



**2009 Philosophy**

**Higher**

**Finalised Marking Instructions**

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2009

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 the Question Paper Operations Team, Dalkeith.

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 Question Paper Operations Team at Dalkeith 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.

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 in these guidelines that indicates the expected points a candidate might make in response to a question are not necessarily the only points that can be made; nor is it necessarily the case that a candidate will have to cover all the listed points to gain the available marks.
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 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><b><i>Knowledge and Understanding</i></b></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><b><i>Critical Analysis and Evaluation</i></b></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, the meta-ethical position of emotivism 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, the meta-ethical position of emotivism 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, the meta-ethical position of emotivism 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, the meta-ethical position of emotivism and an account of knowledge</p>

**GRADE DESCRIPTIONS AT A AND C (continued)**

<b>Skills</b>	<b>Grade C</b>	<b>Grade A</b>
<p><i><b>Critical Analysis and Evaluation (continued)</b></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 1

- (a) **A statement and an argument differ in a number of ways. Clearly explain the difference between a statement and an argument.** **4 KU**

- Statements can be true or false
- Arguments can be valid/invalid
- Arguments can be sound/unsound
- Statements assert/deny
- Arguments attempt to prove/refute
- Arguments are composed of statements
- Appropriate examples

- (b) **Clearly explain the difference between valid and invalid arguments. Support your answer with an example of each type of argument.** **3 KU**

- One mark for any accurate explanation that may mention ‘truth preserving’, ‘true premises guarantee the truth of the conclusion’; ‘in invalid arguments it is possible for the conclusion to be false even if the premises are true’
- One mark for each appropriate example

- (c) **Imagine you read an argument and have no idea whether any of the premises are true or false. To what extent would you be able to come to a decision about the soundness of the argument? Explain your answer.** **3 KU**

- You could never be sure that the argument was sound because to do that you would need to know that the premises were true
- You could know that the argument was unsound if the conclusion was false because sound arguments always have true conclusions
- You could know that the argument was unsound if the argument was invalid because validity is a requirement for sound arguments
- ‘Soundness’ is defined

**(d) Read the following extract and answer the questions that follow.**

*New Zealand is well known for being a safe country to live in. This is seen in the fact that after the attack on the twin towers in New York there was an increase in the number of New Zealanders returning home and in times of trouble people have always looked for a place where they can feel safe.*

*According to the New Zealand government it is true that between 2001 and 2003 there was an increase in “permanent and long term arrivals” of New Zealand citizens returning from overseas.*

**(i) Analyse and evaluate the extract using the skills you have learned in your study of critical thinking. In your answer you should give consideration to:**

- **identifying any premises and conclusion**
- **identifying possible hidden premises (if any)**
- **whether the argument might be inductive or deductive**
- **whether the argument is valid/invalid, sound/unsound.**

**Where appropriate you should explain your reasoning.**

**6 AE**

NB the argument can be reconstructed in many different ways.

- This can be constructed as a deductive argument
- P1 “in times of trouble people have always looked for a place where they can feel safe”
- P2 “after the attack on the twin towers in New York there was an increase in the number of New Zealanders returning home”
- C “New Zealand is a safe country to live in”
- In addition P2 is supported by the claim that the NZ government has asserted it
- Therefore, P2 can be construed as a sub-conclusion
- The above argument is invalid as it assumes without further argument that [P3] those returning to NZ were doing so because they were looking for a place to feel safe
- The argument is therefore also unsound
- [P3] is a hidden premise in this argument
  
- Candidates should also be given credit if they construe this as an inductive argument:
- iP in past times of trouble people moving to safe places have been doing so because of their need to feel safe
- iC [unstated] in this time of trouble those people moving to safe place (ie NZ) were doing so because of their need to feel safe
  
- Candidates may claim that “well known” is contentious.

NB **one** mark should be awarded for identifying at least two premises; one mark should awarded for identifying the conclusion; and one mark should be awarded for suggesting a possible hidden premise. Three marks are available for any other appropriate points.

**(ii) Some would say that the extract contains one or more fallacies. Do you agree? Give reasons for your answer.**

**4 AE**

- Some people may consider that a claim isn't true just because the NZ government asserts it and consider this a fallacious appeal to authority. Others may reject this and say that on inductive grounds it is reasonable to accept as true claims such as these when made by a responsible government.
- Discussion of the post-hoc fallacy – just because there was an increase in returns following 9/11 does not mean this is the reason why people were returning.

It is possible for a candidate to gain the full four marks by discussing just one of the possible fallacies if they go into sufficient detail concerning that fallacy.

**(20)**

## SECTION 2 – METAPHYSICS

### Section 2 – Total Marks 20

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit ‘Metaphysics’
- 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 **4-20** and requires either a restricted or extended response.

Candidates answer **all** parts of the **one** structured question which relates to the option they have studied.

### Question 2

**Read the following extract and answer the questions that follow.**

*“Look at the world – the whole world and every part of the world – you will see that it is just one big machine made up of an infinite number of smaller machines. When we use our human intelligence to build machines we make sure that they are well-designed for the job they are meant to do. It is just like this in nature with every little bit being just right for the role it has to play – although in nature everything works together even more impressively than in human products. Since the end results are similar we can use the rules of analogy to infer that the causes are also similar, and that whatever is responsible for the natural world is somewhat similar to a human mind – albeit with much greater powers for they will be in proportion to the magnificence of the natural world. This a posteriori argument is enough to prove that there is a god and that he resembles human mind and intelligence.”*

*David Hume, Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion  
Re-written in modern English*

**(a) What is an argument from analogy?**

**Give your own example to illustrate your answer.**

**4 KU**

- Clear description of argument from analogy:
  - where two things are alike in one respect then they are likely to be alike in some relevantly similar respect.
- Up to two marks for an appropriate example eg if two cars have an engine and are emitting particular gasses, then if one engine is burning a particular kind of fuel then it is likely that the other car is burning a similar fuel.

NB “own example” should not be taken to mean that the candidate must supply a completely novel example but merely one different to the one in the given passage.

**(b) What is meant by an a posteriori argument?**

**2 KU**

- Reasoning from experience
- Contrast with a priori

**(c) Explain in your own words the argument being described by Hume in this passage.**

**4 KU**

- The world is similar to the products of human intelligence in that it shows evidence of design.
- The design in any human product is the consequence of it having been designed.
- Similar effects have similar causes.
- Therefore, the apparent design in the world is the consequence of the work of a creator that is similar in some ways to the human mind albeit one that has greater powers and abilities.

NB no more than two marks should be awarded unless the candidate explicitly references the analogical nature of Hume's argument.

**(d) How successful is this kind of argument in proving the existence of God?**

**10 AE**

- The similarity is not sufficient to warrant the conclusion – if we see a house we may conclude it has a designer because other houses have designers, to conclude that our universe had a designer we would have to compare it to other universes that we knew to have designers.
- The world is perhaps more similar to a living organism than a human artifact.
- The problem of evil.
- Even if the analogy held it would suggest the wrong type of God
  - not perfect
  - not intelligent one
  - not just one God.
- Evolution is a challenge to later forms of teleological arguments.

**(20)**

### Question 3

*“Some people say we are free when we do what we desire. But surely a cigarette smoker isn’t free when she’s standing out in the rain just to satisfy her desire to smoke.”*

**(a) Discuss how libertarians and hard determinists might respond to this statement.** **6 KU**  
**4 AE**

- Definition of Libertarianism: the belief that at least some of our choices can be made by us without them being forced upon us by prior circumstances.
- Definition of Hard Determinism: The belief that freedom and determinism are incompatible, that all events including human choices are determined and that, therefore, there is no freedom.
- Application to scenario
  - L might say we ‘freely choose to smoke’ and could do otherwise
  - L might concede causation in this instance but deny its ubiquity
  - L might say they cannot know if this is an instance of free or determined action
  - HD this action is caused by prior events/causes (as are all situations!)
  - the candidate may speculate as to the particular form of causation that is being exhibited (genetic/learned behaviour/chemical dependency).

**(b) Does the example of smoking pose a particular difficulty for compatibilists?** **4 KU**  
**6 AE**

- Definition of compatibilism: the belief that all events are determined but that genuine human freedom is still possible when we are not prevented from doing what we want to do, ie when we can act in accordance with our desires.
- Application to scenario
  - recognition that acting in line with desires is a compatibilist definition of freedom
  - discussion of internal v external causes/constraint
  - particularly a problem for simple compatibilism – freedom from coercion or constraint
  - discussion of possible solution using first and second order desires: Frankfurt would say that although they have freedom of action because they can act in accordance with their desire to have a cigarette, whether or not the smoker has freedom of the will depends upon whether they have a desire to want or not want to smoke. If the smoker wants to want a cigarette then they are free; if they want not to want a cigarette but want one anyway then they are not free
  - critics of compatibilism – why stop at second order desires: collapses into HD.

**(20)**

## SECTION 3 – EPISTEMOLOGY

### Section 3 – Total Marks 40

- This section examines the content of the unit ‘Epistemology’
- It has **two** parts
- Candidates answer **one** structured question in **both parts** of this section

The nature of each question is outlined below:

#### *Part 1 – total marks 10*

- This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section One of the Epistemology Unit
- It has **one** structured question with **2 – 4** related parts
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2 – 6** and requires a restricted response (**KU only**)

Candidates answer **all** related parts of this question

### Question 4

(a) **In what way does propositional knowledge differ from other kinds of knowledge?** 2 KU

- Candidate explains that propositional knowledge is ‘knowing that’ as opposed to ‘knowing how’.

(b) **What is the distinction between necessary truth and contingent truth? Give examples to illustrate your answer.** 4 KU

- Necessarily true = true and could not conceivably be not be true, or
- necessarily true = true in all possible worlds.
- Contingently true = true but could conceivably be not be true, or
- contingently true = not true in all possible worlds.
- Appropriate examples would earn up to two marks, one mark each.

(c) **What are the key features of empiricism?** 4 KU

- Empiricism stands in opposition to rationalism
- Hence denies possibility of knowledge of reality via pure reason
- All knowledge of reality must be a posteriori
- Hence also denies possibility of innate knowledge
- Sense experience
- Tabula rasa
- Modelled on the natural sciences

Any four appropriate comments will be acceptable.

(10)

## Part 2 – Total Marks 30

- This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section Two of the Epistemology Unit.
- It has **two** structured questions, each of which samples across the mandatory content of **one** of the options in this Unit.
- Each structured question contains an extract from the relevant prescribed text and has **2-8** related parts
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **3-20** and requires either a restricted or extended response
- Candidates answer **all** related parts of the **one** structured question which examines the option they have studied

### Question 5

**(a) Why did Descartes write the Meditations?**

**4 KU**

- To find a firm foundation for knowledge
- To refute scepticism
- To vindicate rationalism
- To establish the reliability of science
- To prove the existence of God
- To substitute reason for authority

NB a maximum of two marks should be awarded if the candidate simply gives a developed answer saying that Descartes wanted to establish a foundation for knowledge.

**Read the statement below then answer parts (b) and (c).**

*“All that remains for me is to ask how I received this idea of God...the only option remaining is that this idea is innate in me, just as the idea of myself is innate in me.”*

**(b) Explain the role God plays in Descartes’ argument.**

**6 KU  
4 AE**

- An account of the Trademark Argument
  - I have an idea of God (a perfect being)
  - in every cause there must be at least as much reality as there is in the effect
  - since I am imperfect I cannot be responsible for this idea of perfection
  - whatever caused my idea of perfection must be perfect
  - therefore God (a perfect being) exists.

(Up to five marks are available for the description of the Trademark argument.)

- Explanation of clear and distinct ideas
- To enable him to rebuild knowledge
- To give grounds for faith in our faculties of sense, reason and memory
- To overcome the deceiving God of med.1 and thus establish certainty in a priori reasoning
- A perfect being wouldn’t let him be deceived since “all fraud and deception depend on some defect”
- To act as a guarantor of “clear and distinct” ideas
- To move beyond the cogito

- Criticisms of the method of doubt
  - has failed to doubt everything.
- Criticisms of the cogito
  - assumes prior knowledge
  - assumes reliability of reasoning
  - assumes reliability of memory
  - arguably not entitled to “I”.
- Criticism of the Trademark Argument
  - explanation and discussion of the Cartesian circle
  - reliance on the principle of causal adequacy
  - explanation of the weakness of the principle of causal adequacy (eg a sponge cake has many properties not present in the ingredients; the principle of causal adequacy was intended to apply to physical object not ideas)
  - if God is an innate idea then it is not clear why not everyone has such an idea
  - Descartes assumes that a benevolent God would not fool us but benevolence and deception are not obviously inconsistent (nb caring parents).

NB credit should also be given for a candidate acknowledging the positive achievements of Descartes, eg proving his own existence, and for appropriately setting the scene for the criticisms. However, a candidate should not be awarded excessive marks for simply describing the method of doubt. A professional judgement should be made given the overall quality of the answer.

(30)

## Question 6

*“All of our reasonings concerning matter of fact are founded on a species of ANALOGY”.*

**(a) What does Hume mean by “reasonings concerning matter of fact”?**

**4 KU**

- All the judgements we make about matters of fact that are not directly present to the senses.
- Always based on the notion of cause and effect – “All reasonings concerning matters of fact seem to be founded on the relation of cause and effect. By means of that relation alone we can go beyond the evidence of our memory and senses.”  
Examples:
  - letter from France
  - watch on a desert island
  - someone talking rationally in the dark.
- The causal chain – long/short, direct/correlated.
- Definition of matters of fact:
  - distinguished from relations of ideas (Hume’s Fork)
  - empirically observable
  - do not imply a contradiction when refuted.

NB no more than two marks if the candidate merely describes matters of fact and fails to discuss **reasonings** concerning matters of fact, eg drawing inferences.

**(b) Explain Hume’s argument that there are close similarities between human reason and the reason of animals.**

**6 KU  
4 AE**

- Our conclusions about man will be more convincing if we can show that they operate similarly in animals.
- Humans infer causal connections by habituation – seeing similar events constantly conjoined to events which are in turn similar to each other. We have an instinct for induction that is part of our natural make up.
- Firstly animals clearly learn from experience.
  - young animals show less ability and wisdom than old
  - reward and punishment of animals show that they can be trained to suppress instincts
  - they can learn an arbitrary name
  - we can see that animals can infer facts beyond that which they are immediately experiencing.
- Secondly it’s impossible for this inference to be founded on any argument or reasoning that like events must follow like objects
  - if there were any such arguments (which there may not be) animals couldn’t identify them
  - animals aren’t therefore guided by reasoning in making these inferences and neither are children or men or philosophers
  - reasoning and argumentation are too slow and uncertain a process to cope with the essential ability to infer effects from causes
  - it is custom alone that does this.
- But animals don’t learn all of their knowledge this way, they also have natural instincts. Things which animals are unable to improve on and don’t need to have been taught.
- The experimental reasoning we use in everyday life is nothing but a species of this instinct.

(c) Does Hume succeed in showing that we do not use reason in gaining knowledge of cause and effect?

16 AE

- Candidates may explain Hume's argument in Section IV:
  - nothing other than observation can inform us about which effects will follow from which causes, eg Adam could not tell on first encountering water that it would drown him
  - the fact that we learn from experience is obvious in cases that are unknown, unusual or intricate but less obvious in cases that are familiar, similar or simple
  - if we were to attempt to reason a priori our prediction of the effect would necessarily be arbitrary – billiard balls.
- With regard to Section IX the analysis and evaluation would be:
  - the minds of other people, never mind other animals are closed to us
  - problem of drawing analogies from other species – animals may differ in important respects
  - some species seem more sophisticated than others – ants (completely instinctual) v elephants (more like humans?)
  - Hume allows learning from one experience – this seems right – but problematic – which single experiences count?
  - cause and effect assumption may be instinctive but specific instances of cause and effect have to be observed
- Problems with Hume's overall account:
  - Hume's arguments seem to make science look unscientific
  - too simple understanding of science – Einstein predicted effect of gravity on light prior to observations
  - Hume seems to reduce all causation to cases of correlation
  - Hume can only distinguish cause and effect by temporal priority but some causes are contemporaneous with their effects
  - human psychology is more complex than Hume suggests – constant conjunction does not always yield a better belief in necessary connection – eg the order of traffic lights
  - we also seem to be able to draw inferences about causes from single observations – eg food poisoning.

(30)

## SECTION 4 – MORAL PHILOSOPHY

### Section 4 – Total Marks 40

- This section examines the content of the Unit ‘*Moral Philosophy*’
- It has **two** parts
- Candidates answer **one** structured question in **both parts** of this section

The nature of each question is outlined below:

#### *Part 1 – total marks 30*

- This part of Section 4 samples across the mandatory content of Section 1 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

The question requires an extended response of **500-600** words

### Question 7

**You find you have the opportunity to cheat in an exam that will win you a place in medical school. Discuss how Kantians and Utilitarians would respond to this situation.**

**15 KU  
15 AE**

- Kantian Ethics
  - Deontological/Duty/Motives
  - Importance of Reason/Rational Beings/Moral Law
  - Good Will
  - Categorical Imperative – formulations explained – universalisability, means to an end
  - Maxims.
- Utilitarian Ethics
  - teleological/consequentialist
  - Greatest Happiness Principle
  - Bentham – hedonic calculus
  - Mill – higher and lower pleasures/competent judges
  - Act and Rule Utilitarians.
- Application to the Situation – Kant
  - importance of motives/duty means that it was wrong to cheat
  - acting on the maxim “cheat in exams if it helps you gain entrance to medicine” means in reality that there would be no concept of fair entry to university – contradiction in conception... exam system would cease to exist?
  - contradiction in the will – rationally you cannot will that people cheat in an exam as it would result in your own exam success being invalidated
  - consequences irrelevant – won’t matter if the person might become a brilliant doctor.
- Applications to the Situation – Utilitarianism
  - important thing is to maximise Utility
  - greatest happiness for the greatest number – whether this is achieved in this situation depends upon the detail of the circumstance
  - Act Utilitarians may or may not approve
  - Rule Utilitarianism – focus on rule which has been drawn up to maximise Utility in this particular situation – this may well be that, overall, cheating is wrong and that there are long term benefits of having a rule forbidding cheating.

- Evaluation – Kant
  - most people would agree with ruling (as the Categorical Imperative would) that cheating is wrong in itself
  - not taking account of consequences removes the burden of working out short term and long term consequences
  - ignoring consequences goes against our natural process of deliberating about moral decisions.
  
- Evaluation – Utilitarianism
  - sits easily with our sense of the importance of consequences
  - takes account of consequences – short and long term
  - difficulty of knowing the consequences
  - what if innocent patients suffer in the future?
  - why should the happiness of the cheater be regarded as equal to the happiness of non-cheating students?
  - Act Utilitarianism would seem to allow the cheating person to escape justice
  - would Rule Utilitarianism be too rigid? – presumably if the student was not up to the course he would fail and not practice as a doctor.

**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.**

**(30)**

*Part 2 – total marks 10*

- This part of Section 4 samples across the mandatory content of Section 2 of the Unit
- It has **one** structured question with **1-4** 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
- Candidates answer **all** related parts of this question

**There is no choice of questions in Section 4 of the Question Paper.**

**Question 8**

**(a) Explain why emotivists say that moral judgements are not statements of fact. 5 KU**

- Meta-ethical theory dealing with the nature of moral statements rather than the way in which moral judgements are made – contrast to normative ethics.
- Theory about what we are doing when we describe an action as right or wrong.
- Moral statements for the Emotivist have no factual content/contain no moral truths/are not propositions.

Candidates may answer this with particular reference to a philosopher they have studied or they may simply address the main claims of Emotivism.

**Ayer**

- Explanation of Ayer's view of meaningfulness.
- Possible reference to "Language, Truth and Logic".
- Meaningful putative propositions are either analytic or capable of empirical verification.
- According to Ayer, 4 types of moral statements: 1) definitions of ethical terms, 2) descriptions of moral phenomena, 3) "exhortations to moral virtue" and 4) "actual ethical judgements".  
1 and 2 pass his criteria but not 3 and 4 therefore meaningless – simply expressions of emotion.

**C.L Stevenson's approach**

- Possible reference to "The Emotive Meaning of Ethical Terms"
- Explanation of descriptive and dynamic use of language
- Moral statements have emotive meaning
- Moral statements to persuade others

**(b) What criticisms could be made of the emotivist position?**

- Emotivism makes moral arguments impossible.
- Reduces serious moral issues to level of discussing trivial matters in the context of a “matter of taste”.
- Difficulty of articulating moral values in the manner understood by most people.
- We seem to use the language of facts when discussing moral issues.
- Reduces moral debate to an exchange of emotional attitudes.
- Objectively right moral answers seem important to us.
- Logical Positivism/Verification principle is in itself flawed as it fails its own test of what is a meaningful statement.

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]