

C237/SQP301

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 **4 – 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 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
- It assesses only knowledge and understanding
- Candidates answer **all** related parts of this question

There is no choice of question in Part 1 of Section 3.

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 may contain 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. 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** 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

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.

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:

- answering questions in which the more complex skills of critical analysis and evaluation attract a higher proportion of the marks available than is the case in Unit assessment
- 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). In the Unit assessment this balance is **60% KU** and **40% AE**; in the Course assessment the balance is **50% KU** and **50% AE**.

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
Total Marks	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.

[C237/SQP301]

Philosophy
Higher

Time: 2 hours 40 mins

Specimen Question Paper
for use in and after 2006

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

SECTION 1

Marks Code

Critical Thinking in Philosophy

Question 1

(You should answer all parts, (a–e), of this question).

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|------------|
| (a) Describe the difference between a statement and an argument. | 2 | KU |
| (b) What is inductive reasoning? | 2 | KU |
| (c) Explain what is meant by a valid argument. You should include an example to illustrate your answer. | 4 | 2KU
2AE |
| (d) Consider the following argument:

<i>Global warming is a serious threat to the human race, so we must stop burning fossil fuels. And I know Global warming is a serious threat to the human race because my French teacher told me so.</i>

Now re-write this argument making sure that you clearly show its premises, including any hidden premises, conclusion and stages of reasoning. | 6 | 2KU
4AE |
| (e) Evaluate the argument above.

In your answer you must: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• fully explain any examples of fallacious reasoning• explain whether the argument is valid or invalid | 6 | AE |

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

Statement

When examining the question of the existence of God, the only rational position to adopt is that of agnosticism. All other positions either ignore or over-emphasise the available evidence.

- (a) What is agnosticism? **4 KU**
- (b) *Many philosophers have claimed that belief in God can be rationally justified.*
What evidence have philosophers provided in support of this claim? **6 KU**
- (c) Is agnosticism “*the only rational position to adopt*” in light of the available evidence? You must discuss **two** possible philosophical responses when answering this question. **10 AE**

Section 2 – Metaphysics (continued)

Marks Code

Or

Question 3

(You should answer this question if you have studied the debate “Do we have free will?” If not go to Question 4.)

You should answer both parts of this question (*a and b*).

- (a) *Many philosophers have suggested that morality requires human freedom of the will.*

Describe the moral argument in support of free will.

5 KU

- (b) Is the moral argument in support of free will convincing? You must discuss **two** possible philosophical responses when answering this question.

**15 5KU
10AE**

Section 3 – Epistemology

Marks Code

Question 4

(You should answer all parts of this question.)

- | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---|----|
| (a) Describe the tripartite theory of knowledge. | 3 | KU |
| (b) Why might it be difficult to justify any knowledge claim? | 3 | KU |
| (c) What are the key features of a rationalist theory of knowledge? | 4 | KU |

Either

Question 5

(You should answer this question if you have studied **Descartes' Rationalism** in the Epistemology Unit. If not go to Question 6.)

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

Extract

“. . . there is a fact that I am here, seated by the fire, attired in a dressing gown, having this paper in my hand and other similar matters. And how could I deny that these hands and this body are mine, were it not perhaps that I compare myself to certain persons, devoid of sense, whose cerebella are so troubled . . . that they think they are kings when they are really poor . . . But they are mad, and I should not be any less insane were I to follow examples so extravagant.”

Descartes – Meditations on First Philosophy: Meditation 1

- (a) *By the end of this section in Meditation 1, Descartes concludes that he can doubt that he is “seated by the fire” by using an argument known as the Dream argument.*

Describe Descartes' Dream argument.

4 KU

- (b) What other doubts does Descartes raise in Meditation I?

6 KU

- (c) Explain why, by the end of Meditation III, Descartes believes that he can trust his clear and distinct perceptions.

**1 KU
7 AE**

- (d) *During Meditation VI Descartes tries to resolve the doubts he originally raised in the Dream argument.*

Is Descartes successful in his attempt to resolve these doubts?

12 AE

Or

Question 6

(You should answer this question if you have studied **Hume’s Empiricism** in the Epistemology Unit. If not go to Question 7.)

You should answer all parts of this question (**a–c**).

- (a) What does Hume mean by impressions and ideas?

**6 4KU
2AE**

Extract:

But though our thought seems to possess . . . unbounded liberty, we shall find, upon a nearer examination, that it is really confined within very narrow limits, and all this creative power of the mind amounts to no more than compounding, transposing, augmenting or diminishing the materials afforded us by the senses and experience . . .

To prove this, the two following arguments will, I hope, be sufficient.”

*Hume—Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding:
Section II*

- (b) Analyse the “two arguments” which Hume uses to justify his claim that all human thoughts come from “the senses and experience”.
- (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”?

**10 2KU
8AE**

**14 4KU
10AE**

Section 4 – Moral Philosophy

Marks Code

Answer **both** questions – Question 7 **and** Question 8 (**a and b**) in this section of the Paper.

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?

Question 7

Compare and contrast possible Utilitarian and Kantian responses to this Dilemma.

**30 15KU
15AE**

You should include all of the following as part of your discussion:

- A brief general description of Utilitarian moral principles
- A brief general description of Kantian moral principles
- A discussion of how these different moral principles might be applied to the soldiers' dilemma
- A discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of Utilitarian and Kantian approaches in relation to this dilemma
- A conclusion about the relative merits of each approach in relation to this dilemma

Question 8

(a) Describe the key features of emotivism.

4 KU

(b) What do you think are the strongest objections to the position of emotivism?

6 AE

[END OF SPECIMEN QUESTION PAPER]

[C237/SQP301]

Philosophy
Higher
Specimen Marking Instructions
for use in and after 2006

NATIONAL
QUALIFICATIONS

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

<i>Question No.1</i>	<i>Section 1</i>	<i>Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE</i>	
(a)	<p>Q</p> <p>MI</p> <p>Describe the difference between a statement and an argument.</p> <p>Any accurate description which may include, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statements simply make/state a point, arguments are used to try to prove/establish a point • Statements can form part of an argument but are not in themselves arguments • An example of a statement and a short argument may be given to illustrate the description 	2	
(b)	<p>What is inductive reasoning?</p> <p>Any relevant answer which may include, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inductive reasoning involves drawing general conclusions based on observation of a specific number of cases • it is the most common form of everyday reasoning • the number of cases observed may be comparatively small or very large • may contain a contrast with deductive reasoning • may briefly describe/refer to the problem of induction • may include examples to illustrate description 	2	

(c)	<p>Explain what is meant by a valid argument. You should include an example to illustrate your answer.</p> <p>Any relevant answer which may include, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an argument in which the conclusion must be true if all the premises are true because each premise leads logically to the conclusion • an example of a valid and/or invalid argument to illustrate • a contrast with a sound argument 	2	2
(d)	<p>Now re-write this argument making sure that you clearly show its premises, including any hidden premises, conclusion and stages of reasoning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Correctly identifying premises and conclusions • Presenting the argument in a structured manner – including any hidden premises <p>eg</p> <p>Premise: My French teacher told me that global warming is a serious threat to the human race.</p> <p>Hidden premise: My French teacher is a reliable source of information on global warming.</p> <p>Sub-conclusion: Global warming is a serious threat to the human race.</p> <p>Hidden premise: Burning fossil fuels causes global warming.</p> <p>Hidden premise: We must stop doing anything that causes global warming.</p> <p>Conclusion: We must stop burning fossil fuels.</p>	2	4
(e)	<p>Evaluate the argument above.</p> <p>Evaluation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of any fallacy identified • Discussion of whether or not the argument is valid or invalid • Discussion of individual premises and their underlying assumptions 		6

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.

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

<i>Question No.2</i>	<i>Section 2</i>	<i>Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE</i>	
(a)	<p>Q What is agnosticism?</p> <p>MI Any relevant description which may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agnosticism as the position that the question of whether or not God exists cannot be answered • evidence and arguments cited in support of God's existence are held to be unconvincing/inconclusive • evidence and arguments cited in denial of God's existence are also held to be inconclusive • illustrative examples may be given • may refer to/quote from the writings of agnostics, eg Russell, Huxley or other humanist philosophers 	4	
(b)	<p>Q <i>Many philosophers have claimed that belief in God can be rationally justified.</i> What evidence have philosophers provided in support of this claim?</p> <p>MI A wide variety of possible evidence may be included in the answer, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the fact that the Universe exists at all may be cited as evidence used by philosophers • examples of apparent order and purpose in the universe may be cited as evidence used by philosophers • the fact that human beings experience a sense of morality may be cited as evidence used by philosophers • may cite specific philosophers (eg Plato, Al-Kindi, Maimonides, Aquinas) and the evidence they refer to. 		

		Candidates can be given full marks for giving a detailed answer based on only 2 different types of evidence but should be allocated no marks for simply stating, eg design, cause/purpose, existence of morality.	6	
(c)	Q	Is agnosticism “ <i>the only rational position to adopt</i> ” in light of the available evidence? You must discuss two possible philosophical responses when answering this question.		
	MI	An answer which discusses only one possible philosophical response may be given a maximum of 6 marks. Points in agreement with statement may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rational arguments advanced in support of the existence of God as at best inconclusive • alternative explanations for, eg the existence of the universe, apparent order and purpose and/or human sense of morality may be referred to • evidence/argument/s advanced to refute the claim that God exists (eg denial of causation, problem of evil) may be judged equally as inconclusive • specific points advanced by, eg Huxley, Russell, may be referred to/quoted Points in disagreement with the statement may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • although individual “arguments” or pieces of “evidence” may be inconclusive, taken together they are cumulatively more convincing • the existence of evil and suffering is incompatible with the existence of a loving God therefore atheism is a more rational position • a specific argument or arguments may be cited and a claim that it/they provide convincing evidence may be justified by candidate • the claim that a more rational response would be to “act” as though God did exist (Pascal’s Wager) may be justified by candidate 		
		Total	10 KU	10 AE

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.

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

<i>Question No.3</i>	<i>Section 2</i>		<i>Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE</i>	
(a)	Q	<p><i>Many philosophers have suggested that morality requires human freedom of the will.</i></p> <p>Describe the moral argument in support of free will.</p>		
	MI	<p>Any relevant description which may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the innate human sense of moral accountability as the basis of the argument • human beings regarded as worthy of praise or blame in relation to their moral actions • moral accountability, praise and blame only make sense if human beings can choose between courses of action • choice implies free will • ideas/quotations of specific philosophers 	5	
(b)	Q	<p>Is the moral argument in support of free will convincing? You must discuss two possible philosophical responses when answering this question.</p>		
	MI	<p>An answer which discusses only one possible philosophical response may be given a maximum of 8 marks.</p> <p>Knowledge and understanding of opposing positions may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • description of hard determinism as alternative position • description of compatibilism/soft determinism as an alternative position • accurate statement of objections to moral arguments in support of free will 		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accurate understanding of replies to objections • quotations/descriptions of the ideas of specific philosophers <p>Analysis and evaluation may include:</p> <p>Points in support of moral basis for asserting free will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • human beings can tell the difference between actions which are coerced/accidental and actions which are freely done • the fact that those who are young, unaware or incapable are exempt from moral accountability implies real freedom to act • free will and determinism as compatible • may include examples/scenarios to illustrate points made <p>Points in disagreement with position:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all events, including mental events, determined by scientific laws • human sense of moral accountability may have no factual basis • feeling/sense of moral freedom as itself “caused” by, eg environment/up-bringing/social convention • determinism and free will as incompatible • may include examples/scenarios to illustrate points made 	5	10
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	-----------

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.

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

<i>Question No.4</i>	<i>Section 3</i>	<i>Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE</i>	
(a)	<p>Q Describe the tripartite theory of knowledge.</p> <p>MI A simple statement of the tripartite theory gains only 1 mark: Description may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge as justified, ie having “evidence” to support /convince • knowledge as true, ie conforming to reality • knowledge as belief, ie conviction/feeling of certainty in its truth 	3	
(b)	<p>Q Why might it be difficult to justify any knowledge claim?</p> <p>MI Answer may include reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • potential problems with information/evidence gathered through the senses • examples illustrating instances of sense-deception • potential lack of usefulness of conclusions reached through reason alone in justifying empirical propositions • examples illustrating propositions which are established as true through reason which are of limited value • reference to specific sceptical arguments/writings/quotations of specific sceptical philosophers 	3	
(c)	<p>Q What are the key features of a rationalist theory of knowledge?</p> <p>MI Key features may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • general lack of conviction about, or rejection of, knowledge gained through sense perception • belief that useful knowledge can be gained through the exercise of the reason alone (a priori) 		

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • acceptance of innate ideas • reference to the ideas and/or writings of rationalist philosophers 	4	
		Total	10-KU	0-AE

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

<i>Question No.5</i>	<i>Section 3</i>		<i>Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE</i>	
(a)	Q	<p><i>By the end of this section in Meditation 1, Descartes concludes that he can doubt that he is “seated by the fire” by using an argument known as the Dream argument. Describe Descartes’ Dream argument.</i></p>		
	MI	<p>Any accurate description, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descartes realises that, eg, he sometimes believes he is sitting by the fire when in fact he is dreaming • this means that his mind has the ability to create images when there is no corresponding physical object • he notes there is no certain test to tell whether an experience/event is happening in reality or in a dream • perhaps all his supposed experiences of the external world are a product of his mind • concludes that he cannot trust any knowledge gained from his sense experiences • believes he can still rely on his knowledge of mathematical truths and relations 	4	
(b)	Q	<p>What other doubts does Descartes raise in Meditation I?</p>		
	MI	<p>Description of his initial mistrust of the sense may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • he notes that at times his senses do deceive him • examples given are small or distant objects • he is searching for certainty therefore rejects five senses as a source of knowledge <p>Description of the evil demon/genius argument may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • after the dream argument, he still believes he can trust knowledge based on mathematical truths • examples given are basic sciences (arithmetic, 		

		<p>geometry) which deal with the most simple and basic facts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Evil Demon raises doubt that extra-mental reality exists • introduces Evil Demon/Genius to avoid relying on what may be an unjustifiable preconception rather than knowledge • believes that Evil Demon/Genius would be capable of deceiving him, even in relation to simple mathematical truths • concludes that he can not be certain of anything at all 	6	
(c)	<p>Q Explain why, by the end of Meditation III, Descartes believes that he can trust his clear and distinct perceptions.</p> <p>MI Knowledge and understanding must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A description of what is meant by clear and distinct perceptions <p>Explanation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reference to the Cogito as his foundational truth, established in Meditation II • “clear and distinct perceptions” as the “mark” of truth established in relation to the Cogito • limits to the usefulness of the knowledge that he exists and is a “thinking thing” • explanation of the trademark argument • trademark argument, he believes, helps him to establish the existence of a perfect God who is therefore not a deceiver 	1		7
(d)	<p>Q <i>During Meditation VI Descartes tries to resolve the doubts he originally raised in the Dream argument. Is Descartes successful in his attempt to resolve these doubts?</i></p> <p>MI Analysis/evaluation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • explanation of Descartes’ reasoning (eg noting the differences between dreams and waking experiences, concluding that there are distinct features which help him distinguish dreams from waking experiences) • can also rely on his knowledge that material reality does exist because God would not systematically deceive him <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • accepting his reasoning here relies on also accepting his reasoning re: God and clear and distinct perceptions • circular reasoning re: trademark argument means he has not established that a non-deceiving God exists therefore has not established that he can trust his clear and distinct perceptions • his solution is still vulnerable to the Evil Demon/Genius because he has failed to establish that he can trust his clear and distinct perceptions 			

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> his position is still vulnerable to the Evil Demon/Genius 		12
		Total	11-KU	19-AE

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

<i>Question No.6</i>	<i>Section 3</i>		<i>Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE</i>	
(a)	Q	What does Hume mean by impressions and ideas?	4	2
	MI	Knowledge and understanding may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the thought of man/the contents of the human mind as perceptions • impressions and ideas as the two categories of perceptions • impressions as that which is immediately present to the sense/conveyed by the five senses • ideas as reflections on/memories of, perceptions • phrases such as “lively/less lively perceptions”, “less forcible” Analysis may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impressions as not simply awareness of physical world through five senses – also refers to emotions, eg anger, cruelty, generosity, friendship • memory/imagination distinction • references in other works helps to clarify(or confuse??) these distinctions 		
(b)	Q	Analyse the “two arguments” which Hume uses to justify his claim that all human thoughts come from “the senses and experience”.	2	
	MI	Knowledge and understanding may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hume’s 1st argument is based on premise that “complex” ideas are compounds of “simple” ideas • Hume’s 2nd argument is that those blind or deaf do not have any sensory or auditory ideas because they have no sensory or auditory perceptions 		

		An answer which discusses only one possible philosophical response may be awarded a maximum of 9 marks		10
		Total	10-KU	20-AE

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"> • Accurate, relevant and detailed knowledge of content is demonstrated. • The information is presented in a structured manner
Critical analysis and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of theories, issues and/or dilemmas, shown, and/or • Evaluation is balanced, based on aspects already discussed and is relevant to the question being asked.

<i>Question No.7</i>	<i>Section 4</i>	<i>Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE</i>	
Q	Compare and contrast possible Utilitarian and Kantian responses to this Dilemma.		
MI	<p>Knowledge and understanding, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • description of Utilitarianism as consequentialist • the Greatest Happiness Principle • developments/expansion, eg hedonic calculus, higher/lower pleasures, Mill’s competent judges, Act/Rule distinction • description of Kantian ethics as deontological • the Good Will and Duty v inclination • Categorical Imperative (both forms) • reference to wider moral issues/scenarios to illustrate points or aid description • reference to writings of Bentham, Mill and Kant • accurate application of Kantian and Utilitarian principles to dilemma, eg both forms of Categorical Imperative would rule-out torture per se; variety of possible Utilitarian responses, eg straightforward hedonic calculus or Act approach v higher and lower pleasures or Rule approach <p>Critical analysis and evaluation, eg:</p> <p>Utilitarianism—Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not a quick “emotional” response but provides objective guidance in this difficult/emotive situation • can take account of both immediate and longer-term consequences (eg that the father might subsequently kill many innocent people/may be following the orders of a cruel government, etc) 	15	

<i>Question No8</i>		<i>Section 4</i>	<i>Approx Marks weightings: 50% KU - 50% AE</i>	
(a)	Q	Describe the key features of emotivism.	4	
	MI	Knowledge and understanding may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meta-ethical theory concerned with the nature of moral statements not the way in which moral judgments are made • denies that moral statements have any factual content • references/quotations/ideas of Ayer, Stevenson • asserts that moral judgments are expressions of emotion or assent (boo/hooray) • not necessarily implying that moral statements have no meaningful function • may contrast with one or more views that moral statements do assert matters of moral fact • may include moral statements on one or more issues to illustrate or reinforce points made 		
(b)	Q	What do you think are the strongest objections to the position of emotivism?		6
	MI	Discussion may include expansion on some/all of the following objections: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • doesn't provide any explanation of why/how moral values or views can arise in the absence of any moral facts • if moral statements are non-factual it becomes impossible to judge between competing moral claims • if moral statements function to stimulate others to act in a certain way, emotivism cannot provide a basis to decide why one person's "feelings" on an issue should be more authoritative than another's • doesn't seem to take account of the complexity of moral debate/language <p>A candidate may conclude that none of the objections are strong and justify this conclusion. This is acceptable.</p>		
		Total	4	6