



National
Qualifications
RESOURCE

X854/76/12

**Philosophy
Paper 2**

Marking Instructions

Please note that these marking instructions have not been standardised based on candidate responses. You may therefore need to agree within your centre how to consistently mark an item if a candidate response is not covered by the marking instructions.



General marking principles for Higher Philosophy

Always apply these general principles. Use them in conjunction with the specific marking instructions, which identify the key features required in candidates' responses.

- (a) Always use positive marking. This means candidates accumulate marks for the demonstration of relevant skills, knowledge and understanding; marks are not deducted for errors or omissions.
- (b) If a candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or specific marking instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your team leader.
- (c) We use the term 'or any other acceptable answer' to allow for any possible variation in candidate responses. Award marks according to the accuracy and relevance of candidate responses. Candidates may gain marks where the answer is accurate but expressed in their own words.
- (d) Where candidates give points of knowledge without specifying the context, reward these unless it is clear that they do not refer to the context of the question.

In giving their responses, candidates should demonstrate the following skills, knowledge and understanding.


- **Knowledge:** award 1 mark 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.
- **Analysis:** this is the breakdown of something into its constituent parts and detection of the relationships of those parts and the way they are organised. 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.
- **Evaluation:** this 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.

Questions requiring candidates to represent an argument using an argument diagram


There is more than one way of constructing an argument diagram, but it is expected that candidates will be familiar with those using numbers and an accompanying legend, for example

All men are mortal, so Socrates was mortal. After all, Socrates was a man. Anyway, Mr Fraser told us he was mortal, although quite why he thought we would be interested in that, I'm not sure.

1. All men are mortal
2. Socrates was mortal
3. Socrates was a man
4. Mr Fraser told us Socrates was mortal.







and those where the statements are written directly into boxes, for example



Those with numbers are usually written with the final conclusion at the bottom of the diagram; those with boxes are usually written with the final conclusion at the top of the diagram. Accept diagrams of either type, and written in either direction. The statements in the legend are usually arranged in standard form with the final conclusion at the end, rather than having the statements listed in the order in which they occur in the passage. Accept either option.

If a candidate includes an unstated premise or conclusion in their diagram, they must indicate this clearly. Accept either letters or numbers to indicate unstated premises or conclusions in legends.

Candidates should be able to recognise, explain and construct diagrams that represent **linked arguments** where the premises are **dependent**; **convergent arguments** where the premises give **independent** support to the conclusion; and **serial arguments** where there is at least one **intermediate conclusion**. These may also be combined to form a **complex argument**.




In dealing with a source, it is expected that candidates will be able to recognise and appropriately interpret **inference indicators**, for example **premise indicators** (for example since, because, etc) and **conclusion indicators** (for example therefore, so, etc). It is expected that candidates will be able to distinguish the substance of an argument from any additional material that might be in the source such as

- **repetitions**
- **discounts** – words or phrases that indicate a possible objection has been considered and rejected, for example ‘While it may be true that . . .’
- **assurances** – words or phrases that indicate the confidence of the person presenting the argument, for example ‘Everyone will readily allow that . . .’
- **hedges** – words that indicate that the argument is being put forward tentatively, for example ‘It is reasonable to suppose that . . .’


When writing the legend or placing the argument into boxes it is expected that the candidate will ‘tidy up’ the wording of the argument so that each part of the argument can be read as a stand-alone statement, for example rhetorical questions should be rewritten as statements, some commands might be interpreted as ‘ought’ statements and pronouns should be replaced by the person or object to which it refers.

When reading a diagram to check an answer each arrow can be read as ‘therefore’ or ‘lends support to’.

Argument diagrams sometimes include objections and counter objections. At present this is not a requirement of the course but if for any reason a candidate includes an objection it must be diagrammed in such a way that the objection can be clearly distinguished from a supporting reason, for example.



or



Questions requiring discussion of 'acceptability', 'relevance' and 'sufficiency'

'Acceptability', 'relevance' and 'sufficiency' primarily refer to the premises of the argument

- **acceptability** concerns whether the premises are true or, if not known to be true, can at least provisionally be taken as true
- **relevance** concerns whether the premises are relevant to the conclusion they are intended to support
- **sufficiency** concerns the degree of support they give to the conclusion and whether or not there is enough support to rationally accept the conclusion.

These issues are normally considered in the following order

- are the premises acceptable?
- if they are acceptable, are they relevant?
- if they are both acceptable and relevant, are they sufficient?

They are considered in this order because if the premises are unacceptable and/or irrelevant, they will also be insufficient. It only becomes an issue of sufficiency if the premises have already been deemed acceptable and relevant. However, candidates do not need to follow this procedure. Award marks for any accurate answer supported by appropriate reasons.

This procedure is not strictly necessary. If an argument is deductively valid it will have met the relevance and sufficiency criteria, but the acceptability criterion may still need to be assessed on other grounds. Similarly, some arguments may be trying to establish what conclusion would follow *if* the premises were true and the *actual* truth of the premises might be a matter of concern.

Some textbooks use different terms and split the material in different ways. Although candidates should be familiar with the approach taken in this course as laid out in the course specification, there may be legitimate reasons for considering a topic in relation to more than one of the three criteria. Award marks for any accurate answer supported by appropriate reasons.

Marking instructions for each question

Section 1 – Arguments in action

Question			Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
1.			Any of the following responses should be awarded 1 mark - a statement has a truth value, but an exclamation simply expresses a feeling/emotion - a statement either affirms or denies a claim whilst an exclamation does not. Or any other appropriate answer.	1
2.			Any of the following points should be awarded 1 mark - an argument involves an attempt to persuade someone that they should accept or reject a claim - an argument has at least one premise and a conclusion - an argument attempts to establish that a claim is true or false - an explanation merely offers reasons why, for example, a particular person has decided to do something/holds a particular belief. Or any other appropriate answer.	2
3.			Candidates should be awarded 1 mark for each of the following - presenting an argument - identifying at least one of the premises using a premise indicator such as ‘seeing as’, ‘since’, ‘due to the fact that’, because, etc.	2
4.	(a)		Convergent	1
	(b)		Linked	1
	(c)		Serial	1
	(d)		Linked	1
5.			To disprove a universal claim.	1
6.			Candidates should be awarded 1 mark for stating that a counterexample would be any dog that doesn’t have four legs.	1
7.	(a)		If P then Q, Q, So P.	1
	(b)		1 mark for any appropriate example.	1
	(c)		Award 1 mark each for any of the following points - affirming the consequent is invalid - the fact that Q is true does not guarantee that P is also true - with reference to their example, an explanation of circumstances in which the antecedent could be false even when the consequent is true - given the truth of ‘If P then Q’, the truth of Q is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for the truth of P - in the affirming the consequent fallacy it is assumed that Q is a sufficient as well as a necessary condition for the truth of P. A maximum of 1 mark can be given if candidates do not refer to their own example. Or any other appropriate answer.	2

Question			Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
8.	(a)		- ad hominem arguments typically are of the form X says Y X is/does Z therefore, not Y (1 mark) or an explanation of this - in ad hominem fallacies the attack on the person is irrelevant to the argument's conclusion. (1 mark)	2
	(b)		- this argument simply uses negative facts about the Chief Constable which are relevant to the conclusion (1 mark) - this argument does not follow the form of an ad hominem argument at all. (1 mark)	1
9.			- the conclusion of an inductive argument can at best be highly probable (1 mark) - the intention is that the conclusion goes beyond what is contained within the premises. (1 mark) 1 mark should be awarded for an appropriate example.	2
10.			- in deductive arguments there is an attempt to establish the conclusion for certain (1 mark) - the intention is that the conclusion does not go beyond what is contained in the premises. (1 mark) 1 mark should be awarded for an appropriate example.	2
11.			In a conductive argument each premise supports the conclusion independently. (1 mark) 1 mark should be awarded for an appropriate example.	2
12.			Candidates should be awarded 1 mark for each of the following points - a fallacy is a common error in reasoning - in the post hoc ergo propter hoc fallacy, the conclusion that X caused Y is based only on the observation that X preceded Y - such arguments do not establish that X is either sufficient or necessary for Y to have occurred. Reasons why some people might think this contains a post hoc fallacy - some people may believe that there is an error in reasoning here because the person concerned may have made some other change to their life at the same time as they started taking the new honey (1 mark) - some other change, and not the honey, may be the thing that is responsible for changing their life (1 mark) - the argument does not give us sufficient reason to believe that it is definitely the honey that has brought about the change. (1 mark)	6

Question			Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
			Reasons why some people might think this does not contain a post hoc fallacy • some people may believe that there is not an error in reasoning here because it is not unheard of for people to notice changes occurring as a result of small changes to their diet (1 mark) • some people might think the fact that three changes have occurred since the person started taking the new honey makes it more likely that the honey is the common cause (1 mark) • in conductive arguments each premise lends additional support to the conclusion. (1 mark) A maximum of 5 marks can be given if the candidate only considers reasons for one side of the argument of why/why not it is not a fallacy.	

Section 2 – Knowledge and doubt

Question			Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
13			Award 1 mark for any of the following points - to find a firm foundation for knowledge - to find something firm and lasting in the sciences - to prove that God exists - to prove the sceptics wrong - to eliminate all sources of doubt - to make the distinction between mind and body - to make a case for rationalism.	3
14.			Award 1 mark for each of the following points - Descartes realises that it is possible that an all-powerful God could make it seem to him as though there were such things as sky, earth, size, shape etc, when in fact there were no such things - an omnipotent God might have arranged things such that the truths of mathematics are not what they seem to be - God has the power to be the source of deception.	2
15.			Award 1 mark for any of the following points It is successful - if there was not an all-powerful God, then there would be nothing powerful enough to deceive you at all times - it allows him to doubt his previous held beliefs and further his project of finding foundational truths. It is not successful - he does not apply the methodological scepticism as rigorously as he does in the rest of Meditation 1 - it is not convincing for someone who does not believe in God. Any other relevant point.	3
16.			Award 1 mark for any of the following points - Descartes is concerned that his habitual opinions keep returning - to counter the ‘weight in pre-conceived opinion’ he uses the idea of the malicious demon to deceive himself - he will pretend that his previous beliefs are not just debateable but actually false - he imagines a hypothetical malicious demon that has put every effort into deceiving him.	2
17.			Award 1 mark for A: vivacity.	1
18.			Award 1 mark for C: a corresponding impression.	1
19.			Award 1 mark for D: processes of the imagination.	1

Question			Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
20.			Award 1 mark for any of the following points - although the imagination appears boundless it is actually confined to 4 processes: compounding, transposing, augmenting and diminishing - all of my most unusual ideas can be traced back to earlier impressions - Hume gives the example of the idea of God as one that seems to be far different from our experience, but which can be created by augmenting qualities and ideas we have experienced - Hume gives a number of cases where a person not having the impression would lead to not having the corresponding idea - when the senses have been impaired in some way, we have not the corresponding ideas, for example, a blind man who has never experienced colour has no concept of what colour is - an absence of a relevant experience will lead to the absence of the idea – Hume gives the example of the negro and Laplander never tasting wine or the generous person not understanding abject cruelty - Hume notes we are willing to accept that we have no idea about things other animals experience that we cannot. A maximum of 3 marks if only one argument is identified.	4
21.			Award 1 mark for any of the following points. It is convincing - it is generally true that there is a clear qualitative difference between experiencing something directly and remembering or imagining that thing which justifies the distinction between force and vivacity - cases where ideas are especially forceful and lively and impressions are weaker are covered by the exceptions Hume identifies, which is ‘when the mind is out of order because of disease or madness’ - if we consider force and vivacity to be concerned with causal impact, we are only motivated to act on the basis of impressions. It is not convincing - there are a lot of normal experiences that are so far from forceful or lively, such as things we experience in the periphery of our vision or when we are not really paying attention, and these are much less vivid than some ideas we have - it is not always clear what counts as an impression and what counts as an idea, for example, there are some very vivid perceptions such as in dreams or when people have suffered a significant trauma that are more forceful and lively than our normal impressions of things - arguably Hume’s empiricism collapses into scepticism because it does not guarantee knowledge of an external world – our impressions may not correspond with reality.	3

Section 3 – Moral philosophy

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
22.	Award 1 mark for any of the following points. • there is a contradiction in the will when it is not possible for a rational being to will that their maxim be universalised (1 mark) • in order to pursue my own happiness, which is central to my interest as a free rational agent, I will need to make use of the talents of other people (1 mark) • for example, I cannot will that my maxim, ‘it is ok for me not to develop my talents’ is universalised as I cannot rationally will that no-one ever developed their talents (1 mark) • so my willing that no-one will ever develop their talents undermines my pursuit of my own happiness (1 mark) • an imperfect duty arises from a contradiction in the will. (1 mark) Any other relevant point.	4
23.	Award 1 mark for any of the following points. • we have a perfect duty to refrain from following maxims that lead to a contradiction in conception when universalised (1 mark) • we have an imperfect duty to refrain from following maxims that lead to a contradiction in the will when universalised (1 mark) • we must always follow our perfect duties (1 mark) • we must sometimes follow our imperfect duties/develop a policy about when it is ok not to follow our imperfect duties. (1 mark)	2
24.	Award 1 mark for any of the following points. • although Kant tells us that we must sometimes follow our imperfect duties, he doesn’t tell us when we must follow them (1 mark) • opportunities to help others/develop our talents, come around much more often than opportunities to lie, cheat, steal and kill, so if we can’t clearly determine when we must follow our imperfect duties then Kant’s theory seems incomplete and/or unhelpful (1 mark) • he says we should make a policy that will tell us when it is ok not to follow our imperfect duties (1 mark), but this seems to come down to inclination, circumstances, etc, which Kant said are morally irrelevant (1 mark) • Kant’s concept of imperfect duties is useful in making moral decisions as it reminds us that although we need not develop our talents or help others all the time, we do have duties to do these things sometimes (1 mark) • were it not for the concept of imperfect duties Kant’s theory would be an entirely negative one that told us only about the things we were not allowed to do (1 mark) • the concept of imperfect duties gives us moral cause to prevent moral agents from being cold and detached. (1 mark) Any other relevant point.	4

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]