**General Certificate of Education
January 2011**

Philosophy   PHIL2

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

AS PHILOSOPHY

GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR QUESTIONS WITH A TOTAL OF 15 MARKS

	AO1: Knowledge and Understanding
Level 3	**11–15 marks** Answers in this level provide a clear and detailed explanation of the relevant issue and demonstrate a precise understanding of philosophical positions and arguments. Illustrations, if required, are appropriate and properly developed. Answers at the bottom of this level are accurate and focused but *either* too succinct *or* unbalanced: *either* important points and/or illustrations are accurate but briefly stated so that significance is not fully drawn out *or* one point is well made and illustrated but a second point or illustration is less developed.
Level 2	**6–10 marks** Answers in this level may *either* list a range of points or blur two or more points together *or* explanation is clear but unbalanced so that a point is well made but illustrative material is undeveloped or unconvincing *or* illustrations are good but the point being illustrated is less clear and perhaps left implicit. OR If two points are required answers in this level may *either* clearly identify, explain and illustrate one relevant point so that a partial explanation is given *or* points may be well made but not illustrated. OR The response is broadly accurate but generalised and lacking detail and precision.
Level 1	**0–5 marks** Answers in this level *either* make one reasonable point with little development or without illustration *or* provide a basic, sketchy and vague account *or* a confused or tangential account which may only coincide with the concerns of the question in places.

NB Answers may demonstrate characteristics of more than one mark band, for example:
- *Points are clearly identified and explanation is detailed and precise (level 3) but only one point is illustrated (level 2). The response should be placed at the bottom end of level 3 (ie 11–12 marks).*
- *Two points are required but only one relevant point is clearly identified, explained and illustrated (level 2) and the second point and illustration is confused or tangential to the question asked (level 1). The response should be placed at the top end of level 2 (ie 9–10 marks).*

AS PHILOSOPHY

GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR QUESTIONS WITH A TOTAL OF 30 MARKS

	AO1: Knowledge and Understanding	**AO2: Interpretation, Analysis and Application**	**AO3: Assessment and Evaluation**
Level 4	N/A	**15–18 marks** A clear and closely argued discussion of the issue incorporating a well-developed appreciation focused on some relevant philosophical issues by applying and analysing a range of points in some detail and with precision.	N/A
Level 3	**3 marks** A sound understanding of some issues raised by the question, identifying relevant ideas/evidence.	**10–14 marks** Answers in this level are directed at the relevant issues but: *Either:* a narrowly focused response but detail is pithy and organised intelligently. *Or:* several issues are discussed but the application of points is less well-organised, the focus may drift or analysis may be less developed and unconvincing in places. Answers at the bottom of this band may be full but largely descriptive responses.	**7–9 marks** Answers at the top of this level provide a well thought out appreciation of some problematic issues raised by the specific demands of the question. Reasoning is employed to support the conclusion advanced. Lower in the band the critical discussion is not sharp and reasoning employed to support the conclusion is less well-developed. The response is legible, employing technical language accurately and appropriately with few, if any, errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar. The response reads as a coherent and integrated whole.

GENERIC MARK SCHEME FOR QUESTIONS WITH A TOTAL OF 30 MARKS (cont)

	AO1: Knowledge and Understanding	AO2: Interpretation, Analysis and Application	AO3: Assessment and Evaluation
Level 2	**2 marks** Answers are relevant but *either* fail to maintain a focus on the specific question *or* partial ideas/examples lack detail.	**5–9 marks** Answers in this level provide some relevant material but: *Either:* points are raised but not developed, analysis is limited and the answer lacks organisation. *Or:* the relevance of points may be unclear.	**4–6 marks** Evaluation is not sustained, although it is present. *Either:* alternative approaches are juxtaposed without explicit comparison or assessment. *Or:* a position is briefly stated but not adequately supported by the preceding discussion. The response is legible, employing some technical language accurately, with possibly some errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar.
Level 1	**1 mark** Answers in this level demonstrate a basic grasp of aspects of relevant issues. Responses may be sketchy and vague; *or* confused *or* largely tangential although at least one point should coincide with the concerns of the question.	**1–4 marks** Answers in this level are sketchy, fragmentary responses *or* an isolated relevant point appears in an otherwise tangential or confused response.	**1–3 marks** Critical comments are sketchy and fail to contribute to any explicitly reasoned conclusion *or* argumentation may be confused so that the conclusion advanced does not seem to follow. Lower in the band a view may be outlined without any critical discussion. Technical language may not be employed or used inappropriately. The response may not be legible, errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar may be intrusive.

Theme 1: Knowledge of the external world

Total for this theme: 45 marks

---

01   Outline and illustrate three characteristics of sense-data.   *(15 marks)*

Anticipate the following characteristics:
- We are immediately/directly acquainted with sense-data, (from which we infer a mind-independent reality).
- Sense-data are (usually) mental or mind-dependent.
- Sense-data exist only as they are perceived.
- Reports regarding sense-data are incorrigible.
- Sense-data are nothing other than how they appear – they have no hidden depths.
- The sense-data I experience will vary according to the conditions in which I perceive an object.
- Sense-data, unlike physical objects, can have indeterminate process.
- Sense-data and physical objects/distinguishing sense-data.

Illustrate examples are likely to differ depending on the points being made and can be drawn from various sources:
Illusions and delusions (e.g. bent sticks, mirage, hallucinations), perceptual relativity (the real shape of the coin, the real properties of the table), phenomenology (apparent and real speckled hens) or time-lag arguments (seeing the 'sun') that distinguish between the way the world appears and the way it is.

---

02   Consider the claim that the weaknesses of representative realism outweigh its strengths.

(30 marks)

Knowledge and Understanding

Anticipate the following outline of representative realism:
There is a material reality independent of our perception of it – an external world – from which experience originates. But our perception of material objects is mediated via ' a veil of perception'. Our immediate awareness is of an 'internal' non-material something – 'ideas' or sense-data – that we take as representative of mind independent external reality. The claim that there is an external world is a hypothesis.

Interpretation, Analysis and Application

Possible strengths

- Unlike common sense, representative realism can account for illusions/hallucinations by proposing we experience ideas/sense-data.
- Representative Realism gets the epistemological project right: I have to start from my own 'experience' and work outward to an external world.
- Representative Realism acknowledges the scientific claim that mind-independent reality is not as it appears to us (and the primary/secondary qualities distinction might be used here to articulate this point.)

- Representative realism acknowledges a distinction between appearance and reality but it is able to counter scepticism: it is reasonable to suppose that there is a mind-independent reality that impinges upon me in systematic ways, not subject to will, which my experience 'represents' in ways similar to your experience.

Possible weaknesses
- Representative Realism is incompatible with Empiricism because it makes claims about mind-independent reality that transcend any possible experience: it makes empty assertions devoid of empirical consequences (e.g. 'a something we know not what'); it illegitimately draws inferences from familiar experience (e.g. observations of casual relations) to support judgements regarding a reality that 'must be strange' (Russell).
- The apparatus employed by representative realism cannot avoid scepticism: a veil of perception intermediate between object and perceiver opens up an unbridgeable gap.
- Representative Realism (at least in its 'pure' empiricist form) does not have the resources to escape solipsism.
- The scientific appearance/reality distinction need not have any exceptional 'philosophical significance regarding what there is; it just regulates what counts as relevant/irrelevant when scientists do science (c.f. demarcation issues like 'Are we doing psychology or sociology?' 'Is that a philosophical point of history?').
- A candidate might compare representative realism with other positions (e.g. idealism) just as long as the comparison highlights possible strengths and weaknesses of representative realism.
- Appeals to Occam's Razor. Both direct realism and idealism are ontologically parsimonious contra representative realism.

Assessment and Evaluation

A candidate could argue for the following conclusions:
- The weaknesses outweigh the strengths
- The strengths outweigh the weaknesses
- The strengths and weaknesses balance out, more or less.
- Drawing out the implications of 'something we know not what' as Berkeley was to do.
- Support of direct realism e.g. exceptions can be allowed if they can be explained, correction by other senses.
- Presuppositions of recognising deceptions,
- Reid's criticism of phenomenal variability – we can explain and predict.
- External world seen as hypothetical, but is this like a scientific hypothesis? Verification issues.
- How could we have the concept of a representation if we are only aware of representations. Analysis of how the concept works.
- If we cannot know physical objects, then neither can we know their causal powers.
- The external world could never be more than a probability. But how do we do the calculations needed for such a claim?

Theme 2: Tolerance

Total for this theme: 45 marks

---

03   Explain and illustrate what is meant by repressive desublimation.   *(15 marks)*

Repressive desublimation is a hybrid of Marxist-Freudian theory.

From Freud, sublimation refers to the process of diverting and transforming sexual or aggressive energy from their instinctual manifestations into more civilised or edifying expressions. For instance, Freud sees creative processes like painting, writing or composing music as the sublimation of sexual desires in art.

Marcuse turns this process on its head: desublimation occurs when our energies are not regulated by the kinds of psychological and social constraints that could cultivate and enhance our positive freedom; instead our energies are expressed untamed. Desublimation is repressive because it robs us of the opportunity to realise our fully developed better selves; and our being alienated ramifies throughout our relations with others.

If it's not in our interest then why does desublimation occur? From Marx, Marcuse sees political-economic structures motivating repressive desublimation as a means of gaining control over individuals in the interests of consumption (where the potential many-sided revolutionary instead spends his/her thought, time and and money distracted by false needs – pornography, bread and circuses).

In the affluent society, the authorities are hardly forced to justify their dominion. They deliver the goods; they satisfy the sexual and aggressive energy of their subjects…The people, efficiently manipulated and organised are free…free people are not in need of liberation.

Allow in references to quasi-scientific use (Freud). 'Sublimation' taken from chemistry. Give some credit for general observations: functionalist concept identifying a hidden purpose or 'real' reason – a reason that could not be given by the agents themselves, it is inherently evaluative.

---

04   'Tolerance requires us to accept lifestyles we believe to be objectionable but there are limits as to what we can accept.' Discuss.

(30 marks)

Knowledge and Understanding

Forst will feature a lot here. Basic grasp of what counts as tolerance and awareness of the difficulties of unlimited application.

Interpretation, Analysis, Application

Expect candidates to consider some of the following contested conceptions of what tolerant acceptance requires:

- Do we all agree that the core components of tolerance involve objection (rather than indifference), yet acceptance (as opposed to powerlessness) within reasoned limits?
- How might being 'tolerant' or 'acting tolerantly' be conceived? Is it just a matter of allowing individuals or groups to pursue their own objectionable interests in private (permission conception) or does tolerant acceptance demand we peacefully co-exist in

'public space' with those we find objectionable (coexistence conception)? Does tolerant acceptance demand that we all should adhere at least to the positive value of mutual respect (respect conception) or should we go further so that tolerant acceptance requires celebrating diversity, positively endorsing the fact we think, feel and act in our various way (the esteem conception).

- If we think of tolerance as a virtue then being tolerant requires a particular development of character and sensibility. If we think of tolerance as a practical solution to diversity then tolerant acceptance need only require avoiding situations which might inflame tensions between individuals or groups.

- Do different accounts of what tolerant acceptance involves share the same essential concept of 'tolerance', but contest different applications of that concept? Or, do the disagreements indicate there is no single concept 'tolerance' in operation?

Assessment and Evaluation

- We all agree what tolerance is and what tolerant acceptance requires.
- We all agree what tolerance is but disagree about what tolerant acceptance requires.
- We all disagree what tolerance is and what tolerant acceptance requires. 'Tolerance' as such is not the kind of concept you can say anything general about (c.f. 'game').
- Tolerance as a virtue. Should it apply universally? Pursued for its own sake.
- If tolerance is a virtue, are we likely to increase the possibility of clashes of virtues?
- Tolerating a diversity that makes no impact on me amounts to nothing.
- Discussion of possible and actual harm.
- Differences are not valuable solely in virtue of being different.
- Tolerance within a democratic framework, freedom of opportunity. Tolerance not exclusive to liberal democracy, but some constitutions may specifically exclude it.
- The role of referenda in a democracy may clash with a tolerant society.
- Paradox of democracy – allows freedom to groups who would ultimately destroy such freedom.
- Respect/esteem for others – does this require reciprocation or is it unconditional?
- Tolerance and political correctness.
- The objects of tolerance and the issue of consistency.
- Could we ever have a moral/political duty to be intolerant?
- The bottom-up approach. Even if a tolerant attitude is hard to define, we can begin with clearly defined cases of intolerance and work up from there.
- Some alternatives are inherently insults, may be references to Luther et al.
- Discussions of Locke, Voltaire, Bodin, Burke, Mill.

Theme 3: The value of art

Total for this theme: 45 marks

05	Explain **and** illustrate **two** reasons for rejecting the view that 'art should imitate reality'.
	(15 marks)

Anticipate the following characteristics:
- The claim that 'art should imitate reality' implies that *trompe-l'oeil* is the pinnacle of artistic achievement; and that is an absurd conclusion.
- The claim that 'art should imitate reality' downgrades the value of art: if art is supposed to merely copy then why not bypass the art and attend to the reality itself (Plato).
- The stipulation 'art should imitate reality' prohibits art that we all recognise as valuable (i.e. non-imitative art).
- Mere imitation fails to recognise that art aspires to the transfiguration of the commonplace.
- The notion of imitation is vague: does it mean simulate, resemble, represent, evoke…etc…?.
- Examples like Matisse and the elongated arm in a picture
- Why is black and white photography preferable and more effective in some cases? Examples.
- There is a personal element in art – only so and so could have painted that, not so with imitation or copying. Contrast art/science.
- 'Is this is a good copy?' is not necessarily an artistic question. Examples of forgery might feature.
- If imitation is all that matters, then why do we value imagination?
- Reality matters – but as a springboard for imagination. This allows us to distinguish imagination from fantasy.
- The real/unreal, subjective/objective distinction is made within art rather than by a comparison of art with something external to it.
- Is the claim more plausible for some arts rather than others. Examples, literature/fiction.

06	Assess the claim that 'we value art because it expresses the feelings of the artist.'
	(30 marks)

Knowledge and Understanding

Candidates will probably refer to Croce, Collingwood or Tolstoy as examples of theories that regard 'art proper' (c.f. mere craft or degenerate art) as the product of distilling feeling or as a means of communicating worthy statements between artist and audience.

Interpretation, Analysis, Application

For
- When evaluating art we often consider whether it is a 'sincere', 'authentic', or 'genuine' expression of the artist's feelings towards the world around them. If it is, we tend to think the art work is more valuable because of it.
- We often view the artist as especially emotionally sensitive: someone who has the capacity to convert their vivid inner experience into a publicly accessible work of art. The art work is a symptom of being an artistic soul.

- The artist's intentions are relevant in determining how we ought to judge their work. Frequently artists intend to express their feelings and we should appreciate their art accordingly.

Against
- It is not obvious that all the art we value is emotionally expressive.
- The evaluation of art should restrict itself to focusing on the artwork itself and its intrinsic *aesthetic quality* (e.g. formalism)
- Even if some works of art are best understood as expressions of feeling and emotion, this might have nothing to do with the artist's feelings. Rather, the expressive qualities we value might inhere in the artwork, or else be the effects the artwork stimulates in us.
- The causal origins of an art work are independent of the artistic product and as a matter of fact we have plenty of evidence showing that what or how strongly an artist happens to be feeling has no bearing on their capacity to produce even the most emotionally direct and intense work.
- Artistic production is not a kind of magical realisation of 'inner feeling' and the artistic 'feelings' are not the issue. The judgements artists make in creating an artwork involve the studied application of genre specific techniques onto a more or less reluctant medium, towards an evolving conception of the finished product – we appreciate the artist's practical intelligence.
- The intentions of the artist are often not known, but we can nevertheless appreciate the art. If so, it is implausible to claim the artist's intentions must determine our appreciation of their work.

Assessment and Evaluation

- The strengths of the claim outweigh the weaknesses
- The weaknesses of the claim outweigh the strengths
- There is no general truth to be discovered or stipulated.
- Some works of art can have application to a situation that the artistic could not have intended. The autonomy of a work of art. New comparisons become possible.
- Art can have a cold, impersonal beauty divorced from feelings (Russell's comparison of mathematics with precisely defined sculpture).
- A work could succeed in expressing feelings but fail as art. How do we distinguish expressions of feeling which are art from those that are not?
- What feelings are expressed by, e.g. nonsense poetry, abstract art, atonal music?
- Are form and structure merely useful devices for the clearer expression of feelings or are they important in their own right? They are not just vehicles but modes of expression – analogy with Cheshire Cat.
- Art informs us of something other than the artists' feelings.

Theme 4: God and the world

Total for this theme: 45 marks

07	'We can agree that the world is designed without supposing that God exists.' Explain and illustrate two reasons supporting this claim. *(15 marks)*

Generic strategy undermining the inference of God
Merely thinking about it, we are able to imagine various possibilities regarding the designer (so no logical compulsion is involved): familiar experience will either draw us toward an anthropomorphised conception of the designer or we should admit that the existence and nature of any transcendent designer must remain an open question/meaningless specification.

Expect some of the following particular points:

- There might be more than one designer of the world.
- The designer(s) of the world need not be eternal (just existent at the point of implementing the design).
- The designer(s) of the world need not be all powerful (just powerful enough)
- The designer(s) of the world need not be all knowing (just knowing enough)
- The designer(s) of the world need not be all loving (is this the best possible design?)
- The designer of the world might depend on some other supreme being(s).
- Unity of God not established – Hume's team of gods. Examples of human artefacts.
- Adapting a criticism of the cosmological argument – God may not be a personal or spiritual being (super mathematician).
- Infinity not established – don't know that the universe is infinite. (Effects to causes)
- Not perfect. System contains faults. Examples.
- Difficulty in arguing for probabilities as we lack the relevant past experience to base the judgements on. Examples of judgements. Design as coming about chance (e.g. Hume/Flew)
- Evolution and apparent design. Might be references to the blind watchmaker.
- The designer could be a sexual or mortal being (Hume).

08	'The idea of soul making (moral development) provides a satisfactory solution to the problem of evil.' Assess the validity of this claim. *(30 marks)*

Knowledge and Understanding

The problem – The existence of an omnipotent, all loving God and the existence of evil are not compatible: 'Either God cannot abolish evil, or he will not; if he cannot then he is not all powerful; if he will not then he is not all good.' Augustine.
Evil exists, therefore an omnipotent, all loving God cannot.

The 'soul-making' solution:
Evil is compatible with an omnipotent, all loving God just because the existence of evil is a necessary condition for soul-making, and soul-making leads to the ultimate good – growth into the image of God (achieved in the end by everyone). So God does not want us to suffer, but he must allow it (c.f. a parent allowing their child to learn from hard experience, so they develop into an autonomous, well-rounded mature adult).

Interpretation, Analysis, Application

Expect discussion of some of the following ideas:

For
- Developing into 'the image of God' is the ultimate good.
- The description of what this process involves is prima facie plausible, reflecting our common experience of growing up.
- The justification presents God as universally compassionate – everyone will eventually develop their souls and nobody suffers for eternity.
- The soul-making solution can appeal to biblical authority.

Against

- How can an omnipotent being be constrained in any way? Couldn't God just create ready made souls?
- Even if evil is a necessary condition for soul making, do we need so much evil?
- The distribution of evil seems arbitrary.
- This view implies that our suffering (especially the suffering of the innocent) is justified as a means to an end. However, regardless of consequences it is still wrong that we suffered.
- A supremely good future in heaven is merely a compensation, not a moral justification, for the evil endured in this life.
- Although experiencing evil can produce a positive reaction it is just as likely to produce a negative response.
- Unless the after life is in significant ways similar to our present life, the souls we have developed enduring this world will be 'surplus to requirement'.

Candidates can juxtapose this solution with other theodicies (e.g. Augustinian, Process) but the contrast must be used to evaluate the 'soul-making' solution.

Assessment and Evaluation

- The idea of soul-making does provide a satisfactory solution to the problem of evil for the following reasons…
- The idea of soul-making does not provide a satisfactory solution to the problem of evil for the following reasons…
- Problem of souls who do not have the opportunity to develop. Other-worldly solutions seems essential.
- All things will be 'crowned' in the after-life. But are there some evils that we cannot conceive as part of a greater good?
- Analogy of child learning from painful mistakes breaks down as God is omnipotent. Need to show that some goods **logically** require evils.
- Highest moral stakes (comparison, sympathy) logically presuppose evils. But so do states like callousness.
- Moral development and natural disasters. The latter provide opportunities for the former – but this presupposes knowledge of the evil.
- Need to show that evil plus good is better than the non-occurrence of the evil.
- Suffering of others treated as a means to the end of our soul or moral development.

Theme 5: Free will and determinism

Total for this theme: 45 marks

09	Explain and illustrate the view that providing a reason for action is not the same as giving a causal explanation of it. *(15 marks)*

Expect answers to highlight the following contrasts:

- Giving a reason makes actions intelligible in terms of culturally constrained norms and values. Causes explain events in terms of universal laws of nature.
- A reason identifies the goal of action; a causal explanation identifies an antecedent condition.
- Causal explanations might be true even if we are always ignorant of them, whereas reasons for action are the kinds of things we are typically aware of.
- A cause and its effect are contingently related 'distinct existences'. A reason and the action it produced are intrinsically or conceptually related.
- That reasons guide action is a prerequisite for being an agent. Causal explanations; the notion of agency.
- Distinction between action and movement. The role of justification. Description of actions and movements and what they involve.
- An action has a (motivating) reason as a cause, but not all causes are reasons.

Additional note:

Question 09 featured a mis-print whereby 'causal' was printed as 'casual'. As a result, this question was marked only by senior examiners to ensure that the small number of candidates who answered 'casual' were not unfairly penalised. Please see the January 2011 Report on Examination for more information on this issue.

10	Assess the claim that 'as long as I am able to act upon my decisions, my actions are free'. *(30 marks)*

Knowledge and Understanding

Candidates might refer to soft determinism/compatibilism or refer to Hume. My actions are free if they are not subject to felt constraint.

Interpretation, Analysis, Application

Strengths

- The notion of 'free action' as acting on unconstrained desire is just common sense: we need not resort to any troubling metaphysical doctrines in order to distinguish between actions that are free and actions that are not.
- If desires are causes then one and the same action can be both causes and free (compatibilism).

- Human action, like the action of other natural phenomena, is intelligible in terms of causal generalisations; we observe general regularities that obtain between kinds of desires and the kind of actions these desires produce.

Weaknesses
- The claim changes the subject by ignoring 'free-will' (the ability to do otherwise). As Reid put it; 'By the liberty of a moral agent, I understand a power over the determination of his own will'.
- The phenomenology of 'deliberation' and 'responsibility' require more than a subject identifying what desire has the most force; the issue for the subject is what desire should have the most force.
- This claim treats 'the will' as a kind of appetite rather than a transcendental condition for the possibility of being a rational agent.
- The claim confuses causal explanation and justification citing reasons. The link between being a desire of a particular kind and an action of a particular kind is not a relation between 'distinct existences' but rather an 'intrinsic' conceptual connection.
- This view is really epiphenomenalism. The mental has no impact on the physical.

Assessment and Evaluation
- The strengths outweigh the weaknesses.
- The weaknesses outweigh the strengths.
- There is some good reason why we cannot decide either way.
- Implies the actions of a maniac are free.
- Flew's case of the smiling groom and the attendant problem of no other action was possible.
- If you omit the ability to choose otherwise, then the issue of responsibility is hard to accommodate.
- Responsibility as compatible with an action being an effect. Analogy with strict liability (Honderich) and difficulties with this approach.
- Discussion of second-order desires.
- Kant's notion of freedom as action contrary to one's desires.
- Circularity issues regarding the claims that actions X, Y, Z are caused by desires for X, Y, Z.
- Distinctions between metaphysical and political freedom. The quote confuses the two.

.

- **ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE GRID**

AS Assessment Objective	Marks allocated by Assessment Objective part (a) question	Marks allocated by Assessment Objective part (b) question	Total Marks by Assessment Objective
AO1	15	3	18
AO2	0	18	18
AO3	0	9	9
Total	15	30	45