

Commentary on candidate evidence

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

Candidate 1

Question 2(e)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they have given the correct answer.

Question 2(f)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they have given the correct answer.

Question 2(g)(i)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because they correctly described three aspects of Descartes' dreaming argument:

- ◆ Descartes may think he is sitting next to the fire but in fact he is just in bed dreaming that he is awake.
- ◆ There are no definitive signs to tell the difference between wakefulness and sleep.
- ◆ In dreams geometry and maths survive.

Question 2(g)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** because they have explained one criticism of Descartes' dreaming argument: the fact that dreams do not follow laws of nature or logic. This point is illustrated with the evidence that dreams do not have clear timelines.

Question 2(h)(i)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 3 marks** because the response shows a great deal of confusion about Descartes' Cogito. The candidate is talking about the statement 'I do not exist' and rather than noting that it cannot possibly be true, they say that every time it is said it is confirmed.

Question 2(h)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 3 marks** because they make the point that the Cogito only establishes momentary existence, not the existence of a self. The candidate goes on to claim that the cogito only establishes continuous existence, and was not awarded any further marks due to the confusion demonstrated.

Question 3(e)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 10 marks** because they made clear that they know:

- ◆ that, according to Kant, we have a moral duty to keep our promises
- ◆ the process we should go through to establish whether we have a perfect duty

Question 3(f)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** because they have stated two criticisms of their other moral theory.

Candidate 2

Question 2(i)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because they have correctly described three ways in which impressions can be distinguished from ideas:

- ◆ impressions can be outer or inner
- ◆ impressions are always more lively
- ◆ ideas are the faded remains of an impression

Question 2(j)(i)

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 6 marks** because they have:

- ◆ given the example of the golden mountain
- ◆ described the four operations of the imagination
- ◆ noted that the imagination is limited to the four operations they listed
- ◆ listed the qualities that are augmented without limit to create
- ◆ noted that the idea of God is complex

Question (2)(j)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks** because they understand that the idea of God was used because of its complexity.

Question 3(a)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because they have shown that they understand the hedonic calculus's purpose is to calculate how much pleasure will result from a decision and so be used to calculate which is the most morally praiseworthy action.

Question 3(b)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they have fully answered the question in line with the marking instructions.

Question 3(c)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they have explained the difference between higher and lower pleasures and have given appropriate examples to support their answer.

Question 3(d)(i)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they have shown understanding of two of the factors of the hedonic calculus and applied them appropriately to the scenario.

Question 3(d)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because they have explained why video games is a lower pleasure and why playing the drums is a higher pleasure.

Question 3(e)

The candidate was awarded **8 out of 10 marks** because they have described five key features of Virtue Ethics and applied the theory to the scenario in the following ways:

- ◆ noting that the virtue in this case would be honesty
- ◆ noting that by lying to his mother David would be betraying her
- ◆ explaining that David is demonstrating the vice of obsequiousness

Question 3(f)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** because they have stated two criticisms of their other moral theory.

Candidate 3

Question 3(a)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because they have correctly responded to the question in line with the marking instructions.

Question 3(b)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** because they have explained that one problem with using the hedonic calculus is that it takes too long and sometimes we need to be able to make moral decisions quickly. The second problem the candidate writes about is not a problem with using the hedonic calculus so they were not awarded any marks for this material.

Question 3(c)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they have correctly responded to the question in line with the marking instructions.

Question 3(d)(i)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** because they have shown a basic understanding of the criteria of intensity and certainty.

Question 3d)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 2 marks** because the candidate has made no reference to Mill's theory.

Question 3(e)

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 10 marks** because they have described more than six key features of Kant's theory. Although the candidate has made an attempt at applying the theory to the scenario, they have not been awarded any additional marks for this. There is significant confusion in their framing of the maxims and they do not build at all on their descriptive points in explaining why Kant would not approve of David's decision.

Question 3(f)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they have stated two criticisms of their other moral theory and illustrated the problems with examples.

Candidate 4

Question 2(i)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because they have noted the following points:

- ◆ ideas are less lively and vivid than impressions
- ◆ ideas are based on remembering perceptions

They have also provided examples of impressions and ideas.

Question 2(j)(i)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 6 marks** because they have noted the following:

- ◆ simple ideas are the building blocks of complex ideas
- ◆ the operations of the imagination
- ◆ the idea of God is complex
- ◆ the ideas that our complex idea of God is comprised of and derived from experience

Question 2(j)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because they noted the following:

- ◆ Hume proves that the idea of God isn't innate
- ◆ the fact that the idea of God can be explained through experience supports Hume's empiricism

Question 3(a)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks** because they have only mentioned that the hedonic calculus is used to measure how much pleasure actions bring. They have not stated that it can be used to determine which action one ought to choose.

Question 3(b)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** because they have explained the problem with the difficulty of predicting consequences. The second problem the candidate notes is not a specific problem with using the hedonic calculus but a broader problem with utilitarianism, so they received no marks for this.

Question 3(c)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they responded to the question in line with the marking instructions.

Question 3(d)(i)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 4 marks** because they show an understanding of the factors of intensity and extent.

Question 3(d)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks** because they note that playing games is a lower pleasure and playing the drums is a higher pleasure. They were not awarded the second mark because no explanation was given to support their answer.

Question 3(e)

The candidate was awarded **7 out of 10 marks** because they described five key features of Natural Moral Law theory and applied this theory to the scenario by noting that:

- ◆ David's lie made him less likely to achieve his purpose of becoming one with God
- ◆ David's lie meant he didn't follow his primary precept of worshipping God

Question 3(f)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 4 marks** because they have stated two criticisms of their other moral theory and given an example to support one of them.

Candidate 5

Question 1(d)(i)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly identified the fallacy.

Question 1(d)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 1 mark** because they have not fully explained the slippery slope fallacy.

Question 1(d)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 1 mark** because they have not explained that Sasha had no justification for her assumption that once she'd done the dishes she'd end up with an endless list of jobs.

Question 1(d)(iv)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they have correctly identified the fallacy.

Question 1(d)(v)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they have correctly described the fallacy.

Question 1(d)(vi)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 1 mark** because they have not mentioned any of the alternative chores Sasha could have done instead.

Question 1(d)(vii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they have correctly identified the fallacy.

Question 1(d)(viii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 1 mark** because they have not mentioned the fact that the personal attack is irrelevant.

Question 1(d)(ix)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they have explained that the state of Finlay's bedroom as a child has no relevance to whether or not Derek and Sasha should do housework.

Question 2(i)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because they have given the example of touching the hot stove, noted the impressions can be inward or outward and that ideas are faded memories of impressions.

Question 2(j)(i)

The candidate was awarded **6 out of 6 marks** because they have given a full answer to the question in line with the marking instructions.

Question 2(j)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because they have noted that the idea of God might be thought to be innate and that Hume explains how we might acquire it through experience.

Question 3(a)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks** because they have noted that the hedonic calculus is a way to quantify the pleasure or pain produced by an action.

Question 3(b)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 4 marks** because there is no sufficient accuracy or detail in their response to gain any marks.

Question 3(c)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they have answered the question correctly and in line with the marking instructions.

Question 3(d)(i)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 4 marks** because they have explained two components of the hedonic calculus and correctly applied duration to the scenario.

Question 3(d)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 2 marks** because saying that David's parents are competent judges is not really an explanation of why Mill would agree with them.

Question 3(e)

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 10 marks** because they have described four key features of Kantianism:

- ◆ that duty is the only moral motive
- ◆ that the good will is the highest good and 'shines through like a jewel'
- ◆ that reason is sovereign and allows us all to come to the same moral judgements
- ◆ the process of applying the categorical imperative

There is a lot of confusion in the candidate's attempt to demonstrate how the categorical imperative would be applied in this scenario. However, they were awarded 1 mark for noting that David has a perfect duty to never lie.

Question 3(f)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they have stated two problems with their other moral theory and given examples to support their answer.

Candidate 6

Question 1(a)(i-v)

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 5 marks** because they correctly answered the questions.

Question 1(b)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly answered the question.

Question 1(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** because they replaced 'they' with 'pizzas' in the first premise, and correctly identified the sentence containing the conclusion. They were not awarded the third mark because they did not remove 'it's a no brainer that' from the conclusion.

Question 1(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 1 mark** because their response is incorrect.

Question 1(c)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they have given an appropriate response to the question.

Question 1(d)(i)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly identified the fallacy.

Question 1(d)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 1 mark** because they have not given a sufficient explanation of a slippery slope fallacy.

Question 1(d)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they have noted that Sasha was not justified in assuming that doing the dishes would lead to an endless list of jobs.

Question 1(d)(iv)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly identified the fallacy.

Question 1(d)(v)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly described the false dilemma fallacy.

Question 1(d)(vi)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 1 mark** because they have not mentioned any of the other things Sasha could have done instead of doing the dishes.

Question 1(d)(vii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 1 mark** because they have not correctly identified the fallacy.

Question 1(d)(viii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 1 mark** because they have not correctly described the fallacy.

Question 1(d)(ix)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 1 mark** because they have not sufficiently described why Derek's argument is fallacious.

Question 2(a)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 2 marks** because they understand that knowing how to play the violin is ability knowledge. To gain the second mark the candidate would have had to say that 'knowing that' is knowledge of a fact, or is propositional knowledge.

Question 2(b)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly answered the question.

Question 2(c)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly answered the question.

Question 2(d)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 1 mark** because their answer is not precise enough. An innate idea is not just 'something' humans are born with – that doesn't distinguish it from finger prints, for example.

Question 2(e)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly answered the question.

Question 2(f)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 1 mark** because their answer is incorrect.

Question 2(g)(i)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because they have made three descriptive points about Descartes' dreaming argument:

- ◆ Descartes never truly knows whether he's awake or asleep
- ◆ he can't prove that what he believes he's doing right now is not happening in a dream
- ◆ the state of dreaming and the state of being awake cannot be distinguished from each other

Question 2(g)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** because they have noted that it is possible to tell if you're dreaming because you cannot exercise free will in the way you do in real life.

Question 2(h)(i)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 3 marks** because they have stated the Cogito. They were not awarded any marks for the rest of their response because Descartes would not agree that he must be a living being in an external world.

Question 2(h)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 3 marks** because they have not described at least one criticism of the Cogito.

Question 2(i)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 3 marks** because they noted that impressions can be inward or outward and that ideas can be simple or complex.

Question 2(j)(i)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 6 marks** because they understand that the idea of God is complex. The rest of the response is not relevant to the question.

Question 2(j)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 2 marks** because their response is incorrect.

Question 3(a)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 2 marks** because their response is incorrect.

Question 3(b)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 4 marks** because the problems they describe are not problems with using the hedonic calculus.

Question 3(c)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they correctly answered the question in line with the marking instructions.

Question 3(d)(i)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 4 marks** because they have correctly used the factor of duration to explain why Bentham would agree with David's parents. The candidate was not awarded any further marks because they have not explained what extent or duration are, and because what they say about extent does not actually concern extent.

Question 3(d)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because they have given a full explanation of what makes his hobbies higher pleasures.

Question 3(e)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 10 marks** because they have not stated what their other moral theory is.

Question 3(f)

The candidate was awarded **0 out of 4 marks** because their comments make no reference to their other moral theory.

Candidate 7

Question 1(a)(i-v)

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 5 marks** because they responded correctly to the questions.

Question 1(b)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they responded correctly to the question.

Question 1(c)(i)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because they answered the question in line with the marking instructions.

Question 1(c)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they gave a correct response to the question.

Question 1(c)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly explained why the argument in question 1(c)(i) is not valid.

Question 1(d)(i)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly identified the fallacy.

Question 1(d)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly described the fallacy.

Question 1(d)(iii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly explained why Sasha's argument is fallacious.

Question 1(d)(iv)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly identified the fallacy.

Question 1(d)(v)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly described the fallacy.

Question 1(d)(vi)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly explained why Finlay's argument is fallacious.

Question 1(d)(vii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly identified the fallacy.

Question 1(d)(viii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly described the fallacy.

Question 1(d)(ix)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they correctly explained why Derek's argument is fallacious.

Question 2(a)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because they correctly identified ability knowledge and propositional knowledge.

Question 2(b)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they responded to the question correctly.

Question 2(c)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they answered the question correctly.

Question 2(d)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they answered the question correctly.

Question 2(e)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they answered the question correctly.

Question 2(f)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 1 mark** because they answered the question correctly.

Question 2(g)(i)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because they made three descriptive points about Descartes' dreaming argument:

- ◆ there have been times when he has believed he's sitting by the fire when in fact he's been in bed dreaming
- ◆ perhaps all his perceptions of the external world are a product of his mind
- ◆ there are no definitive signs to distinguish wakefulness from sleep

Question 2(g)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **1 out of 3 marks** because they describe the criticism that the dreaming argument is asymmetric. The other points the candidate makes are not developed enough to be awarded marks.

Question 2(h)(i)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because they made three descriptive points about the Cogito:

- ◆ the demon could not fool nothing into believing it existed
- ◆ Descartes' doubt is a form of thinking
- ◆ as he is thinking, he must exist

Question 2(h)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because they correctly describe three criticisms of the Cogito:

- ◆ it is self-authenticating and true every time he thinks it
- ◆ it shows that there is a thought, not necessarily a thinker
- ◆ there is an unjustified leap from 'I think' to 'I am'

Had the candidate not already had 3 marks, they could have been awarded a further 2 marks for the two remaining points in their response.

Question 2(i)

The candidate was awarded **3 out of 3 marks** because they make three points in line with the marking instructions.

Question 2(j)(i)

The candidate was awarded **5 out of 6 marks** for making the following points:

- ◆ a complex idea is composed of simple ideas
- ◆ listing the operations of the imagination
- ◆ the idea of God is complex
- ◆ we combine ideas we have from experience to form the idea of God
- ◆ example of other complex ideas

Question 2(j)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because they note that Hume uses the idea of God because it hasn't come from experience and employs it to reject innate ideas.

Question 3(a)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because they have answered the question in line with the marking instructions.

Question 3(b)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they have clearly explained two problems with using the hedonic calculus, and go on to explain a further two. The candidate has given an excellent answer to this question.

Question 3(c)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they have answered the question in line with the marking instructions.

Question 3(d)(i)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they have used the factors of purity and fecundity very effectively to explain why Bentham would agree with David's parents. The candidate has done much more than was necessary to achieve full marks in this question.

Question 3(d)(ii)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because they have shown a good understanding of what makes running and playing the drums higher pleasures.

Question 3(e)

The candidate was awarded **10 out of 10 marks** because they have given a thorough answer to the question, with their description of the key features of their other moral theory being woven throughout their explanation of why Kant would not approve of David's decision.

Question 3(f)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they have clearly explained two criticisms of their other moral theory and as well as using examples to illustrate their answer, they have considered how Kant might respond.

Candidate 8

Question 3(a)

The candidate was awarded **2 out of 2 marks** because they have noted that the hedonic calculus is used to rate competing pleasures, and to determine which action is most moral.

Question 3(b)

The candidate was awarded **4 out of 4 marks** because they have stated two difficulties with using the hedonic calculus and developed their points to explain why these are problems.

Question 3(e)

The candidate was awarded **7 out of 10 marks** because they have focused their answer on describing the key features of their other moral theory. Although they have made a lot of mark-worthy points, a maximum of 6 marks can be awarded for describing the key features of the other moral theory. The candidate has only made one point (in their second-last paragraph) where they explain why a Kantian would not approve of David's decision.