

## C268/SQP360

---

Philosophy  
Intermediate 2

NATIONAL  
QUALIFICATIONS

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

# Course Assessment Specification

## Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

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 **60**
- has a time allocation of **2 hours**
- has a mark allocation of approximately **60 % Knowledge and Understanding and 40% critical analysis and evaluation**
- uses language appropriate to the reading range expected of Intermediate 2 candidates in any case study or stimulus.

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

#### **Section 1 – total marks 10**

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “*Critical Thinking in Philosophy*” (Int 2).
- It has **one** structured question with **3-6** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **1-5** 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 10**

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “*Metaphysics*” (Int 2).
- 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 **1-10** 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.

### **Section 3 – total marks 20**

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “*Epistemology*” (Int 2).
- 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 5*

- This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section One of the Epistemology Unit.
- It has **one** question with **1-3** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **1-5** and requires a restricted response.
- Candidates must answer this question.

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

#### *Part two – total marks 15*

- 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 **2-5** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **1-10** 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.

### **Section 4 – total marks 20**

- This section examines the content of the Unit “*Moral Philosophy*” (Int 2).
- It has **one** structured question with 1 – 6 related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of 1- 20 and requires either a restricted or extended response.
- It may contain a short case study or stimulus.

**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 **60% KU** and **40% 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	10
Section 2: Metaphysics	10
Section 3: Epistemology	20
Section 4: Moral Philosophy	20
<b>Total Marks</b>	<b>60</b>

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 (Intermediate 2) 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	51-60
A	2	42-50
B	3	39-41
B	4	36-38
C	5	33-35
C	6	30-32
D	7	27-29
NA	8	24-26
NA	9	0-23

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 39/60 marks.
- 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 4** rather than band 3.



**[C268/SQP360]**

---

Philosophy  
Intermediate 2  
Specimen Question Paper  
for use in and after 2010

Time: 2 hours

NATIONAL  
QUALIFICATIONS

**You should answer**

- Section 1 – all parts of Question 1
- Section 2 – **Either** all parts of Question 2  
**OR** all parts of Question 3
- Section 3 – all parts of Question 4 and  
**Either** all parts of Question 5  
**OR** all parts of Question 6
- Section 4 – all parts of Question 7

**Candidates must answer all questions in this Section.**

1. (a) The following list contains both arguments and statements. Write down the **three** numbers that identify the **arguments**.

- (1) Either he slept in or his train was late.
- (2) You should not have let the monkeys out.
- (3) Birds have wings and most of them can fly.
- (4) I know Maths and English are the two most important subjects in school because my mum told me so.
- (5) I would never eat a cheeseburger because it is so unhealthy.
- (6) If you turn left you will find the cinema and if you take the second right you will find the leisure centre.
- (7) Today is Saturday and the sun is shining outside.
- (8) The computer will not work because there is no power and without power the computer won't work.

**3**

(b) Read the following argument.

**I don't like Mondays. After all, I always find it hard to get up in the mornings and I have Philosophy first thing.**

- (i) State the **two** premises in this argument.
- (ii) State the conclusion of this argument.

**3**

(c) Give an example of a false dilemma and explain why your example is an unreliable form of reasoning.

**3**

**1**

**Total (10)**

Candidates must answer

either all parts of Question 2: Debate 1—Is there a rational basis for belief in God?

or all parts of Question 3: Debate 2—Do we have free will?

## 2. God

*“There seems to be order and purpose in the universe. This requires an explanation.”*

- (a) Give **one** example of what seems to be order and purpose in the universe. 2
- (b) Give **two** objections to the claim that God has designed the universe. 4
- (c) Do you find the Design Argument convincing? Give reasons for your answer. 4

**Total (10)**

## 3. Free will

- (a) *“Free will is an illusion.”*

State one reason that philosophers give to support this claim. 2

- (b) Give **two** objections to the claim that free will is an illusion. 4
- (c) Do you think free will and determinism are compatible? Explain your answer. 4

**Total (10)**

Candidates must answer both parts of Question 4 and either Question 5-Descartes or Question 6-Hume

**Part 1**

**4. Epistemology**

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| (a) Describe the tripartite theory of knowledge.                     | 2 |  |
| (b) What problems are there with the tripartite theory of knowledge? | 3 |  |

**Total (5)**

**Part 2**

**Either**

**5. Descartes**

*“To be sure, it is not astonishing that in creating me, God should have endowed me with this idea, so that it would be like the mark of the craftsman impressed upon his work . . .”*

This argument is sometimes known as “The Trademark Argument”.

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| (a) Describe the Trademark argument.                        | 6 |   |
| (b) Why is God important in Descartes’ <i>Meditations</i> ? | 4 | 5 |

**Total (15)**

**Or**

**6. Hume**

*“All the objects of human reason or enquiry may naturally be divided into two kinds, to wit, Relations of Ideas, and Matters of Fact.”*

This argument is sometimes known as “The Trademark Argument”.

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| (a) What are the differences between “ <i>Relations of Ideas</i> ” and “ <i>Matters of Fact</i> ”? Give examples to support your answer. | 6 |   |
| (b) What are the strengths and weaknesses of Hume’s empiricism?  | 4 | 5 |

**Total (15)**

**Section 4 – Moral Philosophy**

*KU AE*

Candidates must answer **all** questions in this Section.

**7. Normative Ethics**

(a) *“You should never go through a red light when driving.”*

In what ways would Act and Rule Utilitarians respond to this advice? **12** **4**

(b) Which of these responses do you think is best? Give reasons for your answer. **4**

**Total (20)**

*[END OF SPECIMEN QUESTION PAPER]*



**[C268/SQP360]**

---

Philosophy  
Intermediate 2  
Specimen Marking Instructions  
for use in and after 2010

NATIONAL  
QUALIFICATIONS

## **General guidelines for all Sections**

**With regard to the following marking guidelines please note that:**

- **The language used in these guidelines is not necessarily indicative of the language to be expected in the candidates' responses.**
- **When a candidate is asked for objections to an argument it is expected that the proffered objections will have some philosophical merit.**
- **When candidates are asked for their views and opinions on a philosophical position a wider range of possible answers will be acceptable, eg a candidate may make some reference to personal experience for their views on the existence of God.**
- **It is accepted that there may well be overlap between a student's stated opinion on an argument or philosophical position and their earlier explanation or criticism of that argument or position.**

### Specific Marking Information

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 60% KU – 40% AE	
	<p><b>Section 1—total marks 10</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “Critical Thinking in Philosophy (Int 2)”.</li> <li>• It has <b>one</b> structured question with <b>3–6</b> related parts</li> <li>• Each related part has a possible mark range of <b>1–5</b> and requires either a short-answer or restricted response</li> <li>• Candidates answer <b>all</b> related parts of this question</li> </ul> <p><b>There is no choice in Section 1 of the Question Paper.</b></p>		
1. (a)	<p><b>The following list contains both arguments and statements. Write down the three numbers that identify the arguments.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) <b>Either he slept in or his train was late.</b></li> <li>(2) <b>You should not have let the monkeys out.</b></li> <li>(3) <b>Birds have wings and most of them can fly.</b></li> <li>(4) <b>I know Maths and English are the two most important subjects in school because my mum told me so.</b></li> <li>(5) <b>I would never eat a cheeseburger because it is so unhealthy.</b></li> <li>(6) <b>If you turn left you will find the cinema and if you take the second right you will find the leisure centre.</b></li> <li>(7) <b>Today is Saturday and the sun is shining outside.</b></li> <li>(8) <b>The computer will not work because there is no power and without power the computer won’t work.</b></li> </ol>	<b>3</b>	
MI	1 mark each for 4, 5, 8		
(b)	<p><b>Read the following argument.</b>  <b>I don’t like Mondays. After all, I always find it hard to get up in the mornings and I have Philosophy first thing.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) <b>State the two premises in this argument.</b></li> <li>(ii) <b>State the conclusion of this argument.</b></li> </ol>		<b>3</b>
MI	1 mark for each of: Premise 1 - I always find it hard to get up in the mornings Premise 2 - I have Philosophy first thing Conclusion - I don’t like Mondays		

<p>(c)</p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>Give an example of a false dilemma and explain why your example is an unreliable form of reasoning.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any appropriate example e.g. “either you support Celtic or you support Rangers and since you don’t support Rangers you must support Celtic”.</li> <li>• A maximum of 3 marks for the explanation. The explanation should explain or state that a false dilemma wrongly suggests that only two options are possible when there may be more. This means that while false dilemmas may be valid they will be unsound because they have a false premise. Reference should be made to example given: there are more teams to support than just Celtic and Rangers.</li> </ul>	<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>1</b></p>
<b>Totals</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 60% KU – 40% AE	
	<p><b>Section 2—total marks 10</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “Metaphysics” (Int 2)</li> <li>• It has <b>two</b> structured questions, each with <b>1–5</b> related parts</li> <li>• Each structured question samples across the mandatory content of <b>one</b> of the options in this Unit and may contain a stimulus</li> <li>• Each related part has a possible mark range of <b>1-10</b> and requires either a restricted or extended response</li> </ul> <p>Candidates answer <b>all</b> parts of the <b>one</b> structured question which relates to the option they have studied.</p>		
<p><b>2.</b></p> <p><b>(a)</b></p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>God</b></p> <p><i>“There seems to be order and purpose in the universe. This requires an explanation.”</i></p> <p><b>Give one example of what seems to be order and purpose in the universe.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any appropriate example, eg the eye.</li> </ul>	<p><b>2</b></p>	
<p><b>(b)</b></p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>Give two objections to the claim that God has designed the universe.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative sources of apparent design, eg evolution,</li> <li>• Examples of apparently poor design, eg human air pipe is beside our throat; cancer cells; genetic illness; Dawkins’ “botched jobs”.</li> <li>• Equally supports design by committee or an apprentice god.</li> <li>• Possible weakness of analogical arguments.</li> <li>• Reference could be made to the problem of evil (particularly natural evil such as earthquakes)</li> </ul>	<p><b>4</b></p>	
<p><b>(c)</b></p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>Do you find the Design Argument convincing? Give reasons for your answer.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The answer should show that the candidate can support their opinion with two appropriate reasons.</li> </ul>		<p><b>4</b></p>
	<p><b>Totals</b></p>	<p><b>6</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p>

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 60% KU – 40% AE	
	<p><b>Section 2—total marks 10</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “Metaphysics” (Int 2)</li> <li>• It has <b>two</b> structured questions, each with <b>1-5</b> related parts</li> <li>• Each structured question samples across the mandatory content of <b>one</b> of the options in this Unit and may contain a stimulus</li> <li>• Each related part has a possible mark range of <b>1-10</b> and requires either a restricted or extended response</li> </ul> <p>Candidates answer <b>all</b> parts of the <b>one</b> structured question which relates to the option they have studied.</p>		
<p><b>3.</b></p> <p><b>(a)</b></p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>Free will</b> <i>“Free will is an illusion.”</i></p> <p><b>State one reason that philosophers give to support this claim.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any appropriate reason, eg all explicable events are explained by reference to prior causes.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	
<p><b>(b)</b></p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>Give two objections to the claim that free will is an illusion.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overwhelming psychological feeling of being free to choose.</li> <li>• Moral responsibility requires free will.</li> <li>• Moral language and social interactions generally assume the existence of libertarian free will.</li> <li>• Free will is compatible with determinism.</li> <li>• Retributive punishment is predicated on free will</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	
<p><b>(c)</b></p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>Do you think free will and determinism are compatible? Explain your answer.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the question gives the opportunity for the candidate to discuss compatibilism this is not a requirement and the candidate should be given credit for any reasons that are appropriate to the opinion they have stated. Candidates could argue for incompatibilism: that either determinism or libertarianism is true or they could argue for a compatibilist position (eg that we can preserve a meaningful sense in which we are free) or they could give arguments against compatibilism (eg we are constrained by our desires).</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 60% KU – 40% AE	
	<p><b>Section 3—total marks 20</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “Epistemology” (Int 2)</li> <li>• It has <b>two</b> parts</li> <li>• Candidates answer <b>one</b> structured question in <b>both parts</b> of this section.</li> </ul> <p>The nature of each question is outlined below:</p> <p>Part one—total marks 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section One of the Epistemology Unit</li> <li>• It has <b>one</b> question with <b>1–3</b> related parts</li> <li>• Each related part has a possible mark range of <b>1–5</b> and requires a restricted response</li> <li>• Candidates must answer this question</li> </ul> <p><b>There is no choice of question in Part one of Section 3.</b></p>		
<p><b>4.</b></p> <p><i>(a)</i></p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>Epistemology</b></p> <p><b>Describe the tri-partite theory of knowledge.</b></p> <p>The view that for a proposition to count as knowledge it must be justified, true and believed. If any of these three components are missing then it is not knowledge.</p>	<p><b>2</b></p>	
<p><i>(b)</i></p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>What problems are there with the tripartite theory of knowledge?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts at justification can lead to infinite regress.</li> <li>• Scepticism disputes the possibility of certain knowledge.</li> <li>• Empiricist attempts at justification are hampered by the unreliability of sense experience.</li> <li>• Rationalist attempts at justification are hampered by the questions regarding the nature and origin of innate ideas.</li> <li>• All three conditions can be met without guaranteeing a knowledge claim (e.g. the broken watch which happens to be at the correct time when you look at it so causing you to have a justified true belief that isn’t knowledge)</li> </ul>		<p><b>3</b></p>
	<p><b>Totals</b></p>	<p><b>2</b></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 60% KU – 40% AE	
	<p>Part two—total marks 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section Two of the Epistemology Unit</li> <li>• It has <b>two</b> structured questions, each of which samples across the mandatory content of <b>one</b> of the options in this Unit</li> <li>• Each structured question contains an extract from the relevant prescribed text and has <b>2–5</b> related parts</li> <li>• Each related part has a possible mark range of <b>1–10</b> and requires either a restricted or extended response</li> <li>• Candidates answer <b>all</b> related parts of the <b>one</b> structured question which examines the option they have studied.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>5.</b></p> <p><i>“To be sure, it is not astonishing that in creating me, God should have endowed me with this idea, so that it would be like the mark of the craftsman impressed upon his work . . .”</i></p> <p><b>This argument is sometimes known as “The Trademark Argument”.</b></p> <p><b>(a)</b></p> <p><b>Describe the Trademark argument</b></p> <p>MI</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I have an idea of God</li> <li>• This idea must have a cause.</li> <li>• The cause must contain as much reality as its effect.</li> <li>• Therefore, the cause of my idea of God must contain at least as much reality as my idea of God.</li> <li>• The idea of God contains perfection.</li> <li>• Nothing that is not God contains perfection</li> <li>• Therefore, the cause of my idea of God is God</li> <li>• Thus God Exists</li> </ul>	<p><b>6</b></p>	

<p><b>(b)</b></p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>Why is God important in Descartes' <i>Meditations</i>?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To progress beyond the cogito which would otherwise be a dead end</li> <li>• Explanation of clear and distinct perceptions.</li> <li>• Appropriate examples of clear and distinct perceptions</li> <li>• Explanation of the clear and distinct rule.</li> <li>• God guarantees the reliability of the clear and distinct rule.</li> <li>• A benevolent God wouldn't systematically deceive us in the manner of the demon</li> <li>• To progress beyond the cogito.</li> <li>• Explanation of clear and distinct perception.</li> <li>• Appropriate example</li> <li>• explanation of the clear and distinct rule</li> <li>• God guarantees the reliability of the clear and distinct rule</li> </ul>	<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>5</b></p>
	<p>Totals</p>	<p><b>10</b></p>	<p><b>5</b></p>

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 60% KU – 40% AE	
	<p>Part two—total marks 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section Two of the Epistemology Unit</li> <li>• It has <b>two</b> structured questions, each of which samples across the mandatory content of <b>one</b> of the options in this Unit</li> <li>• Each structured question contains an extract from the relevant prescribed text and has <b>2–5</b> related parts</li> <li>• Each related part has a possible mark range of <b>1–10</b> and requires either a restricted or extended response</li> <li>• Candidates answer <b>all</b> related parts of the <b>one</b> structured question which examines the option they have studied.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>6.</b></p> <p>(a)</p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>Hume</b></p> <p><i>“All the objects of human reason or enquiry may naturally be divided into two kinds, to wit, Relations of Ideas, and Matters of Fact.”</i></p> <p><b>What are the differences between “Relations of Ideas” and “Matters of Fact”? Give examples to support your answer.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relations of Ideas—a priori, necessary and analytic.</li> <li>• Matters of Fact—a posteriori, contingent and synthetic.</li> <li>• Relations of Ideas cannot be denied without contradiction, but Matters of Fact can.</li> <li>• Appropriate examples, eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relations of Ideas – “<math>3 \times 5 = \frac{1}{2} \times 30</math>”</li> <li>• Matters of Fact – “My hair is brown”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>6</b>	
<p>(b)</p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>What are the strengths and weaknesses of Hume’s empiricism?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengths might include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• gives a convincing account of most human knowledge.</li> <li>• dispenses with philosophically problematic concepts.</li> <li>• provide a basis for modern science.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Weaknesses might include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• some impressions are faint and some ideas are vivid.</li> <li>• some ideas don’t appear to have a prior impression, eg ultraviolet.</li> <li>• Hume is inconsistent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• description of the missing shade of blue.</li> <li>• explanation of why the missing shade of blue is a problem.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 60% KU – 40% AE	
	<p><b>Section 4–total marks 20</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This section examines the content of the Unit “Moral Philosophy” (Int 2)</li> <li>• It has one essay question which may be divided into <b>two</b> related parts</li> <li>• It may contain a short case study or stimulus</li> <li>• The question requires an extended response</li> </ul> <p><b>There is no choice of questions in Section 4 of the Question Paper.</b></p>		
<p><b>7.</b></p> <p><b>(a)</b></p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>Normative Ethics</b></p> <p><i>“You should never go through a red light when driving”</i></p> <p><b>In what ways would Act and Rule Utilitarians respond to this advice?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear definition of Utilitarianism.</li> <li>• Consequentialism theory</li> <li>• Hedonism</li> <li>• Equity</li> <li>• Greatest Happiness Principle</li> <li>• Appropriate reference to sources eg Bentham, Mill</li> <li>• etc</li> <li>• Calculation of pleasure: Felicific calculus/Higher and Lower Pleasures</li> <li>• Clear statement that AU determines that the rightness of an action depends on the consequences of the individual action.</li> <li>• RU determines the rightness of an action depending on whether the action conforms to a rule that maximises happiness.</li> <li>• Appropriate examples.</li> <li>• Discussion of possible applications of these theories to the issue: AU might go through a red light if the circumstances merited it; RU might stick to the rule if they thought it generally promoted happiness when strictly observed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>12</b></p>	<p><b>4</b></p>

(b)  MI	<p><b>Which of these responses do you think is best? Give reasons for your answer.</b></p> <p>Act Utilitarianism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Might not be possible to calculate on every occasion</li> <li>• Might justify evil deeds on particular occasions.</li> <li>• Less rigid approach to moral dilemmas.</li> </ul> <p>Rule Utilitarianism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefits of rules might be very long term and difficult to assess.</li> <li>• Rules might conflict or some situations may not have a relevant pre-existing rule.</li> <li>• Avoids constant recalculation on every occasion.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>

[END OF SPECIMEN MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]