



# **2015 Philosophy**

## **Intermediate 2**

### **Finalised Marking Instructions**

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2015

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
1	(a)	One mark for identifying the following as arguments: 3, 4 and 6.	3 KU
1	(b)	Two marks for identifying premises and one mark for identifying the conclusion.  <b>P(1) Revision will help me learn.</b> <b>P(2) I want to pass my exam.</b> <b>C I have to work hard and revise.</b>	3 AE
1	(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any appropriate example.</li> <li>• Explaining it is a fallacy.</li> <li>• Recognising that the fallacy targets the person rather than the argument.</li> <li>• Different types of "attacking the person" arguments.</li> <li>• Any other appropriate point or development.</li> </ul>	3 KU 1 AE  (10)

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

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark
2		<b>God</b>	
2	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cosmological argument (or the first cause argument.)</li> </ul>	1 KU
2	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>God is the first cause (or God exists)</li> </ul>	1 KU
2	(c)	<p>Up to <b>2 marks</b> may be awarded, depending on the quality of the answer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An infinite regress of causes is where each effect has antecedent causes which stretch to infinity, without a stopping point.</li> </ul>	2 KU
2	(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One mark for an expression of personal opinion supported by an appropriate reason.</li> <li>The Cosmological Argument is an <i>a posteriori</i> argument (1 mark), i.e. based on sense experience (1 mark)</li> <li>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> <li>(The “schoolboy’s objection”) <i>If God created the universe, who created God?</i></li> <li>Response: this misunderstands the argument as God is necessary not contingent and therefore does not require a cause.</li> <li>Some versions of the argument contain a contradiction saying that all things require a cause and then claim that God does not require a cause.</li> <li>Response: the first cause does not need to be within the universe and only those things within the universe are observed to require a cause.</li> <li>The argument contains the <i>fallacy of composition</i>. i.e. we cannot argue that the universe requires a cause just by looking at the nature its parts.</li> <li>Kant — 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 — <i>any being necessary for bringing the universe into existence is by its very nature beyond our comprehension</i>. We cannot get outside the world to see what caused it.</li> <li>Since we do not know what qualities are required for something to be a first cause we cannot say that the first cause can only be 'God'.</li> <li>Any other pertinent point.</li> </ul>	2 KU 4 AE
			(10)

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark
3		Free will	
3	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All explicable events are caused by prior causes.</li> <li>• Scientific/genetic/historical/psychological causes all determined.</li> <li>• Human behaviour is no different from the rest of the universe.</li> </ul>	3 KU
3	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We feel free to choose between available options.</li> <li>• Moral responsibility requires free will.</li> <li>• Moral language and social interactions generally assume the existence of libertarian free will.</li> <li>• Retributive punishment is predicated on free will.</li> <li>• Religious argument – God made us in his own image and gave us free will.</li> </ul>	3 KU
3	(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hard determinists say all events are caused and therefore there is no human freedom.</li> <li>• Compatibilists say that all events are caused but we are free if not coerced and apparently doing what we want to do.</li> <li>• Libertarians say we are free if we could have done otherwise.</li> <li>• Compatibilists say that we cannot do otherwise but we are free if we could have done otherwise if we had wanted to.</li> </ul>	4 AE  <b>(10)</b>

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

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark
4.		<p><b>Epistemology</b></p> <p><b>Part 1 – total marks 5</b></p>	
4	(a)	<p>Candidates should explain both the Empirical and Rationalist stances.</p> <p>Rationalism: An approach to philosophy which claims that some knowledge of the external world can be established by correct reasoning and without the use of sense experience.</p> <p>Empiricism: an approach to philosophy which claims that knowledge is based on sense experience, that knowledge is not innate, and that knowledge cannot be discovered by reason alone.</p>	3 KU
4	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Senses are unreliable.</li> <li>• Reason is unreliable.</li> </ul> <p>Any other appropriate point.</p>	2 AE  (5)

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark
5.		<b>Descartes</b>	
5	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Clear' meaning – present to the attentive mind.</li> <li>• 'Distinct' meaning – not confused with anything which is not clear.</li> <li>• Any two examples for example, "I am: I exist", existence of God, 2+2=4 etc.</li> </ul>	<b>4 KU</b>
5	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Descartes is aware that he is imperfect.</li> <li>• He concludes that he can only be aware of this because he understands the idea of perfection.</li> <li>• We cannot be the cause of this idea because we are imperfect.</li> <li>• God must have left his trademark in us.</li> <li>• Reference to innate ideas (God and perfection).</li> <li>• Reference to the casual adequacy principle.</li> </ul>	<b>5 KU</b>
5	(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problems with the Trademark argument <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Maybe there is no such thing as innate ideas?</li> <li>○ Examples that possibly undermine the casual adequacy principle.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Maybe God isn't good? Maybe he deceives us for his own pleasure?</li> <li>• Maybe the evil deceiver has deceived us into thinking that God is good and wouldn't deceive us?</li> <li>• Cartesian circle explained.</li> <li>• Any appropriate point.</li> </ul> <p>A single point that is developed can be awarded up to two marks.</p>	<b>6 AE</b>
			<b>(15)</b>

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark
6.		<b>Hume</b>	
6	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Matters of fact – synthetic, a posteriori, contingent knowledge.</li> <li>• Relations of ideas – analytic, a priori, necessary knowledge.</li> <li>• Suitable example of matter of fact: eg ‘the sun will rise tomorrow’.</li> <li>• Suitable example of relations of ideas: eg ‘<math>3 \times 5 = \frac{1}{2} \times 30</math>’.</li> </ul>	<b>4 KU</b>
6	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fork can be used as a test for spotting suspect metaphysical claims.</li> <li>• Statements which fall into neither category are not genuine knowledge claims.</li> <li>• Such items should be rejected.</li> </ul>	<b>3 KU</b>
6	(c)	<p>Areas where he defends empiricism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hume thinks all ideas are ultimately based on impressions.</li> <li>• Hume, therefore, doesn’t believe in rationalist innate ideas.</li> </ul> <p>Areas where Hume’s support of empiricism might be weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problems with Hume’s Theory of Perception – eg the barrier of impressions could lead to scepticism about the outside world.</li> <li>• Missing shade of Blue example opens the door to rationalism.</li> <li>• Problems with Hume’s Fork – eg he conflates epistemological distinctions with semantic distinctions.</li> </ul> <p>A single point that is developed can be awarded up to 2 marks.</p>	<b>2 KU</b> <b>6 AE</b>
			<b>(15)</b>

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

Question		Expected Answer(s)	Max Mark
7.		<b>Normative Ethics</b>	
7	(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kant is a deontologist so concerned with duty rather than consequences.</li> <li>• Kantians would refer to the different formulations of the categorical imperative.</li> <li>• Determine the maxim which is to be acted on in the situation.</li> <li>• Ask the question – 'Does the maxim pass the different formulations of the Categorical Imperative?'</li> </ul>	<b>6 KU</b>
7	(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilitarianism is consequentialist so looks at the possible outcomes of the action.</li> <li>• Utilitarianism attempts to maximise aggregate happiness.</li> <li>• Utilitarianism regards everyone's pleasure as of equal consideration.</li> </ul>	<b>6 KU</b>
7	(c)	<p>Kantianism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gives a clear structure to test a maxim.</li> <li>• Considers justice without the complication of consequences.</li> <li>• Problem of conflicting duties.</li> <li>• Intuition tells us that consequences are important.</li> </ul> <p>Utilitarianism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each situation is considered.</li> <li>• Human beings do want to maximise happiness.</li> <li>• Difficulty of assessing consequences.</li> <li>• Pleasure is a subjective concept.</li> </ul>	<p><b>8 AE</b></p> <p><b>(20)</b></p>

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]