



National  
Qualifications  
2023

---

## 2023 Philosophy

### Paper 2

### Higher

## Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2023

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](mailto: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. 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.

## Marking instructions for each question

### Section 1 – ARGUMENTS IN ACTION

Question		Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
1.		Candidates should be awarded <b>1 mark</b> for ‘You cannot be serious.’	<b>1</b>
2.		Candidates should be awarded <b>1 mark</b> for any premise indicator, such as ‘because’, ‘due to the fact that’, ‘we can take it for granted that’, etc.	<b>1</b>
3.		Candidates should be awarded <b>1 mark</b> for saying that they are used to disprove universal claims.	<b>1</b>
4.		Candidates should not be awarded marks for simply stating that the passage is not best understood as an argument. Candidates should be awarded <b>1 mark</b> each for any appropriate reason. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>arguments need to involve an attempt to persuade and there is no attempt to persuade in the passage</li> <li>the passage does not contain a conclusion</li> <li>the passage does not contain reasons that support any of the claims made</li> <li>this is merely an explanation, and the person is just explaining why they are a Radiohead fan.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>
5.	(a)	Candidates should be awarded <b>1 mark</b> for saying that in a conductive argument each premise lends independent support to the conclusion.	<b>1</b>
	(b)	Candidates should be awarded <b>1 mark</b> for any appropriate argument with at least <b>two</b> premises, such as: P1 – all your friends will be there P2 – you enjoy parties P3 – it’s your best friend’s birthday C – you should go to the party on Saturday night.	<b>1</b>
6.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Professional tennis players get regular exercise.</li> <li>Regular exercise keeps people healthy.</li> <li>Healthy people will live long lives.</li> <li>Professional tennis players will live long lives.</li> </ol> $1 + 2 + 3$ <hr style="width: 50px; margin-left: 0;"/>  Candidates should be awarded <b>1 mark</b> for each of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>presenting a linked argument diagram</li> <li>correctly identifying the conclusion</li> <li>correctly identifying the 3 premises.</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>

Question		Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
7.	(a)	<p>Candidates should be awarded <b>1 mark</b> for a definition of a deductive argument.</p> <p>Deductive arguments attempt to establish their conclusions for certain.</p>	1
	(b)	<p>Candidates should be awarded <b>1 mark</b> for relevant points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• this argument is inductive, as the premises do not make the conclusion certain</li> <li>• the argument must be conductive because each premise provides independent support for the conclusion, which is a feature of conductive arguments</li> <li>• there are other reasons why someone might be persuaded to buy an electric car this year that are not considered in the passage</li> <li>• even if having an electric car might be inconvenient in some ways, that doesn't necessarily make it wrong to buy one this year.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should be awarded a <b>maximum of 1 mark</b> if they say the argument is deductive.</p>	2
8.		<p>Candidates should be awarded <b>1 mark</b> for any of relevant comment on the effectiveness of the argument, and an additional mark for any developed point, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the first premise is acceptable because it is common knowledge/true that humans have rights</li> <li>• some people might think the second premise is not acceptable because they believe it to be false</li> <li>• non-human animals are not moral agents, and this is a morally relevant difference between them and human animals (or any other difference they think is morally relevant).</li> </ul> <p>Candidates may be credited for appropriate comment on the validity of the argument:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• if they assume that rights must be associated with morality, then this argument would be valid.</li> <li>• if they consider that rights need not be associated with morality, for example, legal rights, then the argument would be invalid.</li> </ul> <p>(Candidates should not be awarded a mark for a definition of validity.)</p>	3
9.	(a)	<p>Valid arguments refer to arguments whose structure is such that if the premises are true the conclusion cannot be false. <b>(1 mark)</b></p>	1
	(b)	<p><b>1 mark</b> should be awarded for any appropriate example, such as:</p> <p>Premise 1: – If you want to achieve good grades you should work hard in school.</p> <p>Premise 2: – You do want to achieve good grades.</p> <p>Conclusion: – You should work hard in school.</p>	1
	(c)	<p><b>1 mark</b> should be awarded for any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sammy could be kind and funny and still not be a good friend</li> <li>• there are other factors which are relevant to friendship besides just being kind and being funny</li> <li>• someone can't be a good friend if (for example) you can't trust them.</li> </ul>	1

Question		Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
10.		<p>In a post hoc ergo propter hoc fallacy there is a mistaken assumption that because one event follows another the second event is caused by the first event. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><b>1 mark</b> should be awarded for an appropriate example.</p> <p><b>1 mark</b> should be awarded for an explanation of why the reasoning is flawed in the example.</p>	3
11.	(a)	<p>Candidates should be awarded <b>1 mark</b> for defining a fallacious appeal to authority (A fallacious appeal to authority happens when a claim is accepted because some group or person asserts that it is true, without evidence that they are authoritative in this matter)</p> <p>Candidates can be awarded a maximum of <b>1 mark</b> for identifying the criteria for appropriate appeals to authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• have a relevant area of expertise</li> <li>• have studied a legitimate discipline</li> <li>• have no vested interest or bias</li> <li>• represent the standard view of their community of experts</li> <li>• work for/are a recognised authority.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should be awarded additional marks for focussed discussion of whether the appeals to authority in both arguments are fallacious. This is likely to include identifying assumptions that the arguers have made and the additional knowledge we would need about the authority to make a judgement, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Koyama mentions scientists but does not specify their area of expertise which makes it less appropriate.</li> <li>• the mention of multiple scientists suggests that this may be the standard view of the community which makes it more appropriate.</li> <li>• Ruti only mentions one researcher which may be taken that they go against the standard view which makes it less appropriate.</li> <li>• Ruti assumes that source found on the internet would make it appropriate but they have not given reason for us to take them as such which makes it less appropriate.</li> </ul>	4
	(b)	<p>Candidates may answer this question in different ways. Any of the following approaches would be acceptable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ruti gives undue weight to the evidence of the one researcher on the internet, whose view supports what she believes, <b>(1 mark)</b> and dismisses the evidence of the scientists who disagree <b>(1 mark)</b></li> <li>• confirmation bias involves seeking evidence that confirms what you already believe <b>(1 mark)</b>, and that's what Ruti is doing when making a decision based on a single researcher's opinion <b>(1 mark)</b></li> <li>• confirmation bias involves ignoring evidence that disagrees with what you already believe <b>(1 mark)</b>. Ruti does this when she dismisses the evidence of all the other scientists <b>(1 mark)</b>.</li> </ul> <p><b>A maximum of 1 mark</b> may be given if no reference is made to the dialogue.</p>	2

Question		Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
12.		<p>Candidates may be awarded <b>1 mark only</b> for identifying the fallacy as affirming the consequent <b>or</b> giving the general form of the affirming the consequent fallacy – If P then Q, Q, therefore P.</p> <p>Candidates may be awarded up to <b>2 marks</b> for appropriate explanation of the fallacy with reference to the argument. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• just because you have avoided international travel it does not mean that you want to reduce your carbon footprint. There could be other reasons why you have not travelled abroad, for example, illness or lack of money <b>(1 mark)</b></li> <li>• the example assumes that avoiding international travel is a sufficient criteria for reducing your carbon footprint, rather than a necessary one. <b>(1 mark)</b></li> </ul>	<b>2</b>

Section 2 – KNOWLEDGE AND DOUBT

Question		Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
13.		<p>Award <b>1 mark</b> for any of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to search for a firm foundation for knowledge</li> <li>to identify all sources of doubt</li> <li>to establish the limits of scepticism</li> <li>to test the reliability of what he thinks he knows</li> <li>to withhold assent from any belief he has reason to doubt</li> <li>to examine the foundations of his beliefs</li> <li>to establish a rigorous basis for accepting knowledge claims.</li> </ul> <p>Aims must be specific to the method of doubt and should not be overall aims of the Meditations.</p>	2
14.	(a)	<p>Award <b>1 mark</b> for any of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>he doubts his sensory beliefs about very small and distant things</li> <li>he does not doubt his senses fully but mistrusts them</li> <li>he does not doubt he is sitting by his fire in his dressing gown.</li> </ul>	1
	(b)	<p>He cannot be certain about any knowledge of the external world gained from the senses.</p>	1
15.		<p>Candidates should be awarded <b>1 mark</b> for any appropriate analysis or evaluation of the student’s answer, and additional marks for developing those points. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the malicious demon was meant to be hypothetical, so a lack of evidence is an irrelevance</li> <li>the purpose of the malicious demon hypothesis was to help Descartes stay firm in his doubts</li> <li>the malicious demon was meant to help him take his highly probable beliefs as false to help him in his project for certainty</li> <li>it was not the malicious demon hypothesis that Descartes used to try and doubt his previously held beliefs but the deceiving God argument</li> <li>also, Descartes’ deceiving God argument did not convince him that all his beliefs were definitely false, simply that they could be doubted</li> <li>Descartes wanted to eliminate all doubts in order to find certainty</li> <li>the malicious demon hypothesis helps Descartes to arrive at the Cogito – ‘let him deceive me as much as he can, he will never bring it about that I am nothing so long as I think that I am something’</li> <li>Descartes doesn’t think that everything can be doubted, as he can be certain that he exists</li> <li>you can’t be certain that Descartes was wrong</li> <li>the malicious demon was not meant to be an argument, merely a hypothesis.</li> </ul> <p><b>Candidates may be awarded a maximum of 3 marks for accurate description of the role of the malicious demon even if it does not directly refer to the student’s response.</b></p>	6
16.		<p>Award <b>1 mark</b> for any of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>impressions and ideas are perceptions of the mind</li> <li>impressions are more vivid, lively and forceful than ideas</li> <li>ideas are our memories based on past impressions or our imaginings based on past impressions</li> <li>appropriate examples of impressions and ideas.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates must refer to both impressions and ideas to gain both marks.</p>	2

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
17.	<p>Award <b>1 mark</b> for any of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the copy principle is that all our ideas or more feeble perceptions are copies of our impressions or more lively ones</li> <li>• Hume says that the idea of God is a complex idea that is made up of simple ideas that we have experienced previously, such as love and power, that we have augmented without limit.</li> </ul>	2
18.	<p>Candidates should be awarded <b>1 mark</b> for any appropriate analysis or evaluation of the student's answer, and additional marks for developing those points. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the missing shade of blue was not meant to support his theory of impressions and ideas</li> <li>• the missing shade of blue was presented as a counter-example to the copy principle</li> <li>• the example is so singular that it is hardly worth noticing, and on its own it isn't a good enough reason for us to alter our general maxim</li> <li>• the person in Hume's example is not blind but someone who has seen all shades of blue apart from the one missing shade of blue</li> <li>• Hume describes the missing shade as a class of examples and mentions sounds in the explanation of the example</li> <li>• Hume meant to highlight that there are other similar cases to the missing shade of blue, in terms of anything missing on a scale. So, anything about a missing shade of green or other senses missed Hume's point</li> <li>• the missing shade of blue does undermine the copy principle which is a universal claim and so this is still problematic for Hume</li> <li>• the student hasn't considered the possibility that the missing shade of blue is a complex idea.</li> </ul> <p><b>Candidates may be awarded a maximum of 3 marks for accurate description of the role of the missing shade of blue even if it does not directly refer to the student's response.</b></p>	6

Section 3 – MORAL PHILOSOPHY

Question	Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
19.	<p>Kant believed that pure practical reason was the governing principle of our moral reasoning. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>Kant argues that all rational beings have the capacity to discover the moral law through reason alone. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>By basing morality entirely on reason its sovereignty is guaranteed. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>Reason is the most important factor in Kant’s account of moral decision making – it is through reason alone that we know ‘right’ and ‘wrong’. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>The sovereignty of reason guarantees the universality of moral truths. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>Reason makes the moral law binding on all rational beings. <b>(1 mark)</b></p>	2
20.	<p>A good will is a will whose decisions are fully determined by the moral law. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>A good will is ‘good without qualification’ – it is the only thing in this position. All other ‘things’ are only good conditionally. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>Even if the consequences of an action done from the good will are bad, the good will ‘shines through like a jewel’. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>Any other characteristic such as courage or intelligence can always be used for negative purposes. For example, even burglars can be courageous. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>Any reference to other possible intrinsic goods that Kant rules out should be given credit.</p> <p>Kant’s example of the honest shopkeeper. <b>(1 mark)</b></p>	3

Question		Detailed marking instructions for this question	Max mark
21.	(a)	<p>If Sinead volunteers with a local charity simply because it leads to her feeling satisfied this action has no moral worth. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>She's acting on her inclinations, not because of duty. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>If she volunteered with a local charity because she recognises that she has a duty to do so, then this action would have moral worth. The fact that it also makes her feel satisfied is irrelevant. <b>(1 mark)</b></p>	3
	(b)	<p>Candidates may answer this question in different ways. The following are examples of the kind of content they would be expected to cover:</p> <p><b>Agree/Reasons</b></p> <p>Kant is right to distinguish between duty and inclination here because moral worth lies in acting in the way we should rather than in the way we want to. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>Kant is right to praise people for making choices to act, rather than just acting in accordance with their nature. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>Kant's theory makes morally good actions (and moral praise) accessible to everyone regardless of their starting point. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><b>Disagree/Reasons</b></p> <p>There are other motives for acting morally besides the motive of duty. Helping out at a charity because you want to make a difference is surely a positive thing. Consequences matter. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p>Kant's focus on duty alone seems to downgrade some of our most significant emotions, such as Sinead enjoying getting to know other people. <b>(1 mark)</b> Kindness or sympathy are motives which can be seen as more important than duty when judging a moral act. <b>(1 mark)</b></p>	2

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]