



National
Qualifications
2022

2022 Philosophy

Paper 2

Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2022

These marking instructions have been prepared by examination teams for use by SQA appointed markers when marking external course assessments.

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



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. E.g., 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, e.g., 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.

Marking instructions for each question

Section 1 – ARGUMENTS IN ACTION

Question		Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
1.		<p>Candidates should receive credit for the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> an argument has at least one premise (1 mark) an argument has a conclusion (1 mark) an argument involves an attempt to persuade (1 mark) an argument aims to establish or refute/prove a claim. (1 mark) 	2
2.		<p>Premise1: – If a car has reliable brakes then it has brakes that work on ice. Premise 2: – The brakes on my car don't work very well on ice. Conclusion: – My car does not have reliable brakes.</p> <p>1 mark for identifying the premises.</p> <p>1 mark for the conclusion if they have changed 'it' to 'my car', and removed the phrase 'So you can see that'</p>	2
3.	(a)	Candidates should be awarded one mark for any premise indicator: e.g., since, because, etc.	1
	(b)	Candidates should be awarded one mark for any conclusion indicator: e.g., so, therefore, etc.	1
4.		<p>1 mark for stating it is a convergent argument or for providing a diagram of a convergent argument. (1 mark)</p> <p>The premises give independent support to the conclusion. (1 mark)</p>	2
5.		<p>1 mark for stating it is a linked/dependent argument or for providing a diagram of a linked/dependent argument. (1 mark)</p> <p>The premises do not support the conclusion on their own but work together. (1 mark)</p>	2
6.	(a)	<p>The premise is acceptable because it is true, or it is common knowledge, that all human beings have hearts. (1 mark)</p> <p>(Candidates should not be awarded a mark for stating other factors that make some premises acceptable because these are not the factors that make this premise acceptable.)</p>	1
	(b)	<p>Candidates should be awarded one mark for either of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the premise is not sufficient to establish the conclusion because we do not know that Fluffy is a human being (1 mark) if we assume that Fluffy is a human being then the premise is sufficient to establish the conclusion. (1 mark) 	1

Question		Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
7.	(a)	The conclusion of an inductive argument can at best be highly probable. (1 mark)	1
	(b)	The argument is deductive because it attempts to establish for certain that my house is now at an increased risk of fire. (1 mark)	1
8.		The function of a counter-example is to disprove a universal claim. (1 mark)	1
9.	(a)	In a valid argument if the premises are true then the conclusion must also be true. (1 mark) A response which simply refers to a valid argument having a good structure, or the conclusion following the premises would not be credited with a mark because this could also be true of arguments which are not valid.	1
	(b)	The word 'light' is used to mean different things in the first and second premises, e.g., in one sense of 'light' (tone) the second premise is true, in the other sense (weight) it is false. (1 mark)	1
	(c)	1 mark for any of the following points: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> if we take the meaning of 'light' to be fixed then the argument is valid, but one premise and the conclusion are false if the word 'light' is used to mean different things in the first and second premises then it's possible for the premises to be true and the conclusion false, so the argument is invalid. 	1
10.	(a)	An analogical argument attempts to establish that two things are similar in some respect because they have some other feature in common.	1
	(b)	People's freedom being restricted in prisons and schools is a relevant similarity (1 mark) Examples of other relevant similarities (1 mark) However, there are lots of ways in which prisons and schools are not similar that constitute significant dissimilarities. (1 mark) Examples of significant dissimilarities. (1 mark) Evaluation of the relevance or significance of the similarities or dissimilarities to make a judgement on the quality of the analogy (1 mark) Candidates may be credited for any reference to other relevant criteria in relation to this analogy 'truth, relevance, dis-analogy, diversity'.	3

Question		Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
11.		<p>Slippery slope arguments are generally of the form: ‘If P then Q, if Q then R, if R then S, S is undesirable, so not P’. (1 mark)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>‘P increases the chances of Q, Q increases the chances of R, R increases the chances of S, S is undesirable, so not P’. (1 mark)</p> <p>Slippery slope arguments propose that some undesirable event or commitment is an eventual consequence of accepting or taking some first step. (1 mark)</p> <p>Therefore, we should not take this first step. (1 mark)</p> <p>In fallacious slippery slope arguments, we are not given sufficient reason to believe that the undesirable event or commitment will inevitably follow from the first step. (1 mark)</p> <p>This could be because one of the premises is false (in the ‘If P then Q’ form). (1 mark)</p> <p>It could be because the chances of the undesirable event get more and more remote with each step in the ‘P increases the chances of Q’ form. (1 mark)</p> <p>In an admissible slippery slope argument, there is good enough reason to believe that the undesirable event is an inevitable/likely consequence of the first step. (1 mark)</p> <p>Example of a fallacious slippery slope argument. (1 mark) The example given must contain a complete argument with a conclusion. It is not enough to simply provide a premise with a statement of the form ‘If X then Y’.</p> <p>Candidates can only be awarded a maximum of 3 marks for a description of the slippery slope argument.</p>	6
12.	(a)	The fallacy is denying the antecedent. (1 mark)	1
	(b)	<p>Candidates should be awarded one mark for any of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • even if it is true that if everyone followed a vegetarian diet global warming would be reduced, it does not follow that global warming will not be reduced unless everyone follows a vegetarian diet • there are other ways in which global warming might be reduced besides everyone following a vegetarian diet • everyone following a vegetarian diet might be sufficient to reduce global warming, but it is not necessary. 	1

Section 2 – KNOWLEDGE AND DOUBT

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
13.	<p>1 mark for one of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the claim ‘I am, I exist’ • ‘I think, therefore I am’ • the knowledge that he can be certain of his own existence. 	1
14.	<p>1 mark for any of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • even if Descartes believes that ‘there is absolutely nothing in the world, no sky, no earth, no minds, no bodies’, it does not follow that he does not exist • if he convinced himself of something, then he certainly existed • even if he was dreaming, or his senses were deceiving him, he would exist in order to be deceived • even the malicious demon cannot deceive him on that for if he is being deceived, he undoubtedly exists • his conclusion that ‘this proposition, I am, I exist, is necessarily true whenever it is put forward by me or conceived in my mind’. <p>Candidates should not be credited for discussing any aspect of The Method of Doubt.</p>	4
15.	<p>Candidates may be awarded 1 mark for each appropriate criticism (strengths/weaknesses).</p> <p>Candidates may also be awarded up to 5 marks for a developed discussion of one criticism.</p> <p>Candidates may discuss the following points or other appropriate evaluative comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the phrase ‘I am: I exist’ is self-authenticating, or self-justifying. Any time you express the thought or simply think it in your mind, it must be true; it justifies itself and so does not require any further justification for accepting it • can we fully trust in our powers of reason and logic, given the doubt raised by the hypothetical malicious demon. This hypothesis might mean that we must doubt even the reliability of logic itself • although the Cogito does appear self-evidently true, there are clearly logical steps involved in Descartes’ argument: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Premise 1: – If I’m thinking then I must exist – Premise 2: – I am thinking – Conclusion: – I must exist. • is Descartes right to claim ‘I exist’ – does the concept ‘I’ contain more than he is entitled to know given the doubts he has raised • the self-authenticating nature of the cogito is just a feature of indexical reference and is not an achievement • the Cogito is arguably trivial, which makes it an unlikely foundation for further knowledge claims • he can only be certain of his existence right now; the persistence of self is not established. 	5

Question		Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
16.		<p>1 mark for one of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge about causes is never known a priori but always comes from our experience of finding that particular objects are constantly associated with one another • even after the effect has been suggested the necessity of it being that particular effect cannot be determined a priori • it is based on custom and habit • we never observe any necessary connection • it is not based on any process of reasoning. 	1
17.		<p>1 mark for each of the following points or other appropriate comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we believe that we can know using reason alone that when one billiard ball struck another this would necessarily make the other ball move, but this is not true • the first ball moving is a totally separate event to the second ball moving • as Hume puts it: ‘The mind can’t possibly find the effect in the supposed cause, however carefully we examine it, for the effect is totally different from the cause and therefore can never be discovered in it’ • he asks the reader to imagine they were shown something they had never encountered before and were asked what the effect of it was. They would have to arbitrarily come up with some answer using their imagination, and there could be any number of possible effects that could be entertained • candidates may be credited for providing examples of other things that may happen when the billiard ball is struck • without observation our tendency to believe that the second ball is going to move is arbitrary. 	4

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
18.	<p>Candidates may be awarded 1 mark for each appropriate criticism (strengths/weaknesses).</p> <p>Candidates may also be awarded up to 5 marks for a developed discussion of one criticism.</p> <p>Candidates may use the following points or other appropriate evaluative comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • philosopher Karl Popper argues that the scientific process is much more complicated than Hume suggests. We revise theories in light of new evidence; aware that future events might be different from the past – it is a form of educated guessing • scientists successfully predict a priori, the effects of certain causes before observations, e.g., Einstein’s predictions of the effects of gravity on light prior to observations being possible • Kant suggests we need the idea of cause and effect to understand and make sense of our observations. This means we understand causation first and then apply it to the experience. Hume says we experience constant conjunction then assume causation • human psychology is more complex than Hume suggests – constant conjunction does not always yield a belief in necessary connection • we also seem to be able to draw inferences about causes from single observations • Hume’s view of causation is based on his claim that the only knowledge we can have falls into his two categories (relations of ideas and matters of fact), otherwise known as Hume’s Fork. This, itself, falls foul of the distinction it makes. It is neither a relation of ideas, nor a matter of fact • we may question whether the two events of cause and effect are separate. 	5

Section 3 – MORAL PHILOSOPHY

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
19.	<p>To quantify pleasure. (1 mark) To work out the morally right action to take (1 mark)</p>	1
20.	<p>Candidates should be awarded 1 mark for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intensity: How intense will the pleasure be? • Duration: How long will the pleasure last? • Certainty: How likely is the pleasure to happen? • Propinquity: How immediate or remote is the pleasure? • Fecundity: How likely is it to be followed by similar pleasures? • Purity: How likely is it to be followed by pain? • Extent: How many people will experience the pleasure? <p>Candidates will be awarded no marks for just naming components.</p>	1
21.	<p>Act: an individual action is right if it maximises happiness. (1 mark) Rule: an action is right if it conforms to a rule that would maximise overall happiness if everyone followed it. (1 mark)</p> <p>No marks for just saying that Rule Utilitarians follow rules and Act Utilitarians don't follow rules.</p>	2
22.	<p>Candidates should be awarded 1 mark for any appropriate point.</p> <p>Candidates may also be awarded up to 6 marks for a developed discussion of one criticism where it makes comparisons between Act and Rule Utilitarianism (strengths/weaknesses/comparisons/relevant examples).</p> <p>Candidates may use the following points or other appropriate evaluative comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Act Utilitarianism is better than Rule Utilitarianism as it seems fairer to take individual cases on their own merits • there is potential for accusation of tyranny of the majority with Act Utilitarianism which Rule Utilitarianism arguably avoids • it's not practical to assess every moral act in terms of the hedonic calculus and Rule Utilitarianism avoids this by having an appropriate rule • if focus is on a rule there is less likelihood of causing injustices • following rules based on utility would appear to benefit society as a whole • although Rule Utilitarianism does have some benefits over Act, it has other problems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – objective rules that create the most happiness might be difficult to calculate – conflicting rules is a potential problem • Rule Utilitarianism is an improvement on act utilitarianism as the rules are based on past experiences of what maximises happiness and therefore there is justification for the rules. <p>A maximum of 3 marks can be gained if no comparisons are made between Act Utilitarianism and Rule Utilitarianism.</p> <p>No marks will be gained for simply describing general criticisms of Utilitarianism as a moral theory.</p>	6

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]