



PHILOSOPHY
Intermediate 2

Valid from August 2010

First edition — published March 2010



National Course Specification

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

COURSE CODE C268 11

COURSE STRUCTURE

This Course has four mandatory Units which are:

F8K4 11	Critical Thinking in Philosophy (Intermediate 2)	0.5 credits (20 hours)
F8K5 11	Philosophy: Metaphysics	0.5 credits (20 hours)
F8K7 11	Epistemology (Intermediate 2)	1 credit (40 hours)
F8K6 11	Moral Philosophy	1 credit (40 hours)

All Courses include 40 hours over and above the 120 hours for the Units. This may be used for induction, extending the range of learning and teaching approaches, support, consolidation, integration of learning and preparation for external assessment.

RECOMMENDED ENTRY

While entry is at the discretion of the centre, candidates would normally be expected to have attained one of the following, or equivalent:

- ◆ Intermediate 1 Religious Moral and Philosophical Studies Course or Unit(s)
- ◆ A social subjects Course or Unit(s) at Intermediate 1

Administrative Information

Publication date: March 2010

Source: Scottish Qualifications Authority

Version: 01

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2010

This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part for educational purposes provided that no profit is derived from reproduction and that, if reproduced in part, the source is acknowledged.

Additional copies of this Unit Specification can be purchased from the Scottish Qualifications Authority. Please contact the Customer Contact Centre, telephone 0845 279 1000.

National Course Specification (cont)

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

PROGRESSION

This Course or its Units may provide progression to:

- ◆ Higher Philosophy or Higher Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies
- ◆ Further Education Courses which include the study of philosophy or require the ability to reason in a critical manner
- ◆ Employment

CREDIT VALUE

The Intermediate 2 Course in Philosophy is allocated 24 SCQF credit points at SCQF level 5.

**SCQF points are used to allocate credit to qualifications in the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF). Each qualification in the Framework is allocated a number of SCQF points at a SCQF level. There are 12 SCQF levels, ranging from Access 1 to Doctorates.*

CORE SKILLS

Achievement of this Course gives automatic certification of the following:

Complete Core Skill	None
Core Skills component	Critical Thinking at SCQF level 5

National Course Specification: course details

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

RATIONALE

Scotland has long been recognised as providing educational opportunities to its citizens that encompass both breadth and depth. The need to educate the whole person, and not simply concentrate on immediately obvious practical skills, is also firmly embedded in all Scottish educational philosophy. As a result, education focuses on the dual objectives of providing citizens with practical skills and knowledge related to employment, and broader intellectual and social skills which enable them to participate fully in society and lead rich, fulfilling lives. It is also recognised that these broader skills are increasingly important as societies become more complex and ideologically diverse. Scottish society today has been influenced by a wide variety of cultures and traditions, and it is therefore important that all its citizens are able to develop and express their own values and perspectives in a reasoned way. In addition, it is important that they are able to discuss and reflect upon perspectives and values which may be different from their own. This can only be accomplished through a process of reasoned debate and discussion which acknowledges shared human experiences and also the validity of alternative views. Developing a structured approach to all forms of discourse will contribute to this process.

The opportunity for individuals to develop and discuss their own values and perspectives, and learn to appreciate those of others, is an important aspect of Scottish Primary and Secondary Education. For this reason the process of discussion, debate and reflection features in many areas of the curriculum from P1-S4. The Intermediate 2 Philosophy Course provides the opportunity for candidates to continue to develop the concepts and skills needed for productive social discourse and offers certificated progression in S5 and S6. The Course is also suitable for delivery in Further Education colleges and is appropriate for adult students who have an interest in philosophical issues.

Candidates who gain a Course award will be in a good position to continue their studies of philosophical issues at Higher level or in Further Education colleges. Those who choose to progress to study alternative subjects will also benefit. Developing basic critical thinking skills and the ability to reason in a structured way is an important part of the Intermediate 2 Philosophy Course and these skills are of relevance in all subject areas. This will help candidates to develop as members of society who can express their own opinions and values confidently but also appreciate the opinions and values of others.

The Course consists of four mandatory Units. The *Critical Thinking in Philosophy* Unit helps candidates to develop an understanding of good and bad arguments and develop basic reasoning skills. In the *Metaphysics* Unit candidates investigate aspects of a perennial philosophical debate and some of the positions adopted in relation to that debate. The *Epistemology* Unit focuses on questions surrounding the nature, sources and possibilities of knowledge. *Moral Philosophy* involves the study of issues and theories concerning moral judgements.

National Course Specification: course details (cont)

COURSE **Philosophy (Intermediate 2)**

AIMS

- ◆ develop basic analytical and evaluative skills which help candidates to begin to examine the reasoning and assumptions on which the positions and theories they study are based
- ◆ present their own ideas and opinions confidently and in a reasoned manner
- ◆ gain insight from the ideas and opinions of others which may conflict with their own
- ◆ engage personally with a range of important questions and issues in order to inform their own ideas and opinions in a way which contributes to personal and social development

The Course aims to allow candidates to:

- ◆ develop basic critical thinking skills which are of importance in all areas of human life and discourse
- ◆ develop knowledge and understanding of basic philosophical techniques, issues, positions and concepts which are relevant in many areas of human life and discourse

National Course Specification: course details (cont)

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

COURSE CONTENT

The Course consists of four mandatory Units (*Critical Thinking in Philosophy, Metaphysics, Epistemology* and *Moral Philosophy*). Although the content of each Unit does not presuppose knowledge acquired in the other Units, there are significant opportunities to integrate both knowledge and skills while studying the Course. Whenever an opportunity to integrate knowledge and skills across the Units arises, candidates should be made aware of this and be encouraged to maximise this potential. Detailed guidance on opportunities for integration and development can be found in the ‘Guidance on Learning and Teaching Approaches for this Course’ in the Course Specification.

A summary of the content of each Unit appears below:

1 **Critical Thinking in Philosophy (Intermediate 2)**

The knowledge and skills they acquire are invaluable and directly relevant when studying the issues, positions and arguments in the remaining Units.

In this Unit, candidates develop some basic skills which will help them begin to examine arguments in a structured manner. They develop an understanding of the building blocks of arguments and some of the characteristics of reliable and unreliable arguments. Candidates then use this understanding to critically examine examples of ordinary language arguments.

Candidates must study **ALL** content. The content is studied under two headings which are:

- ◆ the building blocks of arguments
- ◆ reliable and unreliable arguments

A detailed outline of all mandatory content can be found in the Appendix at the end of the Unit Specification.

2 **Metaphysics (Intermediate 2)**

In this Unit candidates study aspects of **one** metaphysical debate from a choice of two. The relevant metaphysical debates are:

- ◆ Debate 1: Is there a rational basis for belief in God?
- ◆ Debate 2: Do we have free will?

Candidates investigate specific positions which are adopted in relation to the chosen debate. They also study objections and replies in relation to these positions.

A detailed outline of the mandatory content for both debates can be found in the Appendix at the end of the Unit Specification. Candidates must study **ALL** content **in relation to their chosen debate**.

National Course Specification: course details (cont)

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

3 Epistemology (Intermediate 2)

In this Unit candidates study specific philosophical issues in the area of Epistemology. They also study aspects of the positions of either René Descartes or David Hume. The Unit is divided into two Sections and a brief overview of each Section appears below:

Section 1:

There is no choice of options in this Section of the Unit. All candidates must investigate the following question:

- ◆ What is knowledge?

When investigating this question, candidates study a variety of issues and concepts in the area of epistemology. The specific content to be covered in relation to this question is outlined in the Appendix at the end of the Unit Specification.

Section 2:

In this Section of the Unit there is a choice of option to be studied. Candidates investigate aspects of **either** a specific rationalist **or** a specific empiricist epistemological position. The options are:

- ◆ Option A: Descartes' Rationalism

or

- ◆ Option B: Hume's Empiricism

Candidates must study all mandatory content in relation to their chosen option.

The positions adopted by each philosopher are based on reasoning which can only properly be understood by examining the writings of the relevant philosopher. Candidates must therefore investigate the chosen position by studying key extracts from the writings of that philosopher. **The key extracts are prescribed.**

A detailed outline of all mandatory content for this Section, including the key extracts, can be found in the Appendix at the end of the Unit Specification.

National Course Specification: course details (cont)

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

4 Moral Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

Candidates must study **ALL** content. A brief overview of the content appears below:

In this Unit, candidates develop a basic understanding of the differences between consequentialist and deontological approaches to moral judgements. They then examine specific aspects of two normative moral theories. They study the content by investigating the following:

- ◆ **Introduction:** How can we decide if an action is right or wrong?
- ◆ **1:** Utilitarianism as an example of a consequentialist theory.
- ◆ **2:** Kant's moral theory as an example of a deontological theory.

Questions in Unit and Course assessment will sample across the mandatory content. It is therefore of vital importance that **ALL** candidates are familiar with **ALL** content. A detailed outline of the mandatory content can be found in the Appendix at the end of the Unit Specification.

National Course Specification: course details (cont)

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

ASSESSMENT

To achieve the Course award the candidate must pass all Unit assessments as well as the Course assessment. The candidate's grade is based on the Course assessment.

Assessment objectives

The aim of both Unit and Course assessment is to allow candidates to demonstrate competence in the following areas:

Knowledge and Understanding of:

- ◆ the building blocks of arguments
- ◆ aspects of a metaphysical debate and selected positions adopted in relation to that debate
- ◆ basic philosophical issues and positions in the area of epistemology
- ◆ basic aspects of normative moral theories

Elements of the skills of Critical Analysis and Evaluation with reference to:

- ◆ ordinary language arguments
- ◆ selected positions adopted in relation to a metaphysical debate
- ◆ objections and replies in relation to a metaphysical debate
- ◆ aspects of normative moral theories
- ◆ specific philosophical issues and positions in the area of epistemology
- ◆ prescribed extracts from the writings of either Descartes or Hume

Allocation of Marks:

A summary of the relative weighting of marks in Unit and Course assessment appears below:

Type of Assessment	Knowledge and Understanding	Analysis and Evaluation
Unit Assessment	60% of the marks available	40% of the marks available
Course Assessment	60% of the marks available	40% of the marks available

Unit assessment

Satisfactory evidence of the attainment of all Outcomes and Performance Criteria for each Unit is in the form of written and/or recorded oral responses to structured or extended response questions. To maintain reliability and credibility assessment evidence is produced under supervision, ensuring that it is the candidate's own work. The evidence is produced in response to a closed-book test with a time limit of 30 minutes each for the *Critical Thinking in Philosophy* and *Metaphysics* Units. The time limit for Unit assessment in the *Epistemology* and *Moral Philosophy* Units is one hour each.

Further details about Unit assessment for this Course can be found in the NAB materials and in the Unit Specifications.

National Course Specification: course details (cont)

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

Course assessment

Attainment in the Course is assessed through an individual candidate's performance in a final exam. The exam is in the form of a single Question Paper. The Question Paper contains questions in relation to all four Units in the Course and has a time allocation of **two hours**. The number of marks available for the Question Paper is **60**.

Candidates are required to attempt both structured and extended response questions which sample across the Course content.

Further details of the Course assessment are given in the Course Assessment Specification and in the Specimen Question Paper.

Link between Unit and Course assessment/added value

Individual Unit assessment instruments allow candidates to demonstrate a level of knowledge, understanding and skills which is appropriate for attaining a Unit award at Intermediate 2. They also allow candidates to demonstrate the ability to critically examine and assess concepts and issues in a structured manner.

When completing the Course assessment candidates have the opportunity to demonstrate the greater attainment required for the Course award by:

- ◆ demonstrating the long-term retention of knowledge and skills
- ◆ demonstrating the ability to answer questions relating to all Units on a single occasion
- ◆ demonstrating the ability to integrate other aspects of knowledge and skills across the component Units
- ◆ demonstrating a greater depth and breadth of knowledge and understanding

GRADE DESCRIPTIONS AT A AND C

The candidate's grade will be based on the total score obtained from the Course assessment. The descriptions below indicate the nature of achievement required for an award at Grade C and A in the Course.

National Course Specification: course details (cont)

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

Skills	Grade C	Grade A
<p><i>Knowledge and Understanding</i></p>	<p>Candidates have described some (but not all) of the basic features of arguments and the philosophical issues, theories and positions in relation to each Unit.</p> <p>Candidates have described some (but not all) of the basic aspects of an account of knowledge, similarities and differences in approaches to moral judgments and objections, and replies in relation to metaphysical positions.</p> <p>The descriptions are mainly clear and largely accurate.</p>	<p>Candidates have described all of the basic features of arguments and the philosophical issues, theories and positions in relation to each Unit.</p> <p>Candidates have described all of the basic aspects of an account of knowledge, similarities and differences in approaches to moral judgments and objections, and replies in relation to metaphysical positions.</p> <p>The descriptions are clear, accurate and presented in a structured manner.</p> <p>The descriptions may provide evidence of the integration of knowledge and understanding across the Units of the Course.</p>
<p><i>Critical Analysis and Evaluation</i></p>	<p>Candidates have explained some (but not all) of the stages of reasoning on which ordinary language arguments and philosophical positions, theories and accounts of knowledge are based.</p> <p>Candidates have explained some (but not all) of the following: sound and unsound arguments; examples of fallacious reasoning (Critical Thinking Unit).</p> <p>Candidates have made attempts to assess or state opinions about: the soundness of ordinary language arguments; metaphysical positions; normative moral theories; an account of knowledge.</p> <p>Candidates have given at least one reason which supports the assessments or conclusions they have reached.</p>	<p>Candidates have explained the main stages of reasoning on which ordinary language arguments and philosophical positions, theories and accounts of knowledge are based.</p> <p>Candidates have explained all of the following: sound and unsound arguments; examples of fallacious reasoning (Critical Thinking Unit).</p> <p>Candidates have made assessments or stated opinions about: the soundness of ordinary language arguments; metaphysical positions; normative moral theories; an account of knowledge.</p> <p>Candidates have given two or more developed reasons which support the assessments or conclusions reached.</p>

National Course Specification: course details (cont)

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

Skills	Grade C	Grade A
	The points made are mainly clear and largely accurate and relate to the question asked.	The points made are clear and accurate. The points made are presented in a structured manner and answer the question asked. There may be evidence of the integration of knowledge and skills across the Units of the Course.

National Course Specification: course details (cont)

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

ESTIMATES AND APPEALS

Estimates

In preparing estimates, evidence must take account of performance across the Course and must be judged against the Grade Descriptions. Further advice on the preparation of estimates is given in the Course Assessment Specification and in the document *Estimates, Absentees and Assessment Appeals* which is available on the SQA website www.sqa.org.uk.

Appeals

Evidence for the *Question Paper* is mandatory; it must show the same breadth of coverage of Course content as SQA's Question Paper and relate to the Course Grade Descriptions. While a prelim paper is not mandatory, it is an indicator of likely candidate performance in the external examination when pressure of time and retention of learning are significant factors. Evidence for the *Question Paper* should replicate as far as possible the standard, format, duration and security of SQA's Question Paper.

The evidence for the *Question Paper* could include:

- ◆ A prelim which covers all Units and replicates the standard, format, duration and security of SQA's Question Paper. This could support an Appeal for Grades A, B and C and would be the most convincing evidence for an Appeal for grade A.
- ◆ A prelim which covers all Units and is split into parts and the two parts have been separated by a period of time rather than being taken on one occasion. Centres should be aware that the level of demand is less than the Course assessment. The level of demand can be increased in a number of ways such as raising the cut-off scores or by increasing the level of challenge of the prelim. This could support an Appeal for Grades A, B and C.
- ◆ A prelim which covers a minimum of two Units of the Course and a NAB for the third Unit. This could support an Appeal for a grade C (possibly grade B), but not an Appeal for a grade A.

Where evidence used for estimates covers only part of the Course and additional evidence is required for Appeals for the remaining Unit or section of the Course, this must be in the same format as the Course assessment and completed under examination conditions.

National Course Specification: course details (cont)

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

QUALITY ASSURANCE

All National Courses are subject to external marking and/or verification. External markers, visiting examiners and external verifiers are trained by SQA to apply national standards.

The Units of all Courses are subject to internal verification and may also be chosen for external verification. This is to ensure that national standards are being applied across all subjects.

Courses may be assessed by a variety of methods. Where marking is undertaken by a trained marker in their own time, markers' meetings are held to ensure that a consistent standard is applied. The work of all markers is subject to scrutiny by the Principal Assessor.

To assist centres, External Assessment and Internal Assessment reports are published on SQA's website **www.sqa.org.uk**.

National Course Specification: course details (cont)

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

GUIDANCE ON LEARNING AND TEACHING APPROACHES FOR THIS COURSE

Induction to the Course

The most important starting-point for the Course will be to establish appropriate expectations and attitudes among the candidates. This will involve making it clear that the Course does not simply involve learning facts about philosophical issues, theories and positions. Philosophy, by its very nature, is an interactive activity since it involves assessing the relative merits of competing claims. It cannot simply be learned by reading books and writing essays; candidates must be given frequent opportunities to engage in debate and other interactive activities. Candidates therefore need to develop an enquiring attitude which allows them to begin to think critically about the issues, theories and positions they study. They must also learn to listen to, and reflect upon, the reasoning and opinions expressed by their teacher or lecturer and fellow students. This will encourage candidates to express their own opinions with confidence and create a climate in which structured, productive philosophical debate can take place.

Candidates should be made aware of the attitudes and skills which will be expected from them before teaching of the Course begins. They should understand that they will need to:

- ◆ respect the right of others to express values and positions which may conflict with their own
- ◆ develop the confidence to share their own values and positions with others who may not agree with them
- ◆ identify and investigate the stages of reasoning which underpin the theories and positions they study
- ◆ critically assess their own values and positions, as well as those of others, in a structured manner
- ◆ review and critically assess philosophical issues, theories and positions
- ◆ reach conclusions about philosophical issues, theories and positions based on the information and evidence they have studied
- ◆ be prepared to explain the reasoning they have used in order to reach these conclusions

This can be done in many ways in light of the prior experience of candidates, the range of candidates studying the Course and available resources. Teachers and lecturers will need to use their professional judgment. Attitudes cannot be assessed or instilled but can only be encouraged. However, candidates should have a clear idea of the skills and attitudes they will need to develop and demonstrate during their study of the Intermediate 2 Philosophy Course.

The Order of Delivery of Component Units: maximising opportunities for the integration and development of knowledge and skills

The preferred order for the delivery of component Units is a matter which each centre must decide for itself. This will depend upon the number of staff members who are delivering the Course and the organisation of individual timetables.

National Course Specification: course details (cont)

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

Developing Knowledge and Understanding and elements of the skills of Critical Analysis and Evaluation

There are many ways to promote knowledge and understanding, and critical analysis and evaluation skills. Appropriate methods will, as mentioned above, depend on the prior experience of candidates, the range of candidates studying the Course and the resources available. A menu of possible activities appears below. This menu is not exhaustive, but reflects a variety of learning and teaching approaches:

- ◆ teacher presentations of information
- ◆ teacher-led question and answer sessions
- ◆ individual study which is reinforced by structured questions
- ◆ individual/group/paired work which is focused on the retrieval of information
- ◆ feedback sessions from individual/group/paired work which involves recording information, stages of reasoning and conclusions
- ◆ multiple choice questions — these may be attempted individually, in pairs or in groups — they could be approached in the manner of a formative assessment, quiz, match-up or arranging-under-correct-headings exercises
- ◆ true-or-false activities which require the individual/group/pair to give reasons for the choice of answer
- ◆ visits by external speakers which involve both presentation and feedback
- ◆ structured debates where candidates are required to propose or oppose a motion which may not be in agreement with their personal views
- ◆ homework exercises which are designed to reinforce or extend activities in the classroom or lecture theatre
- ◆ structured individual/group/paired study of sources which relate to the issues, theories, arguments and positions being investigated
- ◆ attempting past paper questions individually or in groups/pairs
- ◆ feedback from Unit assessments which highlights the achievements and next steps for candidates

Assessment as an Important Learning and Teaching Opportunity

Unit assessment provides a clear indication of whether or not candidates have achieved the minimum standards required to pass an individual Unit. As such, Unit assessment is summative. However, for candidates who require reassessment and/or intend to attempt the Course assessment element of the Course, all assessment has a formative value.

In order to make maximum use of assessment, teachers and lecturers need to provide meaningful feedback on all formative and summative Unit assessments. This feedback should highlight areas where candidates have performed well. It should also highlight areas where candidates need additional development. The nature of feedback will depend on the prior experience of candidates, the range of candidates and the resources available.

National Course Specification: course details (cont)

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

The Use of the Additional 40 Hours

A summary of the use of the additional 40 hours would comprise:

- ◆ an initial orientation programme outlining the content of the Course and the skills to be developed
- ◆ the provision of additional support and follow-up assessment in order to ensure all Outcomes of Units have been achieved
- ◆ engaging in discussion and practice to extend the use of analytical and evaluative skills in a variety of contexts
- ◆ the use of oral or written extended responses — this will help to integrate and extend skills and provide estimated grades

DISABLED CANDIDATES AND/OR THOSE WITH ADDITIONAL SUPPORT NEEDS

The additional support needs of individual candidates should be taken into account when planning learning experiences, selecting assessment instruments, or considering whether any reasonable adjustments may be required. Further advice can be found on our website www.sqa.org.uk/assessmentarrangements



National Unit Specification: general information

UNIT	Critical Thinking in Philosophy (Intermediate 2)
CODE	F8K4 11
COURSE	Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

SUMMARY

This Unit is a mandatory Unit of the Intermediate 2 Philosophy Course, but it can also be taken as a free-standing Unit.

This Unit offers progression for candidates who have studied an appropriate Intermediate 1 Course or Unit(s). It is also suitable as an Intermediate 2 level introduction for those who have no background in the subject. In this Unit, candidates develop some basic skills which will help them begin to examine arguments in a reasoned and structured manner. The terms and concepts studied in this Unit, and the skills involved in applying them, are relevant to all areas of human life. The ability to understand and recognise some of the basic characteristics of reliable and unreliable arguments is a powerful tool in all personal and social contexts.

Specific features of reliable and unreliable arguments are studied in this Unit but the basic understanding and critical examining skills developed are relevant in a wide variety of contexts. These skills prepare candidates for the study of Philosophy at Higher or in Courses at Further Education colleges. Candidates will also be prepared for the study of any other subject which involves understanding and examining arguments. In addition, candidates will have demonstrated the skills necessary for entry into any field of employment where basic reasoning skills are required.

OUTCOMES

- 1 Demonstrate an understanding of the building blocks of arguments.
- 2 Critically examine ordinary language arguments.

Administrative Information

Superclass:	DE
Publication date:	March 2010
Source:	Scottish Qualifications Authority
Version:	01

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2010

This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part for educational purposes provided that no profit is derived from reproduction and that, if reproduced in part, the source is acknowledged.

Additional copies of this Unit Specification can be purchased from the Scottish Qualifications Authority. Please contact the Customer Contact Centre, telephone 0845 279 1000.

National Unit Specification: general information (cont)

UNIT Critical Thinking in Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

RECOMMENDED ENTRY

While entry is at the discretion of the centre, candidates would normally be expected to have attained one of the following, or equivalent:

- ◆ Intermediate 1 Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies course or Unit(s)
- ◆ A social subjects course or Unit(s) at Intermediate 1

CREDIT VALUE

0.5 credits at Intermediate 2 (3 SCQF credit points at SCQF level 5*).

**SCQF credit points are used to allocate credit to qualifications in the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF). Each qualification in the Framework is allocated a number of SCQF credit points at an SCQF level. There are 12 SCQF levels, ranging from Access 1 to Doctorates.*

CORE SKILLS

Achievement of this Unit gives automatic certification of the following:

Complete Core Skill	None
Core Skills component	Critical Thinking at SCQF level 5

National Unit Specification: statement of standards

UNIT Critical Thinking in Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

Acceptable performance in this Unit will be the satisfactory achievement of the standards set out in this part of the Unit Specification. All sections of the statement of standards are mandatory and cannot be altered without reference to the Scottish Qualifications Authority.

OUTCOME 1

Demonstrate an understanding of the building blocks of arguments.

Performance Criteria

- (a) Describe the difference between statements and arguments.
- (b) Use ordinary language examples to support this description.
- (c) Given previously unseen examples of ordinary language arguments, identify their premises and conclusions.

OUTCOME 2

Critically examine ordinary language arguments.

Performance Criteria

- (a) Given previously unseen examples of ordinary language argument, present the premises and conclusions in a structured manner.
- (b) Explain specific examples of unreliable reasoning.
- (c) Explain whether or not the conclusions follow from true premises.
- (d) State reasons to support the explanations given.

National Unit Specification: statement of standards (cont)

UNIT Critical Thinking in Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

EVIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR THIS UNIT

Details of the mandatory content for this Unit can be found in the Appendix to the Statement of Standards at the end of this Unit specification.

To demonstrate satisfactory attainment of all the Outcomes and Performance Criteria candidates must produce written and/or recorded oral evidence which samples across the mandatory content of this Unit. The evidence should be produced in response to a closed book, supervised test with a time limit of 30 minutes. It should be gathered on a single occasion.

The mandatory content for this Unit should be assessed by short and restricted response items. The questions should sample across the mandatory content. The questions should allow candidates to generate answers which demonstrate competence in all Outcomes and Performance Criteria. 60 percent of the marks available should be awarded for knowledge and understanding in line with Outcome 1. The remaining forty percent of the marks available should be awarded for critical examination in line with Outcome 2. The use of a cut-off score is appropriate for this assessment.

Unit assessment is holistic in nature. When reassessment is required individual candidates should therefore attempt a new assessment in its entirety to ensure that a different range of mandatory content is sampled.

The standard to be applied, cut-off score and the breadth of coverage are illustrated in the National Assessment Bank items available for this Unit. If a centre wishes to design its own assessments for this Unit they should be of a comparable standard.

National Unit Specification: support notes

UNIT Critical Thinking in Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

This part of the Unit Specification is offered as guidance. The support notes are not mandatory.

While the exact time allocated to this Unit is at the discretion of the centre, the notional design length is 20 hours.

GUIDANCE ON THE CONTENT AND CONTEXT FOR THIS UNIT

In this Unit, candidates develop some basic skills which will help them begin to examine arguments in a structured manner. They develop an understanding of the building blocks of arguments and some of the characteristics of reliable and unreliable arguments. Candidates then use this understanding to critically examine examples of ordinary language arguments.

Candidates must study **ALL** content. The content is studied under two headings which are:

- ◆ the building blocks of arguments
- ◆ reliable and unreliable arguments

A detailed outline of all mandatory content can be found in the Appendix to the Statement of Standards at the end of these Support Notes.

GUIDANCE ON LEARNING AND TEACHING APPROACHES FOR THIS UNIT

Throughout their study of this Unit, candidates will develop basic knowledge and skills which are relevant when examining forms of philosophical and everyday human discourse. This fact should be emphasised at the beginning of the learning and teaching process. Teachers and lecturers should therefore avoid introducing relevant terms and concepts in an abstract manner. For example:

- ◆ When investigating the distinction between statements and arguments, candidates might be asked to distinguish between straightforward examples of ordinary language statements and arguments and to discuss the differences they recognise. This will allow them to appreciate some of the ways in which statements and arguments function differently in everyday human discourse.
- ◆ Candidates might also be encouraged to find their own examples of statements and arguments — this will reinforce their understanding of the distinctions involved.
- ◆ When introducing the common fallacy of *appealing to authority*, candidates might be asked to comment on straightforward examples which teachers or lecturers have adapted from television/radio debates, newspaper columns or letters pages. By identifying that there is a problem of reasoning and discussing the nature of that problem, candidates will gain an understanding of the fallacy. They will also be more likely to recognise this fallacy when encountering it in new contexts.

National Unit Specification: support notes (cont)

UNIT Critical Thinking in Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

- ◆ Understanding can also be reinforced by encouraging candidates to find examples of the fallacy of *appealing to irrelevant authority*.

Candidates will be expected to critically examine previously unseen, straightforward examples of ordinary language arguments in both Unit and Course assessment. This ability can be developed only if candidates are continually given practice in applying the relevant concepts and skills in new and varied contexts. Teachers and lecturers should ensure that candidates develop techniques to help them examine previously unseen, straightforward ordinary language arguments in a reasoned and structured manner. One possible approach to developing such techniques appears below.

A variety of simple, topical or relevant ordinary language arguments might be composed by the teacher/lecturer. Candidates can then critically examine the arguments by asking the following questions:

- ◆ What is the conclusion of the argument?
- ◆ What are the premises?
- ◆ How can the premises and conclusion be presented in standard form?
- ◆ Does the argument use any of the forms of fallacious reasoning I have studied?
- ◆ Are any of the premises I have identified either obviously true, false or debatable in any way?
- ◆ If the premises are true/undebatable, must the conclusion be accepted as true? (sound argument)

All of the content of this Unit can also be studied in the Higher *Critical Thinking in Philosophy* Unit. If a centre makes the judgement that the Higher Unit would be more appropriate for a particular candidate, the candidate can be assessed at that level. However, it should be noted that there is additional content and differences in the skills being assessed at Higher. Additional learning and teaching will be required to ensure the successful completion of the Higher Unit in these circumstances.

For candidates who study this Unit as part of the Intermediate 2 Course, there are significant opportunities to integrate the skills they acquire into other course Units. The ability to understand and critically examine the reasoning on which specific arguments, theories and/or positions are based is relevant when studying all other Units in the Intermediate 2 Course.

Guidance on induction and a variety of classroom activities, can be found in the *Guidance on Learning and Teaching Approaches for this Course* within the Course Details.

GUIDANCE ON APPROACHES TO ASSESSMENT FOR THIS UNIT

Details of the appropriate conditions for assessment of competence in this Unit are outlined in the Evidence Requirements for the Unit in the Statement of Standards. Centres must make sure that all Unit assessment is carried out under the stated conditions.

Candidates will develop their knowledge and skills throughout their study of all mandatory content. This would suggest that appropriate instruments of assessment may best be attempted as an end-of-Unit test.

National Unit Specification: support notes (cont)

UNIT Critical Thinking in Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

The mandatory content for this Unit should be assessed by short answer and restricted response questions. The questions should sample across the mandatory content. The questions should allow candidates to generate answers which demonstrate competence in all Outcomes and Performance Criteria. sixty percent of the marks available should be awarded for understanding in line with Outcome 1. The remaining forty percent of the marks available should be awarded for Critical Examination in line with Outcome 2.

Appropriate instruments of assessment, marking schemes and cut-off scores are contained in the National Assessment Bank items for this Unit.

DISABLED CANDIDATES AND/OR THOSE WITH ADDITIONAL SUPPORT NEEDS

The additional support needs of individual candidates should be taken into account when planning learning experiences, selecting assessment instruments, or considering whether any reasonable adjustments may be required. Further advice can be found on our website www.sqa.org.uk/assessmentarrangements

National Unit Specification: Appendix to the statement of standards

UNIT Critical Thinking in Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

NB: This Appendix is within the Statement of Standards, ie the mandatory requirements of the Unit.

There are no options in this Unit. The mandatory content is detailed below and candidates must study **all** content.

In this Unit candidates must develop an understanding of the building blocks of arguments and some of the characteristics of reliable and unreliable arguments. Candidates must then use this understanding to critically examine examples of ordinary language arguments.

Candidates must study **all** of the following content:

Content

1 The building blocks of arguments

The purpose of an argument

- ◆ establishing, rather than simply stating a point

Distinction between statements and arguments

- ◆ asserting and proving
- ◆ denying and refuting

Argument structure

- ◆ premises
- ◆ conclusion
- ◆ standard form

2 Reliable and unreliable arguments

Reliable arguments

- ◆ the conclusion follows from the premises (validity)
- ◆ and the premises are true (soundness)

Unreliable arguments

- ◆ attacking the person
- ◆ false dilemma
- ◆ illegitimate appeals to authority
- ◆ argument from ignorance

National Unit Specification: Appendix to the statement of standards (cont)

UNIT Critical Thinking in Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

Glossary

It is accepted that different critical thinking and logic textbooks may use different terminology from one another or use the same terminology in different contexts.

Therefore for the purposes of clarity and consistency, the following definitions are those which will be used in SQA documents, Unit assessments and Course assessments and associated marking schemes:

Argument from ignorance: 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).

Argument: a collection of statements (the premises) put forward to support a central claim (the conclusion)

Assert: To claim that something is the case without supporting evidence. Statements can only assert a claim, they cannot prove one.

Attacking the person: this fallacy is committed if it is argued that p is false on the grounds that it is advanced by a particular person, for example because that person stands to gain from our acceptance of it as true or because that person's behaviour is not consistent with the truth of p .

Deductive argument: an argument which attempts to prove certain conclusions based on what is contained in the premises alone, eg 'All cats have tails. Felix is a cat therefore Felix has a tail.'

Deny: To simply claim that something is not the case without supporting evidence. Statements can only assert a claim, they cannot prove one.

False dilemma: this fallacy is committed if, in the course of an argument, it is presumed without argument that p and q are the only two possibilities, when in fact there are other possibilities.

Illegitimate appeals to authority: this fallacy is committed if a conclusion c is inferred from the fact that some person or group asserts c , without justifying the right of that person or group to be regarded as authoritative in this matter.

Prove: To support an assertion with evidence. Only arguments can prove a claim.

Refute: To deny an assertion with supporting evidence. Only arguments can refute a claim.

Soundness: a deductive argument which has true premises and is valid is said to be sound. An unsound argument is therefore one which has either a false premise or is invalid or both.

Standard form: a consistent way of organizing and presenting arguments which involves identifying the premises and conclusions; converting any rhetorical questions; making explicit hidden premises; identifying intermediate conclusions and listing them in a logical sequence (eg premise, premise, conclusion).

Statement: a sentence capable of being true or false (eg 'the sky is blue'). Statements are also known as propositions.

Validity: a valid argument is one which would guarantee a true conclusion if the premises were true. An invalid argument does not guarantee a true conclusion when the premises are true.



National Unit Specification: general information

UNIT Philosophy: Metaphysics (Intermediate 2)

CODE F8K5 11

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

SUMMARY

This Unit is a mandatory Unit of the Intermediate 2 Philosophy Course, but it can also be taken as a free-standing Unit.

This Unit offers progression for candidates who have studied an appropriate Intermediate 1 course or Unit(s). It is suitable as an Intermediate 2 level introduction to philosophy. The debates and positions studied in this Unit are relevant to many questions of ultimate human significance, for example: Is human life simply an accident of nature? Is there some ultimate meaning and purpose to be found in the universe? Do I have control over my actions? Are my actions simply a product of my genes and environment?

Candidates develop an understanding of some aspects of a specific metaphysical debate and positions adopted in relation to that debate. They gain an understanding of **either** aspects of the debate concerning the existence of God **or** aspects of the free will/determinism debate. Candidates then critically examine specific positions which are relevant to the chosen debate.

A specific metaphysical debate and positions are studied in this Unit but the understanding and critical thinking skills developed are relevant in a wide variety of contexts. The skills and content prepare candidates for the study of Philosophy at Higher or in courses at further education colleges. Candidates will also be prepared for the study of any other subject which requires the ability to understand and critically examine complex problems or positions. In addition, candidates will have demonstrated the skills necessary for entry into any field of employment where basic abstract reasoning skills are required.

OUTCOMES

- 1 Demonstrate an understanding of a metaphysical debate.
- 2 Critically examine positions adopted in relation to a metaphysical debate.

Administrative Information

Superclass: DE

Publication date: March 2010

Source: Scottish Qualifications Authority

Version: 01

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2010

This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part for educational purposes provided that no profit is derived from reproduction and that, if reproduced in part, the source is acknowledged.

Additional copies of this Unit Specification can be purchased from the Scottish Qualifications Authority. Please contact the Customer Contact Centre, telephone 0845 279 1000.

National Unit Specification: general information (cont)

UNIT Philosophy: Metaphysics (Intermediate 2)

RECOMMENDED ENTRY

While entry is at the discretion of the centre, candidates would normally be expected to have attained one of the following, or equivalent:

- ◆ Intermediate 1 Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Course or Unit(s)
- ◆ A social subjects Course or Unit(s) at Intermediate 1

CREDIT VALUE

0.5 credits at Intermediate 2 (3 SCQF credit points at SCQF level 5*).

**SCQF credit points are used to allocate credit to qualifications in the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF). Each qualification in the Framework is allocated a number of SCQF credit points at an SCQF level. There are 12 SCQF levels, ranging from Access 1 to Doctorates.*

CORE SKILLS

Achievement of this Unit gives automatic certification of the following:

Complete Core Skill	None
Core Skills component	Critical Thinking at SCQF level 5

National Unit Specification: general information (cont)

UNIT **Philosophy: Metaphysics (Intermediate 2)**

Acceptable performance in this Unit will be the satisfactory achievement of the standards set out in this part of the Unit Specification. All sections of the statement of standards are mandatory and cannot be altered without reference to the Scottish Qualifications Authority.

OUTCOME 1

Demonstrate an understanding of a metaphysical debate.

Performance Criteria

- (a) Describe the philosophical problem which gives rise to a specific metaphysical debate.
- (b) Describe specific positions which are adopted in relation to this debate.

OUTCOME 2

Critically examine positions adopted in relation to a metaphysical debate.

Performance Criteria

- (a) Explain the reasoning on which specific positions adopted in relation to a metaphysical debate are based.
- (b) Describe objections and replies in relation to these positions.
- (c) State an opinion about which position is most appropriate in light of the available evidence.
- (d) Give reasons to support the opinion stated.

National Unit Specification: statement of standards (cont)

UNIT Philosophy: Metaphysics (Intermediate 2)

EVIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR THIS UNIT

Details of the mandatory content for this Unit can be found in the Appendix at the end of this Unit Specification.

To demonstrate satisfactory attainment of all the Outcomes and Performance Criteria candidates must produce written and/or recorded oral evidence which samples across the mandatory content of the chosen option. The evidence should be produced in response to a closed book, supervised test with a time limit of 30 minutes. It should be gathered on a single occasion.

The mandatory content for this Unit should be assessed by restricted and extended response questions. The questions should sample across the mandatory content. The questions should allow candidates to generate answers which demonstrate competence in all Outcomes and Performance Criteria. Sixty percent of the marks available should be awarded for knowledge and understanding in line with Outcome 1. The remaining forty percent of the marks available should be awarded for critical examination in line with Outcome 2. The use of a cut-off score is appropriate for this assessment.

Unit assessment is holistic in nature. When reassessment is required individual candidates should therefore attempt a new assessment in its entirety to ensure that a different range of mandatory content is sampled.

The standard to be applied, cut-off score and the breadth of coverage are illustrated in the National Assessment Bank items available for this Unit. If a centre wishes to design its own assessments for this Unit they should be of a comparable standard.

National Unit Specification: support notes

UNIT Philosophy: Metaphysics (Intermediate 2)

This part of the Unit Specification is offered as guidance. The support notes are not mandatory.

While the exact time allocated to this Unit is at the discretion of the centre, the notional design length is 20 hours.

GUIDANCE ON THE CONTENT AND CONTEXT FOR THIS UNIT

Candidates study aspects of **one** metaphysical debate from a choice of two. The relevant metaphysical debates are:

- ◆ Debate 1: Is there a rational basis for belief in God?
- ◆ Debate 2: Do we have free will?

Candidates investigate specific positions which are adopted in relation to the chosen debate. They also study objections and replies to these positions.

A detailed outline of the mandatory content for both debates can be found in the Appendix at the end of these Support Notes. Candidates must study **all** content **in relation to their chosen debate**.

GUIDANCE ON LEARNING AND TEACHING APPROACHES FOR THIS UNIT

Candidates gain an understanding of specific positions which are adopted in relation to a particular metaphysical debate. The positions are prescribed. Care must be taken to ensure that candidates do not simply learn to describe these positions but also learn to critically examine them in a meaningful way. **For this reason it is essential that candidates are taught how to recognise and explain the reasoning on which each position is based. It is also essential that candidates can describe objections and replies to these positions.** This will allow them to appreciate some aspects of philosophical debate and enhance their ability to critically examine such debates.

Specific objections and replies to each position are not prescribed. These are a matter for the professional judgement of teachers and lecturers in light of the resources available and their knowledge of the prior experience of candidates. However, care must be taken to avoid distorting candidates' understanding of these perennial philosophical debates by selecting obscure or trivial objections or by misrepresenting the position discussed.

For candidates who study this Unit as part of the Intermediate 2 Course, there are significant opportunities to integrate knowledge and/or skills across the Course. The ability to critically assess positions and debates is relevant to all Units in the Course. Candidates will have many opportunities to adapt and refine these skills when using them in a variety of contexts.

All of the content of this Unit can also be studied in the Higher *Metaphysics* Unit. If a centre makes the judgement that the Higher Unit would be more appropriate for a particular candidate, the candidate can be assessed at that level. However, it should be noted that there is additional content and differences in the skills being assessed at Higher. Additional learning and teaching will be required to ensure the successful completion of the Higher Unit in these circumstances.

National Unit Specification: support notes (cont)

UNIT Philosophy: Metaphysics (Intermediate 2)

If candidates go on to study the Higher *Metaphysics* Unit there will be significant opportunities to build on and develop the knowledge and skills they have already acquired. However, it may be advisable to choose a different debate at Higher level. This will help to maintain student motivation and interest. It will also allow candidates to develop their knowledge and skills in a different context.

Guidance on induction and a variety of classroom activities, can be found in the *Guidance on Learning and Teaching Approaches for this Course* within the Course Details.

GUIDANCE ON APPROACHES TO ASSESSMENT FOR THIS UNIT

Details of the appropriate conditions for assessment of competence in this Unit are outlined in the Evidence Requirements for the Unit in the Statement of Standards. Centres must make sure that all Unit assessment is carried out under the stated conditions.

Candidates will develop their knowledge and skills during their study of all mandatory content. This would suggest that appropriate instruments of assessment may best be attempted as an end of Unit test.

The mandatory content for this Unit should be assessed by restricted and extended response questions. The questions should sample across the mandatory content. The questions should allow candidates to generate answers which demonstrate competence in both Outcomes and all Performance Criteria. Sixty percent of the marks available should be awarded for understanding in line with Outcome 1. The remaining forty percent of the marks available should be awarded for critical examination in line with Outcome 2.

Appropriate instruments of assessment, marking schemes and cut-off scores are contained in the National Assessment Bank items for this Unit.

DISABLED CANDIDATES AND/OR THOSE WITH ADDITIONAL SUPPORT NEEDS

The additional support needs of individual candidates should be taken into account when planning learning experiences, selecting assessment instruments, or considering whether any reasonable adjustments may be required. Further advice can be found on our website www.sqa.org.uk/assessmentarrangements

National Unit Specification: Appendix to the statement of standards

UNIT Philosophy: Metaphysics (Intermediate 2)

NB: This Appendix is within the Statement of Standards, ie the mandatory requirements of the Unit.

In this Unit candidates must develop an understanding of aspects of a specific metaphysical debate and positions adopted in relation to that debate. They must choose to study **either** the debate concerning the existence of God **or** the free will/determinism debate. Candidates must then critically examine specific positions which are relevant to the chosen debate.

As already stated, **there is a choice of option to be studied**. All candidates **must** investigate **one** of the following metaphysical debates:

EITHER

Debate 1: Is there a rational basis for belief in God?

OR

Debate 2: Do we have free will?

Candidates must study specific positions in relation to the chosen debate. They must not simply learn to describe these positions but must also be able to critically examine them. In addition, they must state an opinion about which position is most appropriate in light of available evidence. **For this reason, it is essential that candidates also investigate some of the objections and replies to these objections in relation to each position and form a reasoned opinion on each position.** Further guidance on this issue can be found in the Support Notes in this Unit specification.

The mandatory content to be covered when studying **either** Debate 1 **or** Debate 2 is outlined below:

Content

ALL candidates must study **EITHER** Debate 1 **OR** Debate 2.

Debate 1: Is there a rational basis for belief in God?

- (a) The universe requires an ultimate explanation
 - ◆ The Cosmological Argument(eg Aquinas' Cosmological Argument)
 - ◆ Arguments in favour of the cosmological Argument
 - ◆ Arguments against the cosmological Argument
- (b) Apparent order and purpose in the universe requires an explanation
 - ◆ The Teleological Argument (eg Paley's Watch argument)
 - ◆ Arguments in favour of the Teleological Argument
 - ◆ Arguments against the Teleological Argument

National Unit Specification: Appendix to the statement of standards (cont)

UNIT Philosophy: Metaphysics (Intermediate 2)

Debate 2: Do we have free will?

(a) Libertarianism

- ◆ Moral accountability presupposes that we have free will
- ◆ Arguments in favour of Libertarianism
- ◆ Arguments against Libertarianism

(b) Determinism/hard determinism

- ◆ The causal principle implies that our choices are predetermined
- ◆ Arguments in favour of Hard Determinism
- ◆ Arguments against Hard Determinism

(c) Compatibilism/soft determinism

- ◆ Free will as freedom from constraint
- ◆ Arguments in favour of Compatibilism
- ◆ Arguments against Compatibilism

National Unit Specification: Appendix to the statement of standards (cont)

UNIT Philosophy: Metaphysics (Intermediate 2)

Glossary

It is accepted that different textbooks may use different terminology from one another or use the same terminology in different contexts. Therefore, for the purposes of clarity and consistency, the following definitions are those which will be used in SQA documents, Unit and Course assessments and associated marking schemes:

For the Existence of God Topic

A posteriori: Knowable or justified from experience.

A priori: Knowable or justified independently of experience.

Contingent: A reference to something that could have been otherwise.

Cosmological argument: A type of argument that makes an inference from observations of the world (or cosmos) to a unique being (God).

Infinite regress: A series of causes or explanations in which each item in the series requires the preceding item to explain it but where there is no possibility of a first item that can begin the series.

Teleological: The idea, from the Greek word telos, that everything strives towards a purpose or goal.

For the Free will/Determinism Topic

Agent causation: A supposed form of causation argued for by Libertarians whereby agents can initiate a new causal chain without the agents themselves being causally determined.

Compatibilism: The position that even in a fully deterministic world it is possible for free will to exist.

Determinism: The position that all events, including those that make up human behaviour and thinking, are caused to occur by prior sufficient causes.

Event causation: The form of causation whereby an event occurs because it has been caused by a prior event.

Hard determinism: The position that determinism and free will are incompatible, that determinism is true, and that, therefore, there is no free will.

Incompatibilism: The position that determinism and free will are incompatible, ie that if one is true then the other is false.

Libertarianism: The position that determinism and free will are incompatible, that determinism is false, and that we do possess free will.

Soft determinism: Usually used as synonymous with ‘compatibilism’.



National Unit Specification: general information

UNIT Epistemology (Intermediate 2)

CODE F8K7 11

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

SUMMARY

This Unit is a mandatory Unit of the Intermediate 2 Philosophy course, but it can also be taken as a free-standing Unit.

This Unit offers progression for candidates who have studied an appropriate Intermediate 1 course or Unit(s). It is also suitable as an Intermediate 2 level introduction for those who have no background in the subject. The issues studied in this Unit underlie many questions of both philosophical and general human interest such as ‘Can we know what other people are thinking and feeling?’, ‘Can we know about things that we haven’t experienced?’ and ‘Can we be certain that the world will continue to work in the way it does now?’

Candidates develop the knowledge and skills necessary to understand and examine philosophical issues in the area of epistemology. They do this by investigating specific epistemological issues which arise from the question ‘What is knowledge?’ They also examine the position adopted by **either** René Descartes **or** David Hume in relation to this question. The chosen position is studied with reference to specific extracts from the writings of the relevant philosopher.

Specific philosophical questions, issues, positions and extracts are studied in this Unit but the critical thinking skills developed are relevant in a wide variety of contexts. These skills prepare candidates for the study of Philosophy at Higher or in Courses at Further Education colleges. Candidates will also be prepared for the study of any other subject which requires the critical analysis and evaluation of complex or abstract ideas. In addition, candidates will have demonstrated the skills necessary for entry into any field of employment where the ability to analyse basic issues and arguments and assess complex or abstract ideas, is required.

Administrative Information

Superclass: DE

Publication date: March 2010

Source: Scottish Qualifications Authority

Version: 01

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2010

This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part for educational purposes provided that no profit is derived from reproduction and that, if reproduced in part, the source is acknowledged.

Additional copies of this Unit Specification can be purchased from the Scottish Qualifications Authority. Please contact the Customer Contact Centre, telephone 0845 279 1000.

National Unit Specification: general information (cont)

UNIT Epistemology (Intermediate 2)

OUTCOMES

- 1 Demonstrate an understanding of philosophical issues in the area of epistemology.
- 2 Critically examine a standard philosophical position in the area of epistemology.
- 3 Critically assess a standard philosophical position in the area of epistemology.

RECOMMENDED ENTRY

While entry is at the discretion of the centre, candidates would normally be expected to have attained one of the following, or equivalent:

- ◆ Intermediate 1 Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Course or Unit(s)
- ◆ A social subjects Course or Unit(s) at Intermediate 1

CREDIT VALUE

1 credit at Intermediate 2 (6 SCQF credit points at SCQF level 5*).

**SCQF credit points are used to allocate credit to qualifications in the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF). Each qualification in the Framework is allocated a number of SCQF credit points at an SCQF level. There are 12 SCQF levels, ranging from Access 1 to Doctorates*

CORE SKILLS

Achievement of this Unit gives automatic certification of the following:

Complete Core Skill	None
Core Skills component	Critical Thinking at SCQF level 5

National Unit Specification: statement of standards

UNIT Epistemology (Intermediate 2)

Acceptable performance in this Unit will be the satisfactory achievement of the standards set out in this part of the Unit Specification. All sections of the statement of standards are mandatory and cannot be altered without reference to the Scottish Qualifications Authority.

OUTCOME 1

Demonstrate an understanding of philosophical issues in the area of epistemology.

Performance Criteria

- (a) Describe the tripartite theory of knowledge.
- (b) Describe specific philosophical problems associated with the tripartite theory.
- (c) Describe specific aspects of the key philosophical positions of scepticism, rationalism and empiricism.

OUTCOME 2

Critically examine a standard philosophical position in the area of epistemology.

Performance Criteria

- (a) Describe specific aspects of the account of knowledge given by one specific philosopher.
- (b) Explain the reasoning on which these aspects are based.
- (c) Cite specific extracts from the writings of this philosopher in support of the explanation.

OUTCOME 3

Critically assess a standard philosophical position in the area of epistemology.

Performance Criteria

- (a) Explain the strengths and weaknesses of specific aspects of the account of knowledge given by one specific philosopher.
- (b) State a position on the persuasiveness of this account of knowledge.
- (c) Give reasons to support this position.

EVIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR THIS UNIT

Details of the mandatory content for this Unit can be found in the Appendix at the end of this Unit Specification.

To demonstrate satisfactory attainment of all the Outcomes and Performance Criteria candidates must produce written and/or recorded oral evidence which samples across the mandatory content of the Unit. The evidence should be produced in response to a closed-book, supervised test with a time limit of one hour. It should be gathered on a single occasion.

The mandatory content for this Unit should be assessed by restricted response questions together with a series of structured questions based on a section of prescribed text. The questions should sample across the mandatory content. The questions should allow candidates to generate answers which demonstrate competence in all Outcomes and Performance Criteria. Sixty percent of the marks available should be awarded for knowledge and understanding in line with Outcome 1. The remaining forty percent of the marks available should be awarded for critical examination and assessment in line with Outcomes 2 and 3. The use of a cut-off score is appropriate for this assessment.

Unit assessment is holistic in nature. When re-assessment is required individual candidates should therefore attempt a new assessment in its entirety to ensure that a different range of mandatory content is sampled.

The standard to be applied, cut-off score and the breadth of coverage are illustrated in the National Assessment Bank items available for this Unit. If a centre wishes to design its own assessments for this Unit they should be of a comparable standard.

National Unit Specification: support notes

UNIT Epistemology (Intermediate 2)

This part of the Unit Specification is offered as guidance. The support notes are not mandatory.

While the exact time allocated to this Unit is at the discretion of the centre, the notional design length is 40 hours.

GUIDANCE ON THE CONTENT AND CONTEXT FOR THIS UNIT

In this Unit candidates study specific philosophical issues in the area of Epistemology. They also study aspects of the positions of either René Descartes or David Hume. The Unit is divided into two Sections and a brief overview of each Section appears below:

Section 1:

In this section Candidates must investigate the following question:

- ◆ What is knowledge?

When investigating this question, candidates study a variety of issues and concepts in the area of epistemology. The specific content to be covered in relation to this question is outlined in the Appendix at the end of these Support Notes.

Section 2:

In this Section of the Unit there is a choice of option to be studied. Candidates investigate aspects of **either** a specific rationalist **or** a specific empiricist epistemological position. The options are:

- ◆ Option A: Descartes' Rationalism
- ◆ Option B: Hume's Empiricism

Candidates must study all mandatory content in relation to their chosen option.

The positions adopted by each philosopher are based on reasoning which can only properly be understood by examining the writings of the relevant philosopher. Candidates must therefore investigate the chosen position by studying key extracts from the writings of that philosopher. **The key extracts are prescribed.**

A detailed outline of all mandatory content for this Section, including the key extracts, can be found in the Appendix at the end of these Support Notes.

GUIDANCE ON LEARNING AND TEACHING APPROACHES FOR THIS UNIT

In **Section 1** candidates gain an understanding of some time-honoured issues in the area of epistemology. These issues are abstract in nature. Therefore care must be taken to illustrate them in a way that is accessible to Intermediate 2 candidates. The illustrations used are a matter for the professional judgement of the teacher or lecturer in light of the resources available and his/her knowledge of the prior experience of candidates. They might include discussing experiences or scenarios which will be familiar to candidates or investigating contemporary fictional treatments of the issues.

National Unit Specification: support notes (cont)

UNIT Epistemology (Intermediate 2)

In **Section 2**, candidates study **one** option from **a choice of two**. The option chosen is a matter for the professional judgement of the teacher or lecturer in light of the resources available and his/her knowledge of the prior experience of candidates. Candidates must apply their understanding of the issues in Section 1 when critically examining and assessing this position.

Candidates must also critically examine and assess the account of knowledge on which the position chosen in Section 2 is based. For this reason, it is essential that candidates are very familiar with all prescribed extracts.

It is also recommended that prescribed extracts are used to introduce key stages in the relevant philosopher's reasoning. Summaries or paraphrases of the writer's ideas are useful when filling gaps between key stages in the argument or to help overcome problems with understanding or language.

For candidates who study this Unit as part of the Intermediate 2 Course, there are significant opportunities to integrate knowledge and/or skills in the remaining three Units. Understanding of issues and positions in the area of epistemology are also relevant when studying the *Moral Philosophy* and *Metaphysics* Units. In addition, the skills acquired during the study of the *Critical Thinking in Philosophy* Unit will help candidates to examine and assess the issues, positions and reasoning which they study in this Unit. Aspects of the skills of critical analysis and evaluation are relevant to all four Units in the Course. Candidates will have many opportunities to adapt and refine them in a variety of contexts while studying the Course.

All of the content of this Unit can also be studied in the Higher *Epistemology* Unit. If a centre makes the judgement that the Higher Unit would be more appropriate for a particular candidate, the candidate can be assessed at that level. However, it should be noted that there is additional content and differences in the skills being assessed at Higher. Additional learning and teaching will be required to ensure the successful completion of the Higher Unit in these circumstances.

If candidates go on to study the Higher *Epistemology* Unit there will be significant opportunities to build on and develop the knowledge and skills they have already acquired. However, it may be advisable to choose a different Option in Section 2 at Higher level. This will help to maintain student motivation and interest. It will also allow candidates to develop their knowledge and skills in a different context.

Guidance on induction and a variety of classroom activities, can be found in the *Guidance on Learning and Teaching Approaches for this Course* within the Course Details.

National Unit Specification: support notes (cont)

UNIT Epistemology (Intermediate 2)

GUIDANCE ON APPROACHES TO ASSESSMENT FOR THIS UNIT

Details of the appropriate conditions for assessment of competence in this Unit are outlined in the Evidence Requirements for the Unit in the Statement of Standards. Centres must make sure that all Unit assessment is carried out under the stated conditions.

Candidates will develop their knowledge and skills throughout their study of all mandatory content. This would suggest that appropriate instruments of assessment may best be attempted as an end of Unit test.

The mandatory content for this Unit should be assessed by restricted response questions and a series of structured questions based on a section of a prescribed text. The questions should sample across the mandatory content and should allow candidates to generate answers which demonstrate competence in all Outcomes and Performance Criteria. Sixty percent of the marks available should be awarded for understanding in line with Outcome 1. The remaining forty percent of the marks available should be awarded for critical examination and assessment in line with Outcomes 2 and 3.

Appropriate instruments of assessment, marking schemes and cut-off scores are contained in the National Assessment Bank items for this Unit.

DISABLED CANDIDATES AND/OR THOSE WITH ADDITIONAL SUPPORT NEEDS

The additional support needs of individual candidates should be taken into account when planning learning experiences, selecting assessment instruments, or considering whether any reasonable adjustments may be required. Further advice can be found on our website www.sqa.org.uk/assessmentarrangements

National Unit Specification: Appendix to the statement of standards

UNIT Epistemology (Intermediate 2)

NB: This Appendix is within the Statement of Standards, ie the mandatory requirements of the Unit.

In this Unit candidates must develop the knowledge and skills necessary to understand and examine specific philosophical issues in the area of epistemology. They must investigate specific epistemological issues which arise from the question ‘What is knowledge?’ They must also examine aspects of the position adopted by **either** René Descartes **or** David Hume in relation to this question. The chosen position must be studied with reference to key extracts from the writings of the relevant philosopher.

The issues to be studied, relevant positions and key extracts are detailed under the content for Sections 1 and 2 of this Appendix. Candidates must study all content in **Section 1** and the aspects of the position of **either** René Descartes **or** David Hume in **Section 2**.

Section 1:

Candidates must study all content in this Section. Candidates are introduced to specific philosophical issues in the area of epistemology. They gain an understanding of these issues by studying the tripartite theory of knowledge and specific problems associated with this theory, including the challenge of scepticism.

Candidates also develop a basic understanding of the positions of rationalism and empiricism. Both positions suggest that knowledge claims can be justified but claim that justification is achieved through different sources.

Throughout their study of the mandatory content of Section 1 candidates gain an understanding of philosophical issues in the area of epistemology. **Candidates should be encouraged to use this understanding to inform their critical examination and assessment of the chosen position in Section 2.** However, an independent examination and assessment of the issues and positions in Section 1 is not required in Unit or Course Assessment. The mandatory content for Section 1 appears below:

What is knowledge?

The Tripartite Theory of Knowledge

Knowledge as justified true belief

Attempts to justify knowledge claims

- ◆ Rationalism
- ◆ Empiricism

Reason is a reliable source of justification
Sense experience is our primary source of justification

Problems with the Tripartite Theory

Infinite regress
the unreliability of the sense experience
the limitations of reason

National Unit Specification: Appendix to the statement of standards (cont)

UNIT Epistemology (Intermediate 2)

Section 2:

There is a choice of option in Section 2. Candidates must investigate **one** of the following options:

EITHER

The study of aspects of a rationalist epistemological position through an examination of key extracts from the writings of René Descartes.

OR

The study of aspects of an empiricist epistemological position through an examination of key extracts from the writings of David Hume.

By examining key extracts from the writings of the chosen philosopher, candidates will be able to identify some of the reasoning which gives rise to the standard positions of either rationalism or empiricism. Candidates must not simply learn to describe the ideas of the chosen philosopher. They must also develop the ability to identify some of the key stages, strengths and weaknesses in the chosen philosopher's position. For this reason, it is essential that candidates **explain, and** where appropriate **criticise, the stages of reasoning** which are present in each of the extracts prescribed in this Section.

The mandatory content to be covered in Section 2 is outlined below. Candidates must study all mandatory content in relation to either Option A or Option B in this Section:

Option A: Descartes' Rationalism

Searching for a reliable foundation for knowledge:

Mistrust of the Senses	Meditation 1
The Dream Argument	Meditation 1
The Evil Genius Argument	Meditation 1

Reason as the foundation of knowledge:

The Cogito	Meditation 2
God as guarantor of clear and distinct perceptions	Meditation 3

National Unit Specification: Appendix to the statement of standards (cont)

UNIT Epistemology (Intermediate 2)

Option B: Hume's Empiricism

The Origin of Ideas:

Perceptions: Impressions and Ideas	Section II
Simple and Complex Ideas	Section II
The Missing Shade of Blue	Section II

What we can know:

Implicit rejection of Innate Ideas	Section II
Relations of Ideas and Matters of Fact (Hume's Fork)	Section IV.I

Prescribed Texts

The following versions of the philosophical texts are prescribed and extracts from these versions will appear in both Unit and Course assessment:

Meditations on First Philosophy: Renè Descartes
Translated by Donald Cress, Hackett 1993

An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding: David Hume
Hackett 1993

Glossary

It is accepted that different textbooks may use different terminology from one another or use the same terminology in different contexts. Therefore, for the purposes of clarity and consistency, the following definitions are those which will be used in SQA documents, Unit and Course assessments and associated marking schemes:

For the General Epistemological Concepts Section

A posteriori: Knowable or justified from experience.

A priori: Knowable or justified independently of experience.

Contingent: A reference to something that could have been otherwise.

Empirical knowledge: Knowledge gained through the senses experience.

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.

Epistemology: The study of knowledge, its nature and how it is acquired.

Foundationalism: A position in epistemology which claims that there are some self-justifying beliefs that ultimately provide the justification for all other true beliefs.

National Unit Specification: Appendix to the statement of standards (cont)

UNIT Epistemology (Intermediate 2)

Innate idea: An idea that is inborn and not the product of experience.

Necessary: A reference to something that could not have been otherwise.

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.

Scepticism: The view that knowledge is impossible to attain because it is not possible for any knowledge claim to be properly justified.

Tabula rasa/blank slate: A reference to Locke's claim that there are no innate ideas and his metaphor of the mind as a blank sheet of paper.

The infinite regress of justification: The problem that claims to knowledge can never be justified as any attempt at supplying a justification merely makes another claim that in turn also needs to be justified.

Tripartite Theory of Knowledge: The theory that knowledge consists of justified true beliefs and that these criteria are individually necessary and jointly sufficient for knowledge.

For the Descartes Option

Cartesian:

The adjective from 'Descartes'. Used to describe philosophical and other ideas related to Descartes.

Cartesian circle: The name given to a particular objection to Descartes' argument. Descartes needs the notion of clear and distinct perception to move beyond the Cogito but needs God to guarantee the reliability of clear and distinct perception.

Cartesian Doubt: The sceptical method used by Descartes in which any belief that is not certain is treated as false.

Causal adequacy principle: The principle that the cause of an object must contain at least as much reality as the object itself.

Clear and distinct perception: In the Principles Descartes says that a 'clear' perception is one that is present and manifest to the attentive mind and that a 'distinct' perception is one that is so separated from all other perceptions that it contains absolutely nothing except what is clear.

Cogito: Latin for 'I think'. Used as a way of referring to Descartes' argument that he cannot doubt his own existence

Evil Genius: A hypothetical entity used by Descartes to maintain the possibility that we are constantly being deceived.

Method of doubt: Descartes' attempt to arrive at certainty by systematically doubting everything until he discovered something that could not be doubted.

Trademark Argument: Descartes' argument that God must exist because we have an idea of God and that idea must have been implanted there by God as a kind of trademark.

National Unit Specification: Appendix to the statement of standards (cont)

UNIT Epistemology (Intermediate 2)

For the Hume Option

Complex Idea: An idea that is built up from other ideas.

Hume's Fork: A reference to Hume's distinction between 'Relation of Ideas' and 'Matters of Fact'.

Impression: A term invented by Hume to refer to any direct perception of the mind. A perception that involves actually hearing, feeling or the experience of an emotion, etc., rather than just thinking about these things.

Inward sentiment: An impression that is caused by our feelings or emotions.

Matters of fact: Statements about the world that are based on experience.

Outward sentiment: An impression that results from the operation of the senses.

Perception of the mind: Hume's term for any content of the mind of which we are conscious whether an impression or an idea.

Relations of ideas: Propositions that can be discovered purely by thinking, with no need to attend to anything that actually exists anywhere in the universe. .

Simple Idea: A copy of an impression. A perception of the mind that is weaker and less vivid than an impression.



National Unit Specification: general information

UNIT Moral Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

CODE F8K6 11

COURSE Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

SUMMARY

This Unit is a mandatory Unit of the Intermediate 2 Philosophy course, but it can also be taken as a free-standing Unit.

This Unit offers progression for candidates who have studied an appropriate Intermediate 1 course or Unit(s). It is suitable as an Intermediate 2 level introduction for those who have no background in the subject. Candidates develop the knowledge and skills necessary to gain a basic understanding of normative moral theories. The theories studied in this Unit are of both philosophical and general human interest. They are relevant to such questions as ‘What do we mean when we say that an action is right or wrong?’, ‘How can we decide the way we should act?’ and ‘Why is it difficult to agree a common approach to moral issues?’

Specific aspects of normative theories and issues are studied in this Unit but the critical thinking skills developed are relevant in a wide variety of contexts. These skills prepare candidates for the study of Philosophy at Higher or in Courses at Further Education colleges. Candidates will also be prepared for the study of any other subject which requires the critical examination of complex or abstract issues. In addition, candidates will have demonstrated the skills necessary for entry into any field of employment where the ability to examine issues and arguments is required. They will also have demonstrated a basic awareness of the complexity involved in ethical judgements which is relevant to all areas of human activity.

OUTCOMES

- 1 Demonstrate an understanding of normative moral theories.
- 2 Critically examine normative moral theories.
- 3 Critically assess normative moral theories.

Administrative Information

Superclass: DE

Publication date: March 2010

Source: Scottish Qualifications Authority

Version: 01

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2010

This publication may be reproduced in whole or in part for educational purposes provided that no profit is derived from reproduction and that, if reproduced in part, the source is acknowledged.

Additional copies of this Unit Specification can be purchased from the Scottish Qualifications Authority. Please contact the Customer Contact Centre, telephone 0845 279 1000.

National Unit Specification: general information (cont)

UNIT Moral Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

RECOMMENDED ENTRY

While entry is at the discretion of the centre, candidates would normally be expected to have attained one of the following, or equivalent:

- ◆ Intermediate 1 Religious, Moral and Philosophical Studies Course or Unit(s)
- ◆ A social subjects Course or Unit(s) at Intermediate 1

CREDIT VALUE

1 credit at Intermediate 2 (6 SCQF credit points at SCQF level 5*).

**SCQF credit points are used to allocate credit to qualifications in the Scottish Credit and Qualifications Framework (SCQF). Each qualification in the Framework is allocated a number of SCQF credit points at an SCQF level. There are 12 SCQF levels, ranging from Access 1 to Doctorates.*

CORE SKILLS

Achievement of this Unit gives automatic certification of the following:

Complete Core Skill	None
Core Skills component	Critical Thinking at SCQF level 5

National Unit Specification: statement of standards

UNIT Moral Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

Acceptable performance in this Unit will be the satisfactory achievement of the standards set out in this part of the Unit Specification. All sections of the statement of standards are mandatory and cannot be altered without reference to the Scottish Qualifications Authority.

OUTCOME 1

Demonstrate an understanding of normative moral theories.

Performance Criteria

- (a) Describe the difference between consequentialist and deontological approaches to moral judgements.
- (b) Describe specific normative moral theories.
- (c) Describe the approaches taken when these theories are applied to moral issues.

OUTCOME 2

Critically examine normative moral theories.

Performance Criteria

- (a) Compare and contrast normative moral theories.
- (b) Describe the similarities and differences in approach when addressing moral issues.
- (c) Refer to moral issues as part of this examination.

OUTCOME 3

Critically assess normative moral theories.

Performance Criteria

- (a) Explain the strengths and weaknesses of specific normative moral theories.
- (b) Refer to moral issues as part of this explanation.
- (c) State a position on which theory offers the most appropriate approach to making moral judgements.
- (d) Give reasons to support this position.

National Unit Specification: statement of standards

UNIT Moral Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

EVIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR THIS UNIT

Details of the mandatory content for this Unit can be found in the Appendix at the end of this Unit Specification.

To demonstrate satisfactory attainment of all the Outcomes and Performance Criteria candidates must produce written and/or recorded oral evidence which samples across the mandatory content of the Unit.

The evidence should be produced in response to a closed book, supervised test with a time limit of one hour. It should be gathered on a single occasion.

The mandatory content for this Unit should be assessed by restricted and extended response questions. The questions should sample across the mandatory content and allow candidates to generate answers which demonstrate competence in all Outcomes and Performance Criteria. Sixty percent of the marks available should be awarded for knowledge and understanding in line with Outcome 1. The remaining forty percent of the marks available should be awarded for critical examination and assessment in line with Outcomes 2 and 3. The use of a cut-off score is appropriate for this assessment.

Unit assessment is holistic in nature. When reassessment is required individual candidates should therefore attempt a new assessment in its entirety to ensure that a different range of mandatory content is sampled.

The standard to be applied, cut-off score and the breadth of coverage are illustrated in the National Assessment Bank items available for this Unit. If a centre wishes to design its own assessments for this Unit they should be of a comparable standard.

National Unit Specification: support notes

UNIT Moral Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

This part of the Unit Specification is offered as guidance. The support notes are not mandatory.

While the exact time allocated to this Unit is at the discretion of the centre, the notional design length is 40 hours.

GUIDANCE ON THE CONTENT AND CONTEXT FOR THIS UNIT

Candidates must study **all** content. A brief overview of the content appears below.

In this Unit, candidates develop a basic understanding of the differences between consequentialist and deontological approaches to moral judgements. They then examine specific aspects of two normative moral theories. They study the content by investigating the following:

- ◆ Introduction: How can we decide if an action is right or wrong?
- ◆ 1: Utilitarianism as an example of a consequentialist theory
- ◆ 2: Kant's moral theory as an example of a deontological theory

Questions in the Unit and Course assessment will sample across the mandatory content. It is therefore of vital importance that candidates are familiar with **all** content. A detailed outline of the mandatory content can be found in the Appendix at the end of these Support Notes.

GUIDANCE ON LEARNING AND TEACHING APPROACHES FOR THIS UNIT

Candidates gain an understanding of the general distinction between consequentialist and deontological approaches to moral judgements. They then examine specific aspects of two normative moral theories which illustrate these approaches. The concepts involved are abstract in nature, therefore care must be taken to illustrate them in a way that is accessible to Intermediate 2 candidates. Further, it is a requirement of both Unit and Course assessment that candidates refer to moral issues when describing, examining and assessing the relevant aspects of these theories. Teachers and lecturers should therefore illustrate the theories, related concepts and criticisms with reference to moral issues and scenarios. **However, it is important to avoid an in-depth study of specific moral issues. Illustrations should focus only on aspects of the moral issues or scenarios that will help candidates to understand the specific theories, concepts and criticisms they study.**

The moral issues and scenarios chosen for illustration are a matter for the professional judgement of the teacher and lecturer in light of the resources available and his/her knowledge of the prior experience of candidates. They should be directly relevant to the aspects of the theories being examined and be chosen to stimulate discussion and promote understanding. For example:

- ◆ The problem of justice, in relation to Utilitarianism, might be illustrated with reference to crime and punishment. Candidates could examine the implications of the Greatest Happiness Principle in relation to whether it is better to 'punish' an innocent person in order to deter others, rather than allow a crime to appear to go unpunished.
- ◆ The problem of ignoring consequences, in relation to Kant, could be illustrated with reference to a scenario in which a vulnerable, innocent person is being sought by a cruel authority. In order to save the innocent person it is necessary to lie, but lying would go against Kant's principle of Universalisability. Candidates could also discuss the problem of competing duties in relation to such a case.

National Unit Specification: support notes (cont)

UNIT Moral Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

It is of vital importance that candidates do not simply learn to describe the aspects of normative theories and the criticisms they study, but also learn to discuss and apply them. By applying the relevant Utilitarian and Kantian principles to a wide variety of issues and scenarios, candidates will enhance their understanding and their ability to critically examine and assess them in a meaningful way.

For candidates who study this Unit as part of the Intermediate 2 Course, there are significant opportunities to integrate knowledge and/or skills in the remaining three Units. The skills which are developed in the *Critical Thinking in Philosophy* Unit are relevant and should be applied when examining the normative theories issues in this Unit. The ability to critically examine and/or assess concepts and theories is relevant to all Units in the Course. Candidates will have many opportunities to adapt and refine these skills when using them in a variety of contexts.

All of the content in this Unit can also be studied in the Higher *Moral Philosophy* Unit. If a centre makes the judgement that the Higher Unit would be more appropriate for a particular candidate, the candidate can be assessed at that level. However, it should be noted that there is additional content and differences in the skills being assessed at Higher. Additional learning and teaching will be required to ensure the successful completion of the Higher Unit in these circumstances.

If candidates go on to study the Higher *Moral Philosophy* Unit there will be significant opportunities to build on and develop the knowledge and skills they have already acquired.

Guidance on induction and a variety of classroom activities can be found in the *Guidance on Learning and Teaching Approaches for this Course* in the Course details.

GUIDANCE ON APPROACHES TO ASSESSMENT FOR THIS UNIT

Details of the appropriate conditions for assessment of competence in this Unit are outlined in the Evidence Requirements for the Unit in the Statement of Standards. Centres must make sure that all Unit assessment is carried out under the stated conditions.

Candidates will develop their knowledge and skills throughout their study of all mandatory content. This would suggest that appropriate instruments of assessment may best be attempted as an end of Unit test.

The mandatory content for this Unit should be assessed by restricted and extended response questions. The questions should sample across the mandatory content of the Unit. The questions should allow candidates to generate answers which demonstrate competence in all Outcomes and Performance Criteria. Sixty percent of the marks available should be awarded for knowledge and understanding in line with Outcome 1. The remaining forty percent of the marks available should be awarded for critical examination and assessment in line with Outcomes 2 and 3.

Appropriate instruments of assessment, marking schemes and cut-off scores are contained in the National Assessment Bank items for this Unit.

National Unit Specification: support notes (cont)

UNIT Moral Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

DISABLED CANDIDATES AND/OR THOSE WITH ADDITIONAL SUPPORT NEEDS

The additional support needs of individual candidates should be taken into account when planning learning experiences, selecting assessment instruments, or considering whether any reasonable adjustments may be required. Further advice can be found on our website www.sqa.org.uk/assessmentarrangements

National Unit Specification: Appendix to the statement of standards

UNIT Moral Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

NB: This Appendix is within the Statement of Standards, ie the mandatory requirements of the Unit.

In this Unit candidates develop a basic understanding of the difference between consequentialist and deontological approaches to moral judgements. In addition they examine two specific normative moral theories. Important elements of the skills of analysis and evaluation are developed in relation to these theories. The specific normative theories and the aspects to be studied are detailed in the mandatory content below. **Candidates must study BOTH theories; there are no options in this Unit.**

Candidates are introduced to the distinction between consequentialist and deontological approaches to moral judgements. They can study two specific normative moral theories which illustrate one possible consequentialist approach and one possible deontological approach to moral judgements. The Utilitarian ideas of Bentham and Mill are studied to illustrate a consequentialist approach. The ideas of Kant are studied to illustrate a deontological approach.

Candidates at Intermediate 2 level cannot be expected to grasp the relatively complex ideas of Bentham, Mill and Kant through abstract study alone. For this reason, teachers and lecturers should illustrate the **relevant aspects of the theories**, and their **implications, strengths and weaknesses**, with reference to **relevant moral issues**. Specific moral issues are not prescribed. This is a matter for the professional judgement of teachers and lecturers based on the range of candidates studying the Unit and the resources available. However, care should be taken to ensure that the **moral issues selected are relevant to the mandatory content and Evidence Requirements of this Unit**. Candidates must refer to moral issues in response to questions in Unit and Course assessment.

The mandatory content which must be covered is outlined below:

Introduction:

How can we decide if an action is right or wrong?

Consequentialist Approach	the consequences of an action determine if it is right or wrong
Deontological Approach	the motive for an action determines if it is right or wrong

1 Utilitarianism as an example of a consequentialist theory

The Greatest Happiness principle	
Calculating potential happiness	Bentham's hedonic calculus Mill's higher and lower pleasures
Act Utilitarianism	Assessing each situation individually on a case by case basis
Rule Utilitarianism	Adopting rules which tend to promote the greatest happiness when universally adhered to

National Unit Specification: Appendix to the statement of standards (cont)

UNIT Moral Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

Difficulties/weakness	The problems with consequences: short and long-term? The problem with ‘happiness’: the happiness of sadists? The problem of justice: Tyranny of the Majority
-----------------------	--

2 Kant’s moral theory as an example of a deontological theory

The Good Will Duty v Inclination Maxims The Categorical Imperative	1 st formulation: Universalisability 2 nd formulation: Human beings as ends in themselves
Difficulties and weaknesses	The problem of ignoring consequences The problem of competing duties The problem of potentially misguided perceptions of duty

Glossary

It is accepted that different textbooks may use different terminology from one another or use the same terminology in different contexts. Therefore, for the purposes of clarity and consistency, the following definitions are those which will be used in SQA documents, Unit and Course assessments and associated marking schemes:

Act Utilitarianism: A type of Utilitarianism that holds that the moral worth of each action depends upon whether it individually on that occasion produced the greatest happiness.

Aggregate: A sum total of something amassed out of parts.

Autonomy: Being able to choose for oneself.

Categorical Imperative: An unconditional principle that is binding on everyone. Often contrasted with hypothetical imperatives which are only binding if you want to achieve some particular goal or end.

Competent Judges: A term used by Mill to describe people best placed to judge between higher and lower pleasures. Competent judges are those who have experienced both sorts of pleasure.

Consequentialism: The view common to any first-order ethical theory that holds that the consequences of an action are the primary factor in calculating its moral worth.

Contradiction: Asserting that something both is and is not the case at the same time. Eg, Barack Obama cannot be and not be the President at the same time. He either is, or he is not the President; he cannot be both.

National Unit Specification: Appendix to the statement of standards (cont)

UNIT Moral Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

Deontology/Deontological: The ethical theory that the moral worth of an action is intrinsic to the act itself rather than its consequences. Kant's deontological approach argued that moral obligation lay in doing one's duty.

Duty: An action that a person is morally or legally obliged to perform.

Duty Ethics: Another word for deontological theories which focus on duty as the source of moral worth.

Equity/Equity Principle: The first order-ethical theory that everyone's interests are of equal importance or at least are worthy of equal consideration.

Felicitic Calculus: Another name for the Hedonic Calculus.

Greatest Happiness Principle: The morally right action is that action which maximises happiness.

Hedonic Calculus: A method proposed by Jeremy Bentham of calculating how much utility an action produces.

Hedonism/Hedonic Principle: The first-order ethical theory that whether an action is morally right or wrong depends on whether it promotes the maximum pleasure.

Higher Pleasures: A term used by Mill to describe intellectual pleasures such as literature, art or music, as opposed to the 'lower' physical pleasures.

Hypothetical Imperative: A conditional principle that is only binding if you want to achieve some particular goal or end. Contrasted by Kant with categorical imperatives which are unconditionally binding.

Inclination: A tendency, disposition or desire to behave in a particular way or to choose one course of action over another. Kant contrasts inclination with duty as a motive for action.

Intentions: What an agent wishes to achieve by an action.

Intrinsic: Relating to the inherent nature of a thing, eg. skydiving is an intrinsically dangerous activity.

Justice: Concerned with fairness and equality, particularly in the distribution of goods or punishments.

Kantianism: The moral views (and other views) of the Prussian philosopher Immanuel Kant.

Lower Pleasures: A term used by Mill to describe non-intellectual pleasures such as food, drink and sex.

Maxims: Underlying principles of action or rules of conduct such as 'Don't steal'.

Moral Dilemmas: An ethical problem which involves choosing between competing courses of action which may appear to be both morally praiseworthy or both morally blameworthy.

National Unit Specification: Appendix to the statement of standards (cont)

UNIT Moral Philosophy (Intermediate 2)

Moral Law: The law of duty as regards what is right and wrong. Kant claims we can identify the moral law by using reason while other philosophers have argued that we require God's guidance to help us identify the Moral Law.

Moral Philosophy: The branch of philosophy that studies the concepts of right and wrong. It can be subdivided in Normative Ethics and Meta-ethics.

Motive: The reason for doing something.

Normative Ethics: The study of moral issues and the first order theories that attempt to resolve moral dilemmas. Concerned with answering the question of what it is that makes an action right or wrong.

Prudent: Careful or sensible. Often contrasted in philosophical contexts with 'moral' or 'altruistic'. So paying our taxes would not count as moral, no matter if the poor benefit, because my reason is self-interested or prudential.

Qualitative: Concerned with evaluating the non-measurable features of an object. A qualitative measure of a cake might be how tasty it is as opposed to a quantitative measure such as how heavy it is.

Quantitative: Concerned with quantities or amounts of things. A quantitative measure of a cake might be how heavy it is as opposed to a qualitative measure such as how tasty it is.

Quantify: To measure.

Rule Utilitarianism: A type of Utilitarianism that holds that the moral worth of each action depends upon whether it accords with rules which in turn are justified by their tendency to promote the greatest happiness.