



**2008 Philosophy**

**Intermediate 2**

**Finalised Marking Instructions**

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2008

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.

## 2008 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 pupils are expected to use in their answers.

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

## Section 1: total marks 10

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

- |   | <b>Marks</b> |
|---|--------------|
| <p>(a) <b>The following list contains both arguments and statements. Write down the three numbers that identify the arguments.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. You shouldn't put the milk in first because, if you do, it spoils the taste.</li><li>2. So she said, 'Yes, you can' and he replied, 'Really? Are you sure about that?'</li><li>3. Come on, it's not that bad. After all, it can soon be fixed.</li><li>4. Is this the way to make fresh pasta?</li><li>5. If I don't get this finished soon I won't have time to go out and then he'll never forgive me.</li><li>6. Make sure you do the washing up before you go to bed.</li><li>7. There are fewer and fewer fish in the North Sea therefore we should limit the amount of fish that trawlers can catch.</li><li>8. Although the piece of music was played well the audience failed to appreciate what they were hearing.</li></ol> <p><b>1 mark</b> for each of 1, 3 and 7</p> | <b>3</b>     |
| <p>(b) <b>Read the following argument:</b></p> <p><b>If the harvest is good then the price of vegetables falls. Since the price of vegetables has fallen we know that the harvest was good.</b></p> <p>(i) <b>State the conclusion of this argument.</b></p> <p>(ii) <b>Does this conclusion follow from the premises? Give a reason for your answer.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>1 mark</b> for identifying the conclusion as 'the harvest was good'</li><li>• <b>1 mark</b> for saying that the conclusion does not follow from the premises</li><li>• <b>1 mark</b> for an appropriate explanation. However, this explanation does not need to make specific mention of affirming the consequent.</li></ul>   | <b>3</b>     |
| <p>(c) <b>Give an example of an argument from ignorance and explain why your example is an unreliable form of reasoning.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This fallacy is committed if it is argued that since p has not been proved true, it must be false (or that since p has not been proved false, it must be true) (2 marks)</li><li>• Any appropriate example. (2 marks)</li></ul>  | <b>4</b>     |

**Total 10 marks**

**Section 2: total marks 10**

**Question 2 – God**

- This section examines the mandatory content of the unit ‘Metaphysics’ (Int 2)
- It has **two** structured questions, each with **two to four** 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.

**(a) What is the design argument for the existence of God?**

- an appropriate explanation that links apparent design in the world to the existence of God
- may mention Paley’s watch analogy or any other argument.

**2**

**(b) State 2 criticisms that can be made of the design 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.

**4**

**(c) Do you agree with these criticisms?**

- Any appropriate comments on or replies to the criticisms in B. Any appropriate examples or development of points already made should be rewarded.

**4**

**Total 10 marks**

## Section 2: total marks 10

### Question 3 – Free Will

- This section examines the mandatory content of the unit ‘Metaphysics’ (Int 2)
- It has **two** structured questions, each with **two to four** 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.

#### (a) What is compatibilism?

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

2

#### (b) State two reasons for believing that free will and determinism are compatible.

- ‘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 3 marks for each appropriate reason.

4

#### (c) What objections have been made to 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.

**(Full marks can be awarded for a fully developed objection.)**

4

**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 **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.**

(a) **What is epistemology?**

- the study or theory of knowledge, or
- concerned with how knowledge is acquired, or whether knowledge is possible, or
- any other appropriate definition.

**2**

**(NB the full 2 marks is awarded for just the definition.)**

(b) **What is a rationalist approach to epistemology?**

- the claim that some knowledge can be acquired through reasoning alone
- belief in innate ideas
- the rejection of empiricism
- emphasis on deductive rather than inductive learning
- championing of maths as a model for knowledge
- emphasis on a priori truths.

One mark should be awarded for each point made but additional marks up to a maximum of 3 marks can be awarded for sufficiently well-developed points.

**3**

**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.

*Descartes says that he will reject his previous opinions if he finds in them “some reason for doubt”.*

(a) **Describe the stages of Descartes’ method of doubt.**

Relevant points might include:

- appropriate context
- doubting authorities
- doubting senses
- dreaming
- evil demon
- arrival at the cogito.

7

(b) **Does Descartes’ method of doubt provide him with certainty?**

- explanation of the cogito
- cogito depends on prior knowledge
- alternative explanations – there are thoughts without thinkers
- statement of personal conclusion.

8

**(2 marks for each substantive point.)**

## 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.

*‘Suppose ... a person to have enjoyed his sight for thirty years, and to have become perfectly acquainted with colours of all kinds except one particular shade of blue...’*

(a) **What is the ‘missing shade of blue’ example?**

A sufficiently detailed account of the example which may include:

- a thought experiment that shows there is at least one idea that is not based on an impression
- argues that each shade results from a distinct impression just as different colours result from different impressions
- imagines someone who has seen every shade except one
- all the shades seen by the man are arranged in order from darkest to lightest
- questions whether such a man could imagine the missing shade
- Hume claims that such a man can imagine the missing shade
- Hume claims that the example is ‘singular’.

For the full six marks at least **three** of these points need to be sufficiently well made.

**6**

(b) **Why might the ‘missing shade of blue’ be a problem for Hume?**

- Hume is an empiricist
- Hume does not believe in innate ideas
- Hume’s theory claims that all ideas are based on prior impressions
- The example should be impossible if this theory is true
- The example is not singular
- The example can be applied to all other sensations
- The example opens the door to rationalism.

For the full six marks at least **three** of these points need to be sufficiently well made.

**6**

(c) **How might Hume have avoided this problem?**

- He might have denied that the person could have imagined the missing shade
- He might have claimed that colours can be complex ideas, formed through augmenting or diminishing neighbouring shades
- He might have claimed that the shade could be produced through the compounding of the neighbouring shades
- He might have claimed that we can transpose the tone from another colour to the colour blue.

**3**

**Total 15 marks**

#### **Section 4: total marks 20**

#### **Question 7 – Normative Ethics**

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 to 400 words**.

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

*The story is told of several sailors adrift in a lifeboat and dying of starvation. To stay alive the sailors decided to kill and eat one of the group. They ganged up on the unsuspecting little cabin boy who was then eaten. The sailors survived.*

**Discuss how Kantian and Utilitarian theories might deal with this situation.**

Appropriate explanation of Kantian ethics.

- Universalisation
- Treating as an end not a means only
- Deontological.

Appropriate explanation of Utilitarianism ethics.

- Greatest good for the greatest number
- Hedonist
- Consequentialist

Appropriate application of the two theories to the scenario. Evaluative comments may include:

**Kantian ethics would clearly condemn the sailors’ actions.**

- Fails ‘the ends not means only’ formulation
- A student may also discuss whether it fails the first formulation.

**Utilitarianism is less clear in why it would condemn the sailors’ actions.**

- Difficulty in predicting consequences
- Difficulty in calculating sum total of happiness – relatives, guilt, does it matter that the cabin boy was unsuspecting? etc
- A student may comment on the distinction between Act and Rule Utilitarianism with regard to this scenario.

**Total 20 marks**

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]