



National  
Qualifications  
2015

---

# 2015 Philosophy

## New 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 Higher Philosophy

*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 detailed Marking Instructions for each question.*

- (a) Marks for each candidate response must always be assigned in line with these general marking principles and the detailed Marking Instructions for the relevant question.
- (b) Marking should always be positive. This means that, for each candidate response, marks are accumulated for the demonstration of relevant skills, knowledge and understanding: they are not deducted from a maximum on the basis of errors or omissions.
- (c) 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.
- (d) We use the term “or any other acceptable answer” to allow for the possible variation in candidate responses. Credit should be given according to the accuracy and relevance of learner’s answers. Candidates may be awarded marks where the answer is accurate but expressed in their own words.
- (e) For credit to be given, points must relate to the questions asked. Where candidates give points of knowledge without specifying the context, these should be rewarded unless it is clear that they do not refer to the context of the question.
- (f) The marking instructions that follow have been written in such a way as to accommodate a range of responses.

### Marking principles for each question type

The following provides an overview of marking principles for each question type.

1. **Questions that require knowledge and understanding (eg “*Explain ...*”)**  
One mark should be awarded for each relevant, developed point of knowledge and understanding which is used to respond to the question. Not all related information will be relevant. For example, it is unlikely that biographical information will be relevant. Developed points will involve the candidate providing, for example:
  - additional detail
  - reasons
  - evidence
  - drawing out the implications of a question or idea
2. **Questions that require analysis (eg “*Analyse...*”, or “*In what ways ...*”)**  
Analysis is the breakdown of something into its constituent parts and detection of the relationships of those parts and the way they are organized. This might, for example, involve identifying the component parts of an argument and showing how they are related, explaining how an argument develops or identifying key features of a philosophical position.  
An analysis mark should be awarded where a candidate identifies at least one of the following:
  - links between different components
  - links between component(s) and the whole
  - links between component(s) and related concepts
  - similarities and contradictions
  - consistency and inconsistency
  - different views/interpretations

- possible consequences/implications
- the relative importance of components
- understanding of underlying order or structure
- or makes any other relevant analytical comment.

One mark should be awarded for each relevant analytical point. In more extended responses 4 marks may be reserved for analysis. Additional marks may be awarded for developed points of understanding used to respond to the question.

**3. Questions requiring candidates to analyse, using an argument diagram**

Depending on the wording of the question an answer would normally be awarded one mark for each feature of the argument or argument diagram that is identified, eg

- 1 mark for identifying at least one premise
- 1 mark for identifying the final conclusion
- 1 mark for identifying an intermediate conclusion
- 1 mark for identifying any relevant hidden premises
- 1 mark for identifying the relationship between at least two premises and a conclusion.

Where candidates provide a different set of premises/conclusions, and/or different argument diagram to those identified in the Marking Instructions, they should be awarded marks provided these accurately relate to an argument made in the source.

**4. Questions that require evaluation (eg “Evaluate ...”)**

Evaluation occurs when a judgement is made on the basis of certain criteria. The judgement may be based on internal criteria such as consistency and logical accuracy or on external criteria such as whether a philosophical position accords with widely held moral intuitions. Candidates may make reasoned evaluative comments relating to, for example:

- the relevance/importance/usefulness
- positive and negative aspects
- strengths and weaknesses
- any other relevant evaluative comment

One mark should be awarded for each relevant evaluative point. In more extended responses 4 marks may be reserved for evaluation. Additional marks may be awarded for developed points of understanding used to respond to the question.

**5. Questions that require analysis, knowledge and understanding, evaluation and reasoned views (eg “How successful is ...?”)**

Questions of this sort will be worth 20 marks. Marks will be available for:

- Knowledge and understanding—up to a maximum of 10 marks. One mark should be awarded for each relevant developed point of knowledge and understanding.
- Analysis—a minimum of 4 marks are reserved for analysis. One mark should be awarded for each relevant analytical point.
- Evaluation—a minimum of 4 marks are reserved for evaluation. One mark should be awarded for each relevant analytical point.
- Expressing a reasoned view—2 marks are reserved for 'reasoned view'. Two marks to be awarded if there is a very clear, coherent line of argument throughout; one mark if there is a line of argument but which lacks coherence at times; and zero marks if there is no obvious line of argument present.

## Overview of general marking principles for a 20-mark question

| Criteria         | Mark | 0 marks  |   |  |
|------------------|------|--|---|--|
| Use of knowledge | 10   | No developed points of knowledge are made in response to the question, or points made do not relate to the question. | Up to a maximum of 10 marks, one mark should be awarded for each relevant developed point of knowledge and understanding. |  |
|                  | Mark | 0 marks  | 1 mark  |  |
| Analysis         | 4    | No identification of relevant analytical points.   | A minimum of 4 marks are reserved for analysis. One mark should be awarded for each relevant analytical point.            |  |
| Evaluation       | 4    | No relevant evaluative points, or no reasons given for evaluative points.  | A minimum of 4 marks are reserved for evaluation. One mark should be awarded for each relevant analytical point.          |  |
|                  | Mark | 0 marks  | 1 mark  | 2 marks  |
| Reasoned view    | 2    | There is no obvious line of argument present.  | 1 mark if there is a line of argument but which lacks coherence at times.   | 2 marks there is a very clear, coherent line of argument throughout. |

## Detailed Marking Instructions for each question

### Section 1 - Arguments in Action

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question   | Specific Marking Instructions for this question   | Max Mark |
|----------|--|---|----------|
| 1. (a)   | <p>Depending on the wording of the question an answer would normally be awarded one mark for each feature of the argument or argument diagram that is identified, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 mark for identifying at least one premise</li> <li>• 1 mark for identifying the final conclusion</li> <li>• 1 mark for identifying an intermediate conclusion</li> <li>• 1 mark for identifying any relevant hidden premises</li> <li>• 1 mark for identifying the relationship between at least <b>two</b> premises and a conclusion</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifying <b>option two</b> as the most accurate (1 mark).</li> <li>• Identifying the conclusion as: ‘it is quite credible that a lot of cats in a district might determine the frequency of certain flowers in that district’ (1 mark).</li> <li>• Identifying one appropriate premise (1 mark).</li> <li>• An explanation that the premises are dependent whereas diagram one represents a series of sub-arguments and diagram three represents an argument with independent premises (1 mark).</li> </ul> <p><b>NB It is possible for the candidates to gain a maximum of 2 marks even if they have failed to identify the correct diagram.</b></p> <p>The expected statements are: (1, 2 &amp; 3 are interchangeable)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bumblebees are almost essential for the fertilisation of the wild pansy and the red clover.</li> <li>2. The number of bumblebees in any district depends a great deal on the number of field-mice.</li> <li>3. The number of mice is largely dependent on the number of cats.</li> <li>4. It is quite credible that a lot of cats in a district might determine the frequency of certain flowers (the wild pansy and the red clover) in that district.</li> </ol> <p>However, candidates may use slightly different wording or incorporate additional details, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bumblebees are almost essential for the fertilisation of the wild pansy and the red clover for other bees do not visit these flowers.</li> <li>• The number of bumblebees in any district depends a great deal on the number of field-mice, which destroy their nests.</li> </ul> | 4        |

| Question |     | General Marking Instructions for this type of question  | Specific Marking Instructions for this question   | Max Mark |
|----------|-----|---|---|----------|
|          | (b) | <p>Depending on the wording of the question an answer would normally be awarded one mark for each feature of the argument or argument diagram that is identified, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 mark for identifying at least one premise.</li> <li>• 1 mark for identifying the final conclusion.</li> <li>• 1 mark for identifying an intermediate conclusion.</li> <li>• 1 mark for identifying any relevant hidden premises.</li> <li>• 1 mark for identifying the relationship between at least <b>two</b> premises and a conclusion.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifying an appropriate statement. (1 mark)</li> <li>• Correctly linking their chosen statement to their chosen diagram. (1 mark)</li> </ul> <p>It is expected that candidates will identify either</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Bees other than bumblebees do not visit the wild pansy and the red clover (supporting 1), or</li> <li>6. Field-mice destroy the nests of bumblebees (supporting 2).</li> </ol> <p>However, if candidates select other appropriate statements (eg concerning Colonel Newman) then they should be rewarded appropriately.</p> <p>Candidates should be rewarded if they provide an appropriate supporting premise even if they have selected the wrong diagram in question 1(a).</p> <p>A candidate may link their chosen statement to the diagram either by writing the statement with a number and adding the number to the diagram or by linking the written statement directly to the diagram.</p> | 2        |

| Question |     | General Marking Instructions for this type of question   | Specific Marking Instructions for this question   | Max Mark |
|----------|-----|--|---|----------|
|          | (c) | <p>Questions that ask a candidate to explain are typically testing understanding. Where reference to a source is required this may involve analysis.</p> <p>One mark is awarded for each substantive point that meets the relevant criteria.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appeals to authority are made to increase the plausibility of the claims being made (1 mark).</li> <li>• Correctly describes a fallacious appeal to authority as an attempt to increase the plausibility of the claims being made by citing the support of a supposed authority when there are no grounds for supposing that person or institution to be a legitimate authority in the relevant matter (1 mark).</li> <li>• Explanation of the criteria for considering someone to be a legitimate authority <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- identifying one such criterion, eg the person has relevant expertise; the claim is being made within their field of expertise; they are representing the consensus within the field; there is no reason for thinking they are significantly biased on the topic; the topic itself is a legitimate area for expertise; the authority is identified. (1 mark)</li> <li>- giving a detailed explanation (2 marks).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Making appropriate reference to the source in which it is noted that Colonel Newman 'has spent a long time studying the habits of bumblebees' and is therefore being claimed as a legitimate authority (1 mark).</li> </ul> <p>A maximum of three marks if there is no appropriate reference to the source.</p> | 4        |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question   | Specific Marking Instructions for this question  | Max Mark |
|----------|--|--|----------|
| 2.       | <p>Questions that ask a candidate to explain are typically testing understanding. Where reference to a source is required this may involve analysis.</p> <p>One mark is awarded for each substantive point that meets the relevant criteria.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One mark for explaining each difference (2 marks).</li> <li>• Appropriate example of deductive reasoning (1 mark).</li> <li>• Appropriate example of inductive reasoning (1 mark).</li> </ul> <p>Differences might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deductive arguments might lead to certain conclusions whereas inductive arguments lead to conclusions that are probable.</li> <li>• Deductive arguments are described as valid and / or sound whereas inductive arguments are described as strong and / or cogent.</li> <li>• In deductive arguments the conclusion doesn't go beyond the premises whereas inductive arguments it does.</li> </ul> | 4        |
| 3.       | <p>Questions that ask a candidate to explain are typically testing understanding. Where reference to a source is required this may involve analysis.</p> <p>One mark is awarded for each substantive point that meets the relevant criteria.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An account of how analogies are used in arguments, eg Analogical arguments work by saying that x is true of A so x is probably also true of B because B is relevantly similar to A (1 mark).</li> <li>• An account of how analogies are used as explanations, eg Analogical explanations work by comparing something familiar or easy to imagine with something that is difficult to understand (1 mark).</li> </ul> <p>Instead of a detailed description of each kind of analogy an answer might contain appropriate examples.</p>   | 2        |



| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question   | Specific Marking Instructions for this question   | Max Mark |
|----------|--|---|----------|
| 4.       | <p>Questions that ask a candidate to evaluate are testing the candidates' ability to judge something against certain criteria. Depending on the wording of the question a candidate may have to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of both what is being evaluated and the appropriate criteria. Where reference to a source is required this may involve analysis.</p> <p>One mark is awarded for each substantive point that meets the relevant criteria.</p> | <p>I'm sure you will enjoy the holiday. I know you don't like flying but you will have a great time when you get there. It's just like last year when you took part in that talent show. Do you remember how nervous you were in the weeks leading up to the show? On the day you had so much fun.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriate discussion as to whether anxiety before flying is relevantly similar to anxiety before a talent show and whether there are any relevant dissimilarities (2 marks).</li> <li>• A candidate can gain the marks by providing appropriate reasons in support of their opinion irrespective of whether they think the argument is ineffective or effective.</li> </ul> | 2        |
| 5.       | <p>Questions that ask a candidate to say what something is are typically testing knowledge and understanding. Where reference to a source is required this may involve analysis.</p> <p>One mark is awarded for each substantive point that meets the relevant criteria.</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An appeal to emotion is when there is an attempt to manipulate a person's emotions as a way of persuading them to accept a conclusion (1 mark).</li> <li>• Any appropriate example eg 'He shouldn't be punished as it will break his mother's heart'(1 mark).</li> </ul>   | 2        |

## Section 2 - Knowledge and Doubt

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question  | Specific Marking Instructions for this question  | Max Mark |
|----------|---|--|----------|
| 6.       | <p>Questions that ask a candidate to say 'What role...' are typically testing understanding. Where reference to a source is required this may involve analysis.</p> <p>One mark is awarded for each substantive point that meets the relevant criteria.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For Hume all knowledge is based upon experience.</li> <li>• Hume aims to show that all ideas are derived from impressions.</li> <li>• Hume is offering an atomistic account of how we build knowledge from experience, and uses simple ideas as the building blocks.</li> <li>• Every perception of the mind can be categorised as either an impression or an idea.</li> <li>• Impressions may be either inward (eg emotions) or outward (ie the senses)</li> <li>• The distinction between impressions and ideas is made on the basis of their force &amp; vivacity.</li> <li>• Simple ideas are copies of impressions and are put together using the operations of the imagination to form complex ideas.</li> </ul> <p>A maximum of <b>three</b> marks will be awarded unless the answer makes clear that for Hume all knowledge is based upon experience.</p> | 4        |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question   | Specific Marking Instructions for this question  | Max Mark |
|----------|--|--|----------|
| 7.       | <p>Questions that ask a candidate to explain are typically testing understanding. Where reference to a source is required this may involve analysis.</p> <p>One mark is awarded for each substantive point that meets the relevant criteria.</p> | <p>Hume presents two arguments to support his claim that <i>all</i> ideas are copies of impressions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any idea can be traced back to prior impression <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>→ Hume provides the example of God.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If there has been no impression then there is no possibility of forming the idea. Hume provides four examples to support this claim: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>→ Defective sense organs.</li> <li>→ Lack of relevant experience.</li> <li>→ Certain personality types are unable to form certain ideas that conflict with their personality.</li> <li>→ The inability of humans to form ideas relating to non-human senses.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Candidates should be rewarded for each substantive point irrespective of how many arguments they explain.</p> <p>Candidates should also be rewarded if they explain how Hume supports his earlier claim that an individual idea is a copy of an impression. However, candidates should not be rewarded for repeating points already made in response to question six.</p> <p>No credit should be given for simple description, eg describing simple and complex ideas. The answer must relate to the evidence Hume provides in support of his claims.</p> | 6        |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question   | Specific Marking Instructions for this question  | Max Mark |
|----------|--|--|----------|
| 8.       | <p>Questions that ask a candidate to evaluate are testing the candidates' ability to judge something against certain criteria. Depending on the wording of the question a candidate may have to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of both what is being evaluated and the appropriate criteria. Where reference to a source is required this may involve analysis.</p> <p>One mark is awarded for each substantive point that meets the relevant criteria.</p> <p>In a 10 mark question:</p> <p>A minimum of four marks are reserved for <b>evaluation</b>.</p> <p>A maximum of six marks can be awarded for <b>knowledge, understanding and analysis</b>.</p> | <p>Points of Knowledge, Understanding and Analysis might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hume uses the missing shade of blue as a counter-example to his claim that all ideas are derived from impressions.</li> <li>• He says if we imagine someone had seen every shade of blue except one, and that they were all spread out before him from lightest to darkest, he'd be able to detect a gap.</li> <li>• As well as being able to detect the gap, he would be able to imagine the missing shade.</li> <li>• This is a counter-example to Hume's theory because Hume thinks the missing shade of blue is a simple idea.</li> <li>• Hume says the counterexample should not undermine the theory as a whole because it is so singular that it is scarcely worth observing.</li> </ul> <p>Evaluative remarks might include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hume could have said that the missing shade of blue is a complex idea, and candidates could comment on why he didn't do this.</li> <li>• The same point could be made regarding any sort of graded scale - notes on a musical scale, roughness of sandpaper, heat of chillies, etc - and candidates could comment on the significance of this, as well as considering whether or not Hume realised that it might be extended in this way.</li> <li>• Hume is genuinely trying to come up with a science of man and is exploring the only objection he can think of to his theory.</li> <li>• Hume is aiming for a big and comprehensive picture with his theory of knowledge. Given the relatively insignificant role that this kind of example plays in our acquisition of knowledge (even if it is extended), Hume was right to say that it does not undermine his whole theory.</li> <li>• Hume should have accepted that any counterexample to an 'all' claim disproves the claim.</li> </ul> | 10       |

Section 3 - Moral Philosophy

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question  | Specific Marking Instructions for this question   | Max Mark |
|----------|---|---|----------|
| 9.       | <p>A minimum of four marks are reserved for <b>evaluation</b>.</p> <p>A minimum of four marks are reserved for <b>analysis</b>.</p> <p>A maximum of ten marks can be awarded for <b>knowledge and understanding</b>.</p> <p>Two marks are reserved for 'reasoned view'.</p> <p>For evaluation, analysis and KU one mark is awarded for each substantive point that meets the relevant criteria.</p> <p>Marks for a reasoned view:<br/>           2 marks—very clear, coherent line of argument throughout.<br/>           1 mark—there is a line of argument evident, however it lacks coherence at times.<br/>           0 marks—there is no obvious line of argument present.</p> | <p><b>Reasoned view.</b></p> <p>Candidates can be awarded up to 2 marks for 'reasoned view' and this should reflect the clarity and coherence of the response. A response that does not address the usefulness of Kantian ethics as a moral theory but simply describes the theory and lists problems with the theory should receive zero marks for reasoned view.</p> <p><b>Illustrative evaluation points:</b></p> <p>Why some people would disagree and say that Kantian ethics is a useful theory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accords with the view that moral rules should apply to everyone and the essence of immorality is in making yourself an exception.</li> <li>• Accords with the view that morality involves showing respect for people as rational persons.</li> <li>• Accords with the view that morality involves obligation (duty) and is not a matter of personal preference.</li> <li>• Accords with the view that a moral position is rationally defensible and doesn't lead to arbitrary results.</li> <li>• Accords with the view that an important aspect of moral behaviour is the motive and intention of the action.</li> <li>• Provides a mechanism for making moral decisions in a dispassionate way.</li> <li>• Use of appropriate illustrations to clarify why the theory is useful.</li> </ul> | 20       |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Specific Marking Instructions for this question  | Max Mark |
|----------|--|--|----------|
|          |  | <p>Why some people would agree and say that Kantian ethics is not a useful theory.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Its insistence on ignoring consequences means that in certain circumstances the theory advocates actions that are, from an intuitive point of view, clearly wrong.</li> <li>• One of the biggest problems in knowing what to do is when there is a conflict of duties and Kantian ethics fails to address this crucial problem.</li> <li>• The theory presupposes that it is possible to identify the maxim on which a person acts but in reality it is frequently impossible to identify one's own motives let alone the motives of others.</li> <li>• Because there is no assured way of identifying the correct maxim the theory is open to manipulation by specifying a more convenient maxim.</li> <li>• If two people are acting on different maxims only one of which can be universalized the theory will be advocating different good actions for different people and this conflicts with the notion that moral behaviour should be the same for everyone.</li> <li>• The theory's emphasis on treating people as rational individuals means that it has little to say about our obligation to non-human animals.</li> <li>• The theory seems to exclude actions that are not obviously wrong, eg showrooming.</li> <li>• Use of appropriate illustrations to clarify why the theory is not useful.</li> </ul> |          |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Specific Marking Instructions for this question   | Max Mark |
|----------|--|---|----------|
|          |  | <p>The following illustrates the content that a candidate might deal with in an analytical or descriptive way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distinguishing a ‘deontological’ from a consequentialist approach to ethics.</li> <li>• Kantian ethics characterised as looking back to motives and intentions in contrast to other theories that look forward to the consequences.</li> <li>• Distinguishing between acting out of duty and from inclination.</li> <li>• Definition of ‘maxim’ with an appropriate explanation or illustration.</li> <li>• Accurate citation of the first formulation (The Formula of Universal Law)</li> <li>• Explanation of the first formulation as a thought experiment rather than a practical question of whether such a universal law could be implemented.</li> <li>• Explanation of what is meant by contradiction in conception.</li> <li>• Explanation of what is meant by contradiction in the will.</li> <li>• Accurate citation of the second formulation (The Formula of the End in Itself).</li> <li>• Clarification as to what is meant by treating someone as an ‘end’.</li> <li>• Clarification as to what is meant by treating someone ‘simply as a means’.</li> <li>• Distinguishing between perfect duties and imperfect duties.</li> <li>• Distinguishing between duties to self and duties to others.</li> </ul> <p>Any other relevant points should be rewarded appropriately, eg a candidate might discuss what it means for anything to be useful or the different purposes to which an ethical theory might be put.</p> |          |

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]