



National
Qualifications
2022

2022 Philosophy

Paper 1

Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2022

These marking instructions have been prepared by examination teams for use by SQA appointed markers when marking external course assessments.

The information in this document may be reproduced in support of SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is reproduced, SQA must be clearly acknowledged as the source. If it is to be reproduced for any other purpose, written permission must be obtained from permissions@sqa.org.uk.

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 deep, detailed and clear understanding of the relevant 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
- some 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 important 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 with inaccuracies
- Lacks overall clarity
- no relevant evaluative comment.

A response worth 9–11 marks will typically contain:

- some relevant but inaccurate material
- no evaluative comment
- a lack of clarity.

A response worth 5–8 marks will typically contain:

- occasionally relevant but mostly inaccurate material
- no evaluative comment
- Little or no clarity

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.	<p>These instructions must be applied in conjunction with the holistic marking criteria for the knowledge and doubt essay.</p> <p>The question requires candidates to 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.</p> <p>To gain marks for knowledge and understanding, a candidate’s explanation is likely to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explanation of Descartes’ aims in the Meditations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – to eliminate false ideas from his beliefs – to free us of our prejudices – to find a firm foundation to build all knowledge upon – free from error – to ‘establish anything at all in the sciences that was stable and likely to last.’ • the method of doubt: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – as a way of freeing us from pre-conceived opinions, leading the mind away from the senses and providing a foundation for knowledge that is immune to further doubts – the barrel of apples analogy (from the Discourse on Method). • the waves of doubt: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – the unreliability of the senses: the observation that the senses sometimes deceive and the claim that it is prudent never to trust completely those who have deceived us even once. Some information from the senses is impossible to doubt – the dream argument: the claim that that there are never any sure signs by means of which being awake can be distinguished from being asleep, thus bringing into doubt information gained from an apparently reliable use of the senses. A priori knowledge and innate concepts remain undoubted – the deceiving God argument: the suggestion that an omnipotent God might have arranged things such that everything about the external world is an illusion and that the truths of mathematics are not what they seem to be – the conclusion that there is not one of his former beliefs about which a doubt may not be raised. • the malicious demon hypothesis: To counter the ‘weight of pre-conceived opinion’ and the ‘distorting influence of habit’, he proposes ‘to deceive’ himself by pretending for a while that his previous beliefs are not just dubitable but actually false. To achieve this, he suggests the possible existence of a malicious demon that has employed all its energies in order to deceive him. 	30

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
	<p>To gain marks for analysis and evaluation, a candidate's discussion may include some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descartes' method serves as a very successful destructive phase • it is a rigorous approach to gaining knowledge and the criteria of indubitability is a high standard to maintain • Descartes is arguably not radical enough in his scepticism: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – he doesn't doubt logic, memory, language. He uses all of these to begin to reason and move beyond the method of doubt in the rest of the meditations • Descartes assumes the truth of foundationalism. Perhaps a foundation for knowledge does not exist. • he wants all knowledge to have the certainty of maths. Is this a reasonable demand? • was there any value in the incremental nature of the doubts when the deceiving God argument undermines all knowledge without the previous stages? • concerns about the Unreliability of the Senses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Descartes argues it is prudent never wholly to trust in the truth of what we perceive because our senses have deceived us in the past and yet he refuses to doubt the reliability of all our experience. – Descartes thinks he cannot be mistaken about the fact that he is sitting by his fire, in his dressing gown etc., but since we cannot be sure which cases of our senses are reliable and which are not in the first place, it is possible (if not always feasible) to doubt any sensory knowledge. • concerns about the Dreaming Argument: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – just because you don't know that you are asleep when you are dreaming it does not follow that you don't know that you are awake when you are awake. It is an asymmetric argument – there is a coherence to waking life that is absent from dreams – Bernard Williams argued that the fact that we can explain and understand dreaming when we are awake means that there is a qualitative difference between being awake and asleep – Is Descartes right that we can trust our reason/judgements whilst asleep? Could we not dream that $2+2=5$? • concerns about the Deceiving God Argument: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – if the deceiving God or malicious demon is a possibility, then can Descartes ever get out of this state of hyperbolic doubt? Surely all reason and logic fall victim to this argument. Is it not too strong? – Hume argues that embarking on hyperbolic doubt leads to a sceptical dead end • in response to Descartes' consideration of the possibility that someone might prefer to deny the existence of God: Evolution, by natural selection, might ensure that we have become more and more capable of reliable reasoning. 	

Candidates can achieve marks in the following ranges:

21–30 marks

Candidates accurately explain Descartes' arguments as set out in Meditation I, examine the method of doubt and the implications for Descartes' faith in his knowledge claims. They are likely to explain the connections between the arguments and discuss appropriate criticisms of them in detail while fully engaging with the question. At the top end of this range candidates show depth to their discussion, by engaging in a conversational critique of the issues raised. E.g., rather than just stating that Descartes has raised doubts about all of his previously held knowledge claims, they may discuss in some detail whether and how this may be significant.

18–20 marks

Candidates explain Descartes' arguments, as set out in Meditation I, attempt some analysis of them and explain criticisms, while addressing the question. They might also describe the connections between the arguments and some of the implications of these for our knowledge claims. Essays are likely to contain mainly accurate references to Descartes' textual material.

15–17 marks

Candidates describe the arguments in Meditation I and offer at least one appropriate criticism of them, but do not fully engage with the question. Essays are likely to contain mainly descriptive material with insufficient analysis and evaluation.

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.	<p>These instructions must be applied in conjunction with the holistic marking criteria for the knowledge and doubt essay.</p> <p>The question requires candidates to 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.</p> <p>To gain marks for knowledge and understanding, a candidate’s explanation is likely to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • perceptions – impressions and ideas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Hume’s use of the word ‘perceptions’ as the contents of the mind – Hume’s distinction between impressions and ideas is made on the basis of their force and vivacity (liveliness) – Impressions are associated with our sensations, both outward and inward – ideas are associated with memory and imagination and the activity of reflecting on our impressions • the distinction between simple and complex perceptions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – simple ideas are copies of impressions – complex ideas can be formed by the imagination using one of four processes: they can combine (compound), transpose, enlarge (augment) or shrink (diminish) simple ideas copied from impressions • the copy principle – all our ideas or more feeble perceptions are copies of our impressions or more lively ones: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – complex thoughts are made up of simple ideas, copied from earlier feelings or sensations – Hume’s two arguments to support the copy principle: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. any idea that seems to lack relevant corresponding impressions can be traced back to simple ideas that have been worked upon using the processes of the imagination, e.g. the idea of God as a complex idea ii. when the relevant impression has been denied through malfunctioning senses or the absence of relevant experiences or absence due to species limitations • the missing shade of blue as a counter-example to the copy principle. • Hume says it should not undermine the theory as a whole because it is so singular it is scarcely worth observing. <p>To gain marks for analysis and evaluation, a candidate’s discussion may include some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hume’s atomistic theory fits in with our scientific understanding of the world • concerns relating to perceptions – impressions and ideas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – are all ideas really less lively and vivid than impressions? – Hume defends his position against the criticism that some ideas can be more lively than impressions by pointing out that the distinction between impressions and ideas is only confined to the healthy mind – by simply dividing the mind’s contents into impressions and ideas, is Hume presenting a naïve psychology? – are the operations of the imagination sufficient to explain how we acquire complex ideas? 	30

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • concerns about the distinction between simple and complex perceptions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – without the simple/complex distinction Hume could not account for acts of the imagination and thus would have had to abandon empiricism • concerns about the copy principle: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – is Hume right to suggest that we cannot find an idea that does not derive from a sense impression? Can't we have innate ideas? – it seems very plausible that a person who has been blind from birth would not have an understanding, or idea of colour – does a blind person really have no notion of colour? • concerns about the missing shade of blue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – why is it scarcely worth observing? – Hume could have said that the missing shade of blue is a complex idea, and candidates could comment on why he didn't do this – Hume should have accepted that any counter-example to a universal claim disproves the claim • arguably Hume's empiricism collapses into scepticism because it does not guarantee knowledge of an external world – our impressions may not correspond with reality. 	

Candidates can achieve marks in the following ranges:

21–30 marks

Candidates accurately explain Hume's theory of perception as set out in the Enquiry Section II, examine what Hume means by terms such as 'force and liveliness', analyse his claim that our apparently free thought is really confined within very narrow limits and discuss criticisms of the theory in detail while fully engaging with the question. At the top end of this range candidates show depth to their discussion, by engaging in a conversational critique of the issues raised. E.g., when discussing the missing shade of blue they might explain why it does not undermine Hume's empiricism.

18–20 marks

Candidates explain Hume's theory of perception, as set out in the Enquiry Section II, attempt some analysis of it and explain criticisms, while addressing the question. Their grasp of Hume's arguments for the Copy Principle will be mainly accurate. They might also discuss the missing shade of blue and explain Hume's position on it and how successfully it works as a counter-example. Essays in this category are likely to contain mainly accurate references to Hume's textual material.

15–17 marks

Candidates describe Hume's theory of perception and offer at least one appropriate criticism of it, but do not fully engage with the question or the textual material. Essays are likely to contain mainly descriptive material with insufficient analysis and evaluation.

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. These must be applied in conjunction with the detailed marking instructions for each question.

A response worth 26–30 marks will typically contain:

- a deep, 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 the 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
- some 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 important 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 with inaccuracies
- Lacks overall clarity
- no relevant evaluative comment.

A response worth 9–11 marks will typically contain:

- some relevant but inaccurate material
- no evaluative comment
- a lack of clarity.

A response worth 5–8 marks will typically contain:

- occasionally relevant but mostly inaccurate material
- no evaluative comment
- Little or no clarity

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.	<p>These instructions must be applied in conjunction with the holistic marking criteria for the moral philosophy essay.</p> <p>Candidates should discuss the given situation in the context of Kant’s 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.</p> <p>To gain marks for knowledge and understanding, a candidate’s explanation is likely to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that Kant’s moral theory is deontological • Kant’s claim that we have duties and certain things are right or wrong in themselves, regardless of consequences • Kant’s emphasis on the sovereignty of reason and how this relates to duty • the good will: to have a good will is to be motivated to do our duty • the concept of perfect and imperfect duties • what Kant says about duty versus inclination: in determining our duty we must take no account of our inclinations because the demands of duty are categorical • the categorical imperative and its formulations, particularly the formulation of human beings as ends in themselves. <p>To gain marks for analysis and evaluation, a candidate’s discussion may include some of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kant’s focus on how rational beings behave in terms of perfect duties: We have a perfect duty not to kill rational beings, including ourselves; Kant explicitly forbids suicide as a moral action because it is the destruction of a rational being. • applying the categorical imperative test to the situation with discussion about formulations, potential maxims, contradiction in conception, contradiction in the will <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Kant’s explanation that universalising the maxim ‘from self–love I adopt it as a principle to shorten my life, when its longer duration is likely to bring more evil than satisfaction’ will result in a contradiction in conception and thus we have a perfect duty not to do it • the difficulty of discounting consequences: Kant arguably ignores the intuition that consequences of actions determine their moral value; in this case allowing someone in great pain and distress to die would be regarded as merciful • the problem of disregarding inclinations and performing one’s duty: if the person is in great pain, it would be difficult to allow them to continue to suffer • Kant would presumably allow animals to be euthanised to release them from suffering but would not allow humans the same escape; this does not seem fair • Kantian ethics can be seen as insensitive to individual circumstances and people’s feelings, and so may set unrealistic ideals of morality • Kant’s stipulation that we should never treat someone, including oneself, simply as a means, supports the idea that human beings possess an inherent dignity which should be respected 	30

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kant’s insistence on treating rational beings as ends in themselves could protect vulnerable patients in great distress from feeling pressured into agreeing to die. 	

Candidates can achieve marks in the following ranges:

21–30 marks

Candidates explain the main features of Kantianism, analyse and discuss the Kantian position by referring to the given situation in the context of the categorical imperative, and discuss criticisms of Kantianism, while fully engaging with the question. Candidates give a very detailed account of Kantianism and are very clear on how a Kantian would proceed in this situation. At the top end of this range candidates show depth to their discussion, by engaging in a conversational critique of the principles involved. E.g., while discussing consequences, candidates discuss Kant’s position that the consequences we desire cannot be the determining ground of an action if it is to have moral worth, rather than simply saying he does not consider consequences.

18–20 marks

Candidates accurately describe the main features of Kantianism, analyse the Kantian position by referring to the given situation in the context of the categorical imperative, and explain criticisms of Kantianism with reference to the given situation, while addressing the question. Candidates show a clear understanding of the key features of Kantianism, e.g. they accurately demonstrate what Kant meant by ‘Act so as to treat humanity, both in your own person, and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means’.

15–17 marks

Candidates describe the main features of Kantianism, explain the Kantian position by responding to the given situation in the context of the categorical imperative, and offer at least one appropriate criticism of Kantianism, but do not fully engage with the question. Candidates show a basic understanding of Kantianism, e.g. they may mention contradiction in conception and contradiction in the will, 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 deep, 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 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 the 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
- some 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 important descriptive and textual 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 issue that is not necessarily well supported.

A response worth 12–14 marks will typically contain:

- some relevant but basic descriptive material with inaccuracies
- Lacks overall clarity
- no relevant evaluative comment.

A response worth 9–11 marks will typically contain:

- some relevant but inaccurate material
- no evaluative comment
- a lack of clarity.

A response worth 5–8 marks will typically contain:

- occasionally relevant but mostly inaccurate material
- no evaluative comment
- Little or no clarity.

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.	<p>These must be applied in conjunction with the holistic marking criteria for the moral philosophy quotation essay.</p> <p>Candidates must engage with the given quotation in the context of Kant's 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.</p> <p>To gain marks for knowledge and understanding, a candidate's explanation is likely to include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that Kant's moral theory is deontological • Kant's claim that we have duties and certain things are right or wrong in themselves, regardless of consequences • Kant's emphasis on the sovereignty of reason and how this relates to duty • the good will: to have a good will is to be motivated to do our duty • the concept of perfect and imperfect duties • what Kant says about duty versus inclination: in determining our duty we must take no account of our inclinations because the demands of duty are categorical • the categorical imperative and its formulations. <p>To gain marks for analysis and evaluation, candidates may discuss the quotation as a fair and/or unfair criticism, e.g.:</p> <p>Discussion that suggests this is a fair criticism may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the difficulty of discounting consequences: Kant arguably ignores the intuition that consequences of actions determine their moral value • the interpretation of contradiction in the will as a possible appeal to consequences • the problem of disregarding inclinations and performing one's duty • Kantian ethics can be seen as insensitive to individual circumstances and people's feelings, and so may set unrealistic ideals of morality • there are no such things as objective moral truths which are discoverable by reason • If moral truths were discoverable by reason there would be no disagreements on moral matters. <p>Discussion that suggests this is an unfair criticism may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kant's focus on treating human beings with respect as individuals and rational beings provides a foundation for human rights • Kant's claim that some things are 'wrong in themselves' fits intuitively with most people's thinking • Kant's stipulation that we should never treat someone simply as a means supports the idea that human beings possess an inherent dignity which should be respected • that moral truths can be discovered by reason would fit with our reverence for wise judges • it is an intuitive belief that reason is a guide to right action • our ability to reason is what separates us from other animals and makes us morally responsible. 	30

Candidates can achieve marks in the following ranges:

21–30 marks

Candidates should explain in depth the main features of Kantianism, with a focus on Kant's explanation of the sovereignty of reason and the belief that we can solve all moral dilemmas by using reason alone. They will discuss whether the criticism in the quotation is fair or unfair while also evaluating in depth how Kant might respond to the criticism. At the top end of this range candidates show depth to their discussion, by engaging in a conversational critique of the issues raised.

Candidates will give a very detailed explanation of Kant's use of reason as a basis for determining moral rules through the use of the Categorical Imperative, discussing the implications of this and this will form a basis for their discussion in relation to the criticism.

18–20 marks

Candidates should accurately describe the main features of Kantianism, explain Kant's understanding of reason in the context of moral decision making and respond to the quotation by making comments about whether the criticism is fair, while also considering how Kant might respond to the criticism.

Candidates should show a clear understanding of Kantian ethics, e.g. they will demonstrate how Kant makes use of the Categorical Imperative as a way to determine our duties.

15–17 marks

Candidates should describe the main features of Kantianism, make some reference to Kant's understanding of reason and respond to the quotation by making at least one comment about whether the criticism is fair. Candidates will tend to show a basic understanding of Kantianism as a deontological theory, e.g. they will explain how we know what our duty is using reason, 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]