
**A-LEVEL
PHILOSOPHY
7172/1**

PAPER 1 EPISTEMOLOGY AND MORAL PHILOSOPHY

Mark scheme

SAMs

1.0

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to their Team Leader, who will, if necessary, refer them to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the performance at the mid-point of the level. There are marks in each level. For the 3 and 5 mark questions that have only 1 mark in each level you need only apply step 1 below.

To support you in your marking, you will have standardisation scripts. These have been marked by the Lead Examiner at the correct standard. Generally, you will have a standardisation script to exemplify the standard for each level of the mark scheme for a particular item.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start by reading the whole of the student's response and then, using the mark scheme level descriptors and the standardisation scripts, place the response in the level which it matches or best fits.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. Start with the middle mark of the level and then look at the student's response in comparison with the level descriptor and the standardisation script. If the student's response is better than the standardisation script, award a mark above the mid-point of the level. If the student's response is weaker than the standardisation script, award a mark below the mid-point of the level.

For the 25 mark questions examiners should bear in mind the relative weightings of the assessment objectives and be careful not to over/under credit a particular skill. This will be exemplified and reinforced as part of examiner training.

Guidance

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other appropriate points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded zero marks.

Section A - Epistemology

Question number	Question	Total marks
01	What is philosophical scepticism?	3

AO1 = 3

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme
3	A full and correct answer, given precisely, with little or no redundancy.
2	The substantive content of the answer is correct, but there may be some redundancy or minor imprecision.
1	Relevant, but fragmented, points.
0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

Students might respond by contrasting philosophical scepticism with normal incredulity, although this is not a requirement. Credit can be given as long as students use this approach to clarify the nature of philosophical scepticism. Full credit can be given for a response which focuses solely on the nature of philosophical scepticism.

- Philosophical scepticism is generally used as an approach to testing the strength of knowledge claims and better understanding the nature of knowledge and justification.
- Philosophical scepticism arises when the sceptic's hypothesis/challenge is said to render one's ordinary evidence insufficient for justifying one's belief that p. The grounds for doubt cannot be removed by ordinary evidence (but may be combatted by philosophical argument).
- (Students might add that philosophical scepticism can arise from arguments that claim, for example, that all knowledge is circular and hence unjustified).
- Philosophical scepticism can be applied to classes of propositions, so doubt about one member of a class casts doubt on the whole class.

Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

02	Explain one way in which a direct realist could respond to the argument from illusion.	5
----	---	---

AO1 = 5

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme
5	A full, clear and precise explanation. The student makes logical links between precisely identified points, with no redundancy.
4	A clear explanation, with logical links, but some imprecision/redundancy.
3	The substantive content of the explanation is present and there is an attempt at logical linking. But the explanation is not full and/or precise.
2	One or two relevant points made, but not precisely. The logic is unclear.
1	Fragmented points, with no logical structure.
0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

Students might give a brief outline of the full argument from illusion, though this is not a requirement and should not, in the absence of a direct realist response, receive credit. Students should, however, make clear which premise(s) in the argument are the focus for the direct realist’s response.

- The direct realist can challenge the premise in the argument from illusion that ‘when we perceive something having some property *F*, then there is something that has this property’.
- It is not the case that the direct object of perception has the illusory property *F*, but has the property of looking-*F*, which is a relational property (the relata being subject, object and some collection of factors defining a perceptual circumstance or context, such as the spatiotemporal point of view and sense-modality).
- Direct realism claims that what we perceive are physical objects but it does not have to claim that all their properties, as we perceive them, are mind-independent.

Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

03	Explain how Berkeley's idealism differs from indirect realism.	5
----	--	---

AO1 = 5

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme
5	A full, clear and precise explanation. The student makes logical links between precisely identified points, with no redundancy.
4	A clear explanation, with logical links, but some imprecision/redundancy.
3	The substantive content of the explanation is present and there is an attempt at logical linking. But the explanation is not full and/or precise.
2	One or two relevant points made, but not precisely. The logic is unclear.
1	Fragmented points, with no logical structure.
0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- Berkeley's idealism is an anti-realist theory because it denies the existence of mind-independent physical objects, whereas indirect realism is a realist theory of perception because it affirms the existence of mind-independent physical objects.
- This is because Berkeley sees the claim that there are mind-independent physical objects as having no explanatory value and as being incoherent. (Indirect realists disagree).
- Berkeley's idealism is a direct theory of perception because it states that we directly perceive objects (and their properties), these being collections of mind-dependent ideas; whereas indirect realism is an indirect theory of perception because it states that we perceive physical objects (in the external world) indirectly, via mind-dependent representations of/caused by them (sense-data).
- God plays a role in Berkeley's idealism which God does not (generally) play in indirect realism.

Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

04	Explain how Descartes argues that we can gain <i>a priori</i> knowledge through intuition and deduction.	12
----	--	----

AO1 = 12

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme
10-12	<p>The answer is set out in a precise, fully-integrated and logical form.</p> <p>The content is correct and demonstrates detailed understanding.</p> <p>Points are made clearly and precisely. Relevance is sustained, with very little or no redundancy.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used precisely throughout.</p>
7-9	<p>The answer is set out in a clear, integrated and logical form.</p> <p>The content of the answer is correct and demonstrates detailed understanding. The content is clearly relevant and points are made clearly and precisely. Any lack of clarity with respect to particular points is not sufficient to detract from the answer.</p> <p>Relevance is largely sustained. There may be some redundancy, though not sufficient to detract from the answer.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used correctly throughout.</p>
4-6	<p>The answer is clear and set out in a coherent form, with logical/causal links identified.</p> <p>The content of the answer is largely correct and most points are made clearly.</p> <p>Relevance is not always sustained and there is some redundancy.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used correctly, with any minor errors not detracting from the response.</p>
1-3	<p>There are some relevant points made, but no integration.</p> <p>Some points are clear, but there is a lack of precision – with possibly insufficient material that is relevant or too much that is irrelevant.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used, though not always consistently or appropriately.</p>
0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- *A priori* knowledge – knowledge that is justified independent of experience (other than any experiences required to understand the proposition that is known).

Gaining a priori knowledge through intuition

- Intuition is not a 'gut feeling' or 'instinct' but is an intellectual capacity to grasp the truth of a proposition directly and non-inferentially. (Descartes speaks of the 'natural light of reason' and 'clear and distinct ideas.')
- Descartes' claim that 'I exist' is knowledge gained through intuition.
- Some students may give alternative examples of intuitions and this is fine. Descartes himself discusses the concept of God and mathematical and geometric truths.

Gaining a priori knowledge through deduction

- Successful deduction as the drawing of conclusions that necessarily follow from the premises, ie deductively valid arguments.
- There are several examples of deductions from Descartes that students may use:
 - That God exists (via the ontological, trademark and cosmological arguments) and is no deceiver.
 - That mind and body are distinct substances (via the conceivability and divisibility arguments)
 - That there is a world of physical objects external to mind (via his awareness that his perceptions of such a world are involuntary and God exists and is no deceiver.)

(In their examples of deductions, students might suggest that Descartes deduces that the essence of mind is thought. Whilst this is more likely to be an elaboration of the concept 'I,' do not penalise students who make this point. They may also suggest that he deduces that the essence of a material body is extension).

Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

05	How should propositional knowledge be defined?	25
----	--	----

AO1 = 5, AO2 = 20

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme
21-25	<p>The student argues with clear intent throughout and the logic of the argument is sustained.</p> <p>The student demonstrates detailed and precise understanding throughout.</p> <p>The conclusion is clear, with the arguments in support of it stated precisely, integrated coherently and robustly defended.</p> <p>Arguments and counter-arguments are stated in their strongest forms. Reasoned judgements are made, on an ongoing basis and overall, about the weight to be given to each argument. Crucial arguments are clearly identified against less crucial ones.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used precisely throughout.</p>
16-20	<p>The student argues with clear intent throughout and the logic of the argument is largely sustained.</p> <p>The content is correct and detailed – though not always consistently.</p> <p>The conclusion is clear, with a range of appropriate arguments supporting it.</p> <p>Arguments are generally stated in their strongest forms. There is a balancing of arguments, with weight being given to each – so crucial arguments are noted against less crucial ones. Arguments and counter-arguments are stated clearly, integrated coherently and defended.</p> <p>There may be trivial mistakes, as long as they do not detract from the argument.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used correctly throughout.</p>
11-15	<p>A clear response to the question, in the form of an argument, demonstrating intent.</p> <p>The content is detailed and correct and most of it is integrated.</p> <p>A conclusion and reasons are given and those reasons clearly support the conclusion. There might be a lack of clarity/precision about the logic of the argument as a whole.</p> <p>Arguments and counter-arguments are given, but there may be a lack of balance. Not all arguments are stated in their strongest forms. Stronger and weaker arguments are noted and there are attempts to identify the weight to be given to different arguments, but not necessarily those which are crucial to the conclusion.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used correctly, with any minor errors not detracting from the argument.</p>

6-10	<p>The response to the question is given in the form of an argument, but not fully coherently.</p> <p>The content is largely correct, though there are some gaps and a lack of detail. Relevant points are recognised/identified, but not integrated.</p> <p>Alternative positions are identified, but not precisely. Counter-arguments might be stated in weak forms or even slightly misrepresented. Arguments and counter-arguments are juxtaposed, so similarities and contrasts identified, rather than their impact being clear.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used throughout, though not always fully correctly and/or consistently.</p>
1-5	<p>There is little evidence of an argument.</p> <p>There may be missing content, substantial gaps in the content or the content may be one-sided.</p> <p>There may be a conclusion and several reasonable points may be made. There may be some connections between the points, but there is no clear relationship between the points and the conclusion.</p> <p>There is some basic use of philosophical language.</p>
0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

Students should respond in the form of an argument, to a clear conclusion. They might argue:

- that knowledge should be defined in any of a variety of ways – eg Justified True Belief (JTB), Infallibilism, JTB with no false lemmas, Reliabilism, Epistemic virtue theory
- for a particular definition either because that definition is inherently plausible, or because it addresses issues with another definition, or both
- that knowledge cannot be defined
- that there is no good definition available at the moment.

In their evaluation, students can gain credit for making reference to ways of generating philosophical definitions (Zagzebski).

- **Knowledge as justified true belief:**

Tripartite definition of knowledge: ‘S knows that *p*’ iff: S is justified in believing that *p*, *p* is true and S believes that *p*

Arguments in favour of the tripartite view, such as why each condition was thought to be necessary and why each of the three conditions were thought to be jointly sufficient.

Arguments against the tripartite view, such as problems with each condition being necessary (ie knowledge without belief, knowledge without truth, knowledge without justification) and problems with the conditions being sufficient: Gettier-style counter examples.

- **Alternative definitions of knowledge:** such as:

JTB with ‘no false lemmas’: adding a requirement to JTB that you do not infer your belief from anything false.

Arguments for JTB with no false lemmas, such as that it deals with Gettier’s examples.

Arguments against JTB with no false lemmas, such as the possibility of constructing examples of JTB with no false lemmas which do not count as knowledge.

- **Infallibilism: replacing ‘justification’ with a requirement for certainty**

(Students might present this in terms of clarification of the meaning of ‘justification’ rather than replacement)

Arguments for infallibilism, such as the possibility that they avoid Gettier-style problems and the (intuitive) link between knowledge and certainty/not being able to be wrong.

Arguments against infallibilism, such as the possibility that it goes too far and we could end up able to make almost no knowledge claims, leading to scepticism.

- **Reliabilism: belief + truth + a reliable method**

Arguments for reliabilism, such as it being implausible to claim that we need justification for all knowledge claims, or that our knowledge claims do need to be based on absolute certainty; it allows children/animals/those incapable of reasoning to have some knowledge.

Arguments against reliabilism, such as the difficulty in formulating a clear notion of ‘reliable’, and the problem of individuating methods.

- **Virtue epistemology: S’s true belief formed as a result of S’s intellectual virtues operating in a suitable way/brought about by a virtuous disposition**

Arguments for virtue epistemology, such as their success in dealing with Gettier’s examples, because the beliefs there are true because of luck/coincidence, rather than intellectual virtue.

Arguments against virtue epistemology, such as the possibility of constructing cases of beliefs which are true because of intellectual virtue, but those not counting as knowledge.

As the focus of this question is primarily AO2 do not penalise students for misattributing arguments.

Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

Section B - Moral philosophy

Question number	Question	Total marks
06	Briefly explain why Aristotle thinks that pleasure is not the only good.	3

AO1 = 3

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme
3	A full and correct answer, given precisely, with little or no redundancy.
2	The substantive content of the answer is correct, but there may be some redundancy or minor imprecision.
1	Relevant, but fragmented, points.
0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

Students might give a brief outline of the argument to which Aristotle is responding (from Eudoxus), though this is not a requirement and should not, in the absence of any reference to pleasure not being the only good, receive credit.

Eudoxus' argument:

- Every creature (as a matter of empirical fact) aims at pleasure.
- This indicates that pleasure is, for each creature, the good.
- What is good for all creatures is the good.

Aristotle's response:

- Pleasure is not the only thing we aim at (students might phrase this as 'pleasure is not our only end').
- There are other things – such as knowing and being virtuous – which we do, as a matter of fact, seek out.
- We seek out these things even if they bring us no pleasure.
- The pleasure they bring us is not why we seek them.
- Therefore they are final ends (in themselves) and not means to pleasure.
- Therefore pleasure cannot be the only good.

Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

07	Explain why emotivism is a non-cognitivist theory of ethical language.	5
----	--	---

AO1 = 5

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme
5	A full, clear and precise explanation. The student makes logical links between precisely identified points, with no redundancy.
4	A clear explanation, with logical links, but some imprecision/redundancy.
3	The substantive content of the explanation is present and there is an attempt at logical linking. But the explanation is not full and/or precise.
2	One or two relevant points made, but not precisely. The logic is unclear.
1	Fragmented points, with no logical structure.
0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- Non-cognitivists about ethical language claim that:
 - Ethical statements do not (cannot) make, or at least do not (cannot) only make, descriptive claims about reality which are truth-apt (ie true or false / fact-stating).
 - When people are making ethical utterances they are not (or are not merely) expressing beliefs.
- (Note: Some students might explain that emotivists/non-cognitivists do not claim that there is **never** any descriptive content implied by moral utterances: eg 'It was wrong of Jim to hit his brother' implies that 'Jim hit his brother' is true; but the word 'wrong' adds no descriptive content to the utterance. Adding 'It was wrong' simply expresses moral disapproval, according to the emotivist.)
- Emotivists make both of these claims above and add the following:
 - Our moral judgements are (or at least involve) expressions of our emotions - so saying 'Murder is wrong' is like saying 'Murder..Boo!!'.
 - 'X is right' might be seen as the equivalent of cheering and 'X is wrong' as the equivalent of booing (informally, the 'boo-hurrah' theory). So 'Stealing is wrong' means 'Stealing, boo!'.
 - Ethical language expresses emotions or attitudes – 'pro-attitude' or 'con-attitudes'.
 - Moral statements are still meaningful but not (only) because they state facts – they instead have 'emotive meaning'.
- NB: Emotivists do not think that moral judgements give a report on our emotions. So according to an emotivist, 'Murder is wrong' does not mean 'I do not like murder'. Those who do think this would be cognitivists.

Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

08	Explain the analogy drawn between virtues and skills within Aristotelian ethics.	5
----	--	---

AO1 = 5

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme
5	A full, clear and precise explanation. The student makes logical links between precisely identified points, with no redundancy.
4	A clear explanation, with logical links, but some imprecision/redundancy.
3	The substantive content of the explanation is present and there is an attempt at logical linking. But the explanation is not full and/or precise.
2	One or two relevant points made, but not precisely. The logic is unclear.
1	Fragmented points, with no logical structure.
0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- The context of the skill analogy is Aristotle’s account of how you acquire the moral virtues/become virtuous. He draws an analogy between acquiring a skill and becoming virtuous.

No-one is born able to play the harp; rather, we have the capacity to play the harp	No-one is born virtuous; rather we have the capacity to become virtuous
We don’t learn to play the harp and then play it. We learn by playing	We don’t learn to be virtuous, then be virtuous. We become virtuous by doing virtuous actions
To become a harp player, we need to practise. We do this by playing until playing becomes a fixed disposition – so by habituation	To become a virtuous person, we need to practice. We do this by doing virtuous actions until being virtuous becomes a fixed disposition – so by habituation

- Students might give examples, such as becoming temperate by repeatedly refusing to indulge yourself, until it becomes easier for you not to indulge yourself and you start to find it pleasant, rather than painful.

Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

09	Explain how Kant’s deontological ethics can be applied to the question of whether we should ever tell lies.	12
----	---	----

AO1 = 12

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme
10-12	<p>The answer is set out in a precise, fully-integrated and logical form.</p> <p>The content is correct and demonstrates detailed understanding.</p> <p>Points are made clearly and precisely. Relevance is sustained, with very little or no redundancy.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used precisely throughout.</p>
7-9	<p>The answer is set out in a clear, integrated and logical form.</p> <p>The content of the answer is correct and demonstrates detailed understanding. The content is clearly relevant and points are made clearly and precisely. Any lack of clarity with respect to particular points is not sufficient to detract from the answer.</p> <p>Relevance is largely sustained. There may be some redundancy, though not sufficient to detract from the answer.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used correctly throughout.</p>
4-6	<p>The answer is clear and set out in a coherent form, with logical/causal links identified.</p> <p>The content of the answer is largely correct and most points are made clearly.</p> <p>Relevance is not always sustained and there is some redundancy.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used correctly, with any minor errors not detracting from the response.</p>
1-3	<p>There are some relevant points made, but no integration.</p> <p>Some points are clear, but there is a lack of precision – with possibly insufficient material that is relevant or too much that is irrelevant.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used, though not always consistently or appropriately.</p>
0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

- Kant argues that we have duties not to do certain things which are wrong in themselves and lying is one such thing.
- Moral duties are categorical and not hypothetical, because they are your duty regardless of what you want and are not a means to a further end. This means that it is never morally permissible to lie, regardless of circumstances. Students may make reference to Kant’s axe-murderer example.
- Kant argues that moral duties, including this one, are discoverable by reason.
- Only the good will is good without qualification and to have a good will is to do your duty because it is your duty (other motivations are irrelevant): eg, Kant’s ‘shopkeepers’ example about overcharging his inexperienced customers.

- Application of the 1st formulation of the Categorical Imperative to lying:
 - ‘Act only according to that maxim by which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law.’
 - A universalised maxim of lying is incoherent/inconceivable since if there was no default practice of truth-telling then no-one would believe any lie, so there could not (in fact) be lying.
 - It leads to a contradiction in conception, and so not lying is a perfect (absolute) duty.
 - It shows that when we lie, we in fact want to make an exception of ourselves (because that is the only way that our lie will succeed).

- Application of 2nd formulation of Categorical Imperative to lying:
 - ‘Act in such a way that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end’.
 - Lying to someone uses them *merely* as a means to an end, since it is not treating them with respect given that it undermines their power of making a rational choice themselves.
 - People cannot consent to a way of acting when they are given no chance to do so. The victim of a lie cannot consent to being lied to because he doesn’t know he is being lied to.
 - It is a manipulation of someone (and their trusting nature) rather than a treatment of them as a rational subject.

Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

10	How convincing is utilitarianism as an account of what makes an action morally right?	25
----	---	----

AO1 = 5, AO2 = 20

Marks	Levels of response mark scheme
21-25	<p>The student argues with clear intent throughout and the logic of the argument is sustained.</p> <p>The student demonstrates detailed and precise understanding throughout.</p> <p>The conclusion is clear, with the arguments in support of it stated precisely, integrated coherently and robustly defended.</p> <p>Arguments and counter-arguments are stated in their strongest forms. Reasoned judgements are made, on an ongoing basis and overall, about the weight to be given to each argument. Crucial arguments are clearly identified against less crucial ones.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used precisely throughout.</p>
16-20	<p>The student argues with clear intent throughout and the logic of the argument is largely sustained.</p> <p>The content is correct and detailed – though not always consistently.</p> <p>The conclusion is clear, with a range of appropriate arguments supporting it.</p> <p>Arguments are generally stated in their strongest forms. There is a balancing of arguments, with weight being given to each – so crucial arguments are noted against less crucial ones. Arguments and counter-arguments are stated clearly, integrated coherently and defended.</p> <p>There may be trivial mistakes, as long as they do not detract from the argument.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used correctly throughout.</p>
11-15	<p>A clear response to the question, in the form of an argument, demonstrating intent.</p> <p>The content is detailed and correct and most of it is integrated.</p> <p>A conclusion and reasons are given and those reasons clearly support the conclusion. There might be a lack of clarity/precision about the logic of the argument as a whole.</p> <p>Arguments and counter-arguments are given, but there may be a lack of balance. Not all arguments are stated in their strongest forms. Stronger and weaker arguments are noted and there are attempts to identify the weight to be given to different arguments, but not necessarily those which are crucial to the conclusion.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used correctly, with any minor errors not detracting from the argument.</p>

6-10	<p>The response to the question is given in the form of an argument, but not fully coherently.</p> <p>The content is largely correct, though there are some gaps and a lack of detail. Relevant points are recognised/identified, but not integrated.</p> <p>Alternative positions are identified, but not precisely. Counter-arguments might be stated in weak forms or even slightly misrepresented. Arguments and counter-arguments are juxtaposed, so similarities and contrasts identified, rather than their impact being clear.</p> <p>Philosophical language is used throughout, though not always fully correctly and/or consistently.</p>
1-5	<p>There is little evidence of an argument.</p> <p>There may be missing content, substantial gaps in the content or the content may be one-sided.</p> <p>There may be a conclusion and several reasonable points may be made. There may be some connections between the points, but there is no clear relationship between the points and the conclusion.</p> <p>There is some basic use of philosophical language.</p>
0	Nothing written worthy of credit.

Indicative content

Students should respond in the form of an argument, to a clear conclusion. They might argue:

- that utilitarianism is convincing as an account of what makes an action morally right
- that utilitarianism is unconvincing as an account of what makes an action morally right.

Students who argue that utilitarianism is convincing largely because other approaches (eg Kantian deontological ethics) are unconvincing, or unconvincing because other approaches (eg Aristotelian virtue ethics) are more convincing, can only receive credit if this approach is used specifically to evaluate aspects of utilitarianism.

- Students should demonstrate that they understand utilitarianism, generally and/or in its particular forms.
- Utilitarians claim that actions are morally right or wrong based on their consequences/effects and identify the best action as being that action which maximises actual or expected utility.
- Utility can be understood in different ways by utilitarians (eg pleasure, preference satisfaction); utilitarians may disagree about whose utility we are calculating; utilitarians may disagree about whether the focus should be on acts or rules.
- Utilitarianism is convincing:
 - Some may find it prima facie plausible to suppose that all that can ultimately matter morally is future pain and pleasure.
 - It is the best account (or even the only satisfactory account) of moral realism (the only/best account of how moral properties can be mind-independent is if they are (reducible to) natural properties).

- It is, prima facie, a fair account, given that each is to count as one and no-one for more than one.
- A maximising argument - that, if something is good, then (presumably) the more of it we have, the better – can be applied to happiness, pleasure. (preference satisfaction etc).
- Utilitarianism is unconvincing:
 - Fairness and individual liberty/rights (including the risk of tyranny of the majority).
 - Whether utilitarianism ignores both the moral integrity and the intentions of the individual.
 - Utilitarianism is too demanding on us – it requires us to do “supererogatory” acts (acts which are praiseworthy but not obligatory).
 - Whether pleasure is the only good (Nozick’s experience machine).
 - Utilitarianism might demonstrate that the ‘right’ thing to do is something that we find deeply counter-intuitive, morally speaking.
 - Students may discuss issues facing utilitarianism insofar as it is a variety of ethical naturalism: eg, the is-ought problem; the naturalistic fallacy; the open-question argument.
 - Students may discuss issues facing utilitarianism insofar as it is a variety of moral realism: eg, how do we come to recognise moral properties as part of the natural world?, why is there so much disagreement? etc.
 - Problems with the process of calculation (including which beings to include and issues around partiality)
 - Utilitarianism ignores the possible moral status of particular relationships (family/friendship) we may have with others, and indeed ignores the special duty we may have to ourselves.
 - Difficulties with predicting/knowing and/or measuring the relevant consequences.
 - How much of the future can, or ought, the calculation take into account?
 - Difficulties with making calculations quickly and accurately enough for the right decision to be made in time

As the focus of this question is primarily AO2 do not penalise students for misattributing arguments.

Note: This indicative content is not exhaustive: other creditworthy responses should be awarded marks as appropriate.

