



2014 Philosophy

Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2014

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

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's NQ Assessment team may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

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

Part One: General Marking Principles for Philosophy Higher

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

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

GENERAL MARKING ADVICE: Philosophy Higher

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

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

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

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

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

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

GRADE DESCRIPTIONS AT A AND C

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

GRADE DESCRIPTIONS AT A AND C (continued)

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

Part Two: Marking Instructions for each Question

SECTION 1 – CRITICAL THINKING IN PHILOSOPHY

Section 1 – Total Marks 20

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

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

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
1	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statements are sentences with a truth value • Commands are neither true nor false so can't be statements. 	2 KU	
1	(b)	<p>1 mark for the explanation; 1 mark for the examples</p> <p>Any accurate distinction plus appropriate examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To assert a claim means that it is merely stated without support but to prove a claim means to back it up with supporting evidence. • Statements can only assert a claim while arguments can prove a claim. • ‘Paris is in Europe’ is an assertion but ‘Paris is in Europe because Paris is in France and France is in Europe’ is an attempt to prove the assertion by means of an argument. 	2 KU	
1	(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only statements can be true or false. • Arguments are said to be valid/strong or sound/cogent. • Arguments are composed of a number of statements each one of which could be true or false. 	2 KU	
1	(d)	<p>Any two appropriate points, eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They often generalise from the particular to the universal. • They often have probable rather than certain conclusions. • They are arguments based on experience. • They are usually described as being cogent rather than valid. 	2 KU	

Question			Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
1	(e)		<p>Any two appropriate points, eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It could have false premises. • It could make a weak inductive inference. • It could have a false conclusion. 	2 KU	
1	(f)	(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paul, is much more likely to have an accident than his sister or his dad. (If candidates include 'who is 19' that will be accepted.) 	1 AE	
1	(f)	(ii)	<p>Candidates may claim it is either and will be awarded two marks if they support their answer with any appropriate reason. Two reasons are not required.</p> <p>Inductive because, eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The conclusion concerns probabilities rather than certainties • The premises are based on empirical studies <p>Deductive because, eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The argument argues from the general (young men) to the particular (Paul) • The conclusion that Paul is likely to have an accident is true if the premises are true 	2 AE	
1	(f)	(iii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a premise • It supplies additional information to support the conclusion. • Any other reasonable claim. (If a candidate claims it plays no role in the argument this must be supported by an appropriate reason.) 	1 AE	
1	(f)	(iv)	<p>Any two appropriate observations, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates may point out that the premises are supported by an empirical study and if true provide strong evidence for the conclusion. • Candidates may question the statistical accuracy. 	2 AE	

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
1	(g)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarifying the structure of the arguments either in words or symbols (2 marks): $P \rightarrow Q, \sim P$, Therefore $\sim Q$ $P \rightarrow Q, Q$, Therefore P An example of each fallacy. (2 marks) <p>Alternative approaches such as noting both arguments start with a conditional and then clarifying the meaning of 'antecedent' and 'consequent' should also be rewarded</p>	4 AE	
			(20)	

SECTION 2 – GOD

Section 2 – total marks 20

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

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
2		<p>Analysis and evaluation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thomas Aquinas thought that the universe must have been caused by something which was in itself uncaused: he called this “the first cause”. <p>P1: In the world of sense we see that there is an order of efficient causes. P2: Something cannot be prior to itself and so nothing can be the efficient cause of itself. P3: In any series of efficient causes, however long, the first cause is cause of the intermediate cause(s) and the intermediate cause is the cause of the ultimate effect. P4: If there is no cause there is no effect. P5: If we assume an infinite series of causes then there will <u>be no first cause and so no intermediate cause and so no ultimate effect.</u></p> <p>C1: Since this is clearly false there cannot be an infinite series of causes. (a reduction ad absurdum argument). C2: Since something cannot be the cause of itself and there cannot be an infinite series of causes there must be a first cause. This we call God. (It is implied but not stated that this first cause is not ‘in the world of sense’).</p>	<p>10 KU 10 AE</p>	

Question	Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
2.	<p>Continued.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A posteriori. • Chain of cause and effect requires an ultimate cause. • Reference to classical statements of the argument, eg - Aristotle (prime mover) - Aquinas (first cause). • Distinction between necessary and contingent existence. • Leibniz: the principle of sufficient reason – since everything requires an explanation, the universe requires an explanation. <p>A candidate should be given credit for appropriate evaluative comments relating to any version of the cosmological argument. With regard to Leibniz’s version a candidate might say:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sufficient Reason Does Not Exist in this World: Leibniz makes a strong case in arguing that the sufficient reason for the whole world cannot come from within this world. All reasons within this world are contingent and it seems reasonable that no contingent reason could suffice for the whole of the world. • God is the “substance”: God is the substance which carries with it the reason for its existence, and which in consequence is necessary and eternal. By stating that God is special and unique, Leibniz establishes Him as having the necessary characteristics to serve as the creator. • David Hume: David Hume would object to Leibniz’s insistence that every event has a sufficient reason. We cannot unequivocally observe the instance where the sufficient reason provokes the cause and therefore we may be assuming a connection where none exists. • Does the Principle of Non-Contradiction Really Hold? Even a priori reasoning is open to error. Sceptics would point out that we cannot prove with certainty that we are not being fooled by an evil demon into thinking that this world is real, which would include laws of logic and reasoning. If we cannot prove something should we rely on it as a fundamental principle? 		

Question	Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
2.	<p>Continued.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inductive Reasoning: Alternatively, we could be just assuming that the world operates according to the principle of non-contradiction; we may not yet have found an example which would refute this theory. Here, Leibniz' reasoning is inductive and can therefore not be proven with absolute certainty. • Does the Sufficient Reason have to be a Metaphysically Necessary Being? In common with other cosmological arguments, Leibniz argues for a Being, which has been proven from the need to explain a set of contingent sufficient causes. This can be a weakness, as this conclusion is a leap in the manner of a fallacy of composition. • Equally, the sufficient reason could be the Big Bang or any number of reasons of which we have no knowledge. • Why Does the Sufficient Reason Have to Come from Outwith the World? A set of contingent sufficient causes could be self-creating, each perpetuating the others ad infinitum: this could easily come from within the world. • Who/what caused God?. • Russell - the cosmos is a brute fact. • The fallacy of composition. • Hume/Kant – can the 'principle of sufficient reason' be applied to the whole universe. • Kant – collapses into the ontological argument. • Leads to a narrow definition of God. • Natural forces may meet the requirement of a first cause. 	(20)	

SECTION 2 – FREE WILL

Section 2 – Total Marks 20

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

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
3	(a)	<p>1 mark for identifying Compatibilism. 3 marks for the following bullet points or any other appropriate points.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of compatibilism: the belief that all events are determined but that genuine human freedom is still possible when we are not prevented from doing what we want to do, ie when we can act in accordance with our desires. • We are free if not coerced. • Explanation of internal v external causes. 	4 KU	
3	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The compatibilist is a Determinist and therefore accepts the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Universe is governed by the laws of cause and effect • Every choice is a deterministically necessitated choice • When we act we could <u>not</u> have done otherwise, therefore there is no human freedom even if it seems we are free from coercion and doing what we want to do. • The Libertarian believes in Free Will and therefore accepts the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Belief in event causation but does not include human behaviour in this - talk about agent causation • Believe that I am Free if I could have done otherwise • Belief in alternative futures. • Different in the way freedom is defined • Both positions accept moral responsibility although for different reasons. <p>Appropriate examples credited.</p>	6 KU	

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
3	(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It may be argued that Compatibilists have simply moved linguistic goalposts in the way they have defined free actions as not uncaused actions but actions which are free from coercion. • Classic Compatibilism is concerned only with freedom of action not freedom of the will but arguably it is the freedom to have specific intentions, whether or not I am prevented from carrying them out that is more important. • The distinction between a caused event and a coerced event is not sufficiently clarified. In some situations being forced to act or being prevented from acting is clear (as when someone bumps into me causing me to bump into someone else or when I am physically restrained and prevented from moving) but in other cases it is far from clear, eg psychological persuasion, hypnosis, persuasive advertising, addiction etc. • It is not clear that the distinction between an external cause and an internal cause is sufficient. It is not clear why an external force such as a push should be regarded as different to an internal cause affecting our thoughts, eg a tumour on the brain. On the other hand, if an unusual internal cause, the tumour, is accepted as an instance of coercion then it is difficult not to treat a 'normal' physical event such as the random firing of a neuron in the same way. This results in Compatibilism collapsing into Hard Determinism. • Whatever the Compatibilist claims, the fact is that he believes that we are determined which means we have no more choice re our actions than a falling tree or a beautiful sunset. <p>1 mark for any appropriate point with a further mark for appropriate development of that point or for an appropriate example. A maximum of 6 marks can be awarded if the candidate fails to say why the argument being presented refutes the Compatibilist position. It is not appropriate to simply argue for a different position.</p>	10 AE	
			(20)	

SECTION 3 – EPISTEMOLOGY

Section 3 – total marks 40

Part 1 – total marks 10

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

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
4	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition of foundationalism • Definition/explanation of infinite regress. • Rationalism as a foundationalist response. • Empiricism as a foundationalist response. 	4 KU	
4	(b)	<p>Any two appropriate points, eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coherentism argues that true knowledge does not need to be built on foundations. • For a statement to be true, it must show <i>interconnectedness</i> with other statements. What makes it true is its <i>coherence</i> with other statements to create a body of true belief. • It is a view that justification depends on how a particular set of beliefs relate to one another rather than on whether a chain of reasoning rests on foundational beliefs. • Coherentism may rely on a form of <i>circular argument</i> where all statements or beliefs support each other. The justification is assessed holistically. 	2 KU	
4	(c)	<p>Any four evaluative points relating to infinite regress, foundationalism or coherentism, eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The circular arguments of coherentism do not work. These are fallacies. • With coherentism there can be many different sets of coherent beliefs and no agreed way of determining the correct one. • Descartes thought he had found a self-evident truth with the Cogito and could use this as a foundation. • The senses are open to error and can deceive us. 	4 AE	
			(10)	

SECTION 3 – DESCARTES

Section 3 – total marks 40

Part 2 – total marks 30

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

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
5	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cogito has been established as a certain, foundational truth. • A characteristic of the cogito is that it is perceived clearly and distinctly. • General rule is then established that whatever else is perceived clearly and distinctly can also be called knowledge. • A truth rule used to help Descartes build upon his foundation of knowledge. • 'Clear' meaning – present to the attentive mind. • 'Distinct' meaning – not confused with anything which is not clear. • Examples of clear and distinct perceptions eg mathematical concepts. 	6 KU	
5	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maybe Descartes' clear and distinct rule is an invalid generalisation? • Problems agreeing which knowledge claims are in fact clear and distinct • Needs God as a guarantor • Cartesian circle 	4 AE	
5	(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A priori proof (aiming for certainty and carried out in the mind alone). • The causal adequacy principle: the cause of an effect must contain at least as much reality as the effect itself (reference to the extract above should gain extra credit). • Descartes is aware that he is imperfect. • He concludes that he can only be aware of this because he understands the idea of perfection. • We cannot be the cause of this idea because we are imperfect. • God must have left his trademark in us. • Reference to innate ideas (God and perfection). 	8 KU	

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
5	(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • God is the guarantor of clear and distinct perceptions. • If God exists then the evil deceiver argument can be ignored because God wouldn't allow us to be deceived. • God plays a significant role in Descartes' attempts to refute the sceptical arguments in Med. 6 • God is the guarantor of reason 	4 AE	
5	(e)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criticisms of the innate ideas undermines the whole argument eg reference to Locke's comments. • The understanding we have of 'perfection' may be a development from experiences rather than an innate idea. • Descartes' claim that he has a clear and distinct perception of God isn't widely accepted by others. • Examples that possibly undermine the causal adequacy principle. • Maybe God isn't good? Maybe he deceives us for his own pleasure? • Maybe the evil deceiver has deceived us into thinking that God is good and wouldn't deceive us? • Cartesian circle explained. <p>A single point that is developed can be awarded up to two marks.</p>	8 AE	
			(30)	

SECTION 3 – HUME

Section 3 – total marks 40

Part 2 – total marks 30

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

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
6	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our belief in necessary connections is based on experience but in an indirect way. • We never observe necessary connections but we do observe constant conjunctions. • We observe a number of similar events being followed by other events which are in turn similar to each other. • After we have seen events paired together constantly (which could be once or on numerous occasions) we become habituated into expecting this relationship. • We then develop a psychological expectation that the same effects will follow the same causes. • Our belief in necessary connection is therefore based on custom and habit rather than any process of deductive reasoning. • This is a process that even brute beasts can engage in. • This means that our belief in causal laws is not based on reason. • However, it is just a law of human thought that we can't help inferring causes when habituated by observing constant conjunctions of events. • This demonstrates that the role of reason in Human thought is in fact very overstated and this support the empiricist thesis that all knowledge is based in some way on experience. 	8 KU	

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
6	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our conclusions about man will be more convincing if we can show that they operate similarly in animals. • Humans infer causal connections by habituation – seeing similar events constantly conjoined to events which are in turn similar to each other. • We have an instinct for induction that is part of our natural make up. • Firstly animals clearly learn from experience. • Examples: young animals show less ability and wisdom than old; reward and punishment of animals show that they can be trained to suppress instincts; they can learn an arbitrary name. • Secondly it's impossible for this inference to be founded on any argument or reasoning that like events must follow like objects. • Supporting arguments: if there were any such arguments animals couldn't identify them; reasoning and argumentation are too slow and uncertain a process to cope with the essential ability to infer effects from causes. • But animals don't learn all of their knowledge this way, they also have natural instincts. Things which animals are unable to improve on and don't need to have been taught. • The experimental reasoning we use in everyday life is nothing but a species of this instinct. 	8KU	

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
6	(c)	<p>Candidates may make supportive points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pavlov’s dog is a striking demonstration of how animals can form expectations about the future based on past experience. • Hume’s conclusions would have been seen as controversial in his day given they are published 100 years before Darwin. • Modern studies of zoology reveal the sophistication of animal problem solving and studies in marketing show that human desires and expectations can be trained and manipulated in the same way as animals. <p>Candidates may make critical points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arguments from analogy are risky because similar things can vary in important respects. • Anatomical analogies can fail: eg Reptiles are cold-blooded, so psychological analogies could fail. • Moreover, even evidence of anatomical similarity of animals is no guarantee of psychological similarity. • There is a risk of anthropomorphism: attributing human qualities to non-human beings. Eg Dolphins aren’t smiling; Hyenas don’t laugh; Lemmings aren’t depressed. • Problem of other minds: We can never be sure about the unseen mental process of individuals other than ourselves. This is exacerbated when the individuals are different species. • All these considerations might undermine the probability of Hume’s conclusions. • Some species seem more sophisticated than others – ants (completely instinctual) v elephants (more like humans?) • Hume allows learning from one experience – this seems right – but problematic – which single experiences count? • Cause and effect assumption may be instinctive but specific instances of cause and effect have to be observed. 	14 AE	

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
6.	(c)	<p>Continued.</p> <p>Candidates may focus on problems with Hume's overall account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hume's arguments seem to make science look unscientific. • Too simple understanding of science – Einstein predicted effect of gravity on light prior to observations. • Hume seems to reduce all causation to cases of correlation. • Hume can only distinguish cause and effect by temporal priority but some causes are contemporaneous with their effects. • Human psychology is more complex than Hume suggests – constant conjunction does not always yield a better belief in necessary connection – eg the order of traffic lights. • We also seem to be able to draw inferences about causes from single observations – eg food poisoning. <p>A single point that is well developed can be awarded more than 1 mark.</p>	(30)	

SECTION 4 – NORMATIVE ETHICS

Section 4 – total marks 40

Question 1 – total marks 30

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

Question	Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
7	<p>In marking this question it is essential that reference be made to the grade descriptions and the general instructions at the start of this document. If there is an adequate amount of description and an appropriate evaluative comment then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 15 marks; if the answer is indicative of a “B” then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 18 marks; if the answer is indicative of an “A” then a candidate will be awarded a minimum of 21 marks.</p> <p>A candidate may approach this question in a number of different ways and credit should be given for any appropriate answer. However, the question requires the candidate to discuss the quotation.</p> <p>An answer that contains no evaluative comments cannot be awarded more than 20 marks.</p> <p>The following lists points that are likely to be included in an appropriate answer but the list is not exhaustive and credit should be given for any relevant points made, any appropriate development of those points and for appropriate discussion:</p> <p>Utilitarian Ethics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teleological/consequentialist • Greatest Happiness Principle • Reference to the writings of Mill and Bentham • Act and Rule Utilitarians. • Ideal and Preference Utilitarianism 	15 KU 15 AE	

Question	Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
7.	<p>Continued.</p> <p>Application to the Dilemma, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Act Utilitarianism—considering just this case • Rule Utilitarianism—any appropriate rules decided upon using utilitarian principles • Ideal Utilitarianism—a consideration of whether there may be principles other than happiness that pertain to the situation. • Preference utilitarianism—a consideration of how to maximally satisfy the preferences of all those affected by the situation. <p>Analysis and evaluation might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fits in with our ideas that happiness-equality and consequences of actions are important. • Potentially avoids pain and misery for the majority! • Provides a common sense method to try to work out what to do in a difficult situation • Would address short-term and long-term consequences <p>However</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relies on consequences, can't always predict, may turn out badly – your colleague may not get to the bomb in time, terrorists will not be thinking rationally, they may proceed to kill other members of your family • Motive and emotion don't matter, this doesn't seem right when dealing with friends and family • Should everyone count the same? Should your child be given priority? • Hedonic Calculus too demanding. Giving values to human lives does not seem just or rational • seems to allow for the terrible consequence of allowing a child to die. <p>Any other relevant point.</p>	(30)	

SECTION 4 – NORMATIVE ETHICS

Section 4 – total marks 40

Question 2 – total marks 10

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

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
8	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contradiction in Conception (1 mark) • Where attempting to universalise a maxim is attempting to will a logically impossible state of affairs – you cannot even imagine a world where the maxim is universalised. (1 mark) • Contradiction in the Will (1 mark) • Where maxims cannot be universalised because, although it is possible to conceive of them being universalised, to do so would bring them into conflict with other maxims that a rational person would want to bring about. (1 mark) <p>Up to 2 marks for each of the two reasons why a maxim may not be universalised.</p>	4 KU	
8	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an incorrect attempt to apply one of the formulations of the categorical imperative. • The correct wording is 'so act as to treat humanity, both in your own person, and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means.' • The formulation does not rule out using someone as a means; the formulation rules out using someone as simply a means and not at the same time as an end. • Relevant examples to illustrate the point – eg buying and selling involves using each other as a means but not simply as a means as each is contributing the others ends. • Treating someone as an end means recognizing the plans of others and helping to promote them. • There is a perfect duty not to treat someone as a means only; there is an imperfect duty to act on some maxims that assist other people in achieving their ends. 	6 AE	

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]