.

A response worth 9–11 marks will typically contain

- some relevant but poorly expressed material
- no evaluative comment
- a very fragmented structure.

A response worth 5–9 marks will typically contain

- occasionally relevant but very poorly expressed material
- no evaluative comment
- no structure.

A response worth 0–4 marks will typically contain

- little detail and/or accuracy
- little or no reference to the question.

In the 0-4 range, award 1 mark for each relevant point up to a maximum of 4 marks.

Marking instructions for each question

Section 1 – Knowledge and doubt

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
1.	These must be applied in conjunction with the holistic marking criteria for the knowledge and doubt essay. Candidates should demonstrate detailed knowledge, analysis and evaluation of Hume's text. The following list contains content that is likely to be included in an appropriate answer. This list is not exhaustive. Candidates may respond to the question in different ways. Essays at the top of this range will contain a clear line of argument from start to finish. To gain marks for knowledge and understanding, candidates may explain the following ideas in Hume's writing • the distinction between relations of ideas and matters of fact • all reasoning about matters of fact are based on the relation of cause and effect • knowledge about causes is never known a priori but always comes from our experience of finding that particular objects are constantly associated with one other • even after the effect has been suggested, the necessity of it being that particular effect cannot be determined a priori • after establishing that we don't know about cause and effect through deductive reasoning, Hume goes on to argue that we cannot justify our beliefs about it on the basis of inductive reasoning either • 'even after we have experience of the operations of cause and effect, the conclusions we draw from that experience are not based on reasoning or on any process of the understanding' • 'all inferences from experience are based on the assumption that the future will resemble the past . . . so no arguments from experience can support this resemblance of the past to the future, because all such arguments are based on the assumption of that resemblance' • Hume claims his conclusion that such inferences are not based on reason is supported by the fact that those with limited reasoning ability are still able to draw such inferences. To gain marks for analysis, candidates may discuss some of the following • why Hume is interested in understanding our beliefs about cause and effect • what are the implications of Hume's claims about cause and effect • Hume's example of Adam and how it supports his claim that knowledge about causes is never known a priori • the examples Hume gives where people would intuitively agree and disagree with his claim and why he asserts that the principle that causes and effects cannot be discovered by reason also applies in the less obvious cases • how Hume's examples of billiard balls and stones support the claim that an effect cannot be determined a priori • why Hume rejects science and applied mathematics as counter-examples to his position • the examples of bread and coal to support the claim that we do not use reason to generalise from past experience.	30

Question			Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
			To gain marks for evaluation, candidates may discuss some of the following • criticism of Hume's claim that any knowledge claims that don't fall into his categories of relations of ideas or matters of fact are not meaningful and can be cast aside • Kant's claim that there can be synthetic a priori truths • Kant's claim that causation is necessary to make sense of experience • science has made successful predictions about causation prior to observation • Popper's suggestion that the scientific process is more like a process of trial and error than inductive reasoning • constant conjunction does not always yield a belief in necessary connection • inferences about causes sometimes come from single observations.	

Candidates can achieve marks in the following ranges.

21–30 marks

Candidates accurately explain Hume's theory of cause and effect, as set out in the Enquiry Section 4, examine some of Hume's examples and arguments used to support his position, and discuss criticisms of it in detail, while fully engaging with the question. At the top end of this range candidates show depth to their discussion. For example, rather than just stating that Hume rejects science and mathematics as counterexamples to his position they may discuss how and why he rejects them and whether he is right to do so.

18–20 marks

Candidates explain Hume's theory of cause and effect as set out in the Enquiry Section 4, attempt some analysis of it and explain criticisms, while addressing the question. They might also describe some examples Hume uses to support his position. Essays are likely to contain mainly accurate references to Hume's textual material.

15–17 marks

Candidates accurately describe Hume's claim that knowledge about causes is never known a priori and offer some explanation of why he believes this is the case. They will give at least one appropriate criticism of it but may not fully engage with the question. Essays may contain irrelevant descriptions of impressions and ideas from the material in Section 2, and insufficient focus on Hume's theory of cause and effect.

0–14 marks

Please refer to the holistic marking criteria for essays in this range.

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
2.	These must be applied in conjunction with the holistic marking criteria for the knowledge and doubt essay. Candidates should demonstrate detailed knowledge, analysis and evaluation of Descartes' text. The following list contains content that is likely to be included in an appropriate answer. This list is not exhaustive. Candidates may respond to the question in different ways. Essays at the top of this range will contain a clear line of argument from start to finish. To gain marks for knowledge and understanding, candidates are likely to explain the following • Descartes' establishment of a general rule that 'whatever I perceive very clearly and distinctly is true' • the Trademark argument: the fact that I have an idea of God is enough to show that there must be a God – 'it must be concluded that the mere fact that I exist and have within me an idea of a most perfect being, that is, God, provides a very clear proof that God indeed exists' • the claim that "something cannot arise from nothing, and also that what is more perfect – that is, contains in itself more reality – cannot arise from what is less perfect" • according to Descartes, the idea of God (an infinite substance) cannot have come from me (a finite substance); it was not acquired through the senses or invented by me and therefore must be innate • the conclusion that God exists • the causal adequacy principle: 'there must be at least as much reality in the efficient and total cause as in the effect of that cause • Descartes conclusion that God 'cannot be a deceiver, since it is manifest by the natural light that all fraud and deception depend on some defect'. To gain marks for analysis, candidates are likely to discuss the following • the importance of proving that God must exist • the causal adequacy principle's dependence on there being degrees of reality • the need to prove God in order to guarantee all clear and distinct perceptions can be relied upon. To gain marks for evaluation, candidates are likely to discuss the following • Descartes' reliance on God • the trademark argument relies on our innate idea of God, of perfection and infinite. What if there is no clear and distinct idea of God? Could Descartes be mistaken? • Descartes' claim that although he does not fully grasp the concept of the infinite, he nonetheless has a clear and distinct perception of it. Is it reasonable to expect that having a clear and distinct perception of something requires grasping the idea fully? • Hume thinks we can come to the idea of God by simply augmenting qualities we grasp through experience of humankind • has Descartes only proved God's existence to those people who similarly have such a perception? Should I take his word for it, if I do not have this kind of idea within my mind? • issues with the causal principle – Descartes claims he knows this principle by the natural light, but it is not obviously self-evident	30

Question			Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
			- the concept of degrees of reality which was part of the medieval metaphysics is not commonly accepted and Descartes relies on this for his Trademark argument to work - it is possible to challenge Descartes application of the causal principle to ideas - can we know for sure whether something is clear and distinct? Descartes claim to have mistook his own faith in the existence of the external world as clear and distinct when it wasn't this that was clear and distinct but simply the ideas in his mind that were - the Cartesian circle – Descartes' argument may be circular. To prove that his clear and distinct judgements can be trusted he needs to rely on God's goodness. To know that God exists he needs to rely on his clear and distinct idea of God. This is circular. Descartes needs some independent proof of one of these to show that the argument works - one defence that Descartes could present would be that he does have independent reasons to believe in clear in distinct perceptions based on the cogito. If we accept this then perhaps Descartes reasoning is not actually circular.	

Candidates can achieve marks in the following ranges.

21–30 marks

Candidates accurately explain Descartes' trademark argument, as set out in the Meditations III, examine some of Descartes' examples and arguments used to support his position, and discuss criticisms of it in details, while fully engaging with the question. At the top end of this range candidates show depth to their discussion. For example, rather than just saying Descartes rejects science and mathematics as counterexamples to his position they may discuss how and why he rejects them and whether he is right to do so.

18–20 marks

Candidates explain Descartes' trademark argument as set out in Meditations III, attempt some analysis of it and explain criticisms, while addressing the question. They might also describe some examples Descartes uses to support his position. Essays are likely to contain mainly accurate references to Descartes textual material.

15–17 marks

Candidates accurately describe Descartes' claim that knowledge about causes is never known a priori and offer some explanation of why he believes this is the case. They will give at least one appropriate criticism of it but may not fully engage with the question. Essays may contain irrelevant descriptions of impressions and ideas from the material in Section2, and insufficient focus on Hume's theory of cause and effect.

0–14 marks

Please refer to the holistic marking criteria for essays in this range.

Moral philosophy situation holistic marking criteria

Mark essays holistically according to the criteria using a 'best fit' approach. Please read in conjunction with the detailed marking instructions for each question.

A response worth 26–30 marks will typically contain

- a detailed and clear understanding of the relevant information and the moral theory
- a detailed, methodical and sophisticated response to the situation
- well-developed evaluative comments that are likely to be the basis of discussion rather than just being described
- either implicitly or explicitly, a clear, well-supported personal position on the issue that is fully consistent with the descriptive and evaluative material the candidate presents in their response.

A response worth 21–25 marks will typically contain

- relevant, accurate and detailed descriptive information in relation to the moral theory that clearly addresses the question
- a detailed and methodical response to the situation
- several well-explained and developed evaluative comments that may themselves be evaluated
- a clear and well-supported personal judgement on the issue (this need not be in the form of a concluding paragraph and may be implicit rather than explicit).

A response worth 18–20 marks will typically contain

- relevant, mainly accurate and detailed descriptive information in relation to the moral theory that clearly addresses the question
- a variable response to the situation in terms of detail and relevance
- several well-explained evaluative comments
- a well-supported personal view on the issue, although this will vary in quality.

A response worth 15–17 marks will typically contain

- the essential descriptive material, although this may be undeveloped and contain some inaccuracies
- reference to the situation but with little depth
- at least one appropriate evaluative comment
- a personal view on the issue that is not necessarily well supported.

A response worth 12–14 marks will typically contain

- some relevant but basic descriptive material
- fragmented information
- no evaluative comment.

A response worth 9–11 marks will typically contain

- some relevant but poorly expressed material
- no evaluative comment
- a very fragmented structure.

A response worth 5–9 marks will typically contain

- occasionally relevant but very poorly expressed material
- no evaluative comment
- no structure.

A response worth 0–4 marks will typically contain

- little detail and/or accuracy
- little or no reference to the question.

In the 0-4 range, award **1 mark** for each relevant point up to a **maximum of 4 marks**.

Section 2 – Moral philosophy

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
3.	Candidates should discuss the given situation in the context of Utilitarianism as a moral theory. The following list contains content that is likely to be included in an appropriate answer. This list is not exhaustive. Candidates may respond to the question in different ways. To gain marks for knowledge and understanding, candidates are likely to explain - the principles of classical utilitarianism – consequentialism, hedonism and equity - Bentham's hedonic calculus – properties of the happiness (intensity, duration, certainty and propinquity); properties of the action (fecundity and purity, that is, a consideration of future consequences); extent, that is, the need to calculate the effects on all those affected by the action - act utilitarianism – an action is right if it maximises happiness - rule utilitarianism – an action is right if it conforms to a rule that is in place because having that rule maximises happiness - rule utilitarians will advocate the use of rules as a way of ensuring that people end up performing actions which maximise happiness. To gain marks for analysis and evaluation, candidates are likely to discuss - how Bentham's calculus may be applied in this situation. The immediacy of the pleasure to those who get a job; the likelihood that this will lead to further pleasures, for example, that they will gain pleasure from spending the money they have earned from the jobs they have secured - local versus global consequences – this scenario points to a difficulty in the utilitarian theory. How do we compare the pleasure gained by the people in the local area, who are likely to benefit from jobs and increased prosperity, with those in other parts of the world who may be caused pain by global warming? How do we rate the quantity of pleasure in each situation? - short term versus long-term consequences – it might be argued that the short-term consequences in this scenario would lead to act utilitarians agreeing that the power station should be built because the immediate pleasure of many people will be greater than the displeasure or pain of a few. However, they may reflect that in the long term the pain caused will over-take these pleasures as global warming will negatively affect many millions of people around the world. Candidates could point out that an extra layer of complexity is added to the utilitarian's decision because in future a way to counteract the effects of CO₂ emissions to global warming may be found. They could also argue that global warming is not caused by human agency making this decision simpler for the utilitarian - the use of rules to avoid bias in calculations. A general difficulty with utilitarianism is the difficulty in calculating happiness and in a scenario such as this it might be unreasonable to expect the person in the town to consider the pleasures and pain of those in distant places and times. Rule utilitarians may advocate the use of rules as a way of more reliably selecting the action that maximises happiness or minimises pain. In this case it could be argued that rules based on the protection of the planet may be considered.	30

Candidates can achieve marks in the following ranges.

21–30 marks

Candidates fully engage with the question. They would do this by analysing and discussing utilitarian approaches to the given situation with detailed reference to the main features of the theory – consequentialism, hedonism and equity and discuss criticisms of utilitarianism, while fully engaging with the question. Candidates give a very detailed account of utilitarianism and are very clear on how a utilitarian would consider the moral implications and the morally relevant features of this situation. At the top of this range, evaluative comments form the basis of discussion and are much more than a list of problems. For example, while considering consequences, candidates are fully aware that this is a problematic process as in this situation the complications are manifest.

18–20 marks

Candidates accurately describe the main features of utilitarianism, analyse utilitarian approaches by referring to the given situation in the context of the main features of the theory – consequentialism, hedonism and equity, and explain criticisms of utilitarianism, with reference to the given situation, while addressing the question. Candidates show a clear understanding of the key features of utilitarianism: for example, they accurately describe how the hedonic calculus could be applied.

15–17 marks

Candidates describe the main features of utilitarianism, explain utilitarian approaches by responding to the given situation in the context of the main features of the theory – consequentialism, hedonism and equity, and offer at least one appropriate criticism of utilitarianism, but do not fully engage with the question. Candidates show a basic understanding of utilitarianism, for example, they may mention the Hedonic Calculus and Act and Rule Utilitarianism, but their comments lack development.

0–14 marks

Please refer to the holistic marking criteria for essays in this range.

Moral philosophy quotation holistic marking criteria

Mark essays holistically according to the criteria using a 'best fit' approach. These must be applied in conjunction with the detailed marking instructions for each question.

A response worth 26–30 marks will typically contain

- a detailed and clear understanding of the relevant information and the moral theory
- a detailed, methodical and sophisticated response to the issues raised by the quotation
- well-developed evaluative comments that are likely to be the basis of discussion rather than just being described
- either implicitly or explicitly, a clear, well-supported personal position on the issues raised by the quotation that is fully consistent with the descriptive and evaluative material the candidate presents in their response.

A response worth 21–25 marks will typically contain

- relevant, accurate and detailed descriptive information in relation to the moral theory that clearly addresses the question
- a detailed and methodical response to the issues raised by the quotation
- several well-explained and developed evaluative comments that may themselves be evaluated
- a clear and well-supported personal judgement on the issues raised by the quotation (this need not be in the form of a concluding paragraph and may be implicit rather than explicit).

A response worth 18–20 marks will typically contain

- relevant, mainly accurate and detailed descriptive information in relation to the moral theory that clearly addresses the question
- a response to the issues raised by the quotation which, in the main, shows detail and relevance
- several well-explained evaluative comments
- a well-supported personal view on the issues raised by the quotation, although this will vary in quality.

A response worth 15–17 marks will typically contain

- the essential descriptive material, although this may be undeveloped and contain some inaccuracies
- reference to the issues raised by the quotation but with little depth
- at least one appropriate evaluative comment
- a personal view on the issues raised by the quotation that is not necessarily well supported.

A response worth 12–14 marks will typically contain

- some relevant but basic descriptive material
- fragmented information
- no evaluative comment.

A response worth 9–11 marks will typically contain

- some relevant but poorly expressed material
- the issues raised by the quotation.

A response worth 5–9 marks will typically contain

- occasionally relevant but very poorly expressed material
- the issues raised by the quotation
- no structure.

A response worth 0–4 marks will typically contain

- little detail and/or accuracy
- little or no reference to the question.

In the 0–4 range, award **1 mark** for each relevant point up to a **maximum of 4 marks**.

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
4.	These instructions must be applied in conjunction with the holistic marking criteria for the moral philosophy quotation essay. The question requires candidates to engage with the given quotation in the context of utilitarian moral theory. The following list contains content that is likely to be included in an appropriate answer. This list is not exhaustive. Candidates may respond to the question in different ways. To gain marks for knowledge and understanding candidates are likely to include • the principles of classical utilitarianism – consequentialism, hedonism and equity • an explanation of how this criticism might be applied against utilitarianism • Bentham’s hedonic calculus – properties of the happiness (intensity, duration, certainty and propinquity); properties of the action (fecundity and purity, that is, a consideration of future consequences); extent, that is, the need to calculate the effects on all those affected by the action • act utilitarianism – an action is right if it maximises happiness • rule utilitarianism – an action is right if it conforms to a rule that is in place because having that rule maximises happiness – rule utilitarians will advocate the use of rules as a way of ensuring that people end up performing actions which maximise happiness • Mill’s distinction between Higher and Lower Pleasures as an attempt to rate pleasures in terms of quality rather than quantity and to answer the accusation that utilitarianism is a ‘swine philosophy.’ To gain marks for analysis and evaluation, candidates are likely to discuss the quotation as a fair and/or unfair criticism, for example • It is a fair criticism – an explanation of how the tyranny of majority is applied as a criticism of utilitarianism – Bentham’s hedonic calculus may be used to calculate pleasure in such a way that the pleasure of many people could be used to offset the pain of a few – a person may have evil motives but unintentionally cause great pleasure for many people – act utilitarianism, in particular, is open to this suggestion – classical utilitarianism claims that pleasure is the only good, but others would argue that concepts like justice should be considered in moral decision making – rules can be created to justify arguably immoral actions, on the grounds that the rule causes more pleasure overall.	30

Question			Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
			• It is an unfair criticism – our intuition is to consider the greatest pleasures as the right outcome and so this justifies the utilitarian approach – if the pleasure outweighs the pain then it is fine, this is just a fact about utilitarianism – candidates might discuss how Mill's hierarchy of pleasures (qualitative instead of quantitative approach) could be a solution to this problem and the accusation of utilitarianism as a 'swine philosophy' – rule utilitarianism as a response to the problem. Rule utilitarians base these rules on actions, which have proven over time to lead to greater pleasure and less pain. They would therefore not pursue any action which has been shown to cause more pain than pleasure – any utilitarian could argue that no amount of pleasure could outweigh causing significant pain – utilitarians would not want to support the tyranny of the majority, on the grounds of the long-term global consequences. Act utilitarians would reject the criticism because of this.	

Candidates can achieve marks in the following ranges.

21–30 marks

Candidates show a thorough understanding of utilitarianism, explaining its main features and the various ways in which this criticism might be used to challenge it. They will appreciate and can discuss the distinct implications the criticism has for different types of utilitarianism. They will consider whether the criticism in the quotation is fair or unfair, while also discussing in depth how utilitarians might respond to the criticism. At the top of this range, evaluation will form the basis of discussion and is much more than a list of problems.

18–20 marks

Candidates accurately describe the main features of utilitarianism, explain utilitarianism's emphasis on consequentialism, hedonism and equity and respond to the quotation by making comments about whether the criticism is fair, while also considering how utilitarians might respond to the criticism. Candidates show a clear understanding of utilitarian ethics, for example, they will demonstrate that for utilitarians pleasure is the only good and pain the only bad.

15–17 marks

Candidates describe the main features of utilitarianism, make some reference to utilitarianism's emphasis on consequentialism, hedonism and equity and respond to the quotation by making at least one comment about whether the criticism is fair. Candidates tend to show a basic understanding of utilitarianism as a consequentialist theory, for example, they will explain how Bentham would have applied the hedonic calculus, although the explanation may lack clarity.

0–14 marks

Please refer to the holistic marking criteria for essays in this range.

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]