

# Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for question paper 2.

## Question paper 2

### Candidate 5

#### Section 1: arguments in action

##### Question 1(a)

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

##### Question 1(b)

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

##### Question 1(c)

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

##### Question 2(a)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. This was because the candidate demonstrated knowledge about what is required to make a premise of the argument acceptable, even though what they say about premise 1 is not correct.

##### Question 2(b)

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**. This was because the explanation as to why the premises are sufficient is not a reason to accept them as so.

**Question 2(c)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 3(a)**

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. This was because they correctly wrote the first premise and conclusion but failed to replace the 'there' with 'at school' in the conclusion.

**Question 3(b)**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**. This was because they did not give an accurate definition of a valid argument.

**Question 3(c)**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**. This was because they did not explain correctly why this argument was invalid.

**Question 4(a)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 4(b)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**. This was because they correctly noted that if the cat did this again, their conclusion would seem to be confirmed which implied some understanding of the inductive strength of the argument. However, they did not explain this enough to get a further mark.

**Question 5**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**. This was because even though they referred to evidence which reinforces pre-existing beliefs, they did not clearly explain that

confirmation bias involves favouring or looking for such evidence or ignoring evidence that opposes this.

### **Question 6(a)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

### **Question 6(b)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

### **Question 6(c)**

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. They were awarded 1 mark for the comment that the priest would have gathered information about God's relationship with animals, and an additional 1 mark for the counter point that they don't have firsthand experience of God and so don't know for sure what is meant.

### **Question 7(a)**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**. This was because an appeal to emotion is not necessarily for your personal gain, but to convince you of a particular point and the emotion is irrelevant to the point being made.

### **Question 7(b)**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**. This was because the candidate did not clearly explain whether the emotions are relevant to the conclusion being argued for or not.

### **Question 8(a)**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

**Question 8(b)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 8(c)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 9(a)**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

**Question 9(b)**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

**Section 2: knowledge and doubt****Question 10**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

**Question 11**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

**Question 12**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

**Question 13**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

### Question 14

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

## Section 3: moral philosophy

### Question 15

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. They received 1 mark for the explanation that they would look at the outcomes to see how much pleasure and pain people would receive. They received an additional 1 mark for their explanation of some of the criteria of the hedonic calculus.

### Question 16

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**. They did not receive any marks for the first two comments on the strengths of the hedonic calculus as it was not clear from what was said why these were strengths rather than simply descriptions of what the hedonic calculus did. They received 1 mark for the strength that the hedonic calculus guides us to an unbiased decision based on outcomes. They gained another 1 mark for the explanation of why a Kantian would disagree with the hedonic calculus. They then gained a further 2 marks for the explanation of the two weaknesses of the hedonic calculus, which were that it does not recognise that pleasure and pain were different for everyone and that there is uncertainty as to which decision was the right one.

## Candidate 6

### Section 1: arguments in action

#### Question 1(a)

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 1(b)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 1(c)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 2(a)**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**. This was because they did not show in their answer an understanding of what made a premise acceptable or not.

**Question 2(b)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 2(c)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 3(a)**

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. This was because they correctly provided the first premise and the conclusion but not the second premise.

**Question 3(b)**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**. This was because their definition could have applied to arguments that were not valid.

**Question 3(c)**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

**Question 4(a)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 4(b)**

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. They were awarded 1 mark for the recognition that the inductive strength would be affected by the amount of times the cat has done this, and a further 1 mark for the fact that since it was every time and not just once or twice, it would be stronger.

**Question 5**

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**.

**Question 6(a)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 6(b)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 6(c)**

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**.

**Question 7(a)**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**. This was because in this fallacy, the arguer uses emotion in place of offering reasoned points to support a conclusion rather than to distract from the argument they have made.

**Question 7(b)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 8(a)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 8(b)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 8(c)**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**. This was because although they have said that the person in the argument has given trustworthy reason to believe that the sore throat is from the ice cream, this is not actually the case in the argument provided. No reason is given as to why you would expect the ice to have caused the sore throat.

**Question 9(a)**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**. The candidate correctly describes formal fallacies but not informal fallacies.

**Question 9(b)**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

**Section 2: knowledge and doubt****Question 10**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 11**

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**.

**Question 12**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

**Question 13**

The candidate was awarded **0 marks**.

**Question 14**

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**. They were awarded 1 mark for the explanation that the clear and distinct rule might be difficult to use because it may be hard to know what qualifies as clear and distinct. A further 1 mark was awarded for the claim that some points made by Descartes are not clear and distinct, which makes it less useful. A final 1 mark was awarded for the point that the clear and distinct rule can be used to support the Trademark argument.

**Section 3: moral philosophy****Question 15**

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

**Question 16**

The candidate was awarded **3 marks**. They were awarded 1 mark for the explanation that the hedonic calculus values each pleasure equally which is opposed by John Stuart Mill. An additional 1 mark was awarded to the claim that it is not possible to predict long term consequences and the impact of this. A final 1 mark was given for the fact that it can be praised for providing a clear way to focus on achieving the maximum happiness.