



National
Qualifications
2017

2017 Philosophy

Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2017

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is reproduced, SQA should be clearly acknowledged as the source. If it is to be used for any other purpose, written permission must be obtained from permissions@sqa.org.uk.

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.



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. The marking schemes are written to assist in determining the “minimal acceptable answer” rather than listing every possible correct and incorrect answer.

Marks should always be assigned in accordance with these marking instructions. In problematic cases advice should be sought from your Team Leader or Principal Assessor.

In the short answer questions marking should always be positive, ie marks should be awarded for what is correct and not deducted for errors or omissions.

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.

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.

In giving their responses, candidates will show the following skills, knowledge and understanding.

Knowledge: 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.

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.

Reasoned view: This is the ability to develop and sustain an argument that leads to and supports a clear conclusion.

Marking principles for each question type


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

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, eg

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, eg



It is usual for those with numbers to be written such that the **final conclusion** is at the bottom of the diagram; it is common for those with boxes to be written such that the **final conclusion** is at the top of the diagram. Diagrams of either type and written in either direction are acceptable. It is common for the statements in the legend to be arranged in standard form with the final conclusion at the end rather than have the statements listed in the order in which they occur in the passage. Either option is acceptable.

If a candidate includes an unstated premise or conclusion in their diagram it should be clearly indicated as such. When using a legend, some people choose to indicate unstated premises and conclusions by using letters rather than numbers. This is acceptable.

It is expected that candidates will 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**, ie **premise indicators** (eg since, because, etc.) and **conclusion indicators** (eg 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, eg ‘While it may be true that...’
- **assurances** – words or phrases that indicate the confidence of the person presenting the argument, eg ‘Everyone will readily allow that...’
- **hedges** – words that indicate that the argument is being put forward tentatively, eg ‘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, eg 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, eg



or



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

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

- **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, and
- **sufficiency** concerns the degree of support they give to the conclusion and whether or not there is enough support to rationally accept the conclusion

In considering these issues, it would be usual to consider them in order—are the premises acceptable? If they are acceptable then are they relevant? If they are both acceptable and relevant, then are they sufficient? The reason for this is that if the premises fail to be acceptable and/or relevant then they will also fail to be sufficient; it only becomes an issue of sufficiency *per se* if the premises have already been deemed acceptable and relevant. However, learners are not required to follow this procedure and should be rewarded for any accurate answer supported by appropriate reasons.

Markers should also note that the procedure isn't strictly necessary for if an argument is deductively valid then 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 not be a matter of concern.

Markers should be aware that some textbooks use different terms and may divide the material up differently. Although it is expected that learners will be familiar with the approach taken in this course as laid out in the course assessment specification markers should be aware that there may be legitimate reasons for considering a topic in relation to more than one of the three criteria.

Learners should be rewarded for any accurate answer supported by appropriate reasons.

Marking instructions for each question

Section 1 - Arguments in Action

Question		Specific marking instructions for this question	Max mark
1.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is a premise indicator/inference indicator. (Specific terminology is not required as long as the meaning is required.) 	1
2.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No arrows, ie no indication of which is the conclusion and which are premises. Not written as standalone statements. Diagram should show the argument has two independent premises. “in any case” is extra wording that indicates an independent premise (or, at least, is not part of the premise.) 	3
3.		<p>1 mark for any substantive point/example, eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant area of expertise Legitimate discipline No vested interest/bias Recognised authority Representing the standard view <p>A candidate should not be awarded a second mark for making the same point in a different way eg ‘An appropriate appeal to authority is where the person is a recognised authority. A fallacious appeal to authority is where a person is not a recognised authority.’ This would be worth only one mark. A second mark can be awarded if a point is developed with a relevant example.</p>	3
4.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 mark for explaining deductive reasoning, eg deductive reasoning attempts to draw certain conclusions from a given set of premises. 1 mark for explaining inductive reasoning, eg inductive reasoning attempts to draw probable conclusions from a given set of premises. 1 mark for explaining why analogical arguments are best described as inductive reasoning. 1 mark for an example of an analogical argument. <p>Maximum of two marks if the answer is not given as ‘inductive’. It is not acceptable to say deductive reasoning is arguing from the general to the specific or that inductive reasoning is arguing from the specific to the general. (nb ‘x is A; x is B; therefore, some A’s are B’s’)</p>	4

Question		Specific marking instructions for this question	Max mark
5.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 mark for a precise explanation of validity, eg if the premises are true then the conclusion <u>must be true</u>/the truth of the premises will <u>guarantee</u> the truth of the conclusion. (It is not acceptable to say the conclusion can be inferred from the premises or the argument is well-structured.) • 1 mark for example of a valid argument. 	2
6.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 mark for words having multiple meanings/lexical ambiguity/equivocation. • 1 mark for grammatical ambiguity/syntactic ambiguity/amphiboly. <p>Or any other appropriate answer, for example it is acceptable for a candidate to give two different types of syntactic ambiguity (eg scope/pronoun reference) or another type of ambiguity.</p> <p>It is not acceptable to merely say that ambiguity makes the premise 'vague' or 'unclear'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2 marks – one for each appropriate example. 	4
7.		<p>1 mark for each substantive point/example eg defining confirmation bias as the tendency to seek out or give greater weighting to evidence that confirms one's own pre-existing beliefs ('cherry picking' of the evidence); it leads to a failure to consider contrary evidence; the ready acceptability of the conclusion leads to the reasoning supporting the conclusion not being properly examined.</p> <p>A maximum of two marks to be awarded if there is no appropriate example.</p>	3

Section 2 - Knowledge and Doubt

Question	Specific marking instructions for this question	Max mark
8.	<p>Candidates may answer this question in a variety of ways. For example, they may concentrate on analysing and evaluating the trademark argument itself or they may combine that with its relationship to the clear and distinct rule.</p> <p>This question will be marked holistically according to the criteria given below.</p> <p>Candidates who have written answers worthy <u>of at least ten marks</u> will be awarded marks as follows:</p>	20

An answer gaining 10-11 marks

- will be a satisfactory response that includes the essential descriptive material but which may be undeveloped and contain some inaccuracies.
- will contain at least one appropriate evaluative comment.
- may include a personal view on the issue that is not necessarily well supported.

eg a candidate will demonstrate a basic understanding of the trademark argument and may demonstrate a basic understanding of the role of God in the *Meditations* and will be able to make at least one evaluative comment such as giving a reason for believing the causal adequacy principle to be unconvincing.

An answer gaining 12-13 marks

- will be a good answer that clearly addresses the question using relevant, mainly accurate and detailed descriptive information.
- will contain several evaluative comments that are well explained.
- may include a personal view on the issue that is well supported.

eg a candidate will give a description of the trademark argument that, whilst it may not be comprehensive in its detail, shows a clear understanding of the key features of the argument. Criticisms offered will be significant and developed.

An answer gaining 14-17 marks

- will be a well-structured answer that clearly addresses the question using relevant, accurate and detailed descriptive information.
- will contain several evaluative comments that are developed and well explained and may themselves be evaluated.
- is likely to include a clear and well supported personal judgment on the issue, although this need not be in the form of a concluding paragraph and may be implicit rather than explicit.

eg a candidate will give a very detailed account of the argument. This will probably entail showing that they fully understand what is meant by “there must be at least as much reality in the ... cause as in the effect...” Evaluative comments may show that they know how Descartes was relying on concepts that are no longer accepted.

An answer gaining 18-20 marks

- will be an excellent and full answer that demonstrates a detailed and clear understanding of the relevant information.
- will contain evaluative comments that are well developed and are likely to be the basis of discussion rather than just being described.
- will, either implicitly or explicitly, reveal a clear personal position on the issue that is well supported and fully consistent with the descriptive and evaluative material presented in the answer.

eg a candidate will give a very detailed account of the argument and may give a clear explanation of the difference between such things as formal and objective reality. Evaluation will be sophisticated and the candidate may, for example, give reasons for rejecting Cottingham’s sponginess counter-example, etc.

Answers worthy of less than ten marks will be awarded marks as follows:

An answer gaining 9 marks will typically

- have some relevant but basic descriptive material but information necessary to demonstrate understanding crucial to the question is either missing or confused, and/or
- have basic descriptive material but no evaluative comments.

eg a candidate may demonstrate a basic understanding of the role of God in Descartes meditations but show only a very confused understanding of the trademark argument.

An answer gaining 0-8 marks will

Be a poor answer lacking in detail and/or accuracy. Candidates should be awarded one mark up to a maximum of eight marks for each relevant point that they make.

Knowledge, understanding and analysis points that a candidate might make regarding the trademark argument:

- Basic idea – the fact that I have an idea of God is enough to show that there must be a god - "it must be concluded that the mere fact that I exist and have within me an idea of a most perfect being, that is, God, provides a very clear proof that God indeed exists."
- The causal adequacy principle - "there must be at least as much reality in the efficient and total cause as in the effect of that cause."
- The causal adequacy principle – "something cannot arise from nothing, and also that what is more perfect—that is, contains in itself more reality—cannot arise from what is less perfect."
- Depends on there being degrees of reality – an infinite substance has more reality than a finite substance which in turn has more reality than a mode.
- Depends on degrees of objective reality having the same degrees of reality as formal reality - "although this cause does not transfer any of its actual or formal reality to my idea, it should not on that account be supposed that it must be less real."
- Descartes' examples of stones and heat.
- According to Descartes the idea of God (an infinite substance) cannot have come from me (a finite substance), it wasn't acquired through the senses or invented by me and therefore must be innate.

Evaluative points that a candidate might make regarding the trademark argument:

- Putative counter-examples to the causal adequacy principle, e. Cottingham – the sponginess of a sponge cake.
- The claim that the causal adequacy principle and its reliance on degrees of reality is "manifest by the natural light" is unconvincing.
- That others find the trademark argument unconvincing suggests it is not clear and distinct.
- If it is not clear and distinct then it depends on claims that Descartes should have doubted if he had consistently applied his method of doubt.

Additional points that a candidate might make regarding Descartes' use of the trademark argument.

- Having established certainty through the cogito and the clear and distinct rule Descartes needs God to guarantee the reliability of knowledge.
- Explanation of the clear and distinct role and its relation to the cogito
- Explanation of the 'Cartesian Circle'.
- Discussion as to whether Descartes' 'memory explanation' successfully avoids the accusation of circularity.

Section 3 - Moral Philosophy

Question		Specific marking instructions for this question	Max mark
9.	(a)	<p>Intensity, duration, certainty, propinquity, fecundity, purity, extent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 mark for identifying at least four; 2 marks for identifying all seven. <p>It is acceptable for a candidate to correctly explain an item rather than simply list the items, eg it would be acceptable to say 'nearness/remoteness' rather than 'propinquity'.</p> <p>If a candidate states an item correctly but then gives an incorrect explanation and thereby show they do not understand the term they should still be credited as they would have been if they had simply given the term without the explanation.</p>	2
	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> having experience of both types of pleasure, ie the 'higher' and 'lower' pleasures. 	1
	(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 mark for saying that for act utilitarians, an action is right if it maximises happiness. 1 mark for saying that for rule utilitarians, an action is right if it conforms to a rule that is in place because it maximises happiness. <p>It is not sufficient to say rule utilitarians follow rules and act utilitarians don't follow rules for act utilitarians advocated the use of rules to assist in selecting the right action.</p>	2

Question		Specific marking instructions for this question	Max mark
10.	(a)	<p>1 mark for linking 'deontological' to the ethical position that morality is based on duty/obligation/it is a moral theory where morality is determined by something intrinsic to the action rather than the consequences.</p> <p>It is not enough to say it is to do with motives.</p>	1
	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 mark for "Act only on that maxim through which you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law." • 1 mark for "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." • 1 mark for "Act as if he were through his maxim always a legislating member in the universal kingdom of ends." <p>Due to there being different translations it is not necessary for the wording to be exactly as given here but it should be close enough to capture the important features of the formulation. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the first formulation concerns what we can logically <u>will</u> to be the case not what we would wish or desire to be the case or what we might successfully get people to follow; - in the second formulation (the humanity/end in itself formulation) it is not acceptable to say, "You shouldn't treat someone as a means" the crucial point is that they must always be treated as an end. 	2
	(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 mark for saying that you cannot conceive of a maxim becoming a universal law because the attempt to do so removes the conditions which make it possible. 	1
	(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 mark for saying that a perfect duty is one that has no exceptions. A candidate may say that in Kantian ethics if attempting to universalise the maxim leads to a contradiction in conception then we have a perfect duty to refrain from acting on that maxim. 	1

Question	Specific marking instructions for this question	Max mark
11.	<p>1 mark for each developed point/example. Candidates might consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consequences are taken into account in many non-moral decisions so it is odd to exclude them from moral decision making. • experience shows that we can often predict consequences reliably even if not perfectly. • appropriate discussion of long-term v short-term consequences. • appropriate discussion of intended v actual consequences. • given that Kant undoubtedly knew that we predict consequences all the time and can often do so reliably the most able candidates may consider why he excluded them from moral decision making. 	10

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]