



# **2009 Philosophy**

## **Intermediate 2**

### **Finalised Marking Instructions**

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2009

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 Question Paper Operations 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 Question Paper Operations 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.

## **2009 Intermediate 2 Philosophy**

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.

**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 **3 to 5** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **1 to 5** and requires either a short answer or restricted response.
- Candidates answer **all** related parts of this question.

**There is no choice in Section 1 of the Question Paper.**

**Question 1**

- (a) **The following list contains both arguments and statements. Write down the three numbers that identify the arguments.**

- (1) Today is Sunday and the sun is shining.
- (2) Since the planet is warming up we should not leave our televisions on standby.
- (3) Do you want a second cup of coffee?
- (4) You ought to set the alarm clock otherwise you might miss the exam.
- (5) Peter said, “That song is awful” and Shilpa said, “No it isn’t, it’s my favourite.”
- (6) Roses are red, violets are blue, kittens are cute and so are you.
- (7) This is not a statement.
- (8) You’ve got your new shoes on so you must be going to the party.

**1 mark** for each of 2, 4 and 8.

**3**

- (b) **Read the following argument.**

**“Scientific tests show that fish feel pain. And if fish feel pain then it is wrong to fish. So, you shouldn’t fish.”**

- (i) **State the conclusion of this argument.**
- (ii) **Does this conclusion follow from the premises? Give a reason for your answer.**

- **1 mark** for identifying the conclusion as “you shouldn’t fish.”
- **1 mark** for saying that the conclusion does follow from the premises.
- **1 mark** for an appropriate explanation – you shouldn’t do something which is wrong!

**3**

NB the reason should add something and not just restate the premises.

- (c) *“Philosophy is an important subject. Otherwise I will have just wasted my time doing this course and I don’t want to have wasted my time.”*

(i) **What fallacy is contained in this argument?**

- Appeal to consequences 1

(ii) **Explain how the fallacy makes the above argument unreliable.**

- This fallacy is committed if it is argued that p must be true because it has desirable consequences, or false because it has undesirable consequences.
- Because the truth or falsity of the claim that ‘Philosophy is an important subject’ is not affected by the desirability of not wasting your time (or something appropriately similar). 3

NB credit should be given for any appropriate point or example but a maximum of two marks should be awarded if not applied to the given example.

**Total 10 marks**

## Section 2: total marks 10

- This section examines the mandatory content of the unit 'Metaphysics' (Int 2).
- It has **two** structured questions, each with **2 to 4** 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 **2 to 6** 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) **How does the design argument attempt to prove 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

NB credit should not be given for isolated facts that do not answer the question, eg no credit should be given for naming Paley.

(b) **How has the design argument been criticised?**

- 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) **Explain whether or not you find these criticisms convincing.**

- Any appropriate comments on or replies to the criticisms in (b). Any appropriate examples or development of points already made should be rewarded. 4

NB two marks should be awarded for a new point that is then developed.

**Total 10 marks**

### Question 3 – Free Will

(a) **What do philosophers mean when they say that freedom and determinism are “compatible”?**

- Explanation of determinism.
- Compatibilism characterised as a fully deterministic position.
- Freedom from constraint/coercion.
- Freedom to act on one’s desires.
- Reference to appropriate philosophers.
- Appropriate examples.

**6**

(b) **Do you find compatibilism convincing? Give two reasons for your answer.**

#### Advantages

- “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.

#### Objections

- 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.

Up to 2 marks for each appropriate reason.

**4**

**Total 10 marks**

### Section 3: total marks 20

- 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 **1 to 2** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2 to 5** 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

(a) **State the tri-partite theory of knowledge.**

- Two marks should be awarded for a fully correct answer. One mark might be awarded for a less than fully correct answer that contains the notion of justified, true belief.

**2**

(b) **Why have sceptics said that it is not possible to acquire knowledge?**

- Any three appropriate reasons (unreliability of the senses/reason, infinite regress, brain in a vat, etc).

**3**

**Total 5 marks**

## 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.

### Question 5 – Descartes

Read the statement below then answer all parts of the question (a-c).

*To be sure, it is not astonishing that in creating me, God should have endowed me with this idea, so that it would be like the mark of the craftsman impressed upon his work, although this mark need not be something distinct from the work itself.*

Descartes – Meditations on First Philosophy

#### (a) Describe Descartes' argument for the existence of God.

- Establishes the clear and distinct rule.
- Descartes has the idea of perfection.
- The idea must have a cause.
- The cause of this idea can't be Descartes himself.
- Because of the principle of causal adequacy, the quality of the effect must exist in the cause.
- Therefore a perfect being must exist.
- This can all be seen clearly and distinctly.

7

#### (b) Why does Descartes need to prove the existence of God?

- To overcome the deceiving God of Med.1 and thus establish certainty in apriori reasoning.
- A perfect being wouldn't let him be deceived since "all fraud and deception depend on some defect."
- To act as guarantor of "clear and distinct" ideas.
- To move beyond the cogito.

4

#### (c) Provide two criticisms of the trademark argument.

Any two appropriate criticisms eg:

- reliance on the principle of causal adequacy
- explanation of the weakness of the principle of causal adequacy (eg a sponge cake has many properties not present in the ingredients; the principle of causal adequacy was intended to apply to physical object not ideas)
- if God is an innate idea then it is not clear why not everyone has such an idea.

4

**Total 15 marks**



## Question 6 – Hume

*“The idea of God, as meaning an infinitely intelligent, wise and good Being, arises from reflecting on the operations of our own mind.”*

(a) **What does Hume mean by “simple” and “complex” ideas?**

- Simple ideas based directly on ‘impressions’.
- Simple ideas result from remembering or imagination.
- Complex ideas result from combining or modifying simple ideas in various ways – compounding, transposing, augmenting, or diminishing.
- Appropriate examples.

4

(b) **Explain how Hume believes we acquire the idea of God.**

- The idea of God, as meaning an infinitely intelligent, wise and good Being, arises from reflecting on the operations of our own mind, and augmenting, without limit, those qualities of goodness and wisdom.

3

(c) **How convincing is Hume’s explanation of how we come to have our ideas?**

- Claim that all ideas can be traced back to sensory experience seems correct but difficult to test.
- Explanation of Hume’s argument
  - sensory deprivation
  - senses not exposed to an experience.
- Distinction between simple and complex ideas unclear
  - the same idea may be either simple or complex
  - possible link to ‘missing shade of blue’.
- Classification of ideas and impressions not clear
  - some impressions seem less vivid than the corresponding idea
  - allowing for ‘disease or madness’ as an exception means there must be something other than vivacity that distinguishes impressions and ideas.

8

**Total 15 marks**

#### Section 4: total marks 20

- 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.**

#### Question 7 – Normative Ethics

*You promise your brother that you will help him on Monday evening with some very difficult homework. However, a concert ticket becomes available for that same evening. You very much want to go to the concert and your friends are begging you to join them.*

(a) **Explain the main features of Act and Rule Utilitarianism and say how the Act and Rule Utilitarian would respond to this situation.**

- Utilitarianism – normative/teleological.
- Greatest Happiness Principle/Utility – Consequentialism/Hedonism/Utility.
- Bentham – quantitative – hedonic calculus.
- Mill – qualitative – higher and lower pleasures.
- Act Utilitarianism – assessing each individual situation re Greatest Happiness Principle.
- Rule Utilitarianism – formulating the general rules taking account of experience in the light of the Greatest Happiness Principle.
- The situation – Act Utilitarian: assess net balance of pleasure/pain. Greatest number made happy by going to the concert. Brother unhappy but this may be justified. Consequences? Brother may fail exams.
- The situation – Rule Utilitarian: may regard keeping a promise as a rule which generally maximises Utility, bringing good consequences. Therefore, important to keep promise to brother.

**12**

NB A maximum of eight marks is to be awarded if the answer does not address both Act and Rule Utilitarianism.

**(b) Explain the strengths and weaknesses of Act and Rule Utilitarianism.**

**Act Utilitarianism**

- Recognises the importance of human happiness.
- Sees each case as unique to be assessed on merit.
- Simple rule for each situation – promote pleasure/avoid pain.
- May involve hurting people – eg breaking a promise to the brother.
- Happiness is not equally divided – the individual loses out/injustice.
- How can we measure pleasure/pain accurately?

**Rule Utilitarianism**

- Recognises the global importance of preventing unhappiness by making appropriate rules.
- Considers human experiences in making rules.
- Rules are for the benefit of society – not breaking promises would lead to more happiness.

**8**

NB A maximum of six marks is to be awarded if the answer does not address both Act and Rule Utilitarianism.

**Total 20 marks**

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]