



2013 Philosophy

Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2013

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from SQA's NQ Assessment team.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (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 centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's NQ Assessment team may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.

Part One: General Marking Principles for Philosophy Higher

This information is provided to help you understand the general principles you must apply when marking candidate responses to questions in this Paper. These principles must be read in conjunction with the specific Marking Instructions for each question.

- (a) Marks for each candidate response must always be assigned in line with these general marking principles and the specific Marking Instructions for the relevant question. If a specific candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or detailed Marking Instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your Team Leader/Principal Assessor.
- (b) Marking should always be positive ie, marks should be awarded for what is correct and not deducted for errors or omissions.

GENERAL MARKING ADVICE: Philosophy Higher

The marking schemes are written to assist in determining the “minimal acceptable answer” rather than listing every possible correct and incorrect answer. The following notes are offered to support Markers in making judgements on candidates’ evidence, and apply to marking both end of unit assessments and course assessments.

Marking a philosophy exam is not a purely mechanical exercise and it is important for markers to use their professional judgment within the framework laid down by these guidelines. In particular it is important to note the following:

1. The information indicating the points which a candidate might be expected to make in response to a question should be treated as a guideline: a candidate will not necessarily have to cover all the points listed in order to gain the available marks and credit should be given for additional valid points made by the candidate, even if they have not been listed.
2. Marking is positive not negative. That is to say marks are not deducted when an error is made. If a candidate makes an incorrect statement that does not impinge on anything else they have written then that statement can be ignored. However, it can often be the case, especially in the longer answers, that the marker will have to make a judgment about what a candidate means by a particular statement and how this illustrates their understanding of the material. Making these kinds of judgments requires the marker to consider the wider context. In these cases it can be legitimate to consider the incorrect statements when trying to form a judgment about what the candidate has written.
3. Each question (or sub-question) is marked holistically. That is to say the marker is not required to identify separate marks for KU and AE. The allocation of marks to KU or AE is there as a guide and a help to candidates; the distribution of KU and AE was never intended to be ‘followed slavishly’. Similarly, the marker should use the distribution of marks as a guide when assessing an answer. In particular, markers should be aware that if a question is allocated AE marks then there must be evidence of analysis and/or evaluation in the candidate’s answer. On the other hand, markers should also be aware that analysis and evaluation depends upon knowledge and understanding. For this reason credit should be given when additional KU points contribute to a candidate’s AE answer.

4. Markers should be aware that the final mark awarded to a question does not necessarily have to correspond exactly to the number of substantive points that have been made. A fewer number of points that are developed, show insight or demonstrate a more sophisticated understanding of the material may carry more weight than a greater number of points that are superficial or are inaccurately or ambiguously expressed. This consideration is likely to be more relevant when marking questions that attract a higher number of marks.
5. If a candidate writes more in answer to one part of a question than is necessary to gain full marks and the additional content is relevant to the next part of that question then credit for what the candidate has written can be carried forward.
6. The following procedure should be used for marking:
 - a As the answer is read, all points relevantly made in accordance with the marking instructions for that question and the marker's own professional judgment will be ticked. (Markers must **not** write any comments on the scripts but may use ticks, crosses, question marks or underlining to assist with their marking.)
 - b At the same time, or through a re-reading of the answer, an initial impression should be formed about the quality of an answer as indicated by the Grade Descriptions for an A and C. This is particularly relevant for questions that attract a higher number of marks.
 - c Taking into account both a and b the total mark for that question is to be written at the end of the question and circled.

To assist with the final allocation of marks the following table should be consulted.

	Indicative of a grade C	Indicative of a grade A
30 mark question	15-17	21-30
20 mark question	10-11	14-20

GRADE DESCRIPTIONS AT A AND C

Skills	Grade C	Grade A
<p><i>Knowledge and Understanding</i></p>	<p>candidates have described some (but not all) of the features of argument, and the philosophical issues, theories and positions in relation to each Unit</p> <p>the descriptions are mainly clear and largely accurate</p>	<p>candidates have described the main features of argument, and the philosophical issues, theories and positions in relation to each Unit</p> <p>the descriptions are clear, accurate and presented in a well-structured manner</p> <p>the descriptions may provide evidence of the integration of knowledge and understanding across the Units of the Course</p>
<p><i>Critical Analysis and Evaluation</i></p>	<p>candidates have explained some (but not all) of the stages of reasoning and the assumptions on which ordinary language arguments and philosophical positions, theories and accounts of knowledge are based</p> <p>candidates have explained some (but not all) of the following: deductive and inductive reasoning; sound and unsound arguments; examples of fallacious reasoning when these are present (CTU)</p> <p>candidates have explained some (but not all) of the implications, strengths and weaknesses of positions adopted in relation to a metaphysical debate and normative moral theories, and an account of knowledge</p> <p>candidates have made attempts to assess, or reach conclusions on, the soundness of ordinary language arguments and the relative merits of normative moral theories, and an account of knowledge</p>	<p>candidates have explained the main stages of reasoning and the assumptions on which ordinary language arguments and philosophical positions, theories and accounts of knowledge are based</p> <p>candidates have explained the following: deductive and inductive reasoning; sound and unsound arguments; examples of fallacious reasoning when these are present (CTU)</p> <p>candidates have explained the main implications, strengths and weaknesses of positions adopted in relation to a metaphysical debate and normative moral theories, and an account of knowledge</p> <p>candidates have made assessments or reached conclusions on the soundness of ordinary language arguments and the relative merits of normative moral theories, and an account of knowledge</p>

GRADE DESCRIPTIONS AT A AND C (continued)

Skills	Grade C	Grade A
<p><i>Critical Analysis and Evaluation (continued)</i></p>	<p>candidates have given at least one reason which supports the assessments or conclusions they have reached</p> <p>the points made are mainly clear and largely free from inaccuracy</p> <p>the points made relate to the question asked</p>	<p>candidates have given 2 or more developed reasons – based on evidence, aspects and, or sources previously discussed – which support the assessments or conclusions reached</p> <p>the points made are clear and free from inaccuracy</p> <p>the points made are presented in a well-structured manner and are used to support a conclusion that answers the question asked</p> <p>there may be evidence that the candidate is aware of the wider implications and/or relevance of the skills, theories, positions and issues they have studied</p> <p>there may be evidence of the integration of knowledge and skills across the Units of the Course</p>

SECTION 1 – CRITICAL THINKING IN PHILOSOPHY

Section 1 – Total Marks 20

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit ‘*Critical Thinking in Philosophy*’.
- It has **one** structured question with **4-10** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **1-6** and requires either a short answer or restricted response.
- Candidates answer **all** related parts of this question.

There is no choice in Section 1 of the Question Paper.

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
		(You should answer all parts, (a–g), of this question)		
1	a	“An argument is just a collection of sentences.” Is this an adequate definition of an argument? Explain your answer.	2 KU	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all sentences are statements and arguments need to be composed of statements. Questions are sentences but aren’t statements. • There needs to be some effort to infer the conclusion from the premises, 3 unrelated statements wouldn’t be an argument. 		
	b	What is an intermediate conclusion? Provide an example in your answer.	2 KU	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An intermediate conclusion is a conclusion that appears in the middle of an argument as a stepping stone to proving a further and more important conclusion. • For example: ‘All men are bald and Archie is a man, so Archie is bald, and since no bald men own combs, Archie does not own a comb.’ In this argument ‘Archie is bald’ is an intermediate conclusion. 		
	c	Can questions ever play a significant role in an argument? Give reasons for your response.	2 KU	
		<p>A candidate may answer yes or no as long as they give appropriate reasons or examples that support their answer e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, some questions are rhetorical, i.e. posed as question for dramatic effect but can be reformulated as a statement (1mark) e.g. ‘Do I look like I’m kidding?’ might be interpreted as ‘I am not kidding’, (1 mark) Any relevant points should be credited up to a total of two marks. • No. An argument can only contain statements (1 mark). A statement is capable of being true or false whereas a question cannot be true or false (1 mark). Any relevant points should be credited up to a total of two marks. 		

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	d	<p>How does a valid argument differ from a strong one?</p>	2 KU	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validity is a feature of deductive arguments • Strength is a feature of inductive arguments. • A valid argument is one where if the premises are true they will guarantee a true conclusion. • A strong argument is one where the premises would make the conclusion very probable. 		
	e	<p>Rewrite the argument in the passage below in Standard Form, labelling each statement appropriately.</p> <p><i>“The government should fight any attempt to legalise cannabis. Why? Cannabis is a drug that is full of cancer causing chemicals. Furthermore, it severely affects both brain development and bone density. Sustained use of this drug also doubles your chances of developing serious mental illness. Thus, there is no doubt that cannabis is a harmful substance. It is the duty of any government to protect its citizens from harm and danger.”</i></p>	4 AE	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 mark for correctly identifying the premises • 1 mark for correctly identifying the conclusion • 1 mark for correctly identifying the intermediate conclusion • 1 mark for laying out in Standard Form <p>The correct layout should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Premise – Cannabis is a drug that is full of cancer causing chemicals. • Premise – Furthermore, it severely affects both brain development and bone density. • Premise – Sustained use of this drug also doubles your chances of developing serious mental illness. • Int. Conclusion – Thus, there is no doubt that cannabis is a harmful substance. • Premise – It is the duty of any government to protect its citizens from harm and danger. • Conclusion – The government should fight any attempt to legalise cannabis. 		

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	f	What is the difference between a formal fallacy and an informal fallacy?	2 KU	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A formal fallacy is one which has an invalid structure such as denying the antecedent. An informal fallacy could be valid but is unreliable because its premises are false or misleading. 		
	g	Suggest fallacies that could be at work in each of the following examples. In each case explain why it is an example of that type of fallacy.		
	i	<i>“If you take legal drugs like alcohol you will end up on harder drugs like heroin, so you shouldn’t take any drugs at all.”</i>	2 AE	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slippery slope It assumes without proof that a cause will lead inevitably to an unlikely effect. It is not obvious that everyone who takes alcohol will go on to take heroin. 		
	ii	<i>“My grandmother smoked cigarettes all her life and she lived to be 98 years old. So cigarettes must extend your life.”</i>	2 AE	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Post hoc fallacy Just because something proceeds an event doesn’t mean that it has to be the cause of that event. The fact that the smoking precedes the long life doesn’t prove that smoking is the cause of the long life. 		
	iii	<i>“If you try drugs then you have experienced life. You haven’t tried drugs so you haven’t really lived.”</i>	2 AE	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Denying the antecedent It is a formal fallacy which has an invalid structure. The premise doesn’t say ‘<i>Only</i> if you have experienced drugs you have experienced life’. If it had it would have been valid. However, it merely asserts that all people who have tried drugs have experienced life, so it may be possible to experience life in other ways too. <p>Total 20 marks</p>		

SECTION 2 – GOD

Section 2 – total marks 20

- It has **two** structured questions, each with **1-5** related parts.
- Each structured question samples across the mandatory content of **one** of the options in this Unit and may contain a stimulus.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2-20** and requires either a restricted or extended response. Possible options within this structure are: a series of restricted response questions/restricted and extended response questions/an essay question.

Question	Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
2	<p>(You should only answer this question if you have studied the debate “Is there a rational basis for belief in God?” If not, go to Question 3.)</p> <p>‘The teleological argument fails to prove the existence of God.’ Do you agree or disagree? Give reasons for your answer.</p>	<p>10 KU 10 AE</p>	
	<p>In marking this question it is essential that reference be made to the grade descriptions and the general instructions at the start of this document. If there is an adequate amount of description and an appropriate evaluative comment then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 10 marks; if the answer is indicative of a ‘B’ then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 12 marks; if the answer is indicative of an ‘A’ then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 14 marks.</p> <p>It is likely that most candidates will respond to this question by discussing Paley’s version of the argument but appropriate credit should be given if a candidate responds by discussing other versions of the argument.</p> <p>Description of the teleological argument:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an <i>a posteriori</i> argument. • <i>Teleological</i> is derived from the Greek word <i>telos</i>, and relates to the idea that things strives toward a purpose or goal. • The argument is often presented as an analogical argument in which if two things are relevantly similar then if something is true of one it is likely to be true of the other. 		

Question	Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>Paley's version of the argument.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If a watch is found when crossing a heath and we asked how the watch came to exist we could not reasonably suggest it had always been there (as we might if we found a stone). • the reason is because when we inspect the watch its many parts have been put together for a purpose. • from the fact that we detect that it has been put together for a purpose we conclude that it must have had a maker. • In like manner, evidence of design and purpose in nature suggests it was created by a maker. • appropriate examples of possible design and purpose in nature, eg the eye. <p>Critically evaluation of the argument:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The argument is based on an inappropriate analogy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the strength of an analogy depends on the closeness of similarity but the world is not very like something designed by humans. - Hume's analogy with house building. If the world is similar to a house then by analogy we might conclude that the world was the product of a team working together. - There are alternative analogies to explain the apparent design without recourse to a designer, eg the world resembles a vegetable. It is consistent to believe that an object may contain within itself the source of its own order. Evolution can give an alternative account of how order can arise within nature and similar ordering can be found in non-living chemical reactions. • An intrinsic weakness with analogical arguments is that like effects are not always the result of like causes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - eg two artefacts may look very similar but be produced using two very different production techniques. • To assess the strength of an analogy we need multiple examples to compare. We do not have the requisite experience of the origin of worlds and their development to know whether a comparison with a human artefact is appropriate. • If the analogy were strong then the argument fails to prove the existence of the God that was intended. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the apparent flaws in the design suggest a less than perfect God. - the suffering in the world suggests a less than good God. - if the existence of some designer is established the argument fails to establish anything about that designer. 		

Question	Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strength of the teleological argument is that it is intuitively plausible. • A candidate may consider non-analogical versions of the teleological argument, eg the fine-tuning argument, that avoid the above criticisms. • In turn, a candidate may discuss the anthropic principle as a criticism of the fine-tuning argument. <p>Total 20 marks</p>		

SECTION 2 – FREE WILL

Section 2 – Total Marks 20

- It has **two** structured questions, each with **1-5** related parts and candidates choose **one** question.
- Each structured question samples across the mandatory content of **one** of the options in this Unit and may contain a stimulus.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2-20** and requires either a restricted or extended response. Possible options within this structure are: a series of restricted questions/restricted and extended response questions/an essay question.

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
3		<p>(You should only answer this question if you have studied the debate “Do we have free will?”)</p> <p>The compatibilist claims that we are “free if not coerced.” Do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.</p>	<p>10 KU 10 AE</p>	
		<p>In marking this question it is essential that reference be made to the grade descriptions and the general instructions at the start of this document. If there is an adequate amount of description and an appropriate evaluative comment then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 10 marks; if the answer is indicative of a ‘B’ then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 12 marks; if the answer is indicative of an ‘A’ then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 14 marks.</p> <p>A candidate may approach this question in a number of different ways and credit should be given for any appropriate answer. However, the question requires the candidate to ‘discuss’ the phrase “free if not coerced”. An answer that simply lists the different positions on the free will/determinism debate should be awarded a maximum of 13 marks. A candidate being awarded a mark indicative of an A will show awareness that the focus of discussion is the Compatibilist position.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of the Free Will versus Determinism problem. • Explanation of Hard Determinism – cause and effect, deterministically necessitated, when we act we cannot do otherwise, cause of every event is the antecedent event. Different types of determinism – genetic, scientific, psychological etc. 		

Question	Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of Libertarianism – free – it could have done otherwise, psychological sense of feeling free, agent and event causation, alternative futures • Compatibilists – Explain the notion of compatibilism. • Confusion over definition of freedom, to be free does not necessarily mean to be uncaused but to be free from coercion. Free if we are doing what we want without any constraint. Freedom to do what we want is the only freedom that matters. • Internal and external causation. First and second order desires. • Hard Determinism – problem of removal of moral responsibility – praise and blame. Undermining our sense of being free and experiencing a decision making process. • Counter claims from Hard Determinist – if we are not caused we are acting randomly, feeling free is not the same as being free. • Libertarianism – to say we are uncaused is to reduce our behaviour to random behaviour. How can human behaviour be different from the rest of nature? What is the difference between agent and event causation? Is there a grey area? Is the sense of freedom an illusion? Yet moral responsibility is accepted. • Compatibilism – fits in with scientific theories of cause and effect, • Compatibilism – allows for praise and blame, • Compatibilism – idea of freedom difficult to accept as it seems to focus on linguistic definitions/understandings – shifts the goalposts • Compatibilism – difference between internal and external causation, • Compatibilism – problems with concept of first and second order desires. • The compatibilist is a Determinist and therefore accepts the following: • Universe is governed by the laws of cause and effect – compatibilist. • Every choice is a deterministically necessitated choice – compatibilist. • When we act we could <u>not</u> have done otherwise, therefore there is no human freedom even if it seems we are free from coercion and doing what we want to do. • Suitable conclusion and examples given throughout. <p>Total 20 marks</p>		

SECTION 3 – EPISTEMOLOGY

Section 3 – total marks 40

Part 1 – total marks 10

- It has **one** structured question with **1-5** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2-10** and requires either a restricted response or extended response.

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
4		(You should answer all parts of this question and either Question 5 or Question 6.)		
	a	Explain how the Gettier problem challenges the Tripartite Theory of Knowledge. Give an example in your answer.	5 KU	
		<p>1 mark for identifying the three conditions of the Tripartite Theory of Knowledge – i.e. justified, true belief.</p> <p>1 mark for saying that the three conditions are individually necessary and jointly sufficient.</p> <p>Explanation of the Gettier problem:</p> <p>1 mark for saying there are situations where the three conditions have been met but the situation does not feel like true knowledge.</p> <p>1 mark for saying that Gettier problems challenge the claim that the criteria are jointly sufficient.</p> <p>1 mark for any other appropriate point/example.</p>		

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	b	What criticisms can be made of Rationalism?	5 AE	
		<p>Up to 5 marks can be awarded for relevant criticisms of rationalism including the rationalist version of foundationalism and the rationalist support for innate ideas.</p> <p>A single point that is developed can be awarded an additional mark.</p> <p>1 mark can be awarded for appropriate scene setting, e.g. Rationalism hold that reason is the foundation of knowledge.</p> <p>Any other relevant criticism.</p> <p>Total 10 marks</p>		

SECTION 3 – DESCARTES

Section 3 – total marks 40

Part 2 – total marks 30

- Each structured question may contain an extract from the relevant prescribed text and has **2-8** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2-20** and requires either a restricted or extended response. Possible options are: Series of restricted response questions/Some restricted response questions and 1 extended response/2 extended responses.

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
5		<p>(You should only answer this question if you have studied Descartes' Rationalism in the Epistemology Unit. If not, go to Question 6.)</p> <p>In Meditation 6 Descartes attempts to refute the sceptical arguments first raised in Meditation 1. He attempts to show why we can be certain that material reality must exist and that errors in sense perception can be recognised and corrected.</p>		
	a	<p>Explain the arguments Descartes uses in Meditation 1 to suggest that we cannot be certain about the existence of material reality.</p>	6 KU	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background comments about the method of doubt (2 mark maximum). • Explanation that a priori truths such as mathematical truths and belief in the existence of an outside world, survive the dream argument. • Explanation that even a priori truths are undermined by the Evil Genius argument. • The existence of an outside world was put into doubt by the demon. <p>A single point that is developed can be awarded an additional mark.</p> <p>If a candidate makes more comments than can be credited in 5a and does not repeat these in 5b, if they are relevant to their answer in 5b, then they may be credited as part of their answer to 5b.</p>		

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	b	In Meditation 6, is Descartes successful in refuting his earlier sceptical arguments?	9 KU 15 AE	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of Descartes' argument that God is no deceiver so we can know that material reality must exist <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensations that we have come from outside the mind (the mind is unextended whereas the material world is made up of extended things). • Either God or matter itself is the source of ideas of material things. • The sensations we have of material things must originate from matter itself because God is no deceiver. • Errors in sense perception can be recognised and corrected <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of the 2 distinct faculties of the mind (the imagination and the intellect). The intellect understands a priori truths 'clearly and distinctly' whereas the imagination can only perceive representations of reality. • Reason must take priority over sense experience. • Refuting the Dream argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dreams don't follow coherent patterns as normal life does. • Reason can be used to distinguish between normal life and dreams. • God is no deceiver so gives us a faculty of reason that can help us distinguish between dreams and waking states. • Issues with the cogito explained. Without the cogito Descartes hasn't discovered a foundational truth from which to establish his strategies in Meditation 6. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are logical processes involved in the conclusion that I am: I exist is true that the demon may undermine? However, 'I am: I exist' is a self-evident truth so is immune to this criticism. • For 'I am: I exist' to be necessarily true we must accept the meaning of the language concepts employed. Does the possibility of the evil deceiver undermine the meaning of these concepts? 		

Question	Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>Cont...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problems with Descartes' use of God. We need God in order to trust our reason. Descartes needs to establish God's existence in order to refute the sceptical arguments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criticisms of innate ideas undermine the whole argument eg reference to Locke's comments. • Examples that possibly undermine the causal adequacy principle. • Is Descartes justified in assuming that God is good? Maybe God deceives us for his own pleasure? • Maybe the evil deceiver has deceived us into thinking that God is good and wouldn't deceive us? • Problems with the clear and distinct rule. Is Descartes justified in employing the rule in Med. 6? Criticisms of the clear and distinct rule undermine his success in Med. 6. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maybe Descartes' clear and distinct rule is an invalid generalisation? • Problems agreeing which knowledge claims are in fact clear and distinct. • Cartesian circle explained. <p><i>A single point that is developed can be awarded up to two marks.</i></p>		

SECTION 3 – HUME

Section 3 – total marks 40

Part 2 – total marks 30

- Each structured question may contain an extract from the relevant prescribed text and has **2-8** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2-20** and requires either a restricted or extended response. Possible options are: Series of restricted response questions/Some restricted response questions and 1 extended response/2 extended responses.

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
6		(You should only answer this question if you have studied Hume’s Empiricism in the Epistemology Unit.)		
	a	What is empiricism?	4 KU	
		Any 4 points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A school of epistemology which contends that the primary source of knowledge is experience. • Empiricists dispute the existence of innate ideas and argue that the role of reason in supplying us with knowledge is overstated. • Empiricist argues that much of our useful knowledge is contingent and gained a posteriori. • Examples include Locke, Berkeley and Hume. (No marks for simply stating that Hume was an empiricist) 		
	b	How far does Hume’s theory of impressions and ideas support his empiricism?	6 KU 7 AE	
		Candidates should outline Hume’s theory of impressions and ideas. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hume distinguishes all perceptions into impressions or ideas. • Ideas are faint copies of livelier impressions. • Every idea must therefore have an impression annexed to it. • Hume distinguishes simple and complex ideas. • Complex ideas are made by compounding, transposing, augmenting or diminishing simple ideas. • Hume offers supporting arguments: • Hume challenges us to think of an idea with no corresponding impression. • A blind man can’t imagine colour nor a deaf man sound. 		

Question	Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>Cont...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Laplanders can't imagine the taste of wine because they have had no prior impressions. • A selfish heart can't imagine generosity. • Animals may have ideas that we cannot because they have access to different impressions. <p>Candidates should analyse and evaluate how successfully the theory supports empiricism. Arguments may be supportive or critical.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theory seems intuitively obvious and corresponds with a lot of our experiences. • Gives an account of knowledge based on experience and innate faculties rather than reason and innate ideas. • His supporting arguments suggest that a priori deduction of ideas is impossible. • Using vivacity to distinguish ideas and impressions is fraught with difficulties: some ideas vivid and some impressions faint. • Some ideas do not have any obvious impression (eg ultraviolet) • Barrier of impressions leads to scepticism about the outside world. • Barrier of ideas questions the possibility of comparing ideas with impressions and so distinguishing imagination from reality. • Problems arising from the missing shade of blue: arguably leaves the door open for innate ideas. 		

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	c	To what extent does Hume's Fork support his empiricism?	6 KU 7 AE	
		<p>Candidates should outline Hume's Fork.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hume distinguishes all knowledge into two types: Matters of Fact and Relations of Ideas. • Matters of Fact are the sort of propositions we find in the empirical sciences. They are Synthetic, Contingent and learned A Posteriori. • Relations of Ideas are the sort of propositions we find in Maths and Geometry. They are Analytic, Necessary and learned A Priori. • "The sky is blue" is a Matter of Fact. "2+3=5" is a Relation of Ideas. • The negation of a relation of ideas implies a contradiction ("2+3=6") but the negation of a matter of fact is never logically impossible (It is logically possible that "the sun won't rise tomorrow"). • These are the only two possibilities. • Any proposition which is neither of these types is metaphysical nonsense. • Statements about God or Form fall into neither camp and are not worthwhile subjects of enquiry. <p>Candidates should analyse and evaluate how successfully Hume's Fork supports empiricism. Arguments may be supportive or critical.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hume's epistemological framework is elegant and simple. • Hume's Fork casts relations of idea as yielding only analytic truths which can tell us nothing about the world. • Matters of fact give us substantive empirical knowledge that is about more than simply the meanings of terms. • Hume's Fork rules out metaphysical terms which empiricists often oppose because they are not grounded in experience. • Hume's Fork might itself fall foul of the distinction it makes. • Hume's Fork conflates two different distinctions: analytic/synthetic; <i>a priori/a posteriori</i>. • Kant points out that synthetic a priori concepts may exist (eg Every effect has a cause). <p><i>A single point that is well developed can be awarded more than 1 mark</i></p> <p>Total 30 marks</p>		

SECTION 4 – NORMATIVE ETHICS

Section 4 – total marks 40

Question 1 – total marks 30

- This Question samples across the mandatory content of the Unit.
- It has **one** essay question which may be divided into **two** related parts.
- It may contain a short case study or stimulus.

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
		You should answer both questions – Question 7 and Question 8.		
7		<p>Read the following scenario and answer the question that follows.</p> <p><i>You and your friend are talking one night after a hard revision session for your Higher Philosophy prelim exam. She tells you, in confidence, that she has a secret to tell you. She proceeds to tell you that she went into the Philosophy teacher’s room at the end of the day and stole a copy of the prelim exam and the marks scheme. She then tells you that she was questioned by the teacher and she told the teacher that she was with you all the time.</i></p> <p>How might a Kantian approach this situation?</p>	<p>15 KU 15 AE</p>	
		<p>In marking this question it is essential that reference be made to the grade descriptions and the general instructions at the start of this document. If there is an adequate amount of description and an appropriate evaluative comment then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 15 marks; if the answer is indicative of a “B” then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 18 marks; if the answer is indicative of an “A” then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 21 marks.</p> <p>A candidate may approach this question in a number of different ways and credit should be given for any appropriate answer. However, the question requires the candidate to discuss the dilemma. An answer that simply lists the main features of Kantianism and lists the problems with that ethical theory should be awarded a maximum of 18 marks.</p> <p>The following lists points that are likely to be included in an appropriate answer but the list is not exhaustive and credit should be given for any relevant points made, any appropriate development of those points and for appropriate discussion.</p>		

Question	Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	<p>Knowledge and Understanding may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deontological ethics. • Intention not consequences. • Motives/duty versus inclination/desires. • The Good Will. • Self-legislators/moral agency/rational beings/autonomy. • Hypothetical Imperative compared to Categorical Imperative. • Maxims. • Components of Categorical Imperative – how it works. • Universalisation/Ends not Means. <p>Analysis of example and Evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kant's focus on how rational beings behave – duty to tell the truth, regardless of consequences. • The example should undergo the Categorical Imperative test. • An appropriate maxim should be identified and stated. Possible contradiction in conception and/or the will. • Does it pass the Universalisation test? • How does the maxim survive Ends not Means? • Problem of conflicting duties – telling the truth and protecting a friend. • Difficulty of ignoring consequences – intuition to consider consequences. • Problem of ignoring emotions/attachment to your friend. • Kantianism distinguishes between duty and inclination which is particularly required when a friend is involved. • Kantianism fits in with our wish for justice/intuitive sense of right and wrong. • Not considering consequences “frees us” to do our duty. <p>Total 30 marks</p>		

Section 4 – total marks 40

Question 2 – total marks 10

- This Question samples across the mandatory content of the Unit.
- It has **one** structured question with **1-5** related parts.
- It may contain a short stimulus.
- The related parts have a possible mark range of **2-10** and require either a restricted or extended response.

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
8	a	What is the difference between Act and Rule Utilitarianism?	4 KU	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bentham’s calculus and component parts.• Reference to GHP applied to individual situations.• Mill’s “secondary principles”.• Rules made up by referring to GHP.• Examples given.		
	b	Which theory, Act or Rule Utilitarianism, offers the best approach to moral problems?	6 AE	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Seems rational to assess individual acts – Act.• Potential for innocent to be punished – Act.• Not practical to assess every act in terms of the calculus – Act.• Less likely to cause injustices if focus on rule – Rule.• Following rules would appear to benefit society as a whole – Rule.• Problem of formulating objective rules – Rule.• Problem of conflicting rules – Rule. <p>Total 10 marks</p>		

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]