

2005 Philosophy

Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments.

HIGHER PHILOSOPHY 2005

All essay answers are marked out of 25.

The logic option is also marked out of 25.

In their essays 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 following descriptions provide some additional guidance on the features of essays categorised as A, B and C respectively. Clearly, many essays will exhibit some, though not all of the features listed in any one category. Others will be stronger in one area than another. These characteristics do however, provide a general indication of aspects to be expected in an essay at a particular marks band.

A: Total 18 – 25 marks

The answer covers all or most of the main points relevant to answering the question, with development (definition; explanation; exemplification; quotation; etc) as appropriate. The essay is a closely-argued and sustained response to the question, making effective use of philosophical concepts and terminology and presenting an effective exposition and evaluation of the texts and/or positions under consideration.

B: Total 15 – 17 marks

Most of the answer engages with the question and is a coherent response. Exposition of the texts and/or positions under consideration is accurate. There will be some coherence to the candidate’s analysis of the philosophical argument or issue, and appropriate evaluation and some attempt will be made to arrive at a conclusion which relates to the rest of the answer.

C: Total 13 – 14 marks

The candidate demonstrates sufficient competence in the subject area, and a grasp of the texts and/or positions under consideration. There may be omission or inaccuracy, but there will be basic analysis of the argument or issue and limited evaluation.

In marking essays the full range of marks is available to be awarded. It is important to bear in mind that most candidates will have had little contact with philosophy before. Marking should reflect what it is reasonable to expect from a newcomer to the subject and quality is rewarded accordingly. Full marks are attainable for answers written within the time constraints even though these can never be a fully comprehensive analysis of the arguments or issue.

Non-standard answers, as long as these are supported by appropriate reasons or argumentation, should not be penalised but marked according to the criteria outlined above. In the case of logic, non-standard answers should be accepted and rewarded accordingly if the reasons given are appropriate to the question asked.

The detailed information which follows indicates the points that a candidate is likely to make in response to the questions. This list is not to be considered exhaustive and it is also possible for candidates to write high quality essays and not mention all the points listed.

SECTION A: CLASSIC TEXTS

Candidates must answer ONE question.

1 Plato

Discuss Plato's theory of forms, with reference to the divided line. (25)

- explanation of the theory of forms
- accurate description of the divided line simile
- comments/criticisms of the simile
 - the nature of the dialectic (what is it?)
 - the content of each division
 - some comment/explanation on the unequal division of the line
 - correspondence with other similarities
 - varying mental states can be questioned
- the extent of the Forms
- appropriate references to the text

Typically an answer in the range:

18-25 would be a discussion of the forms in the context of the divided line

15-17 would be an appropriate discussion of the forms with an accurate description of the divided line

13-14 would make some mention of the line but might not be accurate or detailed or integrated into the answer in any way.

2 Descartes

Does Descartes succeed in overcoming scepticism? Give reasons for your answer. (25)

- Stages of doubt – senses, dream and demon
- Details of the Cogito. Points might include
 - foundational proposition
 - necessarily true
 - basis for clear and distinct rule which provides 'certainty' of other things like the existence of external bodies.
- Evaluation. Points might include
 - does seem to be immune from the disease of doubt
 - criticism of the sceptical method
 - does thinking/doubting need a thinker?
 - no unified 'I' – may just be a bundle of perceptions
 - the nature of language presupposes the external world
 - not foundational – needs to use logic
 - needs God as guarantor of reliability of human logic/reason
 - problems for the clear and distinct rule – definitions not clear and distinct, needs God
 - inappropriate standards of certainty.
- Appropriate references to the text.

ALL ESSAYS SHOULD BE MARKED WITH REFERENCE TO THE RANGE
DESCRIPTIONS ON PAGE 2.

3 Aristotle

Discuss the importance of habit in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*. (25)

- definition of virtue (habit discussed in context of the acquisition of virtue)
- cultivation of right desires will lead to virtuous acting, feeling and responding
- habituation secures happiness because desire and reason are in harmony
- comments and criticisms
 - no clear definition of the virtues
 - not clear how to apply in actual situations
 - not clear that virtue leads to eudaimonia
 - not clear that effort of will can lead to appropriate feelings, etc
- appropriate references to text

4 Hume

Critically evaluate the key elements of Hume's epistemology. (25)

- Source of knowledge – empiricism
 - ideas and impressions
- Hume's Fork
- building up of knowledge
 - laws of association
 - custom and habit
- comments and criticisms
 - standard criticisms of theory of ideas and impressions
- appropriate references to the text
- appropriate examples

If the answer focuses on just one area, eg impressions of ideas, then the analysis and evaluation would need to be much more sophisticated to earn a top mark than if the candidate discusses a number of different areas.

ALL ESSAYS SHOULD BE MARKED WITH REFERENCE TO THE RANGE DESCRIPTIONS ON PAGE 2.

SECTION B: PROBLEMS IN PHILOSOPHY

Candidates must answer ONE question.

1 Induction

Evaluate Popper's response to the problem of induction. (25)

- a definition of the problem of induction
 - matters of fact beyond our experience
 - assumption that the future will resemble the past and present
- Popper's distinction between the epistemological and psychological elements of the problem of induction
- falsification as opposed to induction as the basis of science
- a possible problem with falsification, eg reliance on induction
- evaluation of Popper's response

2 Scepticism

Can knowledge claims ever be justified? Give reasons for your answer. (25)

- definition of knowledge – justified, true belief
- definition of 'foundation'
 - empiricist position
 - rationalist position
- problems with attempts to identify a foundation
- coherentist description of justification
- critique of coherentism

3 Existence of God

Is the ontological argument successful in proving the existence of God? Give reasons for your answer. (25)

- explanation of the ontological argument
- identification of ontological argument as prior to experience
- supporters of/formulations of the argument
- God's existence as logically necessary
- existence as a perfection
- identification of problems associated with argument, eg
 - it begs the question, ie existence of God is true by definition
 - 'existence is not a predicate'
 - you cannot define things into existence
- even if successful the OA only argues for the god of the philosophers as opposed to any spiritual reality
- any other suitable criticism.

ALL ESSAYS SHOULD BE MARKED WITH REFERENCE TO THE RANGE DESCRIPTIONS ON PAGE 2.

4 Free-will and Determinism

“We sometimes have the freedom to do what we desire but we never have the freedom to choose what we desire.” Discuss. (25)

- clarification that the quote represents the compatibilist position
- arguments for determinism
 - causes required for explanations; uncaused events equivalent to random events
 - twin studies
 - neural activity precedes awareness of choice
- arguments against determinism; outline of libertarianism
 - personal experience of free decision making
 - undermines the rationality of philosophical argument
- recognition that both hard determinists and compatibilist would accept the quote
 - evidence that compatibilism collapses into hard determinism

5 Moral Philosophy

Is morality wholly subjective? Give reasons for your answer. (25)

- subjective position outlined
 - examples of cultural and other influences
 - difficulty of identifying any universal moral beliefs
- objective position outlined
 - examples of theories
- comments and criticisms
 - standard criticisms of subjective and objective positions
 - recognition of similarities between cultures
 - possible identification of moral absolutes
 - why can duties conflict with cultural expectations?

6 Social Philosophy

“Preserving individual liberty is more important than bringing about equality.”

Discuss (25)

- definition of ‘liberty’ and ‘equality’ in this context
- explanation of the tensions between liberty and equality
 - clarification of the consequences for equality of preserving liberty
- appropriate argument for the priority of individual liberty
 - self evident truth
- appropriate arguments for the need/benefits of equality
 - argument based on notions of justice
- recognition that the question presents something of a false dilemma.

ALL ESSAYS SHOULD BE MARKED WITH REFERENCE TO THE RANGE DESCRIPTIONS ON PAGE 2.

SECTION C: MORAL PHILOSOPHY

If this optional section is chosen, candidates must answer ONE question.

1 “What really matters is the intention behind an act.”

Discuss with reference to Kantian and Utilitarian theory (25)

- outline of Kant’s theory emphasising the role of intention
 - deontological, duty not inclination, maxims and the CI (universal moral law, ends not means)
- outline of Utilitarian theory emphasising the role of intention
 - Greatest Happiness Principle
 - Act U – act will maximise happiness
 - Rule U – act conforms with rule that maximises happiness
- appropriate illustrations (perhaps from the issues covered)
- standard criticisms of Kantian and Utilitarian theories.

2 “Voluntary euthanasia must be allowed if we are to treat people with respect.”

Discuss how adequately a Kantian may respond to this claim. (25)

- explanation of voluntary euthanasia
- outline of Kant’s theory – deontological, duty not inclination, maxims and the Categorical Imperative, Universal moral law, ends not means
- possible negative response – Kant’s view of suicide, UML, maxim of self love
- possible positive response – fits in with ends not means, could be a UML (maxim of self love)
- evaluation – confusion results, conflict of duties, problems with identifying maxims.

3 “If it ought at all to be admitted, it ought to be admitted in as far as it promises to exclude some greater evil.” (J. Bentham)

To what extent is this Utilitarian view of punishment acceptable? (25)

- outline of utilitarianism – GHP, Hedonism, consequentialism, impartiality, Mill’s higher/lower pleasures, act/rule utilitarianism
- relation of theory to punishment – protection, deterrence, reform. Reference to consequences, hedonism, impartiality
- strengths of Utilitarian approach – aim of punishment is positive/forward looking, allows flexibility for differing circumstances
- weakness of Utilitarian approach – no consistency/fairness in punishments, could be very harsh or light, could justify punishing the innocent.

ALL ESSAYS SHOULD BE MARKED WITH REFERENCE TO THE RANGE DESCRIPTIONS ON PAGE 2.

SECTION D: LOGIC

If this optional section is chosen, candidates must answer ALL questions.

1 “No arachnids are insects so no spiders are insects because all spiders are arachnids.”

Using examples drawn from the argument above, define the following logical terms:

(a) Premise

- a premise is a proposition in an argument which supports the conclusions, eg “No arachnids are insects” or “All spiders are arachnids”.

(b) Conclusion

- a conclusion is a proposition in an argument that the premises support, eg “No spiders are insects”.

(c) Proposition

- a proposition is a statement which is capable of being true or false. The premises and the conclusion in an argument are all propositions, eg “No arachnids are insects”, “All spiders are arachnids” or “No spiders are insects”. Questions or commands cannot be propositions because they cannot be true or false.

(d) Form

(4)

- the form of an argument is its underlying structure

eg No A are B A = Arachnids
 All C are A B = Insects
 No C are B C = Spiders

In each of (a) to (d) credit should be given for reasons and examples up to a maximum of 4 marks, ie one reason and one example earns one mark.

2 “I think she presents a perfectly valid argument in favour of animal rights but I still think she’s wrong.”

In logic does this comment make sense? Give reasons for your answer.

(2)

- Yes, because validity refers only to the structure not the content of the argument. So an argument can be well structured whilst having either false premises or a false conclusion or both.

2 marks for ‘yes’ and appropriate reason (as above)

1 mark for ‘no’ and a very clear reason that shows the student has understood the philosophical point but perhaps misread or made assumptions about the stimulus quote.

3 Consider the following argument:

All cats are animals
All mammals are animals
All cats are mammals

Evaluate the above argument for validity and soundness. Explain your answer.

(2)

The argument is neither valid nor sound. It is invalid because it has an invalid form which is:

All A are B A = Cats
All C are B B = Animals
All A are C C = Mammals

The content of the argument concerns Cats, Animals and Mammals and all these propositions are true. However, even though the argument has true premises and a true conclusion it still cannot be sound because sound arguments must have a valid form.

Up to 2 marks for the explanation.

NB Because of the missing line the student may take either the first line as the conclusion (in which case the argument is valid and sound) or the last line as the conclusion (in which case the argument is neither valid nor sound).

4 Which **one** of the following statements is **true**?

- (i) A false conclusion in a valid argument requires at least one false premise.
- (ii) A true conclusion in a valid argument requires all the premises to be true.
- (iii) A false conclusion in an invalid argument requires all the premises to be true.
- (iv) A true conclusion in an invalid argument requires at least one of the premises to be true.

(1)

- (i) is true because if all the premises were true the conclusion would have to be true in a valid argument.

- 5 Which **one** of the following statements is **false**?
- (i) A sound argument never has false premises.
 - (ii) A valid argument never has sound conclusions.
 - (iii) An invalid argument is always an unsound argument.
 - (iv) An unsound argument always has false premises. (1)

(iv) is false because they can have true premises but have an invalid form.

- 6 Can a sound argument have any invalid forms? Explain your answer. (2)

Yes. All arguments have multiple forms so an argument could have some invalid forms and some valid forms but is deemed sound so long as it has at least one valid form and true premises.

2 marks for a fully correct answer as above.

1 mark for an explanation that shows understanding of the relationship of soundness to validity but fails to recognise that a sound and therefore valid argument may also have an invalid form.

- 7 Consider the following invalid argument.

No whatsits are thingummies.

No thingummies are widgets.

Therefore, no widgets are whatsits.

- (a) Produce a logical form for this argument which has separate variables for whatsits, thingummies and widgets.

No A are B
No B are C
 No C are A

A = whatsits
 B = thingummies
 C = widgets



NB A key is not a requirement to earn the mark for this question.

- (b) Produce a new invalid argument which has the same form but different content such that the new content makes the invalidity more obvious.

Any argument with the same form but having true premises and a false conclusion.

eg No humans are horses
No horses are two legged creatures
 No two legged creatures are human

- (c) Explain why your new argument shows the argument form to be invalid. (3)

Eg the definition of validity explicitly rules out the possibility of valid arguments having true premises and a false conclusion.

1 mark to be allocated to part (a).

2 marks to be allocated to (b) and (c) taken together in which case:

- 1 mark for any substitution instance (b) with a relevant explanation (c) that results in an appropriate response.
- 2 marks for a substitution instance with true premises and a false conclusion (as explained above).

8. Consider the following invalid argument.

“Miracles are never witnessed, so they don’t occur.”

- (a) Provide a suppressed/implicit premise which, when made explicit, would result in this argument having the form:

If P then Q

P

Q

If miracles are never witnessed then they don’t occur.

- (b) Provide a suppressed/implicit premise which, when made explicit, would result in this argument having the form:

If P then Q

Not Q

Not P

If miracles occur then they will be witnessed.

- (c) Is it possible for these arguments to be regarded as having the same form? Give reasons for your answer. (3)

Yes, since both can have the form

P

Q

R

which can represent any two premise argument.

- 9 Consider the following argument. (2)

“Australia is surrounded by water, so Australia must be an island, since all islands are surrounded by water.”

This argument can be represented by the form:

If P then Q

$\frac{Q}{P}$

- (a) State what the variables represent;

If P then Q

$\frac{Q}{P}$

where P = Australia is an island; Q = Australia is surrounded by water
(or P = x is an island; Q = x is surrounded by water; x = Australia).

A general answer explaining that variables are used to represent the content of the argument is also acceptable.

- (b) State the name of the fallacy.
- affirming the consequent

- 10 Read the following dialogue.

Hermione: I think that Shakespeare’s plays were written by Christopher Marlowe.

Perdita: How do you make that out?

Hermione: Well, I can’t prove that it was Marlowe who wrote the plays but it certainly wasn’t Shakespeare. Those plays were written by someone who was well educated and it is clear that Shakespeare was not educated because we know he lived in Stratford but there was no record of him ever having entered the local school.

Hermione could be criticised for using a logical fallacy in her argument.

- (a) State the name of the fallacy.
- argument from ignorance.

Any other fallacy would be acceptable if the candidate succeeds in giving an appropriate explanation eg false dilemma: Shakespeare is known to have been educated **OR** Shakespeare is known not to have been educated, not the former, therefore the latter. A false dilemma between the authorship of Shakespeare and Marlowe is **NOT** acceptable as the passage explicitly says that they cannot prove that Marlowe was the author.

- (b) Explain the fallacy. (2)
- the fallacy assumes that because we don’t know something it didn’t happen.

11 “At certain times the British Secret Service has refused to employ homosexuals. Those who were discovered were immediately dismissed. It was argued that because of their fear of dismissal many homosexuals would not disclose the fact to their employers. This in turn would leave them vulnerable to blackmail from anyone, including enemies of the state, who discovered their sexual orientation. As a result, they would be unsuitable for work in the Secret Service.”

(a) Name the fallacy committed in this passage.

- begging the question/circular reasoning/petito principii.

(b) Explain what is wrong with this sort of fallacy.

- in order to arrive at a conclusion the argument uses that conclusion as one of the premises. Or, two interlocking arguments are used where the conclusion of one provides the premises for the other and vice versa.

(c) Give a logical form of the argument which clearly shows it to be a fallacy. (3)

- the circularity may be shown in several ways, eg

P
 If P then Q
If Q then P
 P

Where P = x should be dismissed; Q = x is a security risk

If P then Q
P
 Q

If Q then P
Q
 P

Where P = x should be dismissed; Q = x is a security risk.

NB For parts (b) and (c) candidates should not automatically lose the marks because of a wrong answer in part (a).

Part (b) can earn the mark through being an explanation of the answer given in (a) (whether correctly given in (a) or not).

Part (c) can earn the mark as long as it is correct on its own terms, ie whether it refers to a correct or incorrect answer in (a).

Total (25)

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]