



2007 Philosophy

Intermediate 2

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2007

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 Assessment Materials Team, 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 Assessment Materials Team 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.

2007 Intermediate 2 Philosophy

All questions are marked out of 20.

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 likely that candidates will write high quality answers and not mention all the points listed. The suggested marks for each point are assuming 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 candidates are expected to use in their answers.

Although the marking scheme allocates two marks for each point made by the candidate, the markers should use their professional judgment as to whether one or two marks should be awarded.

Section 1:

This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit ‘Critical Thinking in Philosophy’ (Int 2). It has **one** structured question, with **three to five** related parts.

Each related part has a possible mark range of **one to five** and requires either a short answer or restricted response.

Candidates must answer **all** related parts of this question.

There is no choice in Section 1 of the question paper.

Question 1

- | | Marks |
|---|--------------|
| (a) The following list contains both arguments and statements. Write down the three numbers that identify the arguments . | |
| 1. If you go down to the woods today you are sure of a big surprise. | |
| 2. My love is like a red, red rose. | |
| 3. If you don’t want to injure yourself when playing sport you will need to warm up properly before the game. | |
| 4. PE is a waste of time because you can’t get a good job by studying it, so we shouldn’t have to do it in school. | |
| 5. People who listen to rock music are happier than people who listen to classical music because it helps them get rid of all their anger. | |
| 6. You can’t step into the same river twice. | |
| 7. When all the snow has melted and the sun is shining higher in the sky then the birds will return and it will be spring once more. | |
| 8. Birds have wings, therefore they can fly. | |
| • 1 mark for each of 4, 5 and 8 | 3 |
| (b) Read the following argument: | |
| Because the planet is warming up and the ice caps are melting, the polar bears are in danger. | |
| (i) State the two premises in this argument. | |
| (ii) State the conclusion of this argument. | |
| • 1 mark for each of: | |
| • the planet is warming up | |
| • the ice caps are melting | |
| • the polar bears are in danger (conclusion) | 3 |
| (c) Why is ‘attacking the person’ an unreliable type of argument? Give an example to support your answer. | |
| • This fallacy is committed if it is argued that p is false on the grounds that it is advanced by a particular person, for example, because that person stands to gain from our acceptance of it as true, or because that person’s behaviour is not consistent with the truth of p. (2 marks) | |
| • Any appropriate example. (2 marks) | 4 |

Total 10 marks

Section 2:

This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit ‘Metaphysics’ (Int 2).

It has **two** structured questions, each with **two to three** 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 **two to six** 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.

Question 2 – God

(a) Describe the cosmological argument for the existence of God.

- 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
- Reference to appropriate sources

6

(b) Discuss two objections to this 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 (Quantum theory).

4

Total 10 marks

Question 3 – Free Will

(a) What do philosophers mean when they say that we are totally determined?
Give two examples to support your answer.

- All events have a sufficient set of causes.
- Human beings are like physical objects in that their actions are explicable in terms of prior causes.
- Appropriate examples, eg
 - example related to genetics: preferences determined by physical make up
 - example related to environmental factors: preference for ice cream influence by temperature

6

Credit should be given irrespective of how many examples are given.

(b) Discuss two objections to the claim that we are totally determined.

- Overwhelming psychological feeling of being free to choose.
- Moral responsibility requires free will.
- Moral language and social interactions generally assume the existence of libertarian free will.
- Some events are uncaused and therefore not everything is determined.

4

Total 10 marks

Section 3:

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 Unit Epistemology (Int 2).
- It has **one** question with **one to two** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **two to five** and requires a restricted response.
- Candidates must answer this question.

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

Question 4 – Epistemology

Describe what is meant by ‘Rationalism’.

- The belief that some knowledge can be gained through reason alone.
- Acceptance of innate ideas.
- An example of a rationalist philosopher.

5

Total 5 marks

Part 2 – total marks 15

- This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section Two of the Unit ‘Epistemology’ (Int 2).
- 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 **two to three** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **two to ten** 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.

Question 5 – Descartes

“...after everything has been most carefully weighed, it must finally be established that this pronouncement, ‘I am, I exist’, is necessarily true every time I utter it or conceive it in my mind.”

This argument is sometimes called *The Cogito*.

(a) What sceptical arguments has Descartes “carefully weighed” to arrive at *The Cogito*?

- Purpose of Descartes’ sceptical arguments.
- Distrust of the senses.
- Dream argument.
- Evil genius.
- Appropriate references to the text.

7

(b) Why does Descartes believe *The Cogito* is beyond doubt?

- It is impossible to doubt that you are thinking because doubt is a kind of thinking.

2

(c) What problems are there with *The Cogito*?

- Use of previous knowledge:
 - what doubt is
 - what thinking is
 - possible suppressed premise
 - the stability of language
- Possibly assumes the reliability of reason.
- Problems of identifying the ‘I’.
- Yields only subjective certainty.
- Impossibility of building on the foundation.

Up to three marks for each well-defined point.

6

Total 15 marks

Question 6 – Hume

“Every one will readily allow, that there is a considerable difference between the perceptions of the mind, when a man feels the pain of excessive heat, or the pleasure of moderate warmth, and when he afterwards recalls to his memory this sensation, or anticipates it by his imagination.”

In this extract, Hume is explaining the difference between ‘Impressions’ and ‘Ideas’.

(a) Explain the difference between ‘Impressions’ and ‘Ideas’. Use appropriate examples in your answer.

- Empirical approach to epistemology.
- Impressions supply the raw data of knowledge.
- Ideas are copies of impressions.
- Distinction between inward and outward impression.
- Appropriate examples of both impressions and ideas.

7

(b) What problems have some philosophers found with Hume’s epistemology?

- Some impressions are faint and some ideas are vivid.
- Some ideas don’t appear to have a prior impression, eg ultraviolet.
- Hume is inconsistent:
 - description of the missing shade of blue
 - explanation of why the missing shade of blue is a problem.

8

Total 15 marks

Section 4:

This section examines the content of the ‘Moral Philosophy’ (Int 2) Unit. 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 to 400 words**.

There is no choice of questions in Section 4 of the question paper.

Question 7 – Normative Ethics

(a) Explain the main features of Kant’s Categorical Imperative. Use appropriate examples in your answer.

- Deontological approach.
- The role of reason.
- Duty is the only acceptable motive.
- Universalising the maxim.
- Using people as ends not means only.
- Appropriate examples (credit will be given for a maximum of two examples).

12

(b) What difficulties are there in applying the Categorical Imperative?

- Identifying the maxim.
- Conflicting duties.
- Is duty the only acceptable motive?
- Consequences are normally thought to be relevant.

8

Total 20 marks

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]