



# **2012 Philosophy**

## **Intermediate 2**

### **Finalised Marking Instructions**

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2012

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 SQA's NQ Delivery: Exam Operations.

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 NQ Delivery: Exam Operations 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.

## 2012 Intermediate 2 Philosophy

In their answers candidates are rewarded according to the quality of thought revealed in their answers. They are not rewarded solely or even mainly for the quantity of knowledge conveyed. "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**

**KU AE**

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “*Critical Thinking in Philosophy*” (Int 2).
- It has **one** structured question with **3-6** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **1-5** 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 soup was cold but the waiter disagreed.**
- 2. The internet wasn’t working and I didn’t do my homework.**
- 3. She wasn’t at the party because I saw her at the zoo.**
- 4. I’m feeling tired and I want to go home.**
- 5. I think therefore I am.**
- 6. It must be cold outside because there is ice on the pond.**
- 7. If you want to get fit do more exercise.**
- 8. It is wrong to hit the dog.**

**1 mark** for each of 3, 5 and 6

**3**

- b. (i) What is a valid argument?**

**1**

- (ii) What is a sound argument?**

**1**

- (iii) Read the following argument:**

**All birds have eyes  
All parrots have eyes  
So, all parrots are birds.**

**Is this a sound argument? Give a reason for your answer**

- **Validity:** a valid argument is one which would guarantee a true conclusion if the premises were true. An invalid argument does not guarantee a true conclusion when the premises are true.
- **Soundness:** a deductive argument which has true premises and is valid is said to be sound. An unsound argument is therefore one which has either a false premise or is invalid or both.
- **No,** whilst the premises are both true the argument is invalid. Although the conclusion is true it doesn’t follow from these two premises—the fact that birds have eyes and parrots have eyes does not establish that parrots are birds. This can be seen by replacing the first premise with, ‘All dogs have eyes’.

**(1 mark for ‘No’, 1 mark for appropriate reason)**

**2**

|  | KU       | AE       |
|--|----------|----------|
| c. She says smoking is bad for you but I saw her smoking in a bar just last week so I don't see why I should listen to what she says.  |          |          |
| What is a fallacy?   | 1        |          |
| What fallacy is being committed in the above example? Justify your answer.   |          |          |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A fallacy is a common error in reasoning.</li> <li>• Ad hominem because her behaviour is not relevant to the arguments that she has used to say that smoking is bad.</li> </ul> |          | 2        |
| <b>Totals</b>  | <b>6</b> | <b>4</b> |

## Question 2 – God

### Section 2 – total marks 10

KU AE

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “*Metaphysics*” (Int 2).
- It has **two** structured questions, each with **1-5** 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 **1-10** 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 a posteriori argument for the existence of God?

- An argument that begins with observations/experiences from the world ( The mark should be awarded if the candidate gives an example of an a posteriori argument, eg teleological argument)

1

#### b. Describe the argument used by Aquinas to show that God is the ‘uncaused cause’.

- Everything has a cause
- Nothing can be its own cause
- An infinite chain of causes is impossible
- Aquinas’ justification for the premise above
- There must be an uncaused cause
- God is the only possible first cause

5

#### c. Has Aquinas proved that God exists? Give reasons for your answer.

- Aquinas may have shown that there is a ‘first cause’ but does the ‘first cause’ have to be God?
- Could the ‘first cause’ be the Big Bang?
- Who caused God?
- even if the argument is successful it doesn’t prove the existence of most people’s concept of God.
- Comments relating to the difference between proving that God exists and presenting evidence that it is reasonable to believe that God exists

4

**Totals 6 4**

### Question 3 – Free will

#### Section 2 – total marks 10

KU AE

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “*Metaphysics*” (Int 2).
- It has **two** structured questions, each with **1-5** 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 **1-10** 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. In the free will debate what is ‘compatibilism’?

- Any appropriate description, eg the belief that free will is still possible in a determined world.

2

#### b. State two arguments for compatibilism.

- “Free” can mean absence of coercion or constraint.
- “Free” can mean in accordance with one’s desires however those desires come to exist
- Moral choices need an explanation—choices that have no explanation are indistinguishable from chance.
- Determinism helps us understand the world; Libertarianism helps us understand morality. Compatibilism is the best of both worlds.

Up to 2 marks for each appropriate reason.

4

#### c. What problems are there with compatibilism?

- It ‘shifts the goalposts’ by using a different definition of “Free”
- It cannot clearly distinguish between cause and coercion.
- Absence of coercion is not enough to enable moral responsibility if the decisions are still caused.
- The kind of freedom envisaged by some compatibilists still leaves humans as no more than clockwork automatons.

Up to 2 marks for each appropriate criticism

4

**Totals 6 4**

## Question 4 – Epistemology

### Section 3 – total marks 20

KU AE

- 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 one – 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 **1-3** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **1-5** and requires a restricted response.
- Candidates must answer this question.

**There is no choice of question in Part one of Section 3.**

#### **a. What is the tripartite theory of knowledge?**

- The theory that knowledge consists of justified true beliefs and that these criteria are individually necessary and jointly sufficient for knowledge. (Just mentioning the three criteria ‘justified’, ‘true’ & ‘belief’ merits one mark. A further statement eg these ‘must’ be the case earns the second mark)

2

#### **b. In what ways can the tripartite theory of knowledge be criticised?**

- Sceptics may question whether the evidence is ever reliable enough to satisfy the justification criterion.
- Anything cited as justification may itself need justification leading to an infinite regress.

3

**Totals 2 3**

## Question 5 – Descartes

*Part two – total marks 15*

**KU AE**

- 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 **MAY** contain an extract from the relevant prescribed text and has **2-5** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **1-10** 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.

### a. Describe Descartes' Trademark argument for the existence of God.

- Establishes the clear and distinct rule
- Descartes has the idea of perfection
- This idea must have a cause.
- The cause of this idea can't be Descartes himself
- Because of the principle of causal adequacy, the quality of the effect must exist in the cause.
- Therefore a perfect being must exist
- This can all be seen clearly and distinctly

**7**

### b. Why is God important in Descartes' Meditations?

- To overcome the deceiving God of Med.1 and thus establish certainty in a priori reasoning.
- A perfect being wouldn't let him be deceived since "all fraud and deception depend on some defect."
- To act as a guarantor of "clear and distinct" ideas
- To move beyond the cogito

**2 2**

### c. Give two reasons why the Trademark Argument can be criticised.

- Any two appropriate criticisms e.g.
  - Reliance on the principle of causal adequacy
  - Explanation of the weakness of the principle of causal adequacy (e.g. a sponge cake has many properties not present in the ingredients; the principle of causal adequacy was intended to apply to physical object not ideas)
  - If God is an innate idea then it is not clear why not everyone has such an idea.

**4**

**Totals 9 6**

## Question 6 – Hume

*Part two – total marks 15*

**KU AE**

- 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 may contain an extract from the relevant prescribed text and has **2-5** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **1-10** 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.

**a. According to Hume what is the difference between ‘simple’ and ‘complex’ ideas?**

- Simple ideas based directly on ‘impressions’.
- Simple ideas result from remembering or imagination.
- Complex ideas result from combining or modifying simple ideas in various ways – compounding, transposing, augmenting, or diminishing.
- Appropriate examples.

**4**

**b. Why is it important for Hume to explain how we acquire the idea of God?**

- Hume is an empiricist.
- As an empiricist Hume believes all ideas are based on impressions.
- Impressions can be outward or inward.
- There are no outward impressions that give rise to the idea of God (we cannot see God, etc.)
- The idea of God arises from reflecting on the operations of our own mind, and augmenting, without limit, those qualities of goodness and wisdom.

**3**

**c. Critically discuss Hume’s theory of ideas?**

- Claim that all ideas can be traced back to sensory experience seems correct but difficult to test.
- Explanation of Hume’s argument.
- -sensory deprivation
- -senses not exposed to an experience
- Distinction between simple and complex ideas unclear
- -the same idea may be either simple or complex.
- -possible link to ‘missing shade of blue’.
- Classification of ideas and impressions not clear.
- -some impressions seem less vivid than the corresponding idea
- -allowing for ‘disease or madness’ as an exception means there must be something be something other than vivacity that distinguishes impressions and ideas.

**2 6**

**Totals 9 6**

## Question 7 – Normative Ethics

### Section 4 – total marks 20

KU AE

- This section examines the content of the Unit “Moral Philosophy” (Int 2).
- It has **one** structured question with **1-6** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **1-20** and requires either a restricted or extended response.
- It may contain a short case study or stimulus.

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

**a. What is meant by the ‘Greatest Happiness Principle’.**

- The morally right action is that action which maximises happiness. (mention of maximizing happiness earns one mark, the second mark is earned from any further relevant point eg it is a moral principle (‘ought’), it is a utilitarian principle)

2

**b. According to Bentham how should happiness be measured?**

Any relevant point with appropriate expansion or example, eg

- Mention of the Hedonic calculus
- Mentioning at least one criterion from the Hedonic Calculus

2

**c. Explain what Mill meant by ‘higher’ and ‘lower’ pleasures. Give examples to support your answer.**

- **Higher Pleasures:** A term used by Mill to describe intellectual pleasures such as literature, art or music, as opposed to the ‘lower’ physical pleasures.
- **Lower Pleasures:** A term used by Mill to describe non-intellectual pleasures such as food, drink and sex.

4

**Read the following scenario:**

**Scott is suspicious that his partner is cheating on him by seeing someone else. One of Scott’s friends finds out that this is true. If Scott asks his friend should the friend tell Scott the truth?**

**d In what ways would act and rule utilitarians respond to this situation?**

- **Accurate definition of act utilitarianism:** A type of Utilitarianism that holds that the moral worth of each action depends upon whether it individually on that occasion produced the greatest happiness.
- **Accurate definition of rule utilitarianism:** A type of Utilitarianism that holds that the moral worth of each action depends upon whether it accords with rules which in turn are justified by their tendency to promote the greatest happiness.
- **Application to the scenario:**  
Act utilitarians would calculate the amount of happiness and pain for all those affected by each possible action, decide which results in the greatest happiness or least pain and then advocate that choice. Each relevant point made should earn one mark up to a total of four marks.

4 8

- Rule utilitarians will have previously decided what rules should be followed by appropriate application of utilitarian principles. A likely rule being 'Don't tell lies'. The issue for the RU will be whether this is an absolute rule or whether it is a generalization that permits the telling of 'white lies'. A candidate may consider whether utilitarian principles would have justified 'always protect your friend from harm'. Each relevant point made should earn one mark up to a total of four marks.

**KU AE**

**Totals 12 8**

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]