



2015 Philosophy

Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2015

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.
- (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"> • They can be cogent (2) • They can be sound (8) • They can be valid (10) 	3 KU	
1	(b)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The argument is invalid because the conclusion does not necessarily follow from the premises. <p>2 marks or nothing—must say 'invalid' and must give a supporting reason.</p>	2 AE	
1	(c)	(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any suitable example, eg, "I enjoyed cornflakes today so I will enjoy them tomorrow". 	1 KU	
1	(c)	(ii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are often based on a finite number of observations but it is always possible that important exceptions, which would refute the conclusion, have not been observed. Future observations may be different from past observations. 	1 KU	
1	(c)	(iii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If it had true premises • If it made an inference based on a large number of observations. <p>ie what is required for a cogent inductive argument.</p>	2 KU	

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
1	(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any suitable example, eg “I wore a blue tie today and my cat died. I’m not wearing that tie again!” It is fallacious because just because the cat died after you wore the tie, this doesn’t entail that the tie was the cause of the cat’s death. 	1 KU 1 AE	
1	(e)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Ad hominem</i> arguments sometimes attempt to refute a proposition by alleging some, usually derogatory, claim about the arguer and taking this as proof that the proposition they hold must be false. Some <i>ad hominem</i> arguments suggest that the arguer doesn’t practice what they preach and take this as proof that the proposition that they hold must be false. Other <i>ad hominem</i> arguments claim that the proposition must be false purely because the arguer has something to gain from the general acceptance of that proposition. Some <i>ad hominem</i> arguments are unsound because they contain explicit or implicit false premise. For example, the argument “How can drinking be bad for you? You drink all the time!” assumes the false hidden premise that “If you drink then drinking can’t be bad for you”. <p>N.B. explaining the fallacy <i>can</i> be understood as explaining why the fallacy is unreliable.</p>	2 KU	

Question			Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
1	(f)	(i)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P1: None of Bill Gates, Richard Branson and Mark Zuckerberg completed a university degree and all of them are billionaires. • P2: All university does is make you think like millions of other university graduates. • P3: If you want to come up with a new idea you need to be original and different, not the same. • C: You don't need to sit exams or have a degree to guarantee success. <p>1 mark for an answer presented in standard form. 1 mark for correctly identifying the conclusion. 1 mark for correctly identifying any premise. 1 mark accurately presenting the premises without the additional material.</p>	4 AE	
1	(f)	(ii)	Up to 2 marks for any appropriate reasons in support of the answer they have given eg It is deductive because there is an attempt to draw a certain conclusion from the given premises, or, it is inductive because there was an attempt to draw a probable conclusion.	2 AE	
1	(f)	(iii)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any suitable example, eg "Wealth is a measure of success" <p>N.B. 'at work in this argument' means helping you to get to the conclusion. Statements that merely have related content are not sufficient.</p>	1 AE	
				(20)	

SECTION 2 – METAPHYSICS

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><u>Anselm’s Ontological Argument</u></p> <p>P1: It is a conceptual truth (or, so to speak, true by definition) that God is a being than which none greater can be imagined (that is, the greatest possible being that can be imagined.)</p> <p>P2: God exists as an idea in the mind.</p> <p>P3: A being that exists as an idea in the mind and in reality is, other things being equal, greater than a being that exists only as an idea in the mind.</p> <p>P4: Thus, if God exists only as an idea in the mind, then we can imagine something that is greater than God (that is, a greatest possible being that does exist).</p> <p>P5: But we cannot imagine something that is greater than God (for it is a contradiction to suppose that we can imagine a being greater than the greatest possible <u>being that can be imagined</u>.)</p> <p>C: Therefore, God exists.</p> <p>It is better to exist than not to exist: it is more perfect to exist than not to exist. Therefore, the idea of a perfect being must naturally include existence.</p>	<p>10 KU 10 AE</p>	

Question	Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
2	<p>(cont)</p> <p>Analysis and evaluation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anselm does not appeal to evidence from the senses and the world around us. His ontological argument is an a priori argument and, as such, is not open to errors from the senses. • René Descartes defends the ontological argument by suggesting that in the same way the conception of a three-sided object necessarily implies a triangle, or that the concept of a valley necessarily implies a mountain, to understand God, necessarily implies that He exists. • Gaunilo of Marmoutier, a monk and contemporary of Anselm's, is responsible for one of the most important criticisms of Anselm's argument. It is quite reasonable to worry that Anselm's argument illegitimately moves from the existence of an idea to the existence of a thing that corresponds to the idea. As the objection is sometimes put, Anselm simply defines things into existence – and this cannot be done. Gaunilo offers the counter-example of the perfect island. He points out that the mere conceiving of the most perfect island does not mean that such a place exists. However, Anselm countered this by stating that God is a special case because God exists necessarily: the concept of God necessarily implies His existence. • Another criticism which can be levelled concerns the whole idea of the Great Chain of Being. Is existence really a perfection? In other words is it really more perfect to exist than not to exist? There are several examples which would serve to refute this idea, including cancer, humans having knowledge which allows them to invent nuclear weapons and famine. Would it not be better if these did not exist? 		

Question	Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
2	<p>(cont)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thomas Aquinas objected to Anselm’s argument firstly on the grounds that not everyone has the same concept of God and, secondly, on the grounds that the argument assumes we can have a complete and correct understanding of an infinite being. • David Hume argued that a description of something can be complete but we need to go beyond that description to decide whether the thing described exists. Hume argued that <i>a priori</i> arguments can never succeed in proving the existence of anything for, if something has been proved <i>a priori</i>, its opposite would imply a contradiction and as such would be inconceivable. Since 'whatever we conceive as existent, we can also conceive as non-existent. There is no Being, whose existence is demonstrable.' • Immanuel Kant also considered the argument unsound on the grounds that existence cannot be deemed a predicate. A perfect red car which exists is no more perfect than a perfect red car which is only imagined. The concept is the same whether the car is real or not. Similarly to say that God has existence adds nothing to the idea of God and therefore cannot be grounds for God’s necessary existence. • Bertrand Russell – Existence is not a property of an object but is something that can be attributed to a description. 'Lions exist' makes sense because it can be analysed as 'there are lions' or ' there is an x such that "x is a lion" is true'. However, it would be technically meaningless to say that the x exists. <p>Any other pertinent point.</p>		
		(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	<p>A description of Hard Determinism might include:</p> <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. • The cause of every event is the antecedent event. • Examples of determinism in the human sphere might be drawn from, eg genetic determinism, environmental determinism, psychological determinism. The success of science which is based on the presumption of determinism. Explanations require a reference to how things came about and so without causation there can be no explanation. • The consequence argument: if determinism is true then our acts are the consequence of laws of nature and events in the remote past. But it is not up to us what went on before we were born, and neither is it up to us what the laws of nature are. Therefore, the consequences of these things (including our present acts) are not up to us. A candidate may argue that the examples of determinism function as an inductive argument but do not by themselves establish that all events are caused. 	<p>10 KU 10 AE</p>	

Question	Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
3	<p>(cont)</p> <p>Evaluation of Hard Determinism might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fact that as certain causes are recognised we do tend to attribute less responsibility to an individual, eg when people who are mentally ill are treated differently to those deemed sane. • A candidate may discuss how chance and indeterminism are presumed to play a role at the quantum level and how this may result in chance operating at the larger scale in which we operate. This might mean that ultimately not all events are caused. This would refute a strict definition of hard determinism but a candidate may then consider whether this has any impact on the issue of human responsibility. • A candidate may discuss whether events have to be caused by events. This has implications for the stance taken on the mind-body problem for it would mean that all thoughts are reduced to brain events that thoughts arise from brain events but that thoughts cannot in turn affect brain events. In this context a student may discuss agent causation as an alternative position. • A candidate may argue that determinism is self-refuting for in a world where prior states of affairs determine our attitude to an argument we can no longer have any confidence in why we hold any particular position. • A candidate may argue for a compatibilist understanding of freedom. • A candidate may argue that determinism does not imply lack of responsibility and argue that just as we identify a faulty component in a deterministic mechanical system and act to deal with the fault so we can identify persons as particular causes of problems in society and act to deal with them in a similar way. • A candidate might argue the Libertarian position. 		
		(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)	<p>Answers may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the Empiricist, the foundations of knowledge lie in sense experience. All ideas are ultimately derived from experience and reason assists us to see connections between these ideas. • To be sure about knowledge we have to check it with our senses. This is known as <i>a posteriori</i> knowledge. • Mention may be made of Empiricist philosophers such as John Locke, David Hume or George Berkeley. <p>Any appropriate example.</p>	5 KU	
4	(b)	<p>Evaluation may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The senses are open to error and can deceive us. For example, a mirage or hallucination. • Only some human knowledge can be adequately explained through sense experience. A physical pain may result in anger, but it is hard to explain the origins of guilt, fear, depression and grief in sense experience. • Empiricism tends to suggest that we are merely passive recipients of sense experiences. • If knowledge is not innate, then it is difficult to explain the ability to learn, which rationalists claim is inborn. • Passive reception of knowledge needs subjective interpretation, which in itself may be open to variation. <p>Any other pertinent point.</p>	5 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"> • He is looking for certainty so needs a method that is rigorous • He only adopts those beliefs that he could say were beyond doubt • He must withhold his assent from any belief that contains even the slightest doubt • He focuses on categories of knowledge rather than individual beliefs • His method attempts to undermine the foundations rather than individual knowledge claims • If a belief can be doubted then all beliefs within that category must be rejected • Focuses his doubts on a posteriori truths 	6 KU	
5	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The realisation that nothing is certain • The conclusion that there are in fact no foundational truths so knowledge appears unattainable 	2 KU	

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
5	(c)	<p>(The question is looking for a balanced answer so a maximum of 4 marks should be awarded for a discussion on either the strengths or weakness on their own)</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sceptical approach encourages us to examine all our deeply held beliefs and develop an open mind when doing philosophy • Provided a good basis/principle for scientific certainty <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descartes doesn't apply his doubt to everything, e.g. his memory or his ability to reason. • Hume – method leads to a sceptical dead-end • Introduction of the evil deceiver makes success almost impossible • The Dream argument is not wholly successful—just because you cannot tell when you are asleep does not mean that you cannot tell when you are awake. 	6 AE	
5	(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of the Cogito • Explanation of the Trademark argument • Explanation of the arguments in Meditation 6 that Descartes uses to resolve the sceptical doubts • Issues with the cogito explained. eg for 'I am: I exist' to be necessarily true we must accept the meaning of the language concepts employed. Does the possibility of the evil deceiver undermine the meaning of these concepts? • Problems with the Trademark argument. eg issues with the causal adequacy principle • Cartesian circle explained • Possible discussion of the strengths of Descartes' rationalism eg focus on a priori truths became a basis for scientific proofs and certainty <p>A single point that is developed can be awarded up to two marks</p>	7 KU 9 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)	<p>Any 6 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We gather ideas about the world through experience alone • We generate mental representations of the outside world called impressions • Impressions include internal and external perceptions, eg feeling angry or seeing a car • Impressions are the lively original experiences, eg seeing a red apple • Impressions come ‘unbidden to the mind’ • We then make faint copies of the impressions • These copies are called ideas, eg remembering a red apple • Ideas can be summoned at will and constitute memories 	6 KU	
6	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These are explained by Hume’s distinction between simple and complex ideas. • Acts of the imagination are complex ideas which have been created by compounding, augmenting, diminishing or transposing simple ideas, which have in turn been copied from impressions 	2 KU	
6	(c)	<p>Any 3 critical points, eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notable exceptions to his claim that impressions are usually lively and ideas usually faint • Impossibility of comparing ideas with impressions (Barrier of ideas) • Representative account leads to scepticism about the outside world (Barrier of impressions) • Missing shade of blue appears to contradict his theory 	6 AE	

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
6	(d)	<p>Outline of Hume's arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All ideas can be traced to prior impressions • Even God is a complex idea copied from impressions • Hume challenges us to come up with an idea without a prior impression • People who cannot have a particular impression can never have the idea (eg blind men can't imagine colour, nor a deaf man sound) • People who have the faculty for experiencing things but have never had the appropriate experience, are similarly incapable of conjuring the idea (eg a Laplander cannot imagine the taste of wine) • The same applies to emotions (eg a generous heart can't conceive of inveterate revenge) • Other beings (presumably animals) can have ideas which we cannot conceive since we do not have their sensory apparatus and so can't have the impressions <p>Critical Evaluation of his arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some ideas have no obvious prior impression (eg ultraviolet or infrared) and we seem to grasp them only indirectly • Establishing that something can be grasped through the construction of a complex idea is no guarantee that it can't also be innate or grasped in some other way. For example we can grasp what a zebra is either by building a complex idea or by simply seeing one. Hence the fact that we can imagine God by building a complex idea doesn't rule out the possibility that he might be known innately too. • Problem of other minds prevents us speculating with assurance about the contents of blind or deaf people's minds, although his claims do seem tenable. • Hume's claims about emotions seem less tenable than his claims about visual perception. Can't a generous man imagine the opposite sentiments to his own? • We do now know that animals have sensory capabilities alien to our own. For example: dogs hear ultrasound; snakes taste infrared; bats use echolocation. However, it is even more difficult to speculate about the contents of different species than it is to speculate about other members of our own species. 	<p>7 KU 9 AE</p>	
			(30)	

SECTION 4 – MORAL PHILOSOPHY

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>Critically examine possible Utilitarian responses to this situation.</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. An answer that simply lists the main features of utilitarianism and lists the problems with that ethical theory should be awarded a maximum of 18 marks.</p>	15 KU 15 AE	

Question	Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
7	<p>(cont)</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 Bentham and Mill • Act and Rule Utilitarians • Ideal and Preference Utilitarianism <p>Application to the problem, 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"> • The sacrifice of one life so that others may live might be acceptable from Utilitarian perspective. • Permitting such operations may lead to undue pressure on others so decreasing the general wellbeing of society. • Strengths of Utilitarianism: takes account of consequences; everyone’s life given equal weight; provides objective guidance. • Weaknesses of Utilitarianism: difficult to anticipate all consequences; could be advocating injustice towards the young man. • Difficult to take into account the feelings of others for example the immediate family. <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)	In Kant's philosophy this is a contradiction, which some impermissible maxims are guilty of, because they attempt to will a logically impossible state of affairs.	2 KU	
8	(b)	In Kant's philosophy this is a contradiction which some impermissible maxims are guilty of because, although they are possible to conceive, they are inconsistent with other maxims which any rational person would wish to assent to at some point.	2 KU	
8	(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicting duties issue not resolved • We have natural inclination to consider consequences in moral decision making • Role of emotion is downplayed in favour of duty 	6 AE	
			(10)	

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]