



**2014 Philosophy**

**Intermediate 2**

**Finalised Marking Instructions**

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2014

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. *You can do this by posting a question on the Marking Team forum or by e-mailing/phoning the e-marker Helpline.*
- (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	(a)	One mark for identifying the following as arguments:  2, 4 and 6	3 KU	
1	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A statement can assert or deny that something is the case.</li> <li>• Statements are used as premises and conclusions.</li> <li>• Statements have a truth value.</li> <li>• Arguments attempt to prove or refute something.</li> <li>• Arguments consist of premises that aim to support a particular conclusion.</li> </ul> <p>Any three relevant points.</p>	3 KU	
1	(c)	<p>Candidates should get two marks for explaining that the argument is valid and for giving an appropriate reason.</p> <p>Candidate should get two marks for explaining that the argument is unsound as the premises are false.</p> <p>A candidate who only states that the argument is valid and unsound should only be awarded two marks.</p>	4 AE	
		<b>Total marks</b>	<b>10</b>	

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

Question	Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
2	<p>Up to 2 marks may be awarded for any of the following descriptive points, depending on quality, up to a total of 6 marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The problem of the universe’s beginning can lead us to suspect that God may be an explanation for its existence. The universe and everything in it was caused.</li> <li>• However, this chain of causes and effects must have started somewhere. The beginning of events must be in itself somehow <i>uncaused</i>, or else the chain of events would continue backwards into infinity.</li> <li>• The Cosmological argument uses God’s very <i>nature and existence</i> to explain the beginning of the universe and everything in it. God’s nature is by its definition very different to other causes and breaks the infinite chain of cause and effect.</li> <li>• Thomas Aquinas thought that the universe must have been caused by something which was in itself uncaused: he called this “the first cause”. The argument runs as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P1: Everything in the world of sense has a cause.</li> <li>• P2: Nothing is its own cause.</li> <li>• P3: A chain of causes cannot be infinite.</li> <li>• <u>P4: There must be a “first cause”.</u></li> <li>• C: God is the “first cause”.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Any other relevant points.</li> </ul> <p>Up to <b>2 marks</b> may be awarded for any of the following evaluative points, depending on quality, up to a total of <b>4 marks</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Cosmological Argument is an <i>a posteriori</i> argument, which allows evidence from the world around us to give strength to its conclusion. It uses empirical evidence from our senses.</li> <li>• The use of God in solving the problem of the beginning of the universe is very effective.</li> <li>• Everything in the universe is contingent, that is, dependent upon something else for its existence. God’s nature is special and unique and therefore cannot be contingent. Because God is not contingent, God <i>can</i> be an explanation for the existence of the universe. He does not depend upon anything else to come into existence.</li> </ul>	<p><b>6 KU</b> <b>4 AE</b></p>	

Question	Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
2	<p>Cont....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (The “ schoolboy’s objection”) <b><i>If God created the universe, who created God?</i></b> What is the cause of God, we may now ask? If we can answer this we may then have to ask, “What is the cause of the cause of God?” This is not a strong objection. As explained above, God is not contingent: God is necessary. If God was contingent, God would not be God. We have to have in mind a special understanding of the label “God”.</li> <li>• The Cosmological Argument can be seen to contain the <b><i>fallacy of composition</i></b>. That the universe requires a cause seems to come from our observation of this world, that everything in it has a cause. We cannot argue to the whole of a thing (the universe) just by looking at the nature of parts of it (planets, stars, everyday events etc.).</li> <li>• Kant develops this objection by stating that the idea of causes and effects is only true in this world, but God is beyond the world of sense experience. We use the idea that one thing causes another to help us make sense of the world, but we cannot jump from reasoning about this world to reasoning about God.</li> <li>• David Hume objects to the Cosmological Argument for the existence of God. He states that <b><i>any being necessary for bringing the universe into existence is by its very nature beyond our comprehension</i></b>. We cannot get outside the world to see what caused it. We should not restrict our definition of this to “God”. We have no reason to assume that God is the only being or event with the necessary characteristics to cause the beginning of the universe.</li> </ul>		

Question	Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
2	<p>Cont...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• David Hume also states that there is <b>no necessary connection between cause and effect</b>. All we see when we assume one thing causes another is that the two events happen in close proximity to one another. This does not show that one thing causes another. The experience we have of the world isn't enough to prove God caused it.</li> <li>• Must there be a first cause for the universe? Could the universe not have caused itself?</li> <li>• The "Schoolboy's Objection" is not a good counter argument, although it should be mentioned. Remember that God, by nature, is different from other causes and so does not require a cause. The "Schoolboy's Objection" is therefore based on a misunderstanding about the nature of God.</li> <li>• The reasoning from parts to wholes commits the fallacy of composition and this is a reasonable objection. However, note that sometimes it is possible to reason from parts to wholes. For example, reasoning from the <b>existence</b> of body parts to the <b>existence</b> of whole humans is possible. Therefore, reasoning from causes in the world to causes for the universe may not be so objectionable after all.</li> <li>• <b>Remember</b> Hume says that God is not the only explanation. He does not claim that God is not a good explanation.</li> <li>• The universe could have caused itself is a good objection because it provides a logical answer which does not rely on an extra entity to resolve the issue. This is known as <b>Occam's razor</b>.</li> <li>• Any other pertinent point.</li> </ul>		
	<b>Total marks</b>	<b>10</b>	

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
3	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Universe is governed by the laws of cause and effect.</li> <li>• Every choice is a deterministically necessitated choice.</li> <li>• When we act we could not have done otherwise, therefore there is no human freedom.</li> <li>• The cause of every event is the antecedent event.</li> </ul>	3 KU	
3	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We feel that our actions are not dictated by cause and effect but are purely down to our free choice – the claim that we have free will.</li> <li>• We have a strong psychological sense that we freely make decisions.</li> <li>• Our intuition tells us that we make free choices.</li> <li>• Libertarians talk of event causation.</li> <li>• Libertarians also talk of agent causation.</li> </ul>	3 KU	
3	(c)	<p>Hard Determinism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Hard Determinist would argue that, if we are uncaused, then we are not free but behaving randomly – this does not make sense.</li> <li>• The Hard Determinist points out that feeling free is not the same as being free – our actions are already determined by previous events.</li> <li>• Hard Determinist ideas about human behaviour fit with theories about the scientific world which are governed by cause and effect.</li> </ul> <p>Libertarianism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agent causation would seem to accommodate morality/moral responsibility. The Libertarian does not accept the charge of randomness.</li> <li>• We feel free – we are aware of a decision making process. This would seem to suggest we are the causes of our destiny. Agent causation makes sense.</li> <li>• We are confident that “we are free if we could have done otherwise.”</li> </ul>	4 AE	
		<b>Total marks</b>	<b>10</b>	

**Section 3 – EPISTEMOLOGY – total marks 20**

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
4	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Justified</li> <li>• True</li> <li>• Belief</li> </ul>	3 KU	
4	(b)	<p>One problem with the tripartite theory is the sceptical claim that the justification criterion cannot be satisfied due to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infinite Regress</li> <li>• unreliability of sense experience</li> <li>• limitations of reason.</li> </ul> <p>A candidate should be awarded a mark for any substantive point and a mark for any expansion on a point.</p>	2 AE	
		<b>Total marks</b>	<b>5</b>	

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
5	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To find a certain foundation of knowledge.</li> <li>To defeat the sceptics.</li> <li>Credit should also be given for an accurate reference to the source above eg to establish something 'firm and lasting in the sciences'.</li> <li>Any other pertinent point (eg prove the existence of God and that the mind is distinct from the body).</li> </ul>	3 KU	
5	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Descartes raised the possibility that maybe God's omnipotent, omniscient etc but isn't benevolent.</li> <li><i>A priori</i> truths are open to doubt.</li> <li>If there is an evil deceiver then maybe even simple mathematical truths are open to doubt.</li> <li>If there is an evil deceiver then maybe even the simple idea that there must be an external world is open to doubt.</li> <li>The evil deceiver allows Descartes to say that he has found a certain piece of knowledge that is beyond doubt.</li> <li>Any other relevant point.</li> </ul>	4 KU	
5	(c)	<p>A candidate may argue that the cogito has overcome the evil deceiver.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You have to exist in order to be deceived.</li> <li>The cogito is a self-evident truth.</li> <li>Accurate reference to the text eg "I am: I exist".</li> </ul> <p>Issues with the cogito explained. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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?</li> <li>Ayer – all we can say with certainty is that 'there are thoughts'.</li> </ul> <p>Issues with Descartes' use of God later in the Meditations. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Without God all Descartes appears to have proved is that he exists. This isn't very satisfactory.</li> <li>Maybe God isn't good? Maybe he deceives us for his own pleasure?</li> <li>Cartesian circle explained.</li> <li>Any other relevant point</li> </ul> <p>A single point that is developed can be awarded up to 2 marks</p>	2 KU 6 AE	
		<b>Total marks</b>	<b>15</b>	

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
6	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An idea present in the mind from birth.</li> <li>• Any two appropriate examples.</li> <li>• Moral truths ('Murder is wrong').</li> <li>• Religious propositions ('God exists').</li> <li>• Mathematical axioms ('A straight line is the shortest distance between two points').</li> </ul>	3 KU	
6	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All ideas are copied from impressions.</li> <li>• Impressions are internal or external experiences.</li> <li>• Impressions could include seeing a dog or feeling angry.</li> <li>• Ideas are faint copies which are less lively.</li> <li>• Ideas could include memories or acts of the imagination.</li> <li>• Ideas can be simple or complex.</li> <li>• Complex ideas are made by compounding, augmenting, diminishing or transposing simple ideas.</li> <li>• Examples could be thinking about the colour gold (simple) or imagining a gold mountain (complex).</li> </ul>	6 KU	
6	(c)	<p>Opposing arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• problem of the barrier of ideas (we can't compare ideas with impressions)</li> <li>• problem of the barrier of impressions (we can't compare impressions with the outside world)</li> <li>• leads to scepticism about the outside world</li> <li>• not all impressions are vivid</li> <li>• not all ideas are faint</li> <li>• some ideas don't appear to have a prior impression</li> </ul> <p>Supporting arguments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hume broadly right over vivacity and points out himself that 'fever' can change the vivacity of ideas</li> <li>• dispenses with controversial concepts like innate ideas and fits in with a scientific/empirical view of the world</li> </ul> <p>A single point that is developed can be awarded up to 2 marks</p>	6 AE	
		<b>Total marks</b>	<b>15</b>	

**Section 4 – MORAL PHILOSOPHY – total marks 20**

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark	Additional Guidance
7	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consequentialism theory.</li> <li>• Greatest Happiness Principle.</li> <li>• Appropriate reference to sources eg Bentham, Mill.</li> <li>• Calculation of pleasure: Hedonic calculus/Higher and Lower Pleasures.</li> <li>• Clear statement that AU determines that the rightness of an action depends on the consequences of the individual action.</li> <li>• RU determines the rightness of an action depending on whether the action conforms to a rule that maximises happiness.</li> <li>• Discussion of possible applications of these theories to the issue: Act Utilitarians might advise lying if it produced the greatest happiness in this scenario.</li> <li>• Rule Utilitarians might stick to the rule if they thought it generally promoted happiness when strictly observed.</li> </ul>	12 KU	
7	(b)	<p>Act Utilitarianism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Might not be possible to calculate on every occasion.</li> <li>• Might justify evil deeds on particular occasions – lying here.</li> <li>• Would consider the long-term consequences.</li> <li>• Less rigid approach to moral dilemmas.</li> </ul> <p>Rule Utilitarianism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefits of rules might be very long term and difficult to assess.</li> <li>• Rules might conflict or some situations may not have a relevant pre-existing rule.</li> <li>• Avoids constant recalculation for every scenario.</li> </ul>	8 AE	
		<b>Total marks</b>	<b>20</b>	

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]