



National
Qualifications
2024

2024 Philosophy

Paper 1

Higher

Question Paper Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2024

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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 and 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• relevant, accurate and detailed descriptive information and textual material that clearly addresses the question• several well-explained evaluative comments that may themselves be evaluated• either implicitly or explicitly, a clear and well-supported personal judgement on the issue.
A response worth 18–20 marks will typically contain: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• relevant, mainly accurate and detailed descriptive information and textual material that clearly addresses the question• some well-explained evaluative comments• a justified personal view on the issue, although this will vary in quality.
A response worth 15–17 marks will typically contain: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 may simply be stated.
A response worth 12–14 marks will typically contain: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• some relevant but basic descriptive material with inaccuracies• lacks overall clarity• no relevant evaluative comment or evaluative comment that is inappropriate.
A response worth 9–11 marks will typically contain: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• some relevant but inaccurate material• no relevant evaluative comment or evaluative comment that is inappropriate• a lack of clarity.
A response worth 5–8 marks will typically contain: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• occasionally relevant but inaccurate material• no relevant evaluative comment or evaluative comment that is incoherent• little or no clarity.
A response worth 0–4 marks will typically contain: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• little detail and/or accuracy• little or no reference to the question. <p>In the 0–4 range, award 1 mark for each relevant point up to a maximum of 4 marks.</p>

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>Because of the nature of this question, candidates' essays will vary significantly in terms of content. Appropriate content that could be included in an essay is listed below.</p> <p>A description of their selected argument(s) and discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the argument(s) (candidates may select from any aspect of the mandatory course content on Descartes to support their line of argument):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an explanation of Descartes' aims will include some of the following: <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: The method of doubt 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 <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. The recognition that some information from the senses is harder 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. Descartes recognises that, even if everything is a dream, some simple and universal things are still real as are the truths of mathematics – 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; Descartes dismisses the objection that a supremely good God wouldn't allow the meditator to be deceived all of the time and claims that the non-existence of God would make it even more likely that he is mistaken about his judgements all of the time. His conclusion is that there is not one of his former beliefs about which a doubt may not be raised – the malicious demon hypothesis: despite having arrived at a conclusion that all his former beliefs are dubitable, his habitual opinions keep returning. To counter the 'weight of pre-conceived opinion' and the 'distorting influence of habit', he proposes to deceive himself by pretending that his previous beliefs are not just dubitable but are false. To achieve this, he imagines a malicious demon that has employed all its energies to deceive him 	30

Question			Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meditation 2 – The Cogito: Even if Descartes believes that ‘there is absolutely nothing in the world, no sky, no earth, no minds, no bodies’, does it follow that he does not exist? Descartes concludes that he certainly exists. Even the malicious demon cannot deceive him about that. Descartes concludes that ‘this proposition, I am, I exist, is necessarily true whenever it is put forward by me or conceived in my mind’ • meditation 3 – Clear and distinct perception: From his certainty that he is a thinking thing Descartes establishes the general rule that ‘whatever I perceive very clearly and distinctly is true’ • meditation 3 – the Trademark argument: ‘I must examine whether there is a God, and, if there is, whether he can be a deceiver. For if I do not know this, it seems that I can never be quite certain about anything else.’ 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’ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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 . . . It follows from this both 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.’ Depends on there being degrees of reality – an infinite substance has more reality than a finite substance which in turn has more reality than a mode – depends on degrees of objective reality having the same degrees of reality as formal reality – ‘although this cause does not transfer any of its actual or formal reality to my idea, it should not on that account be supposed that it must be less real.’ Descartes’ examples of stones and heat – 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 – his conclusion that God ‘cannot be a deceiver, since it is manifest by the natural light that all fraud and deception depend on some defect’. 	

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
	<p>Discussion of the effectiveness of using reason as a foundation for knowledge.</p> <p>Here are some possible ways candidates might argue their case. This is by no means exhaustive:</p> <p>Meditation 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a strength of Descartes' rationalist approach is that he can eliminate other possible foundations of his knowledge with progressively extreme doubt • the fact that Descartes can dismiss the senses more easily than reason in the first two waves of doubt shows the superiority of reason. It can be questioned how effective he is in doing this • could reason be doubted as easily as the senses? For example, should Descartes be certain about $2+3=5$ when in a dream? • Is the deceiving God argument too strong? Does this leave Descartes in a state of diabolic doubt that he cannot get out of? <p>Meditation 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a strength of Descartes' rationalist approach is that he discovers the cogito which is his foundation for knowledge • how certain is the cogito? Does it beg the question? Can we know the nature of the 'I'? • can the cogito be used as a foundation for all knowledge? • don't we know that thinking requires existence through experience rather than reason? <p>Meditation 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a strength of Descartes' rationalist approach is that he finds his clear and distinct rule that 'whatever I perceive very clearly and distinctly is true' • Descartes argues that his judgement that sense experience relates to objects outside the mind is not clear and distinct. Is this reasonable? If not, then reason should not be trusted over the senses. • candidates may question the success of Descartes' proof of the existence of God in the Trademark argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Is the idea of God innate? Is God the guarantor of clear and distinct perceptions? – is the idea of God clear and distinct? Descartes claims 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? – can we know for sure whether something is clear and distinct? – Descartes claims he knows the causal adequacy principle by the natural light, but is it self-evident? – Descartes relies on the concept of degrees of reality in his Trademark argument. Is it right to dismiss the argument because this idea is outdated? • the Cartesian circle – is Descartes' argument circular? 	

Candidates can achieve marks in the following ranges:

21–30 marks

Candidates accurately explain the selected aspects of Descartes' Meditations and show how Descartes uses reason as a basis for knowledge. They will likely 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 Descartes' attempt to establish reason as a basis for all knowledge.

18–20 marks

Candidates explain the selected aspects of Descartes' Meditations, engage in some analysis of them and explain criticisms. They will explain Descartes' arguments for the view that reason forms a basis for knowledge and show how their selected aspects support or oppose this idea. Essays are likely to contain mainly accurate references to Descartes' textual material.

15–17 marks

Candidates describe the selected aspects of Descartes' Meditations and offer at least one appropriate criticism, but do not fully engage with the question. Essays are likely to contain mainly descriptive material with little analysis or 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 and well-supported personal position on the issues raised by the situation 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
- either implicitly or explicitly, a clear and well-supported personal judgement on issues raised by the situation.

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 justified personal view on issues raised by the situation, although this will vary in quality.

A response worth 15–17 marks will typically contain:

- the important 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 issues raised by the situation that may simply be stated.

A response worth 12–14 marks will typically contain:

- some relevant but basic descriptive material with inaccuracies
- lacks overall clarity
- no relevant evaluative comment or evaluative comment that is inappropriate.

A response worth 9–11 marks will typically contain:

- some relevant but inaccurate material
- no relevant evaluative comment or evaluative comment that is inappropriate
- a lack of clarity.

A response worth 5–8 marks will typically contain:

- occasionally relevant but inaccurate material
- no relevant evaluative comment or evaluative comment that is incoherent
- 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
2.	<p>These instructions must be applied in conjunction with the holistic marking criteria for the moral philosophy situation essay.</p> <p>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>Points of knowledge and understanding may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The key features of classical utilitarianism which are appropriate to the scenario: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Consequentialism – the view that holds the consequences of an action as the primary factor in calculating its moral worth – Hedonism or the hedonic principle – the principle that claims that whether an action is morally right or wrong depends on whether it promotes the maximum pleasure – Equity principle – this principle claims that everyone’s interests are of equal importance or at least are worthy of equal consideration – greatest happiness principle – the principle that the more happiness and the less unhappiness an action produces, the more morally praiseworthy it will be; an action is right if it produces the greatest happiness for the greatest number and wrong if it produces the reverse of happiness – 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 everyone following that rule maximises happiness. <p>Points of analysis and evaluation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how Bentham’s calculus may be applied to this scenario. For example, discussion on the certainty that ending the life of the leader will minimise pain and suffering vs. the likelihood of the leader being responsible for future deaths. Discussion on the purity of the pleasure based on the likelihood of guilt following either the action of killing the leader or saving their life • short term vs long term consequences – the immediate consequences may be more suffering for the surgeon because of their guilt, but in the long term they are able to get over that and feel proud of their action • intended vs actual consequences – getting rid of the leader might result in another leader taking power who may be more ruthless • rule utilitarians – the Hippocratic Oath is a promise made by medical professionals to do no harm. By killing the leader, the surgeon would be breaking a rule put in place to generate maximum pleasure • aggregate happiness could be affected by people finding out about the surgeon’s action; rule utilitarians may claim that a surgeon or doctor who ends a patient’s life on purpose diminishes trust in medical professionals and fewer people may see doctors resulting in less aggregate pleasure 	30

Question			Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the surgeon choosing to kill the leader may be classed as a supererogatory action as it requires the surgeon to go beyond the ordinary duties of a moral agent for benefit of the majority and their pleasure. 	

Candidates can achieve marks in the following ranges:

21–30 marks

Candidates fully engage with the question by analysing and discussing utilitarian approaches to the given situation with detailed reference to the main features of the theory. Candidates are likely to give a very detailed and accurate account of utilitarianism and are clear on how a utilitarian would consider the moral implications and the morally relevant features of this situation. At the top end of this range candidates show depth to their discussion by engaging in a conversational critique of the issues raised: eg, whether utilitarianism demands supererogatory actions to produce maximum pleasure.

18–20 marks

Candidates accurately describe the main features of utilitarianism, analyse utilitarian approaches and explain relevant criticisms with reference to the situation. Candidates show a clear understanding of the key features of utilitarianism. For example, they accurately describe how the hedonic calculus could be applied to the scenario.

15–17 marks

Candidates describe the main features of utilitarianism and explain utilitarian approaches in relation to the given situation although this may be lacking development. They offer at least one appropriate criticism but do not fully engage with the question. Candidates show a basic understanding of utilitarianism, for example, they may mention the hedonic calculus, but their comments and analysis may 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 and 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
- Either implicitly, or explicitly, a clear and well-supported personal judgement on the issues raised by the quotation.

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 justified 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 may simply be stated.

A response worth 12–14 marks will typically contain:

- some relevant but basic descriptive material with inaccuracies
- no relevant evaluative comment or evaluative comment that is inappropriate.
- lacks overall clarity.

A response worth 9–11 marks will typically contain:

- some relevant but inaccurate material
- no relevant evaluative comment or evaluative comment that is inappropriate
- little or no clarity.

A response worth 5–8 marks will typically contain:

- occasionally relevant but mostly inaccurate material
- No evaluative comment or evaluative comment that is incoherent
- 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
3.	<p>These instructions must be applied in conjunction with the holistic marking criteria for the moral philosophy quotation essay.</p> <p>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>Points of knowledge and understanding may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The key features of classical utilitarianism which are appropriate to the scenario: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Consequentialism – the view that holds the consequences of an action as the primary factor in calculating its moral worth – Hedonism or the hedonic principle – the principle that claims that whether an action is morally right or wrong depends on whether it promotes the maximum pleasure – Equity principle – this principle claims that everyone’s interests are of equal importance or at least are worthy of equal consideration – greatest happiness principle – the principle that the more happiness and the less unhappiness an action produces, the more morally praiseworthy it will be; an action is right if it produces the greatest happiness for the greatest number and wrong if it produces the reverse of happiness – 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 everyone following that rule maximises happiness. <p>Points of analysis and evaluation may include:</p> <p>It is a fair criticism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • special obligations – We intuitively prioritise the happiness of those close to us. For example, a mother may feel a natural intuition to want to save their child over a stranger, but if saving the stranger generates more aggregate pleasure a Utilitarian would argue that it is the more moral action • is utilitarianism intuitively too demanding? It requires us to always act in a way that maximises pleasure and often demands that we go above and beyond what we consider to be required of us. The utilitarian theory cannot allow for the category of supererogatory acts • we intuitively regard good motives to be morally relevant. According to Utilitarianism an action done with a bad motive but that produces good consequences could be classed as morally acceptable • intuitively we may not wish to sacrifice our own pleasures for the pleasure of the majority • according to act Utilitarianism certain actions are morally required despite those actions intuitively feeling morally wrong, for example, killing someone to end the majority suffering. 	

Question			Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
			<p>It is not a fair criticism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • when making moral decisions people intuitively consider the consequences of actions to determine what they should do • intuitively we seek to maximise pleasure and minimise pain and suffering • the concept of equity is intuitively appealing; it can be argued treating people as equals seems a good starting point for morality • Utilitarians could argue that maintaining special obligations would result in the greatest aggregate happiness • on the face of it, Utilitarianism seems to demand we act counterintuitively by performing actions such as killing an innocent person for the greater good. However, Bentham would never have supported these kinds of actions because the wider impact of their being morally required would result in greater suffering overall. 	

Candidates can achieve marks in the following ranges:

21–30 marks

Candidates provide a very detailed and accurate account of utilitarianism, explaining the relevant features and the various ways in which this criticism might be used to challenge them. They may appreciate and discuss the distinct implications the criticism has for different types of utilitarianism. They consider whether the criticism in the quotation is fair or unfair, while also discussing in depth how utilitarians may respond to the criticism or explain criticisms which may be relevant to the arguments presented. At the top end of this range candidates show depth to their discussion by engaging in a conversational critique of the issues raised: evaluation will form the basis of discussion and is much more than a list of problems.

18–20 marks

Candidates accurately describe the relevant features of utilitarianism and respond to the quotation by making comments about whether the criticism is fair, while also considering how utilitarians may respond to it. Candidates show a clear understanding of utilitarian ethics, and why this criticism might apply, for example, they might highlight the problematic nature of the equity principle, and how special obligations might relate to it.

15–17 marks

Candidates describe the relevant features of utilitarianism and respond to the quotation, showing an understanding of why the criticism may be made. Candidates tend to show a basic understanding of utilitarianism, for example, they will explain how utilitarianism emphasises the maximisation of pleasure, but their explanation in reference to the quotation may lack depth or relevance.

0–14 marks

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

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]