

**C237/SQP304**

---

Philosophy  
Intermediate 2

NATIONAL  
QUALIFICATIONS

<i>Contents</i>	<i>Page</i>
Course Assessment Specification	2
Specimen Question Paper	7
Specimen Marking Instructions	13

## Course Assessment Specification

### Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

The purpose of this document is to provide:

- Details of the structure of the External Course Assessment.
- Guidance on how to use information gathered from a Question Paper appropriate for this Course to estimate candidate performance.

#### Part 1

- ◆ **This part of the Course Assessment Specification details the structure of the Course Assessment.**

The Course assessment has one component – a Question Paper:

The Question Paper:

- has **four** sections (Section 1, Section 2, Section 3 and Section 4)
- has a total mark allocation of **60**
- has a time allocation of **2 hours**
- has an allocation of between **36-38 marks** for knowledge and understanding and between **22-24 marks** for critical analysis and evaluation
- uses language appropriate to the reading range expected of Intermediate 2 candidates in any case study or stimulus.

Detailed guidance on the content of each section is given below.

#### 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 **3-6** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **1-5** 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.**

### **Section 2 – total marks 10**

- This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “*Metaphysics*” (Int 2).
- It has **two** structured questions, each with **2-4** 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 **2-6** 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.

### **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 **1-3** related parts.
- Each related part has a possible mark range of **2-5** and requires a restricted response.
- Candidates must answer this question.

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

#### *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 **2-4** 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.

### **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 **300-400** words.

**There is no choice of questions in Section 4 of the Question Paper.**

### **The Added Value of the Course**

Achieving success in the Course requires some additional skills and abilities over and above those involved in passing individual Units. These are detailed in the Assessment section of the Course Specification and include:

- answering questions in which the more complex skills of critical analysis and evaluation attract a higher proportion of the marks available than is the case in Unit assessment
- demonstrating the ability to apply and adapt the skills of critical analysis and evaluation in a variety of contexts
- demonstrating the ability to integrate knowledge and skills across the component Units of the Course on a single occasion.

When selecting questions, the points above should be kept in mind. All sections of the Question Paper provide opportunities to address these points. In particular, attention should be paid to the balance between knowledge/understanding (KU) and analysis/evaluation (AE). In the Unit assessment this balance is **42 marks KU** and **18 marks AE**: in the Course assessment the balance is between **36-38 marks KU** and between **22-24 marks AE**.

## Part 2

*This part of the Course Assessment Specification provides guidance on how all components contribute to the Course award. It also indicates how to use the assessment information gathered from these components to estimate candidate performance.*

The Course assessment is based on **one** Question Paper which contains **four** Sections:

Question Paper	Mark Range
Section 1: Critical Thinking in Philosophy	10
Section 2: Metaphysics	10
Section 3: Epistemology	20
Section 4: Moral Philosophy	20
<b>Total Marks</b>	60

The mark range for each Section of the paper reflects the proportionately equal weighting given to each of the Units which make up the Course.

In the Philosophy (Intermediate 2) Course, cut-off scores are set at approximately 70% for grade A and 50% for grade C with B grade falling midway at between 60% and 69%.

The following table gives an indication of appropriate cut-off scores:

Grade	Band	Mark Range
A	1	51-60
A	2	42-50
B	3	39-41
B	4	36-38
C	5	33-35
C	6	30-32
D	7	27-29
NA	8	24-26
NA	9	0-23

The cut-off scores may be lowered if Question Paper components turn out to be more demanding. Alternatively, they may be raised if question paper components turn out to be less demanding.

### *Worked example*

- In a centre's own prelim, a candidate scores 39/60 marks.
- The centre's view is that their prelim is slightly less demanding than the SQA examination.
- Using the mark range, a realistic estimate will be **band 4** rather than band 3.



**C237/SQP304**

---

Philosophy  
Intermediate 2  
Specimen Question Paper  
for use in and after 2007

Time: 2 hours

NATIONAL  
QUALIFICATIONS

Candidates should answer:

Section 1—all parts of Question 1

Section 2—**Either** all parts of Question 2  
**OR** all parts of Question 3

Section 3—all parts of Question 4 and  
**Either** all parts of Question 5  
**OR** all parts of Question 6

Section 4—all parts of Question 7





**SECTION 3—EPISTEMOLOGY**

**Candidates must answer both parts of Question 4 and either Question 5—Descartes or Question 6—Hume**

**Part 1**

**4. Epistemology**

- (a) What is the difference between “knowing how” and “knowing that”?
- (b) Describe the tri-partite theory of knowledge.

**Total (5)**

**Part 2**

**Either**

**5. Descartes**

*“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 . . .”*

This argument is sometimes known as “The Trademark Argument”.

- (a) What idea is Descartes referring to when he says that God has, “*endowed me with this idea*”?
- (b) Explain the Trademark argument.
- (c) Why is God important in Descartes’ *Meditations*?

**Or**

**Total (15)**

**6. Hume**

*“All the objects of human reason or enquiry may naturally be divided into two kinds, to wit, Relations of Ideas, and Matters of Fact.”*

- (a) What are the differences between “*Relations of Ideas*” and “*Matters of Fact*”? Give examples to support your answer.
- (b) What are the strengths and weaknesses of Hume’s empiricism?

**Total (15)**

		<i>Marks</i>	
		<i>KU</i>	<i>AE</i>
		2	
		3	
		2	
		5	
			8
		7	
			8

SECTION 4—MORAL PHILOSOPHY

Candidates must answer all questions in this Section.

7. Normative Ethics

(a) What is the difference between Act and Rule Utilitarianism?

(b) “*Honesty is the best policy.*”

How would Act and Rule Utilitarians respond to this claim?

**Total (20)**

[END OF SPECIMEN QUESTION PAPER]

<i>Marks</i>	
<i>KU</i>	<i>AE</i>
12	8

**[BLANK PAGE]**

**C237/SQP304**

---

Philosophy  
Intermediate 2  
Specimen Marking Instructions  
for use in and after 2007

Time: 2 hours

NATIONAL  
QUALIFICATIONS

## **General guidelines for all Sections**

**With regard to the following marking guidelines please note that:**

- **The language used in these guidelines is not necessarily indicative of the language to be expected in the students' responses.**
- **When a candidate is asked for objections to an argument it is expected that the proffered objections will have some philosophical merit.**
- **When candidates are asked for their views and opinions on a philosophical position a wider range of possible answers will be acceptable, eg a candidate may make some reference to personal experience for their views on the existence of God.**
- **It is accepted that there may well be overlap between a student's stated opinion on an argument or philosophical position and their earlier explanation or criticism of that argument or position.**

### Specific Marking Information

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 70% KU – 30% AE	
	<p><b><u>Section 1—total marks 10</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “Critical Thinking in Philosophy (Int 2)”.</li> <li>• It has <b>one</b> structured question with <b>3–5</b> related parts</li> <li>• Each related part has a possible mark range of <b>1–5</b> and requires either a short-answer or restricted response</li> <li>• Candidates answer <b>all</b> related parts of this question</li> </ul> <p><b>There is no choice in Section 1 of the Question Paper.</b></p>		
1. (a)	<p><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) I am late because the train was late.</li> <li>(2) You should not have let the monkeys out.</li> <li>(3) Birds have wings and most of them can fly.</li> <li>(4) I know Maths and English are the two most important subjects in school because my mum told me so.</li> <li>(5) I would never eat a cheeseburger because it is so unhealthy.</li> <li>(6) If you turn left you will find the cinema and if you take the second right you will find the leisure centre.</li> <li>(7) Today is Saturday and the sun is shining outside.</li> <li>(8) The computer will not work because there is no power and without power the computer won't work.</li> </ol>	3	
MI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 mark each for 4, 5, 8</li> </ul>		

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 70% KU – 30% AE	
<p><b>(b)</b></p> <p><b>Read the following argument.</b></p> <p><b>I don't like Mondays. After all, I always find it hard to get up in the mornings and I have Philosophy first thing.</b></p> <p><b>(i) State the two premises in this argument.</b></p> <p><b>(ii) State the conclusion of this argument.</b></p> <p>MI</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 mark for each of:</li> <li>• I always find it hard to get up in the mornings</li> <li>• I have Philosophy first thing</li> <li>• I don't like Mondays (Conclusion)</li> </ul>			<b>3</b>
<p><b>(c)</b></p> <p><b>Give an example of an appeal to consequences and explain why your example is an unreliable form of reasoning.</b></p> <p>MI</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any appropriate example.</li> <li>• The explanation should explain that it has been argued that <math>p</math> must be true because it has desirable consequences, or false because it has undesirable consequences.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>	
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 70% KU – 30% AE	
	<p><b><i>Section 2—total marks 10</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “Metaphysics” (Int 2)</li> <li>• It has two structured questions, each with <b>2–3</b> related parts</li> <li>• Each structured question samples across the mandatory content of <b>one</b> of the options in this Unit and may contain a stimulus</li> <li>• Each related part has a possible mark range of <b>2–6</b> and requires either a restricted or extended response</li> </ul> <p>Candidates answer <b>all</b> parts of the <b>one</b> structured question which relates to the option they have studied.</p>		
2.	<p><b>God</b></p> <p><i>“There seems to be order and purpose in the universe. This requires an explanation.”</i></p>		
(a)  MI	<p><b>Give one example of what seems to be order and purpose in the universe.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any appropriate example, eg the eye.</li> </ul>	2	
(b)  MI	<p><b>Give two objections to the claim that God has designed the universe.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative sources of apparent design, eg evolution,</li> <li>• Examples of apparently poor design, eg suffering, Dawkins’ “botched jobs”.</li> <li>• Equally supports design by committee or an apprentice god.</li> <li>• Possible weakness of analogical arguments.</li> </ul>	4	
(c)  MI	<p><b>Do you find the Design Argument convincing? Give reasons for your answer.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The answer should show that the candidate can support their opinion with two appropriate reasons.</li> </ul>		4
	<b>Totals</b>	6	4

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 70% KU – 30% AE	
	<p><b><i>Section 2—total marks 10</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “Metaphysics” (Int 2)</li> <li>• It has <b>two</b> structured questions, each with <b>2–3</b> related parts</li> <li>• Each structured question samples across the mandatory content of <b>one</b> of the options in this Unit and may contain a stimulus</li> <li>• Each related part has a possible mark range of <b>2–6</b> and requires either a restricted or extended response</li> </ul> <p>Candidates answer <b>all</b> parts of the <b>one</b> structured question which relates to the option they have studied.</p>		
<b>3.</b>	<b>Free will</b>		
<b>(a)</b>  MI	<p><b><i>“Free will is an illusion.”</i></b></p> <p><b>State one reason that philosophers give to support this claim.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any appropriate reason, eg all explicable events are explained by reference to prior causes.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	
<b>(b)</b>  MI	<p><b>Give two objections to the claim that free will is an illusion.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overwhelming psychological feeling of being free to choose.</li> <li>• Moral responsibility requires free will.</li> <li>• Moral language and social interactions generally assume the existence of libertarian free will.</li> <li>• Free will is compatible with determinism.</li> </ul>	<b>4</b>	
<b>(c)</b>  MI	<p><b>Do you think free will and determinism are compatible? Explain your answer.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the question gives the opportunity for the student to discuss compatibilism this is not a requirement and the student should be given credit for any reasons that are appropriate to the opinion they have stated.</li> </ul>		<b>4</b>
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 70% KU – 30% AE	
	<p><b><i>Section 3—total marks 20</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This section examines the mandatory content of the Unit “Epistemology” (Int 2)</li> <li>• It has <b>two</b> parts</li> <li>• Candidates answer <b>one</b> structured question in <b>both parts</b> of this section.</li> </ul> <p>The nature of each question is outlined below:</p> <p>Part 1—total marks 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section One of the Epistemology Unit</li> <li>• It has <b>one</b> question with <b>1–2</b> related parts</li> <li>• Each related part has a possible mark range of <b>2–5</b> and requires a restricted response</li> <li>• Candidates must answer this question</li> </ul> <p><b>There is no choice of question in Part 1 of Section 3.</b></p>		
<b>4.</b>	<b>Epistemology</b>		
<b>(a)</b>  MI	<p><b>What is the difference between “knowing how” and “knowing that?”</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any appropriate explanation: eg “knowing how” refers to a skill or ability, eg knowing how to ride a bike; “knowing that” refers to knowing something that can be either true or false, eg knowing that the earth is larger than the moon.</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>	
<b>(b)</b>  MI	<p><b>Describe the tri-partite theory of knowledge.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One mark for each of “Justified”, “True” and “Belief”.</li> </ul>	<b>3</b>	
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>5</b>	

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 70% KU – 30% AE	
	<p>Part 2—total marks 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section Two of the Epistemology Unit</li> <li>• It has <b>two</b> structured questions, each of which samples across the mandatory content of <b>one</b> of the options in this Unit</li> <li>• Each structured question contains an extract from the relevant prescribed text and has <b>2–3</b> related parts</li> <li>• Each related part has a possible mark range of <b>2–10</b> and requires either a restricted or extended response</li> <li>• Candidates answer <b>all</b> related parts of the <b>one</b> structured question which examines the option they have studied.</li> </ul>		
<p>5.</p> <p>(a)</p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>Descartes</b></p> <p><i>“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 . . .”</i></p> <p><b>This argument is sometimes known as “The Trademark Argument”.</b></p> <p><b>What idea is Descartes referring to when he says that God has, “endowed me with this idea”?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The idea of God.</li> </ul>	2	

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 70% KU – 30% AE	
<b>(b)</b>  MI	<b>Explain the Trademark argument.</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We all have an innate idea of God: which is like a trademark left by our maker.</li> <li>• The idea must have come from somewhere.</li> <li>• There must be as much reality in a cause as in the effect.</li> <li>• The idea cannot have come from me.</li> <li>• Therefore, God exists.</li> </ul>	<b>5</b>	
<b>(c)</b>  MI	<b>Why is God important in Descartes' <i>Meditations</i>?</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to progress beyond the cogito.</li> <li>• explanation of clear and distinct perception. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• appropriate example</li> </ul> </li> <li>• explanation of the clear and distinct rule</li> <li>• God guarantees the reliability of the clear and distinct rule</li> </ul>		<b>8</b>
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 70% KU – 30% AE	
	<p>Part 2—total marks 15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This part of Section 3 samples across the mandatory content of Section Two of the Epistemology Unit</li> <li>• It has <b>two</b> structured questions, each of which samples across the mandatory content of <b>one</b> of the options in this Unit</li> <li>• Each structured question contains an extract from the relevant prescribed text and has <b>2–3</b> related parts</li> <li>• Each related part has a possible mark range of <b>2–10</b> and requires either a restricted or extended response</li> <li>• Candidates answer <b>all</b> related parts of the <b>one</b> structured question which examines the option they have studied.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>6.</b></p> <p><b>(a)</b></p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>Hume</b></p> <p><i>“All the objects of human reason or enquiry may naturally be divided into two kinds, to wit, Relations of Ideas, and Matters of Fact.”</i></p> <p><b>What are the differences between “Relations of Ideas” and “Matters of Fact”? Give examples to support your answer.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relations of Ideas—a priori, necessary and analytic.</li> <li>• Matters of Fact—a posteriori, contingent and synthetic.</li> <li>• Relations of Ideas cannot be denied without contradiction, but Matters of Fact can.</li> <li>• Appropriate examples, eg <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relations of Ideas—geometry, etc</li> <li>• Matters of Fact—any appropriate example</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>7</b></p>	

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 70% KU – 30% AE	
(b)  MI	<p><b>What are the strengths and weaknesses of Hume’s empiricism?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengths might include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• gives a convincing account of most human knowledge.</li> <li>• dispenses with philosophically problematic concepts.</li> <li>• provide a basis for modern science.</li> </ul> </li>   <li>• Weaknesses might include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• some impressions are faint and some ideas are vivid.</li> <li>• some ideas don’t appear to have a prior impression, eg ultraviolet.</li> <li>• Hume is inconsistent <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• description of the missing shade of blue.</li> <li>• explanation of why the missing shade of blue is a problem.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<b>8</b>
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 70% KU – 30% AE	
	<p><b><u>Section 4–total marks 20</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This section examines the content of the Unit “Moral Philosophy” (Int 2)</li> <li>• It has one essay question which may be divided into <b>two</b> related parts</li> <li>• It may contain a short case study or stimulus</li> <li>• The question requires an extended response of <b>300–400</b> words</li> </ul> <p><b>There is no choice of questions in Section 4 of the Question Paper.</b></p>		
<p>7. (a)</p> <p>MI</p>	<p><b>Normative Ethics</b></p> <p><b>What is the difference between Act and Rule Utilitarianism?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear definition of Utilitarianism. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consequentialist theory</li> <li>• hedonism</li> <li>• appropriate reference to sources.</li> </ul> </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>• Appropriate examples.</li> </ul>	<p><b>12</b></p>	

Question No	Question	Approx Marks weightings: 70% KU – 30% AE	
(b)  MI	<p><b><i>“Honesty is the best policy.”</i></b></p> <p><b>How would Act and Rule Utilitarians respond to this claim?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AU—depends upon the individual action and whether or not it maximises happiness. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• appropriate example</li> </ul> </li> <li>• RU—would probably agree with the statement provided that honesty as a policy tended to promote the greatest happiness. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• appropriate example where breaking a rule would on that occasion bring about the maximum utility but should nevertheless be kept, eg returning a lost wallet to a wealthy person.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Maximum of four marks to be allocated to the discussion of each theory.</p>		<b>8</b>
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8</b>

[END OF SPECIMEN MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]