



2013 Philosophy

Intermediate 2

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2013

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 Assessment team.

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 Assessment team 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.

Part One: General Marking Principles for Philosophy Intermediate 2

This information is provided to help you understand the general principles you must apply when marking candidate responses to questions in this Paper. These principles must be read in conjunction with the specific Marking Instructions for each question.

- (a) Marks for each candidate response must always be assigned in line with these general marking principles and the specific Marking Instructions for the relevant question. If a specific candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or detailed Marking Instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your Team Leader/Principal Assessor.
- (b) Marking should always be positive ie, marks should be awarded for what is correct and not deducted for errors or omissions.

GENERAL MARKING ADVICE: Philosophy Intermediate 2

The marking schemes are written to assist in determining the “minimal acceptable answer” rather than listing every possible correct and incorrect answer. The following notes are offered to support Markers in making judgements on candidates’ evidence, and apply to marking both end of unit assessments and course assessments.

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.

Part Two: Marking Instructions for each Question

Section 1 – CRITICAL THINKING IN PHILOSOPHY – total marks 10 (6/4)

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit ‘Critical Thinking in Philosophy (Int 2)’. It has one structured question with 3 to 6 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. 		
1	a	<p>There is no choice in Section 1 of the Question Paper.</p> <p>The following list contains both arguments and statements. Write down the three numbers that identify the arguments.</p> <p>(1) Nobody thinks she is pretty — Why, when she is clearly attractive? (2) What is your favourite colour? (3) Because Philosophy is difficult I will have to study hard. (4) Fish have tails, therefore they can swim. (5) I went to bed late and am tired so I probably won’t do well in my test. (6) This toast is burnt because you left it cooking too long. (7) My legs are sore from doing too much PE. (8) Shut the door! It is really cold in here!</p>	3	
		<p>1 mark each for identifying the following as arguments: 3, 4 and 5</p>		
	b	<p>Read the following argument.</p> <p>“You can’t afford to buy those jeans. If you had more money you could afford to buy them, but you don’t have the money.”</p> <p>Rewrite this argument in Standard Form — showing the premises and conclusion</p>	3	
		<p>Candidates should be awarded: 1 mark for identifying premises 1 mark for identifying the conclusion 1 mark for putting the argument into an appropriate form</p> <p>P1: If you had more money then you could afford the jeans P2: You don’t have more money C: So you can’t afford to buy those jeans</p>		

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	c	<p>Explain why an illegitimate appeal to authority is an unreliable form of reasoning. Give an example in your answer.</p>	3 + 1	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any appropriate example (1 mark) A maximum of three marks for the explanation including one mark for relating the explanation to the example. 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. <p>Total 10 marks</p>		

Section 2 – METAPHYSICS – total marks 10 (6/4)

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
2		<p>God</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit 'Metaphysics' (Int 2). • It has two structured questions, each with 1 to 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 to 10 and requires either a restricted or extended response. <p>Candidates answer all parts of the one structured question which relates to the option they have studied.</p>		
2	a	<p><i>Everyday observations about apparent order and purpose in the world may lead us to conclude that this could never be the result of an accident.</i></p> <p>Give an example of an object which displays apparent order and purpose.</p>	1	
		<p>1 mark should be awarded for an appropriate example.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Honeycomb • Chair • Human eye • Any pertinent example 		

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	b	Describe the argument for the existence of God referred to in the extract above.	5	
		<p>Candidates may describe any teleological argument. William Paley’s argument is suggested as an example in the arrangements document.</p> <p>Up to 5 marks should be awarded for a description of a teleological argument, dependent upon quality and relevance. The most straightforward form of the teleological argument is the argument from analogy. This analogy works by stating that:</p> <p>P1: Complex natural phenomena, such as the eye, display intelligent design (order and purpose), in much the same as the artefacts made by human beings display these intelligent design.</p> <p>P2: The artefacts made by humans display these marks of intelligent design (order and purpose) because they have an intelligent being.</p> <p>P3: We can therefore also infer that the marks of intelligent design (order and purpose) displayed by natural objects and must be the result of being designed by an intelligent being.</p> <p>C: The only candidate for that intelligent being is God.</p>		
		<p>Paley uses a watch to develop an analogy:</p> <p>P1: The universe resembles a watch.</p> <p>P2: The appearance of design in the watch (order and purpose) is attributable to the agency of a designer.</p> <p>P3: Therefore the appearance of design in the universe (order and purpose) entails the existence of a designer.</p> <p>C: That designer is God.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Premise three in both arguments is important, in that it states that similar effects have similar causes. • This analogous argument works by claiming that the complexity in human artefacts and the complexity in natural objects are similar effects and therefore, we can claim that these have similar causes (ie a designer). The designer in the case of the natural objects is God. • Any other pertinent point. 		

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	c			
			4	
		<p>Do you agree that order and purpose are evidence of God's existence? Give reasons for your answer.</p>		
		<p>Up to 2 marks should be awarded for any of the following points, to a maximum of 4 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The grounds for analogy are too weak: David Hume offers this criticism, stating that the world is not similar enough to designed objects for us to accept the analogy. The watch is mechanical: the Earth organic. We can note similarities between the world and non-designed objects. Hume uses a vegetable in his analogy. If we can draw analogies between the world and designed objects and also non-designed objects, then Paley's original analogy using the watch does not look so convincing. • What kind of God is the designer? David Hume again offers this objection. The "design" of the world does not show the kind of God people are looking for. The Teleological argument is most commonly used to argue for an omnipotent, omniscient and benevolent God, but does not infer any of these characteristics. It could easily show that there are lots of designer gods, not just one. An "infant deity" or a "stupid deity" or a deity, which no longer exists, could just as easily have designed the world. • There is a fallacy of composition here. We cannot infer anything just by examining a small part of it. If we only consider evidence for design in the world, we are not taking everything into account. We cannot conclude that the whole world has been designed just by examining those parts of it, which appear to be designed. For example, we could not tell what a person is like by examining one eyelash. • It is possible for matter to be self-ordering: David Hume again offers this objection. In a finite world, given a never-ending amount of time, any combination of things can happen. We only ever see those things which work well and we assume design from that. • Not all things in nature display design or order: For example, a stone or a natural disaster. There are many examples of disorder in the world (eg death or "evil"). Why would there be death in a world designed by an omnipotent, benevolent God? • How much do human beings impose order on thing? We need to have a clearer definition of what we mean by "design". Perhaps humans impose design where it does not exist? Humans may be "programmed" to search for order and design in the world. 		

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	c	<p>Cont...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Darwin gives another explanation of the design of the world without the need for God.</i> Darwin claimed that things have evolved and that the strongest and fittest survived. This claim altered the way the creation of the world could be seen. Humans were the result of blind natural processes, which adjusted to their environment and did not involve God. Darwin's explanation would fit with Occam's Razor, which states that the simplest explanation must be correct. • <i>Hume's criticism about the characteristics of God does not deny the possibility of God.</i> Hume only states that the Teleological Argument does not make any valid claim for the God of Christianity, Judaism or Islam, for which the argument is constructed. • <i>Darwin's objection does not deny the possibility of a God:</i> God could have designed evolution and left us to it! God could have designed everything as fit for purpose. • Any other pertinent point. <p>Total 10 marks</p>		

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
3		<p>Free Will</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit 'Metaphysics' (Int 2). • It has two structured questions, each with 1 to 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 to 10 and requires either a restricted or extended response. <p>Candidates answer all parts of the one structured question which relates to the option they have studied.</p>		
3	a	<p>What is Hard Determinism?</p>	3	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the belief that every event has a cause • events include human actions so they too are entirely caused • we have no control over previous causes so cannot be held responsible for them • free will is an illusion • moral concepts like praise and blame only make sense if we are free - chemical interactions all determined Ghandi's and Hitler's behaviour – for example • genetics, environment etc, stop us from being free. 		
	b	<p>What is the difference between Hard Determinism and Compatibilism?</p>	3	
		<p>Compatibilism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All acts are caused but some are free if not coerced • Human beings are responsible if not coerced • We are free if we are doing what we want to do. 		

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	c	Explain two criticisms of Hard Determinism.	4	
		<p>Any two criticisms with up to 3 marks available for any one criticism.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our use of moral language assumes free will is possible. • Systems of punishment and retribution are predicated on the existence of free will. • Hard determinism is using an incoherent definition of 'freedom' – the compatibilist criticism. • Hard determinism is self-defeating. <p>Total 10 marks</p>		

Section 3 – EPISTEMOLOGY – total marks 20

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
4		<p>Epistemology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>The nature of each question is outlined below:</p> <p>Part 1 – total marks 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section One of the Epistemology Unit. • It has one question with 1 to 3 related parts. • Each related part has a possible mark range of 1 to 5 and requires a restricted response. • Candidates must answer this question. <p>There is no choice of question in Part 1 of Section 3.</p>		
4	a	<p>What do rationalists believe about knowledge?</p>	3	
		<p>Any three relevant points, eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the view that reason is the primary source of knowledge • importance of a priori knowledge emphasised • belief in innate ideas • mathematics held up as a paradigm of knowledge • critical of sense experience 		
	b	<p>Explain one problem associated with Rationalism.</p>	2	
		<p>Any one relevant criticism, eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • innate ideas are controversial – how do we acquire them? What are they? • a priori truths cannot tell us anything about the world • science seems largely empirical in nature. <p>Total 5 marks</p>		

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
5		<p>Part 2 – Descartes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p><i>Yesterday's meditation has thrown me into such doubts that I can no longer ignore them, yet I fail to see how they are to be resolved. It is as if I had suddenly fallen into a deep whirlpool; I am so tossed about that I can neither touch bottom with my foot, nor swim up to the top.</i></p>		
5	a	<p>What are the doubts that Descartes can no longer ignore?</p>	7	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The senses sometimes deceive us. • Small and distant things. • Explanation of the dream argument • Rejection of a posteriori knowledge claims. • Mathematics and knowledge that there must be an outside world from which my dreams are based survives. • Explanation of the Evil Genius. • Rejection of a priori truths. <p>A single point that is developed can be awarded up to two marks</p>		

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	b	What is the cogito?	2	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “I am: I exist” • Explanation that Descartes realises that he must exist in order to be deceived • Any other relevant point 		
	c	How successful is the cogito in providing Descartes with the answers he is looking for?	6	
		<p>Issues with the cogito explained. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For ‘I am: I exist’ to be necessarily true we must accept the meaning of the language concepts employed. Does the possibility of the evil deceiver undermine the meaning of these concepts? • Ayer – all we can say with certainty is ‘there are thoughts’ <p>Issues with Descartes’ use of God. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without God all Descartes appears to have proved is that he exists. This isn’t very satisfactory. • Maybe God isn’t good? Maybe he deceives us for his own pleasure? • Maybe the evil deceiver has deceived us into thinking that God is good and wouldn’t deceive us? <p>Problems with the clear and distinct rule. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problems agreeing which knowledge claims are in fact clear and distinct • Cartesian circle explained. <p>A single point that is developed can be awarded up to two marks</p> <p>Total 15 marks</p>		

Question			Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
6			<p>Hume</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 2-5 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. 		
6	a		<p>According to Hume, if I am thinking about the Loch Ness Monster am I having an impression or an idea? Explain your answer.</p>	2 + 1	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of Impression and ideas: An impression is a live perception or experience; an idea is a faint copy of a previous experience. • Application to the example: Thinking about the Loch Ness Monster is an idea. 		
	b		<p>According to Hume, how is it possible to imagine the Loch Ness Monster if it doesn't exist and I haven't seen a picture of it?</p>	2 + 1	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explanation of simple and complex ideas. • Application to the example: the Loch Ness Monster is a complex idea. 		

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
	c	<p>Describe the example of the Missing Shade of Blue, and explain how Hume thinks it is possible to imagine the missing shade.</p>	5	
		<p>Description of the Missing Shade of Blue Example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> imagines a man who has seen every colour but one shade; the shades are laid out in ascending order; such a man would be aware of a missing shade and would be able to conjure the simple idea of the missing shade. <p>Up to 3KU</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hume doesn't think the missing shade is a complex idea like the Loch Ness Monster; the man can imagine some simple ideas without an impression. <p>Up to 2KU</p>		
	d	<p>Is the Missing Shade of Blue a problem for Hume's theory of impressions and ideas? Explain your answer.</p>	4	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The example seems to refute his claim that all ideas are based on impressions. Threatens to undermine his empirical stance Opens the door to the notion of innate ideas. Could have used his existing conceptual framework to solve the problem: The shade is a complex idea that is compounded from two others or is an augmented or diminished shade of one he has seen. <p><i>A single point that is developed can be awarded up to 2 marks</i></p> <p>Total 15 marks</p>		

Section 4 – MORAL PHILOSOPHY

Question		Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
7		<p>Normative Ethics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This section examines the content of the Unit ‘Moral Philosophy’ (Int 2). • It has one structure question with 1 - 6 related parts. • Each related part has a possible mark range of 1-20 and requires either a restricted or an extended response. • It may contain a short case study or stimulus. <p>There is no choice of questions in Section 4 of the Question Paper.</p>		
		<p><i>You are in a shop and have an opportunity to steal a DVD. You know that your mother would be delighted to get this DVD for her birthday but you are not sure what to do.</i></p> <p>Explain how Kantians and Utilitarians would advise you to deal with this situation.</p>	12 + 8	
		<p>Kantianism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deontological – importance of duty • Categorical Imperative • Maxims • Universalisation • Treating as an end rather than simply as a means <p>Utilitarianism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greatest happiness principle • Happiness/Pleasure as an intrinsic good • Consequentialist • Everyone’s happiness/pleasure given equal consideration <p>Applying to scenario</p> <p>Kantian ethics would clearly condemn the action of stealing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails ‘the ends not means only’ formulation 		

Question	Expected Answer/s	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
7	<p>Cont...</p> <p>Utilitarianism is less clear in what it would advise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty in predicting consequences • Difficulty in calculating sum total of happiness – mother, shop, your guilt • A student may comment on the distinction between Act and Rule Utilitarianism with regard to this scenario • Consideration of whether utilitarianism is a decision making procedure. <p>Evaluation</p> <p>Kantianism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gives a clear structure to test a maxim. • Considers justice without the complication of consequences. • Problem of conflicting duties – mother versus shop. • Intuition tells us that consequences are important. <p>Act Utilitarian</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each situation is considered. • Human beings do want to maximise happiness. • Difficulty of assessing consequences – you might be caught. • Most people see stealing as wrong even if it did maximise happiness. <p>Total 20 marks</p>		

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]