



National
Qualifications
SPECIMEN ONLY

S854/76/11

**Philosophy
Paper 1**

Date — Not applicable

Duration — 2 hours 15 minutes

Total marks — 60

SECTION 1 — KNOWLEDGE AND DOUBT — 30 marks

Attempt the question.

SECTION 2 — MORAL PHILOSOPHY — 30 marks

Attempt ONE question.

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

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

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



* S 8 5 4 7 6 1 1 *

SECTION 1 — KNOWLEDGE AND DOUBT — 30 marks

Attempt the question

1. Read the following passage and answer the question that follows.

'So after considering everything very thoroughly, I must finally conclude that this proposition, 'I am, I exist', is necessarily true whenever it is put forward by me or conceived in my mind.'

Analyse and evaluate Descartes' Cogito.

In your answer you could include the following

- an explanation of Descartes' position at the beginning of Meditation 2
- the steps in Descartes' argument (in Meditation 2) leading up to the Cogito
- discussion of what Descartes meant by the Cogito and how it might be interpreted
- discussion of strengths and weaknesses of Descartes' Cogito

30

SECTION 2 — MORAL PHILOSOPHY — 30 marks

Attempt ONE question

2. Read the following situation and answer the question that follows.

You and your friend are talking one night after revising for an exam. She tells you that she has a secret to tell you. Her secret is that she went into the teacher's room at the end of the day and stole a copy of the exam and the marking instructions. The next day the teacher questioned her and she told the teacher that she had been with you.

Analyse and evaluate how Kant might advise you in the above situation.

In your answer you could include the following

- a description of Kant's moral theory
- an explanation of how Kant says we should make moral decisions
- application of Kantian ethics to this situation
- evaluation of Kantian ethics in relation to this situation

30

OR

3. Read the following quotation and answer the question that follows.

With his total emphasis on duty, Kant leaves out other important considerations when making moral decisions. There must be more to doing the morally right thing than duty.

To what extent is this a fair criticism of Kantianism?

Consider how Kant might respond to this criticism.

In your answer you could include the following

- a description of Kant's moral theory
- an explanation of how Kant says we should make moral decisions
- discussion of how the criticism applies to Kantian ethics
- evaluation of Kantian ethics in relation to this criticism

30

[END OF SPECIMEN QUESTION PAPER]



National
Qualifications
SPECIMEN ONLY

S854/76/11

**Philosophy
Paper 1**

Marking Instructions

These marking instructions have been provided to show how SQA would mark this specimen question paper.

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

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



* S 8 5 4 7 6 1 1 *

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.	<p>These must be applied in conjunction with the holistic marking criteria for the knowledge and doubt essay.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>To gain marks for knowledge and understanding, candidates should explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descartes’ position at the beginning of Meditation II • the steps in Descartes’ argument (in Meditation II) leading up to the Cogito • Descartes’ conclusion: ‘So after considering everything very thoroughly, I must finally conclude that this proposition, ‘I am, I exist’, is necessarily true whenever it is put forward by me or conceived in my mind’ • Descartes’ alternative wording of the Cogito: ‘Cogito ergo sum: I think, therefore I am’. <p>To gain marks for analysis, candidates should discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • why Descartes considers the Cogito to be undeniable • possible interpretations of the Cogito, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — necessarily true proposition — syllogism — self-authenticating statement • Descartes’ intention for the Cogito not to operate as a piece of deductive logic • how the meditations should be seen as a course in guided self-discovery and the Cogito as a self-authenticating proposition. 	30

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
	<p>To gain marks for evaluation, candidates should discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the complaint by some critics that, in referring to the ‘I’, Descartes presupposes what he means to establish in ‘I exist’ • Gassendi’s criticism that thinking does not have the special status claimed by Descartes, and Descartes’ response to him • Lichtenberg’s challenge: the fact Descartes has thoughts is not enough to warrant the conclusion that ‘I exist’ • Russell’s contention that Descartes does not prove that thoughts need a thinker, nor is there reason to believe this except in a grammatical sense • the contention that Descartes strays from his rationalistic agenda here since ‘thinking things exist’ is an <i>a posteriori</i> observation • the distinction between claiming the Cogito as a ‘necessary truth’ and the claim that, if he thinks, then he necessarily exists. 	

Candidates can achieve marks in the following ranges.

21-30 marks

Candidates accurately explain Descartes’ argument for the Cogito as set out in Meditation II, examine different interpretations of the Cogito 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 there is an alternative wording of the Cogito, they may discuss in some detail whether and how this is significant.

18-20 marks

Candidates explain Descartes’ argument for the Cogito, as set out in Meditation II, attempt some analysis of it and explain criticisms, while addressing the question. They might also describe Descartes’ alternative wording of the Cogito. Essays are likely to contain mainly accurate references to Descartes’ textual material.

15-17 marks

Candidates accurately describe the Cogito and offer at least one appropriate criticism of it, but do not fully engage with the question. Essays are likely to contain irrelevant descriptions of the method of doubt from the material in Meditation I, and insufficient focus on the Cogito.

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 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 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
- a clear and well-supported personal judgement on issues raised by the situation (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 situation which, in the main, shows detail and relevance
- several well-explained evaluative comments
- a well-supported personal view on issues raised by the situation, 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 issues raised by the situation 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.

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 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 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>Essays at the top of this range will contain a clear line of argument from start to finish.</p> <p>To gain marks for knowledge and understanding, candidates should explain:</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 should discuss:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kant’s focus on how rational beings behave in terms of perfect duties: duty to tell the truth, regardless of consequences • applying the categorical imperative test to the situation with discussion about formulations, potential maxims, contradiction in conception, contradiction in the will • conflicting duties in this situation • the difficulty of discounting consequences: Kant arguably ignores the intuition that consequences of actions determine their moral value • 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 • 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 • how not considering consequences ‘frees us’ to do our duty. 	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 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.

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 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 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>Essays at the top of this range will contain a clear line of argument from start to finish.</p> <p>To gain marks for knowledge and understanding candidates should explain:</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, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fair criticisms may include: <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. 	30

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unfair criticisms may include: <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 — the observation that Kant never said that consequences are unimportant, only that they cannot be the determining ground of an action if it is to have moral worth. 	

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 SPECIMEN MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]

Published: March 2019

Change since last published:

Question scaffolding added.