

**C268/SQP358**

---

Philosophy  
Higher

NATIONAL  
QUALIFICATIONS

<i>Contents</i>	<i>Page</i>
Course Assessment Specification	2
Specimen Question Paper	7
Specimen Marking Instructions	15

## COURSE ASSESSMENT SPECIFICATION

### PHILOSOPHY HIGHER

The purpose of this document is to provide:

- Details of the structure of the Course Assessment
- Guidance on how to use information gathered from a Question Paper appropriate for this Course to estimate candidate performance

#### Part 1

**This part of the Course Assessment Specification details the structure of the Course Assessment.**

The Course assessment has one component – a Question Paper:

The Question Paper:

- has **four** sections (Section 1, Section 2, Section 3 and Section 4)
- has a total mark allocation of **120**
- has a time allocation of **2 hours 40 minutes**
- has an allocation of approximately **60 marks** for knowledge and understanding and approximately **60 marks** for critical analysis and evaluation
- uses language appropriate to the reading range expected of Higher candidates in any case study or stimulus

Detailed guidance on the content of each section is given below:

#### **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.**

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

### **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 one – 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 **1 – 5** related parts
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2 – 10** and requires either a restricted response or extended response
- Candidates answer **all** related parts of this question

**There is no choice of question in Part one of Section 3.**

#### *Part two – 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 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 within this structure are:

Series of restricted response questions  
 Some restricted response questions and 1 extended response  
 2 extended responses

- Candidates answer **all** related parts of the **one** structured question which examines the option they have studied

## **Section 4 – total marks 40**

- This section examines the content of the Unit “*Moral Philosophy*”
- It has **two questions**
- Candidates answer **both** structured questions

The nature of each question is outlined below:

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

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

## **The “added value” of the Course**

Achieving success in the Course requires some additional skills and abilities over and above those involved in passing individual Units. These are detailed in the Assessment section of the Course Specification and include:

- demonstrating the ability to apply and adapt the skills of critical analysis and evaluation in a variety of contexts
- demonstrating the ability to integrate knowledge and skills across the component Units of the Course on a single occasion

When selecting questions, the points above should be kept in mind. All sections of the Question Paper provide opportunities to address these points. In particular, attention should be paid to the balance between knowledge/understanding (KU) and analysis/evaluation (AE). This balance is approximately **50% KU** and **50% AE** in both the Unit and Course assessment.

## Part 2

This part of the Course Assessment Specification provides guidance on how all components contribute to the Course award. It also indicates how to use the assessment information gathered from these components to estimate candidate performance.

The Course assessment is based on **one** Question Paper which contains **four** Sections:

Question Paper	Mark Range
Section 1: Critical Thinking in Philosophy	0 - 20
Section 2: Metaphysics	0 - 20
Section 3: Epistemology	0 - 40
Section 4: Moral Philosophy	0 - 40
<b>Total Marks</b>	0 - 120

The mark range for each Section of the paper reflects the proportionately equal weighting given to each of the Units which make up the Course.

In the Philosophy (Higher) Course, cut-off scores are set at approximately 70% for grade A and 50% for grade C with B grade falling midway at between 60% and 69%.

The following table gives an indication of appropriate cut-off scores:

Grade	Band	Mark Range
A	1	102-120
A	2	84-101
B	3	78-83
B	4	72-77
C	5	66-71
C	6	60-65
D	7	53-59
NA	8	47-52
NA	9	0-46

The cut-off scores may be lowered if Question Paper components turn out to be more demanding. Alternatively, they may be raised if question paper components turn out to be less demanding.

### Worked example

- In a centre's own prelim, a candidate scores 47/80 and 25/40, giving a total mark of 72/120.
- The centre's view is that their prelim is slightly less demanding than the SQA examination.
- Using the mark range, a realistic estimate will be **band 5** rather than band 4.



**[C268/SQP358]**

---

Philosophy  
Higher  
Specimen Question Paper  
for use in and after 2010

Time: 2 hours 40 minutes

NATIONAL  
QUALIFICATIONS

**You should answer**

Section 1 – Question 1

Section 2 – **Either** Question 2  
**OR** Question 3

Section 3 – Question 4 **AND**  
**Either** Question 5  
**OR** Question 6

Section 4 – Question 7 **AND**  
Question 8

**Question 1**

You should answer all parts of this question.

- |   |          |           |
|---|----------|-----------|
| (a) Describe the difference between a statement and an argument.  | <b>2</b> | <b>KU</b> |
| (b) What is a rhetorical question? Give an example to support your answer.  | <b>2</b> | <b>KU</b> |
| (c) Explain what is meant by a valid argument. You should include an example to illustrate your answer.   | <b>2</b> | <b>KU</b> |
| (d) What features does an argument need to ensure that it is sound?   | <b>2</b> | <b>KU</b> |
| (e) Consider the following argument:<br><br><i>“Every Spanish holiday I’ve been on has been most enjoyable. We are going to Spain this year again so it is bound to be a great holiday”</i>               |          |           |
| (i) Is this an inductive or deductive argument? Give reasons for your answer.   | <b>2</b> | <b>AE</b> |
| (ii) What would make this argument reliable?  | <b>3</b> | <b>AE</b> |
| (f) What is wrong with a false dilemma?   | <b>2</b> | <b>KU</b> |
| (g) Consider the following argument:<br><br><i>“Everyone knows that if you are born in France you will grow up to speak French. You must have been born in France because you speak French fluently.”</i> |          |           |
| (i) Re-write this argument in standard form clearly showing its premises and conclusion.  | <b>2</b> | <b>AE</b> |
| (ii) Identify the fallacy committed in this argument.   | <b>1</b> | <b>AE</b> |
| (iii) Is this a formal or informal fallacy? Explain your answer.  | <b>2</b> | <b>AE</b> |

**Section 2 – Metaphysics**

*Marks Code*

Answer **EITHER** Question 2 **OR** Question 3.

**Question 2**

You should answer this question if you have studied the debate “Is there a rational basis for belief in God?” If not go to Question 3.

Read the extract below then answer the question that follows.

**Extract**

“[Even a] fool when he hears of . . . a being than which nothing greater can be conceived . . . understands what he hears, and what he understands is in his understanding . . .”

*Saint Anselm, The Proslogium*

Is the ontological argument successful in proving the existence of God?

**20 10KU  
10AE**

**Section 2 – Metaphysics (continued)**

*Marks Code*

Answer **EITHER** Question 2 **OR** Question 3.

**Question 3**

You should answer this question if you have studied the debate “Do we have free will?”

Read the extract then answer the question that follows.

**Extract**

“I grant, then, that . . . an event uncaused is an absurdity. The question that remains is whether a volition, undetermined by motives, is an event uncaused.

This I deny. The cause of the volition is the man that willed it.”

*Thomas Reid, Letter to James Gregory*

Does Libertarianism give an adequate account of free will?

**20** **10KU**  
**10AE**

### Section 3 – Epistemology

*Marks Code*

#### Part one

#### Question 4

You should answer all parts of this question.

- |  |   |    |
|--|---|----|
| (a) In what ways might the tripartite theory of knowledge be challenged? | 5 | AE |
| (b) What is a coherentist account of knowledge?                          | 5 | KU |

**Part two**

Answer **EITHER** Question 5 **OR** Question 6

**Question 5**

You should answer this question if you have studied **Descartes’ Rationalism** in the Epistemology Unit.

Read the statement below then answer all parts of the question (**a–c**).

**Extract**

“How often does my evening slumber persuade me of such ordinary things as these: that I am here, clothed in my dressing gown, seated next to the fireplace—when in fact I am lying undressed in bed!”

*Descartes—editions on First Philosophy: Meditation 1*

- |   |    |            |
|---|----|------------|
| (a) Describe Descartes’ Dream argument.   | 4  | KU         |
| (b) Explain why, by the end of Meditation III, Descartes believes that he can trust his clear and distinct perceptions  | 12 | 6KU<br>6AE |
| (c) During Meditation VI Descartes tries to resolve the doubts he originally raised in the Dream argument.<br><br>Is Descartes successful in his attempt to resolve these doubts? | 14 | 6KU<br>8AE |

**Part two**

Answer **EITHER** Question 5 **OR** Question 6

**Question 6**

You should answer this question if you have studied Hume's Empiricism in the Epistemology Unit.

Read the Extract below then answer all parts of the question (**a–c**).

**Extract**

“. . . all our ideas or more feeble perceptions are copies of our impressions or more lively ones. To prove this, the two following arguments will, I hope, be sufficient.”

*Hume—Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding:  
Section II*

- |  |    |                    |
|--|----|--------------------|
| (a) What does Hume mean by impressions and ideas?  | 4  | <b>KU</b>          |
| (b) Analyse the “two arguments” which Hume uses to justify his claim that all human thoughts come from “the senses and experience”.            | 12 | <b>4KU<br/>8AE</b> |
| (c) Does Hume’s example of the “Missing Shade of Blue” weaken his claim that all perceptions have their origin in “the senses and experience”? | 14 | <b>8KU<br/>6AE</b> |

**Section 4 – Moral Philosophy**

*Marks Code*

Answer **BOTH** Questions in this Section.

**Question 7**

Read the short case study ('The Soldiers' Dilemma) then answer the question that follows.

**The Soldiers' Dilemma:**

During the war a group of soldiers entered a small village while they were searching for an enemy commander. A spy had told them that the commander's daughter lived in the village and knew where her father was hiding. The soldiers found the girl, who was 12 years old, but she refused to give them any information. They soon realised that they would only get the information from the girl if they tortured her.

None of the soldiers could agree what to do next. Should they torture the girl to get valuable information which might save their own and other lives? Or was torturing a 12 year old girl so wrong that they shouldn't even discuss it as a possibility?

Critically examine possible Utilitarian responses to this dilemma.

**30 15KU  
15AE**

**Question 8**

- (a) What does Kant mean by 'maxim'? **2 KU**
- (b) What approach does Kant use to decide which maxims should guide our actions? **4 KU**
- (c) Give two possible criticisms of this approach. **4 AE**

[END OF SPECIMEN QUESTION PAPER]

**[C268/SQP358]**

---

Philosophy  
Higher  
Specimen Marking Instructions  
for use in and after 2010

NATIONAL  
QUALIFICATIONS

## General Marking Information

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 extended responses, 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. This means 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 students. 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.

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

## Section 1: Critical Thinking in Philosophy

### Specific Marking Information

*Allocation of marks: Knowledge and Understanding – Approximately 50% of total marks available*  
*Critical Analysis and Evaluation – Approximately 50% of total marks available*

*The marking information below illustrates some possible candidate responses to the questions. It is not exclusive and credit should be given for alternative appropriate responses.*

<i>Assessment objective</i>	<i>Generic requirements</i>
Knowledge and understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accurate, relevant and detailed knowledge of content is demonstrated.</li> <li>• The information is presented in a structured manner</li> </ul>
Critical analysis and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of arguments, reasoning, positions and evidence is shown, and/or</li> <li>• Evaluation is balanced, based on aspects already discussed and is relevant to the question being asked.</li> </ul>

<i>Question No.1</i>	<i>Section 1</i>	<i>Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE</i>	
(a)	<p><b>Q</b> Describe the difference between a statement and an argument.</p> <p><b>MI</b> Any accurate description which may include, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statements simply make/state a point, arguments are used to try to prove/establish a point</li> <li>• Statements can form part of an argument but are not in themselves arguments</li> <li>• An example of a statement and a short argument may be given to illustrate the description</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	
(b)	<p><b>Q</b> What is a rhetorical question? Give an example to support your answer?</p> <p><b>MI</b> A question that is asked in order to state a point or for dramatic effect rather than to elicit an answer. Rhetorical questions can therefore sometimes be interpreted as statements. E.g. the question “Who knows?” might be interpreted as being equivalent to the statement “Nobody knows”.</p> <p>One mark for the definition and one mark for the example.</p>	<b>2</b>	



(f)		<p>What is wrong with a false dilemma?</p> <p>This fallacy is committed if, in the course of an argument, it is presumed without argument that p and q are the only two possibilities, when in fact there are other possibilities.</p>	<b>2</b>	
(g)		<p>Consider the following argument</p> <p><i>‘Everyone knows that if you are born in France you will grow up to speak French. You must have been born in France because you speak French fluently.</i></p> <p>(i) Re-write this argument in standard form clearly showing its premises and conclusions.</p> <p>Premise 1: If you are born in France you will grow up to speak French.  Premise 2: You speak French fluently.  Conclusion: You must have been born in France.</p> <p>(ii) Identify the fallacy committed in this argument</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affirming the consequent.</li> </ul> <p>(iii) Is this a formal or informal fallacy? Explain your answer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal fallacy</li> <li>• The unreliability of the argument depends on the ‘form’ or structure of the argument.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

**Section 2: Metaphysics**

Debate One – Is there a rational basis for belief in God?

**Specific Marking Information**

*Allocation of marks: Knowledge and Understanding – Approximately 50% of total marks available*

*Critical Analysis and Evaluation – Approximately 50% of total marks available*

*The marking information below illustrates some possible candidate responses to the questions. It is not exclusive and credit should be given for alternative appropriate responses.*

Assessment objective	Generic requirements
Knowledge and understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accurate, relevant and detailed knowledge of content is demonstrated.</li> <li>The information is presented in a structured manner</li> </ul>
Critical analysis and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis of arguments, reasoning, positions and evidence is shown, and/or</li> <li>Evaluation is balanced, based on aspects already discussed and is relevant to the question being asked.</li> </ul>

Question No.2	Section 2	Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE	
(a)	<p><b>Q</b> Read the extract then answer the question that follows.</p> <p><b>Extract</b></p> <p>“[Even a] fool when he hears of ..... a being than which nothing greater can be conceived ... understands what he hears, and what he understands is in his understanding....”</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Saint Anselm, The Proslogium</i></p> <p>Is the ontological argument successful in proving the existence of God?</p> <p><b>MI</b> Knowledge and understanding may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explanation of the ontological argument.</li> <li>Identification of argument as an a priori argument.</li> <li>Explanation of ‘nothing greater can be conceived’.</li> <li>Existing in reality is greater than existing in thought alone,</li> <li>Necessary existence is greater than contingent existence.</li> <li>Explanation of the terms ‘necessary’ and ‘contingent’.</li> </ul> <p>Analysis and evaluation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objection that you cannot define something into existence and Gaunilo’s parody of Anselm’s argument. Appropriate discussion as to whether Gaunilo’s objection is an effective response.</li> </ul>	<b>10</b>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aquinas’ objection that knowledge of existence must precede knowledge of nature.</li> <li>• Kant’s observation that if existence is part of the definition of God then the statement ‘God exists’ is a tautology.</li> <li>• Kant’s objection that ‘existence is not a predicate’.</li> <li>• Russell’s analysis of ‘exists’ as a propositional function—‘cows exist’ equates to ‘There is an x such that ‘x is a cow’ is true’.</li> </ul> <p>In marking this question reference should be made to 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>		<b>10</b>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>10 KU</b>	<b>10 AE</b>

**Section 2: Metaphysics (continued)**

Debate Two – Do we have free will?

**Specific Marking Information**

*Allocation of marks: Knowledge and Understanding – Approximately 50% of total marks available*

*Critical Analysis and Evaluation – Approximately 50% of total marks available*

*The marking information below illustrates some possible candidate responses to the questions. It is not exclusive and credit should be given for alternative appropriate responses.*

Assessment objective	Generic requirements
Knowledge and understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accurate, relevant and detailed knowledge of content is demonstrated.</li> <li>• The information is presented in a structured manner</li> </ul>
Critical analysis and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of arguments, reasoning, positions and evidence is shown, and/or</li> <li>• Evaluation is balanced, based on aspects already discussed and is relevant to the question being asked.</li> </ul>

Question No.3	Section 2	Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE	
(a)	<p><b>Q</b></p> <p>Read the extract then answer the question that follows.</p> <p><b>Extract</b></p> <p>“I grant, then, that ... an event uncaused is an absurdity. The question that remains is whether a volition, undetermined by motives, is an event uncaused. This I deny. The cause of the volition is the man that willed it.”</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Thomas Reid, Letter to James Gregory</i></p> <p>Does Libertarianism give an adequate account of free will?</p> <p><b>MI</b></p> <p>Knowledge and understanding may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Libertarians are incompatibilists who reject determinism.</li> <li>• Clarification that Libertarians do not necessarily believe all human actions to be free actions.</li> <li>• Distinguishes between event causation and agent causation.</li> <li>• Reasons for the Libertarian position: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The psychological sense of freely deciding.</li> <li>– The seeming need of libertarian freedom to make sense of morality and justice.</li> <li>– The fact that it supports the idea that human autonomy contributes to humans having a special dignity.</li> <li>– The need for libertarian freedom as a necessary assumption.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>10</b>	

	<p>Analysis and evaluation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The recognition that the Libertarian notion of freedom is incompatible with determinism.</li> <li>• The objection that Libertarians too readily reject determinism.</li> <li>• Critical observations on the reasons for the Libertarian position: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The psychological sense of freely deciding might be an illusion with possible discussion of fMRI results which indicate that our awareness of having taken a decision comes after the decision has already been made.</li> <li>– There may be no need for libertarian freedom to make some sense of morality.</li> <li>– The claim that libertarian freedom is required for morality may be a fallacious appeal to consequences.</li> <li>– The claim that libertarian freedom is required for human dignity may be a fallacious appeal to consequences.</li> <li>– Discussion as to whether libertarian freedom is a necessary assumption may involve comparison with other supposed necessary assumptions such as the existence of an external world or other minds.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The objection that appropriate causes are required if an event is to be fully explained and that, therefore, Libertarian freedom makes human decisions inexplicable.</li> <li>• The objection that agent causation is incompatible with the scientific assumption that event causation is required for an event to be explained.</li> <li>• Discussion as to whether simple indeterminism supports Libertarianism.</li> </ul> <p>NB. the question requires the candidate to focus on Libertarianism. Whilst it may be appropriate for the candidate to mention Hard Determinism and Compatibilism the description and discussion should concentrate on the Libertarian position. Credit should only be given to a discussion of other positions if that discussion is relevant to a discussion of Libertarianism.</p> <p>In marking this question reference should be made to 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>		10
		<b>10 KU</b>	<b>10 AE</b>

### Section 3: Epistemology

#### Specific Marking Information

*Allocation of marks: Knowledge and Understanding – Approximately 50% of total marks available  
Critical Analysis and Evaluation – Approximately 50% of total marks available*

*The marking information below illustrates some possible candidate responses to the questions. It is not exclusive and credit should be given for alternative appropriate responses.*

Assessment objective	Generic requirements
Knowledge and understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accurate, relevant and detailed knowledge of content is demonstrated.</li> <li>• The information is presented in a structured manner</li> </ul>
Critical analysis and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of texts, arguments and positions is shown, and/or</li> <li>• Evaluation is balanced, based on aspects already discussed and is relevant to the question being asked.</li> </ul>

Question No.4	Section 3		Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE	
(a)	<b>Q</b>	In what ways might the tripartite theory of knowledge be challenged?		
	<b>MI</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation of the Tripartite Theory of Knowledge and the fact that the criteria are taken to be individually necessary and jointly sufficient. ( max.1 mark)</li> <li>• Scepticism challenges the possibility of satisfying the justification criterion.</li> <li>• The Gettier problem challenges the claim that the criteria are jointly sufficient.</li> </ul> <p>NB. Credit should be given for any relevant substantive point made by a candidate but a maximum of three marks should be awarded if the candidate only mentions one way in which the tripartite theory might be challenged</p>	<b>5</b>	
(b)	<b>Q</b>	What is a coherentist account of knowledge?		
	<b>MI</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explanation of the problem of the infinite regress of justification.</li> <li>• Explanation of how a coherentist theory of justification attempts to avoid an infinite regress.</li> <li>• The coherentist view that a circular justification is acceptable if the circle is large enough.</li> <li>• The coherentist view that justification depends on a holistic view of the evidence rather than relying on a linear chain of evidence.</li> </ul>	<b>5</b>	
		Total	<b>5 KU</b>	<b>5 AE</b>

### Section 3: Epistemology (continued)

#### Specific Marking Information

*Allocation of marks: Knowledge and Understanding – Approximately 50% of total marks available*  
*Critical Analysis and Evaluation – Approximately 50% of total marks available*

*The marking information below illustrates some possible candidate responses to the questions. It is not exclusive and credit should be given for alternative appropriate responses.*

Assessment objective	Generic requirements
Knowledge and understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accurate, relevant and detailed knowledge of content is demonstrated.</li> <li>The information is presented in a structured manner</li> </ul>
Critical analysis and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analysis of texts, arguments and positions is shown, and/or</li> <li>Evaluation is balanced, based on aspects already discussed and is relevant to the question being asked.</li> </ul>

Question No.5	Section 3	Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE	
(a)	<p><b>Q</b></p> <p>Read the statement below then answer all parts of the question.</p> <p><b>Extract</b></p> <p>“How often does my evening slumber persuade me of such ordinary things as these: that I am here, clothed in my dressing gown, seated next to the fireplace – when in fact I am lying undressed in bed!”</p> <p><i>Descartes – Meditations on First Philosophy: Meditation 1</i></p> <p>Describe Descartes’ Dream argument.</p> <p><b>MI</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Places the dream argument into context.</li> <li>An attempt to doubt the evidence of the senses that has escaped previous doubts.</li> <li>The clarity of the current perception is not a reliable guide as such thought have also been had previously when asleep</li> <li>There are no definitive signs to distinguish a waking state from a sleeping state.</li> <li>Concludes that disciplines that consider composite things—e.g. physics, medicine and astronomy—are doubtful.</li> <li>Certain things escape the dream argument—those that consider only the simplest of things, e.g, geometry and arithmetic.</li> </ul>	4	

(b)	<b>MI</b>	<p>Explain why, by the end of Meditation III, Descartes believes that he can trust his clear and distinct perceptions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to the Cogito as his foundational truth, established in Meditation II</li> <li>• “Clear and distinct perceptions” as the “mark” of truth established in relation to the Cogito</li> <li>• An explanation of what is meant by ‘clear and distinct perception’: In the Principles Descartes says that a 'clear' perception is one that is present and manifest to the attentive mind and that a 'distinct' perception is one that is so separated from all other perceptions that it contains absolutely nothing except what is clear.</li> <li>• Explains the context of Meditation III—Descartes can be certain of his existence as a thinking thing and nothing more.</li> <li>• An account of the Trademark Argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– I have an idea of God (a perfect being).</li> <li>– In every cause there must be at least as much reality as there is in the effect.</li> <li>– Since I am imperfect I cannot be responsible for this idea of perfection.</li> <li>– Whatever caused my idea of perfection must be perfect.</li> <li>– Therefore God (a perfect being) exists.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• God cannot be a deceiver since all deception depends upon some defect.</li> </ul>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>
(c)	<b>Q</b>  <b>MI</b>	<p>During Meditation VI Descartes tries to resolve the doubts he originally had concerning the existence of material things. Is Descartes successful in his attempt to resolve these doubts?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Explains the context of Meditation VI: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– A summary of his reasons for believing in the existence of the physical world.</li> <li>– Reasons for questioning these reasons including the possibility of dreaming</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Explanation of Descartes’ reasons for rejecting the dream argument.</li> <li>• Differences between dreams and waking experiences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– dreams are not tied to the rest of life by memories.</li> <li>– example of person appearing and disappearing.</li> <li>– in waking life the evidence does not conflict.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• God is not a deceiver.</li> </ul>		

		<p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objections to the Trademark Argument: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– the Causal Adequacy Principle should not be applied to ideas in the same way that it was applied to physical things.</li> <li>– the Causal Adequacy Principle suggests an overly strong link between the cause of something and its effect although this is not always the case, e.g. the sponginess of a cake is not in its ingredients.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Discussion of the ‘Cartesian Circle’: Descartes needs God as a guarantor of clear and distinct ideas but uses the notion of clear and distinct ideas in his argument for the existence of God.</li> <li>• Descartes’ response that God only guarantees the memory of the conclusions when we are no longer attending to the arguments that produced them.</li> </ul>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>
		<b>Total</b>	<b>16 KU</b>	<b>14 AE</b>

**Section 3: Epistemology (continued)**

Specific Marking Information

*Allocation of marks: Knowledge and Understanding – Approximately 50% of total marks available*

*Critical Analysis and Evaluation – Approximately 50% of total marks available*

*The marking information below illustrates some possible candidate responses to the questions. It is not exclusive and credit should be given for alternative appropriate responses.*

<i>Assessment objective</i>	<i>Generic requirements</i>
Knowledge and understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accurate, relevant and detailed knowledge of content is demonstrated.</li> <li>• The information is presented in a structured manner</li> </ul>
Critical analysis and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of texts, arguments and positions is shown, and/or</li> <li>• Evaluation is balanced, based on aspects already discussed and is relevant to the question being asked.</li> </ul>

<i>Question No.6</i>	<i>Section 3</i>	<i>Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE</i>	
(a)	<p><b>Q</b></p> <p>Read the Extract below then answer all parts of the question.</p> <p><b>Extract:</b></p> <p>“...all our ideas or more feeble perceptions are copies of our impressions or more lively ones. To prove this, the two following arguments will, I hope, be sufficient.”</p> <p align="right"><b><i>Hume—Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding: Section II</i></b></p> <p>What does Hume mean by impressions and ideas?</p>		
	<p><b>MI</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The thought of man/the contents of the human mind as perceptions.</li> <li>• Impressions and ideas as the two categories of perceptions.</li> <li>• Impression: A term invented by Hume to refer to any direct perception of the mind. A perception that involves actually hearing, feeling or the experience of an emotion, etc., rather than just thinking about these things.</li> <li>• Idea: A copy of an impression. A perception of the mind that is weaker and less vivid than an impression.</li> <li>• simple and complex ideas.</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	

(b)	<p><b>Q</b></p> <p><b>MI</b></p>	<p>Critically examine the “two arguments” which Hume uses to justify his claim that all human thoughts come from “the senses and experience”.</p> <p>Knowledge and understanding may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hume’s 1st argument is <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Inductive argument</li> <li>– based on premise that “complex” ideas are compounds of “simple” ideas</li> <li>– example of God</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Hume’s 2nd argument is <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– those who have not experienced a particular sensation cannot form the corresponding idea.</li> <li>– Examples of the blind or those who have not tasted wine.</li> <li>– Examples of gentle person and selfish person.</li> <li>– Example of non-human beings having senses of which we can have no conception.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Analysis and evaluation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• both arguments based on classically empiricist assumptions</li> <li>• accurate explanation of the stages of reasoning on which each argument is based</li> <li>• comment on the premises on which the arguments are based</li> <li>• first argument builds on his previous examples of the golden mountain and the virtuous horse.</li> <li>• first argument formulated as a challenge rather than as a proof.</li> <li>• In the second argument the example of wine is problematic as perhaps it can be formed as a complex idea.</li> <li>• In the second argument Hume admits that it might not be possible to find an appropriate example of someone who has never felt a particular emotion.</li> <li>• The examples in the second argument do not show that all ideas are based on impressions only that ideas of any inward or outward sense are based on the corresponding impression.</li> <li>• Examples of possible ideas not based on an impression, e.g. justice; cause and effect; etc.</li> </ul>	4	8
-----	----------------------------------	--	---	---

(c)	<p><b>Q</b></p> <p>Does Hume’s example of the “Missing Shade of Blue” weaken his claim that all perceptions have their origin in “the senses and experience”?</p> <p><b>MI</b></p>	<p>A detailed description of the “Missing Shade of Blue”. Such a description may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• accurate recounting of the example</li> <li>• direct quotations</li> <li>• note that it is counter-example to his assertion that all simple ideas are communicated directly through our senses/need a corresponding impression</li> <li>• dismissed as a singular instance but not refuted or explained away</li> </ul> <p>Discussion may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MSB does seem to suggest that simple ideas (colour being an example he has already cited) can arise without impressions</li> <li>• Hume’s “copy principle” as fundamental aspect of his empiricism therefore missing shade of blue should not have been so quickly dismissed.</li> <li>• many related simple ideas could be arranged in order and a “missing” idea be inferred from those present in the series .</li> <li>• Discussion as to whether the MSB is a “singular” counter-example and, if so, in what sense.</li> <li>• if Hume is wrong re:origin of ideas then much of his other philosophical conclusions remain unestablished</li> </ul> <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it may be ideas argued that Hume was wrong to suggest that someone can form an idea of the MSB and that it only seems to be the case because we have all already been exposed to the full range of shades.</li> <li>• it may be suggested/argued that the MSB might be a complex idea.</li> <li>• it may be suggested that because the subject’s perception of the missing shade of blue is a non-verifiable mental event it cannot be established that the subject does have an idea of this missing shade.</li> <li>• it may be argued that the MSB is indeed a rare counter-example that does not invalidate a claim about the way ideas are normally formed.</li> </ul>	8	6
		<b>Total</b>	<b>16 KU</b>	<b>14 AE</b>

### Section 4: Moral Philosophy

#### Specific Marking Information

*Allocation of marks: Knowledge and Understanding – Approximately 50% of total marks available*

*Critical Analysis and Evaluation – Approximately 50% of total marks available*

*The marking information below illustrates some possible candidate responses to the questions. It is not exclusive and credit should be given for alternative appropriate responses.*

<i>Assessment objective</i>	<i>Generic requirements</i>
Knowledge and understanding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accurate, relevant and detailed knowledge of content is demonstrated.</li> <li>• The information is presented in a structured manner</li> </ul>
Critical analysis and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis of texts, arguments and positions is shown, and/or</li> <li>• Evaluation is balanced, based on aspects already discussed and is relevant to the question being asked.</li> </ul>

<i>Question No.7</i>	<i>Section 4</i>	<i>Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE</i>	
<b>Q</b>	<p>Read the short case study (The Soldiers' Dilemma) then answer the question that follows.</p> <p><b>The Soldiers' Dilemma:</b></p> <p>During the war a group of soldiers entered a small village while they were searching for an enemy commander. A spy had told them that the commander's daughter lived in the village and knew where her father was hiding. The soldiers found the girl, who was 12 years old, but she refused to give them any information. They soon realised that they would only get the information from the girl if they tortured her.</p> <p>None of the soldiers could agree what to do next. Should they torture the girl to get valuable information which might save their own and other lives? Or was torturing a 12 year old girl so wrong that they shouldn't even discuss it as a possibility?</p> <p>Critically examine possible Utilitarian responses to this dilemma</p>		
<b>MI</b>	<p>Knowledge and understanding, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Description of Utilitarianism as consequentialist</li> <li>• Reference to writings of Bentham and Mill</li> <li>• The Greatest Happiness Principle</li> <li>• Hedonic calculus and its application to this scenario</li> <li>• Act Utilitarianism: an action is right if it maximizes happiness.</li> <li>• Rule Utilitarianism: an action is right if it conforms to a rule that maximizes happiness.</li> </ul>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A candidate may make reference to wider moral issues/scenarios to illustrate points or aid description.</li> </ul> <p>Critical analysis and evaluation, eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different utilitarians who are using the same moral principle may come to different conclusions depending on their analyses of the probable consequences.</li> <li>• The difficulty of predicting consequences.</li> <li>• Consideration of whether an action is right because of the actual consequences, the reasonably foreseeable consequences or the intended consequences.</li> <li>• Discussion of the extent to which Rule Utilitarianism successfully avoids some of the problems of Act Utilitarianism.</li> <li>• Awareness that a moral theory is not necessarily the correct theory just because it leads to the preferred outcome in a particular situation.</li> </ul> <p>In marking this question reference should be made to 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>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

Question No8		Section 4	Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE	
(a)	<p><b>Q</b></p> <p>What does Kant mean by ‘maxim’?</p> <p><b>MI</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Underlying principle of your action, e.g. if you are about to steal something then your maxim maybe ‘take what you want’ and if you are about to help someone in need then it might be ‘help the needy’.</li> </ul> <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If it is supposed that your action is in obedience to a rule then that rule, good or bad, is the maxim of your action.</li> </ul> <p>N.B. simply saying that they are rules that you follow is not sufficient to distinguish the maxim of your action from more typical rules and should not be credited.</p>		2	
(b)	<p><b>Q</b></p> <p>What approach does Kant use to decide which Maxims should guide our actions?</p> <p><b>MI</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The categorical imperative.</li> <li>• Universalizing the maxim.</li> <li>• Passes the ‘contradiction in thinking’ test.</li> <li>• Passes the ‘contradiction in the will’ test.</li> </ul>		4	
(c)	<p><b>Q</b></p> <p>Give two possible criticisms of this approach.</p> <p><b>MI</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not always possible to identify the principle that someone else is acting on.</li> <li>• One action may have more than one possible principle one of which can be universalized and the other not.</li> <li>• The approach may lead to a conflict of duties</li> <li>• Fails to give due weight to reasonably foreseeable consequences.</li> </ul> <p>For each criticism one mark for a simple statement and an additional mark for an appropriate expansion.</p>			4
		<b>Total</b>	<b>6 KU</b>	<b>4 AE</b>