

**1: What is substance? [3 Marks]**

Errors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Generally fine. Only issue was occasional vagueness (1/3), or responses were too brief (substance is basic/ontologically irreducible etc.) - usually 2/3</li></ul>

Example top band response: See separate doc

**2: Explain the two features of mental states. [5 Marks]**

Errors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The one question that was handled badly (we'll revisit).</li><li>• Sometimes only one term was clearly defined (usually qualia), so that intentionality was omitted entirely)</li><li>• Other responses were general (consciousness is private/subjective/mental etc.)</li><li>• Or blurred (qualia possess 'aboutness'/intentional states identified with the 'thatness' of that etc. - this also applied to qualia)</li></ul>

Example top band response: See separate doc

**3: Outline the conceivability argument for substance dualism. [5 marks]**

Errors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Fine. Vast majority were on 4-5/5</li></ul>

Example top band response: See separate doc

**4: Outline the indivisibility argument for substance dualism and explain the response that not everything thought of as physical is divisible. [12 marks]**

Errors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Analyses of IA were fine</li><li>• Main problem was with the objection. These were often focused/accurate, but brief, or imprecise (atoms aren't divisible etc.). Vast majority were on 8-10/12 which was fine.</li></ul>

Example top band response: See separate doc

**5. Is substance dualism convincing.**

I've a top band response (2 in fact) that I'll upload to Teams. These were generally very well handled indeed, with the majority making it into Level 4 (a few in Level 5). Perhaps this was to be expected – good to write essays more than once and gain feedback prior to submitting 2<sup>nd</sup>? Odd to see a significant proportion arguing for, rather than against SD, but the majority of these were convincing, so good work.

**Final message:** Generally, a very high standard indeed. Keep up the good work (but go back and revise qualia and intentionality!)