

# Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of the question paper.

## Candidate 1

### Question 1(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 3 marks** for stating that there was no attempt to persuade.

### Question 1(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 3 marks** because they have not referenced that the two options are presented as if they are the only two, or explained how Zara's conclusion is reached. The mark was awarded for the final point in the marking instructions; there are more than two options available.

### Question 1(c)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 4 marks** because their explanation for slippery slope was inadequate.

### Question 1(c)(iv)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 3 marks** because they incorrectly identified the conclusion and did not write premises as standalone statements.

## Question 2(a)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** for stating that you are born without ideas and through experience you gain knowledge. They were not awarded the final mark as they did not make reference to experience being like a pen writing on the paper and the paper being like the mind.

## Question 2(b)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 3 marks** for stating that you are born with some innate ideas, but no marks were awarded for the description of the metaphor as they had not explained the veined block of marble.

## Question 2(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks** for the example they gave, but they were not awarded the second mark because they did not state that Descartes identifies that the senses have deceived him in the past and so we can't rely on them.

## Question 2(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 2 marks** as their response did not meet the standard as detailed in the marking instructions.

## Question 2(c)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 3 marks** because their response was an inaccurate description of the dream argument.

### Question 2(c)(iv)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 4 marks** because their response did not contain a relevant criticism of the method of doubt.

### Question 3(e)

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 10 marks** for:

- stating that according to hedonism, pleasure is the only thing worth valuing (**1 mark**)
- stating that we focus on the consequences – if the consequence is good then we can believe the action is as well (**1 mark**)
- evaluating that you can't predict consequences and a further mark for the example given (**2 marks**)
- evaluating that we naturally consider the consequences (**1 mark**)

No marks were awarded for the opening sentences about consequences versus the action, as this should be consequences versus the motive.

### Question 3(f)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 6 marks** because they did not give sufficient, accurate detail in their explanation of the good will and universal law, and they incorrectly stated Kant is concerned with motive rather than the act – they should have written rather than the consequence, as Kant does pay heed to the act (eg lying). The mark was awarded for showing a limited awareness of key terms.

### Question 3(g)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 4 marks** for stating that it is morally wrong to go against your promise.

## Question 3(h)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 6 marks** because their response was poorly expressed and unclear, and the examples used did not support the criticism they were trying to express. It is likely that if you tell the teacher your friend is lying then you will lose your friend's trust, but this doesn't mean that your motive has deceived you, nor make it morally wrong. The second criticism does not link sufficiently to Kant's moral philosophy. By saying that you might ban euthanasia 'to look good' – the candidate has not demonstrated an understanding of the universal law/Kant's philosophy.

## Candidate 2

### Question 1(a)(i)-(v)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 5 marks** as all responses to this question are correct.

### Question 1(b)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks** for correctly identifying a valid argument.

### Question 1(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 3 marks** for 'They aren't trying to persuade ...'

### Question 1(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because their answer clearly meets the criteria set out in the marking instructions:

- two options presented as if they're the only two options

- if you reject one you must accept the other
- there are other things Nel could do

### Question 1(c)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 4 marks** because they did not adequately describe the slippery slope fallacy. The mark was awarded for making the point that by fishing, it does not guarantee it will lead to killing endangered animals (no justification/could be false).

### Question 1(c)(iv)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** because they have identified the conclusion correctly and the premises are standalone statements, but in premise 2 they have not included '*metal detecting gives you the opportunity to get outside...*'.

### Question 2(a)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** for implying that we have no innate ideas and for stating that the blank piece of paper represents the mind at birth. For the final mark to have been awarded, they would need to have explained how the metaphor uses the idea of a pen writing on the paper to represent our experiences, allowing us to gain knowledge.

### Question 2(b)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 3 marks** for the veins representing innate ideas. The candidate has simply repeated this same point in a different way but has not fully explained the metaphor to access any further marks.

### Question 2(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** for their example and for stating that you therefore should not fully trust your senses.

### Question 2(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks** for their point that it seems unreasonable to reject them completely, as you still need your senses even if you can't trust them.

### Question 2(c)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 3 marks** for the point that you can't tell if you are awake or dreaming (point 1 on the marking instructions).

### Question 2(c)(iv)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 4 marks** because they did not provide a relevant criticism.

### Question 2(d)-(e)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks**. They were not awarded a mark for question 2(d) because their response was too vague.

### Question 2(f)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 3 marks** for stating that these qualities can be traced back to when we have experienced them. To be awarded further marks, they needed to have stated that not only are the qualities combined, but more importantly they are augmented to give the idea of God.

## Question 2(g)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** for providing correct examples.

## Question 2(h)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 6 marks** because no adequate point was made.

## Question 3(a)-(d)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for providing correct responses.

## Question 3(e)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 10 marks** for higher/lower pleasures. There was not enough accurate detail to credit any further points that the candidate made.

## Question 3(f)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 6 marks**. The first was awarded for their point in relation to respect (**1 mark**), and the second for the point made about universalizability (**1 mark**). The example of lying was inaccurate and so was not awarded any marks.

## Question 3(g)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 4 marks** because their response did not make clear that Kantians always keep promises – it is not to do with a respect for feelings, but a respect for the friend's dignity.

## Question 3(h)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 6 marks**. No marks were awarded for the first criticism, but they were awarded a mark for the example in the second criticism. There were no further marks awarded here as the candidate did not explicitly identify the problem with ignoring consequences. To be awarded a further mark the candidate would need to have said something like ‘a moral theory that doesn’t reduce harm is problematic.’

## Candidate 3

### Question 1(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** for there not being any attempt to persuade, and for there not being any statements.

### Question 1(c)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 4 marks** because they have not adequately described a slippery slope fallacy. However, if you take the point ‘She may simply enjoy fishing’ and ‘is a fallacy as fishing won’t lead to Zara killing endangered animals’, then the candidate has demonstrated the final bullet point in the marking instructions that it is unlikely fishing will lead to killing endangered animals.

### Question 1(c)(iv)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 3 marks** for changing ‘it’ to metal detecting (premise 2). However, they have incorrectly identified the conclusion and included a sentence that is not a statement – ‘Give metal detecting a go’.

## Question 2(a)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 3 marks** for the point that Locke did not believe in innate ideas, but they have not explained the metaphor and therefore, no further marks can be awarded.

## Question 2(b)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** for explaining that the veins in the marble represent innate ideas which help us build knowledge and that Leibniz believed in innate ideas.

## Question 2(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** for providing a correct response and an example.

## Question 2(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 2 marks** because this is not something Descartes considered.

## Question 2(c)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** for 'question whether the senses are really accurate' and 'what is real and what is a dream.'

## Question 2(c)(iv)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** – 1 mark awarded for each criticism.

## Question 2(d)-(e)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks** because the response to question 2(d) was too vague.

## Question 2(f)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 3 marks** for their point about augmentation. The candidate has effectively repeated themselves but in reverse, by stating that we experience the ideas that we augment and then describing them in their augmented state.

## Question 2(g)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** for providing correct examples.

## Question 2(h)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 6 marks** for their examples of a lively idea and a weak impression. The points made in relation to missing shade of blue were too vague to be credited with marks.

## Question 3(e)

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 10 marks** as follows:

- for describing Mill as interested in qualitative pleasures (**1 mark**) and a further mark for higher/lower pleasures description (**1 mark**)

- for the evaluative point that we naturally consider consequences **(1 mark)** and a further mark for the point we naturally seek pleasure/avoid pain **(1 mark)**
- no mark was awarded for 'the problem with equity ...the tyranny of the majority' as they haven't explained the link explicitly **(0 marks)**, however a mark was awarded for the developed explanation that followed **(1 mark)**
- for the point made in relation to the problem with consequences **(1 mark)**

### Question 3(f)

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 6 marks** as follows:

- deontological theory/duty based **(1 mark)**
- do something not for gain but for duty/good will/pure intentions **(1 mark)**
- description of universal law **(1 mark)**
- 'end in itself' **(1 mark)** and a further mark was awarded for development of this point **(1 mark)**

### Question 3(g)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** for identifying that 'it's your duty to uphold your promise to your friend' **(1 mark)** and for creating a maxim and applying the universal law **(1 mark)**. The rest of the response was not credited as it was inaccurate.

### Question 3(h)

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 6 marks**. In criticism 1, the candidate was awarded a mark for identifying the conflict of duties **(1 mark)** and a further mark for their explanation that if you have two duties that conflict you can't follow them both **(1 mark)**. No mark was awarded for the example as we have a duty not to lie, not a duty to tell the truth; and there is a difference between making a promise and a friend telling you to promise.

Criticism 2, the candidate was awarded a mark for naming the criticism (**1 mark**), a further mark was awarded for the point that humans naturally think about them (**1 mark**) and a final mark was awarded for the point that Kant is setting unrealistic goals (**1 mark**).

## Candidate 4

### Question 1(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 3 marks** for identifying there were no premises or central claim.

### Question 1(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks**. The first mark was awarded for the point that there are only two possible options when in fact there are more (**1 mark**), and the second mark was awarded for noting that there are many other things Nel could do (**1 mark**).

### Question 1(c)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 4 marks** for making the point that if you do the first action (fishing) it will inevitably lead to a worse outcome (killing endangered animals). This is the only point the candidate has made, although they have repeated it. The candidate has not provided any further explanation of slippery slope as a fallacy.

### Question 1(c)(iv)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** because they did not change the 'it' in premise 2 to 'metal detecting'.

### Question 2(a)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** for providing a clear explanation of Locke's metaphor, as detailed in the marking instructions.

### Question 2(b)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** for providing a clear explanation of Leibniz's metaphor, as detailed in the marking instructions.

### Question 2(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** for providing a correct explanation and example.

### Question 2(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 2 marks** because there was no relevant or accurate response to the question.

### Question 2(c)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks**. The first mark was awarded for 'how can he truly know if he is awake or dreaming' (**1 mark**), and the second mark was awarded for the explanation of having dreams that have felt like real life (**1 mark**).

### Question 3(e)

The candidate was awarded **9 out of 10 marks**. The candidate's response was heavily weighted on description of utilitarianism which was capped at 4 marks. A further 5 marks were awarded for criticisms, as detailed in the marking instructions.

### Question 3(f)

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** for a detailed and accurate response, as detailed in the marking instructions.

### Question 3(g)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for a detailed and accurate application of Natural Moral Law to the scenario.

### Question 3(h)

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** as for each criticism they accurately named, they explained why it is a criticism and provided an example.

## Candidate 5

### Question 1(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** for identifying that there is no attempt to persuade/no premises or conclusion, and that it is made up of exclamations, commands and questions.

### Question 1(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** as they have met the necessary criteria and by using the example, they have given their answer in a very concise way. The candidate has shown an understanding that there are two options presented as the only options when there are more available, and that the conclusion is that if you reject one, you must accept the other when in fact you could do something else.

### Question 1(c)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 4 marks**. The first mark was awarded for identifying that there is 'no logical connection' between the two activities (**1 mark**). The second mark is awarded for 'Nel is trying to persuade Zara not to go fishing' (**1 mark**) – this is the conclusion mark as detailed in the marking instructions. The final mark is awarded for stating that it is a false accusation of worse events (**1 mark**). This shows an understanding of a chain of increasingly bad events if the first step is taken.

### Question 1(c)(iv)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** for providing a correct response per the marking instructions.

## Question 2(a)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** for a clear and developed response in relation to the metaphor, per the marking instructions.

## Question 2(b)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** for this response. It is not as precise as their answer to question 2(a), but the candidate has made it clear that they understand that the veins represent innate ideas and guide us through our lives to uncover the knowledge.

## Question 2(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** for providing a correct response with an example.

## Question 2(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 2 marks** because they have not explained why Descartes' confidence in knowledge gained through experience is not undermined.

## Question 2(c)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because their response gives three clear points in response to the question, as detailed in the marking instructions.

## Question 2(c)(iv)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks**. The first mark was awarded for the point that the loss of knowledge guides him to his conclusion or the point that this method is progressive (both of these points are effectively saying the same thing) **(1**

**mark).** The second mark was awarded for 'Descartes explained he wanted to defeat scepticism but ended in a position of diabolic doubt' **(1 mark).**

### Question 2(f)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** for providing a relevant and accurate response as detailed in the marking instructions.

### Question 2(g)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** for providing correct examples.

### Question 2(h)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 6 marks**. The first mark was awarded for 'Hume doesn't really explain what he means by force and vivacity' **(1 mark)**. The second mark was awarded for the point that not all impressions are more vivid and the example of being drunk **(1 mark)**. The final mark was awarded for 'Not all ideas can be traced back to impressions' and the example of beauty **(1 mark)**.

### Question 3(e)

The candidate was awarded **10 out of 10 marks**. They were awarded KU marks for general knowledge points about Utilitarianism **(3 marks)**. They were then awarded marks for their explanation of evil pleasures **(2 marks)**, for their explanation of the tyranny of the majority **(2 marks)** and for their explanation of the difficulty predicting consequences **(2 marks)**. The final mark was awarded for their evaluation of the hedonic calculus being unrealistic (written on the additional space) **(1 mark)**.

### Question 3(f)

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** for:

- 'deontological theory' **(1 mark)**

- 'focuses on duty as a motive and ignores consequences completely' **(1 mark)**
- their definition of a maxim **(1 mark)**
- providing an example of a duty – 'always tell the truth' **(1 mark)**
- 'never use someone as a means to an end but as an end in themselves' **(1 mark)**  
and a further mark was awarded for the explanation and example of this **(1 mark)**

### Question 3(g)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 4 marks**. The first mark was awarded for 'no matter your desires' and this same point was repeated at the end 'no matter if you love the band' **(1 mark)**. The second mark was awarded for 'If you lie ...using them as a mere means to an end' **(1 mark)** and the final mark was awarded for 'Kant would say ...you must perform your duty'; not break your promise **(1 mark)**.

### Question 3(h)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 6 marks**. In the first criticism point, the candidate was not awarded a mark for naming the criticism because they had not made it clear it was a criticism, but they were awarded a mark for the explanation **(1 mark)**. In the second criticism, they were awarded a mark for naming the criticism **(1 mark)** and a further mark for their explanation that sometimes the consequences are morally relevant **(1 mark)**. No marks were awarded for either of the examples because they did not adequately demonstrate the evaluative point being made in relation to Kant's moral philosophy.

## Candidate 6

### Question 1(a)(i)

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 5 marks** for providing five correct responses.

## Question 1(b)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks** for one correctly identified, valid argument.

## Question 1(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** for providing a correct response as detailed in the marking instructions.

## Question 1(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks**. They were awarded marks for the point 'metal detecting and fishing are not the only two options available for activities – they could go hiking' (**2 marks**). Here the candidate has made the points that they are presented with just two options as if they are the only two, and the point that there are other options. The candidate was not awarded the conclusion mark as detailed in the marking instructions, because it is not clear in their response that by rejecting metal detecting you have to go fishing.

## Question 1(c)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for providing an accurate response as detailed in the marking instructions.

## Question 1(c)(iv)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** for providing an accurate response as detailed in the marking instructions.

## Question 2(a)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** for providing a very detailed and accurate explanation of the metaphor as detailed in the marking instructions.

## Question 2(b)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** for providing a very detailed and accurate explanation of the metaphor as detailed in the marking instructions.

## Question 2(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** for providing a correct response and example.

## Question 2(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** for the point that Descartes says he would be a madman to completely reject the senses (**1 mark**), and their final point that it seems excessive to reject a sense that has deceived you just once (**1 mark**).

## Question 2(c)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** because their description of the dream argument does not answer the question of how it undermines the senses. The candidate was awarded the marks for stating that there is no way of distinguishing wakefulness from sleep and their final point.

## Question 2(c)(iv)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks**. The candidate has provided four very well-developed points of evaluation, including both strengths and weaknesses.

## Question 2(d)-(e)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** for providing correct responses.

## Question 2(f)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks**. The first mark was awarded for identifying the idea of God as a complex idea (**1 mark**) and the second mark was awarded for the explanation of how we arrive at this complex idea of God (**1 mark**). No marks were awarded for the first point of not imagining a contradiction as this is irrelevant to the question.

## Question 2(g)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** for providing correct responses.

## Question 2(h)

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** because they have given a clear and logical list of developed criticisms in response to the question, as outlined in the marking instructions.

## Question 3(a)-(d)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for providing correct responses.

## Question 3(e)

The candidate was awarded **10 out of 10 marks**. They have given a detailed description of the Greatest Happiness Principle and Bentham and Mill, achieving the maximum KU marks available (**4 marks**). They were also awarded a mark for their evaluation of the Hedonic Calculus not solving the issue of quantifying pleasure as the comparisons could be arbitrary (**1 mark**). Because the maximum number of

marks have been reached, there are further KU marks which can't be credited. A mark was awarded for the evaluative comment that it is difficult to distinguish between higher and lower pleasures (**1 mark**). Further marks were awarded for the evaluative points made in relation to the tyranny of the majority (**2 marks**) and the final marks were awarded for the developed evaluative comments in relation to predicting consequences and local/global consequences (**2 marks**). Although there are further relevant points in their response, the candidate has now reached the maximum marks available.

### **Question 3(f)**

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** for providing an accurate and detailed response, as detailed in the marking instructions.

### **Question 3(g)**

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** for providing a well justified and accurate application of Kantianism in response to the scenario.

### **Question 3(h)**

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** because they have explained in detail why their named criticisms are an issue for Kantianism and have backed up their developed responses with examples.