



National  
Qualifications  
2019

---

**2019 Philosophy**  
**Higher Paper 1**  
**Finalised Marking Instructions**

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2019

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](mailto: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 detailed and clear and accurate 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 5-8 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.	<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><b>To gain marks for knowledge and understanding, a candidate’s explanation is likely to include the following</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hume’s use of the word ‘perceptions’ as the contents of the mind</li> <li>• Hume’s distinction between impressions and ideas is made on the basis of their force and vivacity (liveliness)</li> <li>• the distinction between simple and complex perceptions</li> <li>• simple ideas are copies of impressions</li> <li>• complex ideas can be formed by the imagination using one of four processes</li> <li>• they can combine (compound), transpose, enlarge (augment) or shrink (diminish) simple ideas copied from impressions</li> <li>• Hume’s two arguments to support the copy principle               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 1 any idea that seems to lack relevant corresponding impressions can be traced back to simple ideas that have been worked using the processes of the imagination, for example the idea of God as a complex idea</li> <li>– 2 when the relevant impression has been denied through malfunctioning senses or the absence of relevant experiences or absence due to species limitations</li> </ul> </li> <li>• the missing shade of blue as a counter-example to the copy principle</li> <li>• Hume says the counter-example should not undermine the theory as a whole because it is so singular that it is scarcely worth observing</li> <li>• Hume’s atomistic theory fits in with our scientific understanding of the world</li> <li>• without the simple/complex distinction Hume could not account for acts of the imagination and thus would have had to abandon empiricism</li> <li>• whether all ideas are really less lively and vivid than impressions</li> <li>• Hume defends his position against criticism by pointing out that the distinction between impressions and ideas is only confined to the healthy mind</li> <li>• by simply dividing the mind’s contents into impressions and ideas, is Hume presenting a naïve psychology?</li> <li>• Hume’s challenge to find an idea that does not derive from a sense impression</li> <li>• whether the operations of the imagination are sufficient to explain how we acquire complex ideas</li> <li>• the missing shade of blue is arguably not a singular example and candidates could comment on how significant this is</li> </ul>	30

Question			Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hume should have accepted that any counter-example to an 'all' claim disproves the claim</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• arguably Hume's empiricism collapses into scepticism because it does not guarantee knowledge of an external world – our impressions may not correspond with reality.</li> </ul>	

## 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 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. For example, when discussing the missing shade of blue they might explain why it does/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 accurately 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. 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 and accurate understanding of the relevant information and the moral theory that clearly addresses the question
- 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 varied 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 5-8 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
2.	<p>These instructions must be applied in conjunction with the holistic marking criteria for the moral philosophy situation 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><b>To gain marks for knowledge and understanding, candidates are likely to explain</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that Kant’s moral theory is deontological</li> <li>• Kant’s claim that we have duties and certain things are right or wrong in themselves, regardless of consequences</li> <li>• Kant’s emphasis on the sovereignty of reason and how this relates to duty</li> <li>• the good will: to have a good will is to be motivated to do our duty</li> <li>• Kant’s claim that the good will is the only intrinsic good</li> <li>• the concept of perfect and imperfect duties</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• the categorical imperative and its formulations.</li> </ul> <p><b>To gain marks for analysis and evaluation, candidates are likely to discuss</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kant’s focus on how rational beings behave in terms of perfect duties: duty to tell the truth, regardless of consequences</li> <li>• applying the categorical imperative test to the situation with discussion about formulations, potential maxims</li> <li>• discussion in relation to contradictions in conception ought to rule out lying as a possible action, that is recognising that Kant would say we have a perfect duty to tell the truth</li> <li>• discussion in relation to contradiction in the will ought to note that there may be a contradiction in the will to be disloyal to your friend and thus we have an imperfect duty to defend your friend</li> <li>• in accordance with the above points a good answer would recognise that there is no conflict of duty in this situation because we are dealing with a perfect duty versus an imperfect duty</li> <li>• the difficulty of discounting consequences: Kant arguably ignores the intuition that consequences of actions determine their moral value</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• how not considering consequences ‘frees us’ to do our duty</li> <li>• how not considering the way people feel, including ourselves, ‘frees us’ to do our duty.</li> </ul>	30

**Candidates can achieve marks in the following ranges.**

**21-30 marks**

Candidates explain the main features of Kantianism, analyse and discuss Kant's advice 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 Kant would offer advice in this situation. Evaluative comments are much more than a list of problems. For example 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 Kant's advice 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, for example they accurately demonstrate what Kant meant by 'So act 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 Kant's advice 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, for example 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 detailed and clear and accurate 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 very fragmented structure.

### **A response worth 5-8 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
3.	<p>These instructions must be applied in conjunction with the holistic marking criteria for the moral philosophy quotation essay.</p> <p>The question requires candidates to 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><b>To gain marks for knowledge and understanding candidates are likely to include.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that Kant's moral theory is deontological</li> <li>• Kant's claim that we have duties and certain things are right or wrong in themselves, regardless of consequences</li> <li>• Kant's emphasis on the sovereignty of reason and how this relates to duty</li> <li>• the good will: to have a good will is to be motivated to do our duty</li> <li>• Kant's claim that the good will is the only intrinsic good</li> <li>• the concept of perfect and imperfect duties</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• the categorical imperative and its formulations.</li> </ul> <p><b>To gain marks for analysis and evaluation, candidates are likely to discuss the quotation as a fair and/or unfair criticism, for example</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>It is a fair criticism</b></li> </ul> <p>Discussion may include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– the problem of disregarding inclinations and performing one's duty: Kantian ethics can be seen as cold and detached from real life and therefore insensitive to individual circumstances and people's feelings, and so may set unrealistic ideals of morality</li> <li>– the difficulty of discounting consequences: Kant arguably ignores the common view that consequences of actions determine their moral value, giving rise to the criticism that Kantianism is cold and detached from real life</li> <li>– the interpretation of contradiction in the will as arguably an appeal to consequences.</li> </ul>	30

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>It is an unfair criticism</b></li> </ul> <p>Discussion may include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Kant’s focus on respecting individual provides an objective foundation for human rights and is therefore not cold and detached</li> <li>– 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 and therefore his theory is not cold and detached from real life</li> <li>– Kant’s claim that some things are wrong in themselves fits with most people’s thinking</li> <li>– Kant’s theory offered impartiality and equality in the way he promoted reason above everything else</li> <li>– the observation that Kant never said that consequences, inclinations and emotions are unimportant, only that they cannot be the determining ground of an action if it is to have moral worth.</li> </ul>	

## Candidates can achieve marks in the following ranges

### **21-30 marks**

Candidates should explain the main features of Kantianism, focus on Kant's understanding of duty and discuss whether the criticism in the quotation is fair or unfair while also discussing in depth how Kant might respond to the criticism. Candidates should give a very detailed explanation of Kant's motive of duty, for example they will clearly explain Kant's view that in order to have moral worth an action must not merely accord with duty, but must be done for the sake of duty

### **18-20 marks**

Candidates should accurately describe the main features of Kantianism, explain Kant's understanding of duty 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, for example they will demonstrate that Kant's analysis of duty is that it is categorical.

### **15-17 marks**

Candidates should describe the main features of Kantianism, make some reference to Kant's understanding of duty 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, for example they will explain how we know what our duty is, 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]**