



2010 Philosophy

Intermediate 2

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2010

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from the External Print Team, Centre Services, Dalkeith.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's External Print Team, Centre Services, at Dalkeith may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.

2010 Intermediate 2 Philosophy

In their answers candidates are rewarded according to the quality of thought revealed in their answers. “Quality of thought” is taken as including the extent to which the candidate:

- gives an answer which is relevant to the question and relates explicitly to the terms of the question
- argues a case when requested to do so
- makes the various distinctions required by the question
- responds to all the elements in the question
- where required explains, analyses, discusses and assesses rather than simply describing or narrating
- answers with clarity and fluency and uses appropriate philosophical language.

The detailed information which follows indicates the points that a candidate is likely to make in response to the questions. These lists are not to be considered exhaustive and it is quite possible for candidates to write high quality answers and not mention all the points listed. The marks suggested for each point are allocated on the assumption that they are mentioned relatively briefly. Development of a point should earn more credit. Answers should be marked positively and irrelevant material ignored rather than penalised.

The language and sophistication of the bullet points are not necessarily indicative of the language pupils are expected to use in their answers.

Section 1 – total marks 10 (6/4)

Question 1

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit ‘Critical Thinking in Philosophy (Int 2)’.
- It has **one** structured question with **3 to 5** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **1 to 5** and requires either a short-answer or restricted response.
- Candidates answer **all** related parts of this question.

There is no choice in Section 1 of the Question Paper.

(a) **The following list contains both arguments and statements. Write down the three numbers that identify the arguments.**

1. The problem with toffee is that it sticks to you teeth.
2. Are you sure you want to resign? Do you want to start again in another company? Do you realize you’ll be paid less money?
3. If you can’t get up in time then you’ll miss your bus.
4. Either we go to Paris or we go to Berlin.
5. Cats must be carnivores because they have sharp teeth.
6. The more Brazil nuts you eat, the more intelligent you become.
7. Sandra is the perfect choice for the post. After all, she has the best qualifications.
8. He always eats his greens so I’d say he has a very healthy diet.

1 mark for each of 5, 7 and 8.

3

(b) **Read the following argument:**

“Either you go to university or you get a job. You’ll have to go to university because you can’t get a job.”

(i) **State the conclusion of this argument.**

(ii) **Does this conclusion follow from the premises? Give a reason for your answer.**

- **1 mark** for identifying the conclusion as “you’ll have to go to university.” (NB “You’ll have to go to university because you can’t get a job” does not merit a mark.)
- **1 mark** for saying that the conclusion does follow from the premises – but only if the conclusion was correctly identified.
- **1 mark** for an appropriate explanation – since there are only two possibilities and one of them is true “if the whole premise is true” then, because one possibility is said to be false the other has to be true. The mark is not awarded if the candidate simply repeats the argument given in the question.

3

(c) (i) **Give an example of an illegitimate appeal to authority.**

- Any appropriate example 1

(ii) **Explain why your example is an unreliable form of reasoning.**

- This fallacy is committed if a conclusion *c* is inferred from the fact that some person or group asserts *c*, without justifying the right of that person or group to be regarded as authoritative in this matter.
- Any appropriate application of the definition to the particular example. 3

(One mark should be awarded if the explanation clearly relates to the example that has been given and a further two marks are available for showing awareness of why the illegitimate appeal to authority is poor reasoning. This understanding can be inferred from the way in which the candidate discusses their own example.)

Total 10 marks

Section 2 – total marks 10 (6/4)

Question 2 – God

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit ‘Metaphysics’ (Int 2).
- It has **two** structured questions, each with **2 to 4** related parts.
- Each structured question samples across the mandatory content of **one** of the options in this Unit and may contain a stimulus.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2 to 6** and requires either a restricted or extended response.

Candidates answer **all** parts of the **one** structured question which relates to the option they have studied.

(a) **What is the cosmological argument?**

- Everything has a cause.
 - The universe must have a cause.
 - There cannot be an infinite series of prior causes.
 - Hence, there must be a first (uncaused) cause.
 - That cause is God.

2

(b) **What is the teleological argument?**

- Any appropriate explanation that links apparent design in the world to the existence of God, eg may mention Paley’s watch analogy.

2

(c) **Do you find these arguments convincing? Give reasons for your answer.**

Problems with the cosmological argument

- There is nothing necessarily wrong with an infinite regress.
- The first cause does not have to be God.
- The conclusion contradicts the premise (in this simplistic version!)
- Just because everything in the universe has a cause doesn’t mean that the universe has a cause.
- Replaces an inexplicable universe with an inexplicable God.
- Science now claims that there are uncaused events.

Problems with the teleological argument

- There is no close analogy between the world and designed objects.
- Apparent bad design.
- Design explained by natural selection.
- Design does not lead to a theistic God.
- Or any other appropriate criticism.

Candidates should only be awarded marks for part (c) if they produce additional arguments/information to what they have already said in answer to (a) and (b).

Candidates should also be given credit for comments on any positive features of these arguments.

A maximum of four marks is available for each of the arguments.

6

Total 10 marks

Section 2: total marks 10 (6/4)

Question 3 – Free Will

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit ‘Metaphysics’ (Int 2).
- It has **two** structured questions, each with **2 to 4** related parts.
- Each structured question samples across the mandatory content of **one** of the options in this Unit and may contain a stimulus.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2 to 6** and requires either a restricted or extended response.

Candidates answer **all** parts of the **one** structured question which relates to the option they have studied.

(a) What is Hard Determinism?

- Explanation of determinism: every event, including human action, has a cause.
- Since human actions are determined by prior events they are not within our control.
- Since our actions are not within our control we cannot be held responsible for those actions.
- Hard Determinism is an incompatibilist position.
- There is no free will.
- Reference to appropriate philosophers.
- Appropriate examples.

2

(b) What is Libertarianism?

- There are at least some events that are not determined by prior causes.
- Some human choices are not determined by prior causes.
- Since our actions are within our control we can be held responsible for those actions.
- Libertarianism is an incompatibilist position.
- There is free will.
- Reference to appropriate philosophers.
- Appropriate examples.

2

(c) Do you think these positions are convincing? Give reasons for your answer.

Objections to Hard Determinism

- Overwhelming psychological feeling of being free to choose.
- Moral language and social interactions generally assume the existence of libertarian free will.
- Science suggests that some events are uncaused.

Objections to Libertarianism

- Increasing evidence that human behaviour is explicable in terms of prior causes. Genetic and Environmental determinism.
- Moral choices need an explanation – choices that have no explanation are indistinguishable from chance.

Possibility of compatibilism

- “Free” can mean absence of coercion or constraint.
- “Free” can mean in accordance with one’s desire however those desires come to exist.
- Determinism helps us understand the world: Libertarianism helps us understand morality. Compatibilism is the best of both worlds.

Candidates should only be awarded marks for part (c) if they produce additional arguments/information to what they have already said in answer to (a) and (b). Candidates should also be given credit for comments on any positive features of these arguments.

6

Total 10 marks

Section 3: total marks 20

Question 4 – Epistemology

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit ‘Epistemology’ (Int 2).
- It has **two** parts.
- Candidates answer **one** structured question in **both parts** of this section.

The nature of each question is outlined below:

Part 1 – total marks 5

- This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section One of the Epistemology Unit.
- It has **one** question with **1 to 2** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2 to 5** and requires a restricted response.
- Candidates must answer this question.

There is no choice of question in Part 1 of Section 3.

Describe what philosophers mean by knowledge.

- Knowing how and knowing that.
- Defining knowledge as “justified, true belief” merits one mark.
- Expanding on each of justified, true belief would normally merit three marks.
- Using the technical term “tripartite theory” merits one mark.

5

Total 5 marks

Question 5 – Descartes

Part 2 – total marks 15

- This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section Two of the Epistemology Unit.
- It has **two** structured questions, each of which samples across the mandatory content of **one** of the options in this Unit.
- Each structured question contains an extract from the relevant prescribed text and has **2-3** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2-10** and requires either a restricted or extended response.
- Candidates answer **all** related parts of the **one** structured question which examines the option they have studied.

Read the statement below then answer all parts of the question (a-c).

Several years have now passed since I first realised how numerous were the false opinions that in my youth I had taken to be true, and thus how doubtful were all those that I had subsequently built upon them.

Descartes – Meditations on First Philosophy

(a) **Describe Descartes' method of doubt.**

- Hyperbolic doubt.
- Not individual pieces of putative knowledge but broad categories to be challenged.
- Any type of knowledge that is any way questionable is to be rejected.
- A demolition process to establish what remains certain.
- Stages of Med 1 leading to the *cogito*.

5

(b) **Why does Descartes consider the cogito to be beyond doubt?**

- Defining the cogito as either “I think, I exist” or “I think therefore I am” merits one mark.
- To deny it would involve a contradiction.

2

(c) **What criticisms can be made of the cogito?**

- The formulation in the “Discourse on Method”.
- There is a suppressed premise.
- “thinking things exist” compromising the rationalistic agenda.
- Do thoughts necessarily imply a thinker? Hume’s bundle theory denies a substantial self.
- Russell’s accusation of circularity.
- But the cogito not intended as a piece of deductive logic rather a self authenticating proposition hence “I am, I exist” is a necessary truth immune from these criticisms.
- It is trivial.

8

Question 6 – Hume

Part 2 – total marks 15

- This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section Two of the Epistemology Unit.
- It has **two** structured questions, each of which samples across the mandatory content of **one** of the options in this Unit.
- Each structured question contains an extract from the relevant prescribed text and has **2-3** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2-10** and requires either a restricted or extended response.
- Candidates answer **all** related parts of the **one** structured question which examines the option they have studied.

“All the objects of human reason or enquiry may naturally be divided into two kinds, to wit, Relations of Ideas, and Matters of Fact.”

(a) **What is the term used to describe this distinction?**

- Hume’s Fork! 2

(b) **What is meant by ‘Matters of Fact’ and ‘Relations of Ideas’. Support your answer with appropriate examples.**

- Matters of Fact are empirically observable 2KU
 - The sun will rise tomorrow.
 - (Any appropriate example = 1 KU).
- Relations of Ideas are logically necessary, 2 KU.
 - $3*5=0.5*30$
 - Pythagoras theorem
 - Every affirmation, which is either intuitively or demonstratively certain
 - (Any appropriate example = 1KU). 6

(c) **Explain why Hume is called an empiricist.**

- Explanation of ‘empiricist’
- Appropriate application to Hume.
 - Impressions and ideas.
 - Dismisses relevance of relations of ideas to an understanding of the world.
 - All knowledge based on observation.
 - Dismisses knowledge claims that cannot be verified by observation. 7

Total 15 marks

Section 4: total marks 20

Question 7 – Normative Ethics

Section 4 – total marks 20

- This section examines the content of the Unit ‘Moral Philosophy’ (Int 2).
- It has **one** essay question which may be divided into **two** related parts.
- It may contain a short case study or stimulus.
- The question requires an extended response of **300-400** words.

There is no choice of questions in Section 4 of the Question Paper.

You work in a shop and your brother has asked you to steal a DVD for him. Discuss how Kantians and Utilitarians would advise you about this situation.

Kantian Ethics

- Duty based.
- Good will.
- Categorical Imperative – Universalisation/Ends not Means.

Utilitarianism

- Great happiness principle/principle of Utility.
- Equity/Hedonism/Consequences.
- Bentham – hedonic calculus.
- Act and Rule Utilitarianism.

The Scenario

- Kant would advise against it on grounds of duty.
- Kant black and white but little account of emotion and your affection for brother.
- Fails Universalisation test and your brother would be using you as a Means to an End.
- Utilitarians might advocate stealing the CD – happiness of brother might outweigh pain of shop at losing CD. Problem of calculating sum total of happiness.
- Difficulty in predicting consequences.
- Possible difference between Act and Rule Utilitarianism.

A maximum of 12 marks if only one theory is discussed.

A maximum of 14 marks if the issue isn't discussed.

20

Total 20 marks

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]